



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Gibbs, Graham R.

CAQDAS teaching in the UK

### Original Citation

Gibbs, Graham R. (2014) CAQDAS teaching in the UK. In: NCRM Research Methods Festival, July 8-10, 2014, Oxford, UK.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/22746/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).


<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

# CAQDAS teaching in the UK

Graham R Gibbs

University of Huddersfield

# Growth in research use of CAQDAS



The number of refereed papers published using qualitative methods that used CAQDAS, 1983-2011. (Original to the author.)

□ So what is the situation in teaching?

# Surveys of QDA teachers

- Using Bristol Online Survey, April 15<sup>th</sup> to May 12<sup>th</sup> 2013,
  - N=115
  - Of which 90% British, 4% other EU.
  - 2 from USA
  - Data from this study unless stated.
  
- Using BOS, January 2011
  - N = 94
  - UK – 39%, USA – 37%, other Europe – 12%

# Disc ip line s re p re se nte d


Disc ip line	2013 %	2011 %
Busine ss	11	} 9
Ma n a g e m e n t	9	
He a l t h	16	9
Ed uc a t i o n	15	26
Psyc ho lo g y	13	13
So c i o lo g y	17	14
Antho p o lo g y	0	6

BUTN.B. fo r 2013, 19 so c i o lo g i s t s a c r o s s a p p r o x. 160 i n s t i t u t i o n s m u s t m e a n a b o u t 6% r e s p o n s e r a t e ( a s s u m i n g 2 q u a l i t a t i v e s o c i o l o g y t e a c h e r s p e r i n s t i t u t i o n ).

# Methods taught

- Over 42 different methods mentioned. Most mentioned several
- Over 2/3 mentioned: Interviews and Case Studies
- Over half mentioned: **Mixed Methods**/ Participant Observation/ Grounded Theory/ Ethnography
- Substantial minority mentioned:
  - Narrative/ Action Research/ Thematic Analysis/ Discourse Analysis/ Document use/ Comparative Analysis/ Life History/ Biographical/ Participatory/ Phenomenology/ Feminist/ Video/ Conversation Analysis
- **Qual Res very diverse. No dominant method.**

# Approaches by discipline



★ 2011 Survey. Use d by > 75% in disc ip line

# Approaches by discipline

- Case study methods most popular in business, management and criminology.
- Ethnography most commonly taught in sociology, health related areas and criminology.
- Feminist methods were rarely mentioned except in sociology.
- Grounded theory most commonly taught in health related
- PO rare in business studies but commonly taught in sociology.
- Phenomenology commonly taught in health related areas but rare in other disciplines.
- Picture of diversity. No approaches were taught by all respondents
- Very few that taught by all respondents from the same discipline.



# Teaching to undergraduates

	Qualitative Research % peryr.	CAQDAS %	2011 QR% peryr.	2011 CAQDAS %
Year 1	22	3	20	1
Year 2 (and Yr. 3 in Scotland)	72	13	36	6
Final Year	48	12	36	} 14
Undergrad dissemination	42		29	
Other	13			
Not taught to undergrads		60		

N.B. some non-responses in CAQDAS.

2011 Survey: 6% of departments used CAQDAS@ undergrad level.

# CAQDAS/Text analysis s/w used

	Program	n (2013)	n (2011)
Undergraduate use	<b>NVivo</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>
	Atlas.ti	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
	Hypertext Research	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
	MAXQDA		<b>1</b>
Postgraduate use	NVivo	46	37
	Atlas.ti	9	16
	MAXQDA	2	4
	WordSmith	1	
	QDA Miner/WordStat		3
	Hypertext Research	1	2
	Others/w	4	6
Site licence	<b>NVivo</b>	<b>63</b>	
	Atlas.ti	7	
	MAXQDA	2	
	WordSmith	1	

Only **11%** in 2013 said they were thinking of expanding undergraduate provision of CAQDAS

# Reasons s/w not used

Percentage of the 67 (81 for 2011) respondents not teaching at undergraduate level

Big Reasons	2013 %	2011 %
No <b>time</b> to use software	49	21
Would take <b>too long</b> to teach	52	30
No teaching expertise in using software	40	16
No access to software	34	17
Data sets used are too small to warrant software use	34	7

# Reasons s/w not used cont.

Percentage of the 67 (81 for 2011) respondents not teaching at undergraduate level

BUTN.B.	2013 %	2011 %
No local support for software use	25	15
Software does not support methodologies / theoretical approach used	10	4
Software not relevant or not needed for the methodologies / theoretical approach used	19	
I was not aware such software existed	10	5

- ?? Biased sample
- One respondent said “Teaching labs not adequately set up to support teaching”

# Main Barriers to CAQDAS/text analysis in institution

Percentage of all respondents

Reason	%
Lack of space in the timetable:	50
Too much additional learning for undergraduates:	50
Lack of qualified teachers:	42
Lack of experienced tutors to support students:	40
Lack of sufficient PC labs with the software:	38
Also N.B.	%
Lack of good learning resources:	18
Insufficient good data sets available:	9

# Main Barriers to CAQDAS/text analysis in general

□ **Time** (mentioned by 21)

Hardly any time to spend on qual in syllabus as it is, so core teaching focuses on qual fundamentals.

time constraints do not allow attention to statistical analyses


Too little time to cover qualitative methods in general - there is a 5 week lab and that's it.

# Main Barriers to CAQDAS/text analysis in general

## □ **Teachers lack expertise** (mentioned by 15)



**Lack of staff  
expertise and  
confidence.**




**Limited number of staff have  
used mixed methods in large  
projects so limited  
experience of other than  
content analysis techniques  
using basic frequency  
counts.**




**A lack of  
experienced  
tutors to  
support the  
teaching**

# Main Barriers to CAQDAS/text analysis in general

## ▣ **Philosophical divide** (mentioned by 8)



**I see these as significantly different methods. I want my undergrads to understand the ontological differences, before we support them in considering mixed methods.**



**Some people object to quantizing qualitative data**



# Main Barriers to CAQDAS/text analysis in general

## □ **Quants dominate** (mentioned by 4)

They already get three years of quantitative! The qualitative is usually crammed into one or two lectures, so they need to be dedicated purely to qualitative.

## □ **Student Fear of Numbers** (mentioned by 6)

Generally speaking students don't like language of numbers :-)

# Staff use of text mining etc.

- **69%** had used quantitative approaches to assist with the qualitative analysis of data or with reporting its results in their own work

Basic frequency counts of code use:	<i>44</i>
Word frequency counts:	<i>35</i>
Keyword in context:	<i>23</i>
Co-occurrence analysis:	<i>7</i>
Producing scales or typologies from qualitative data:	<i>14</i>
Mixed methods approaches:	<b><i>32</i></b>

# Materials/media used in teaching QDA

Material/media	%
PowerPoint slides:	100
Recommended texts:	98
Reading lists:	86
Prepared lecture notes:	85
Required reading:	73
Film/video/animation:	72
Case studies/role plays:	64
Tutorial/problem sheets:	63
Worked examples sheets:	48
In-class Quizzes/Tests:	45
Artifacts (as products, models, drawings/designs):	23
Computer-aided learning software / learning technology:	21
Task specific software:	12
Other ICT	11



# Where third party resources have come from

Resource	%
<b>YouTube:</b>	<b>50</b>
Your Libraries' digital resources (such as e-Books):	44
Other courses on your Institution's VLE (such as Blackboard):	32
Professional body website:	24
<b>HEA website:</b>	<b>19</b>
Discipline specific website (such as Online QDA.hud.ac.uk):	16
Corporate website:	14
Another Institution's website / VLE:	11
National educational repository (such as JORUM):	8
Open access repository (such as OpenLearn):	8
iTunesU:	8
Box of Broadcasts:	8
Flickr:	4
Other (incl. own developed resources):	3
BUFVC:	1
MOOC / open courseware (such as edShare):	0

Lots of use of available digital resources

# Inte rvie w s

- De p th inte rvie w s
- 45 mins to 1.5 ho urs
- se le c te d nu mb e r of su rve y re s po n de n ts + a nu mb e r of ex pe rts in the so ftwa re a n d da ta mi n i n g te ch n i q u e s a n d bo o k a u th o r s

# Issues

- Based on teaching experience of interviewees
- Identified teaching dilemmas and some best practice in using CAQDAS in teaching u/g QDA.
- Here 9 issues highlighted:-

# 1. Teach QDA then CAQDAS?

- Teach QDA on paper then teach CAQDAS
- Or
- Teach QDA as part of teaching CAQDAS
- Some students good at CAQDASs/w but have superficial analysis – stay at descriptive level.
- **Use stages** – first descriptive then force students to develop some analytic/theoretical codes.

## 2. A priori coding or own coding

- Use given coding scheme or let students develop their own coding scheme?
- A priori codes helps students get started
- Own codes are more motivating
- Again, **try a mixture**



## 3. Code hierarchy or not

- Or other theoretical development of codes
- For undergraduates best left out
- Postgrads need this.

## 4. Shared data set or own data?

- Strong consensus that better if students collect their own data
- Students more engaged and better contextual understanding of data
- But this takes time.
- **Use hybrid data**. Some pre-existing data (high quality basis) and students add some of their own data.

## 5. Own research questions etc. or not?

- Usually guidance need to create sensible research design and interview schedule.
- **Hybrid solution** – common core of key, shared research questions and interview topics + students can add one or two issues of their own.

## 6. Who does the teaching

- A few staff do it all. Good for the particular course – good motivation etc.
- But may create increased burden if students want to use CAQDAS in final year project.
- Need for staff development.

## 7. Students need s/w on their own computer

- Site licence facilitates this
- Other possibilities
  - Use free (limited) versions of s/w
  - Use iPad version for early analysis.

## 8. Heavyweight texts are intimidating

- ❑ Do not stop books like Bryman or Robson.
- ❑ Students need **shorter, more specific texts** and/or guidance on what to read.

## 9. Students employability

- Some teachers thought skills in CAQDAS use were good for student CV
- Other thought employers not interested or ignorant of s/w
- One possibility = **badging**. Maybe in collaboration with s/w companies.

# Conclusions

- Software use in QDA
  - Common at postgrad level (but not ubiquitous)
  - Still uncommon at undergrad level.
  
- Common reasons
  - Time/space in curriculum
  - Staff expertise
  
- Good practice
  
- Hybrids – research question, interviewing, coding



# Acknowledgements

- Funding – Higher Education Academy.
- 2013 project report: Count: Developing STEM skills in qualitative research methods teaching and learning  
[http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/events/SS\\_assets/TRM\\_12/Huddersfield\\_Final.pdf](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/events/SS_assets/TRM_12/Huddersfield_Final.pdf)
- 2007-11 project report: Reusable Qualitative Learning Objects: Resources to support the learning of methods of qualitative data analysis in the social sciences  
[http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/ntfs/projects/NTFS\\_Project\\_Huddersfield\\_Final.doc](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/ntfs/projects/NTFS_Project_Huddersfield_Final.doc)