Article:

White Rose Consortium ePrints Repository
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

This is an author produced version of a paper published in **The Psychologist.**

How should we supervise qualitative projects?

*Anna Madill, Institute of Psychological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2

9JT, UK

Telephone: 0113 343 5750

Fax: 0113 343 5749

E-mail: <u>a.l.madill@leeds.ac.uk</u>

Brendan Gough, Institute of Psychological Sciences, University of Leeds

Telephone: 0113 343 6641

E-mail: <u>b.gough@leeds.ac.uk</u>

Rebecca Lawton, Institute of Psychological Sciences, University of Leeds

Telephone: 0113 343 5715

E-mail: <u>r.j.lawton@leeds.ac.uk</u>

Peter Stratton, Institute of Psychological Sciences, University of Leeds

Telephone: 0113 343 5728

E-mail: <u>p.m.stratton@leeds.ac.uk</u>

There is a "shortfall in numbers of highly skilled qualitative researchers" says the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC: 2004, p.7). What is psychology doing about it? The Society's revised syllabus (2002) states that students should be able to collect and analyse qualitative (non-numerical) data. The Quality Assessment Agency (QAA: 2002) also specifies that psychology should cover qualitative methods. Therefore, in time, psychology graduates should have the expertise the ESRC needs.

Including qualitative methods in the mainstream psychology curriculum means finding ways of keeping a high standard of supervision in this specialised field. At the moment, many departments may have only one expert in qualitative methods. However, there is a growing demand for supervision of qualitative projects (Elliott, Fischer & Rennie, 1999; Krahn, Hohn & Kime, 1995). Guidelines could help the lone supervisor benefit from others' experience. Guidelines could also provide a template for departments beginning to make qualitative projects available to their students.

Parker (2004) offers three overarching criteria for good research designed for supervisors of undergraduate qualitative projects: (1) grounding in existing research, (2) coherence of argument, and (3) accessibility of presentation. We, too, identified a need for guidance and consistency and produced a handout for our own qualitative project students at Leeds (Madill, Stratton, Gough, Hugh-Jones, & Lawton, 2001). This made us realise we had different opinions about, for example, the amount of data students should collect. It seemed a good time to ask our colleagues across the UK to help define good practice. It also seemed democratic to ask undergraduates about their experience of doing qualitative research.

We hosted a one-day workshop on 'Developing guidelines for the supervision of undergraduate qualitative research in psychology' funded by a grant from the Learning and Teaching Support Network for Psychology (now the Higher Education

Academy Psychology Network). Fifty-five supervisors participated from all over the UK, representing 36 different institutions. We content analysed audio-tapes of their small group discussions. We also content analysed discussions amongst twelve of our own students who had just completed their qualitative project. Then we combined the information and produced the guidelines shown in table 1 and box 1.

-----table 1 and box 1 about here-----

Evaluation of methods

Table 1 allows student and supervisor to evaluate the demands of a particular method on four relevant criteria. These demands can be weighed against the resources available, such as time and training.

Supervisors agreed a small data set would be fine for methods requiring detailed analysis, such as conversation analysis (Drew, 2003). More data would be needed for methods providing a pre-given analytic structure, such as attributional coding (Stratton, 1997). The minimum amounts of data shown in table 1 are suggestions based on experience of allowing students to complete their project on time while demonstrating competence in the method used. Cross-institutional guidelines like these should reassure supervisors concerned that examiners might baulk at the seemingly small amount of data used.

Supervisors thought their job was particularly demanding due to the lack of prior training students had in qualitative data collection and analysis. And our participating students agreed they felt under-prepared for their project. Supervisors had to offer a lot of guidance and overcome common misconceptions. For example, some students presented hypothesis-testing designs inappropriate to qualitative research.

3

Most qualitative approaches have a strong theoretical basis. For example, free association narrative interviewing (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000) draws heavily on psychoanalytic theory. The student needs to understand the theoretical premises of a method in order to apply it well. Interpretative phenomenological analysis (Smith & Osborn, 2004) and grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) may be exceptions. They offer procedures for extracting themes from textual data which might be applied without too much theoretical overlay.

The students found transcription and analysis very time-consuming. The methods which avoid transcription, such as repertory grid analysis (Fransella & Bannister, 1967), may be less labour intensive. The thematic analysis required by IPA may also be less time-consuming than other more detailed approaches to analysis, such as discourse analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

These guidelines provide a reference point and source of ideas for supervisors. They are not prescriptive or definitive. We agree with Reicher (2000) that 'there are basic differences amongst qualitative methods which render a common standard of excellence difficult or even impossible to achieve' (p.5). We also acknowledge Hollway's (2002) warning that 'qualitative methods need more theoretical development – both in terms of an epistemology and an ontology – before teachers (and researchers) in qualitative psychology could be ready to set guidelines' (p.1). However, our recommendations are about good practice in supervision and are intended to be general, pragmatic, and used flexibly.

Research environment

So far, recommendations have focused on the tasks of student and supervisor. Students feel more satisfied with their research and work more effectively when their tasks are clear, but also value a supportive research environment and opportunities to

influence their work (Swager, 1997). Supervisors should offer educational guidance, but good meetings also include personal support that allows students to own their research (McMichael, 1992). This is understandable as some undergraduates have a huge personal investment in the project they select (Wilkinson, 1994). This challenges us to see project supervision as a form of mentoring.

Parker (2004) helps us understand the mentoring process. He identifies three core principles for aiding student performance. In ascending order these are: (1) Apprenticeship: help the student learn the language and traditions of the research area. (2) Scholarship: encourage the student to argue well in support or against positions within the field. (3) Innovation: nurture the student towards creating something novel.

<u>Issues for discussion</u>

Our recommendations need further development. We can already see several issues that need more discussion. Many of these draw on important and complex debates in qualitative research. For example, Hollway (2002) highlights how the amount of data a student collects depends on 'the research question, the method, the type of analysis, the status of the theories being used, the mode of and constraints upon, generalisability' (p.6-7). We therefore need creative ideas to refine our guidelines on amount of data collected. We also need to extend recommendations to data other than interviews.

We suggest using group supervision to help manage workload where there is few suitably qualified staff. Limiting the number of methods offered may be more controversial.

The workshop revealed different opinions about participant and student vulnerability. Some argued that participant distress in a research interview is not necessarily harmful. Some thought that vulnerable individuals, such as those

diagnosed with a mental illness, should not be exposed to novice researchers. Some were concerned about students they suspected of using their project as therapy. For example, the emaciated student wanting to study eating disorders. A widely accepted suggestion was that students should conduct a pilot interview. This would allow the supervisor to check the student's reaction to the research topic, their interpersonal sensitivity, and skills in using an enquiring technique. However, supervisors were concerned about their ability to manage interpersonal issues such as counselling a student away from a research topic. Mentoring students towards a reflexive account of their involvement in the production and analysis of their material also requires a great deal of skill and sensitivity that is unlikely to have been taught in any course.

We believe it is worthwhile to produce guidelines for the supervision of undergraduate qualitative research in psychology. One useful outcome will be greater parity in the demands made of undergraduates in different psychology departments. We hope the recommendations presented here will stimulate discussion. We invite constructive comments through the letters page of The Psychologist and at the following web address which includes an extended report of this work: http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/QUALITATIVEPROJECTS.html

Preparation

- Prepare students for the labour-intensive nature of qualitative research and help them time-manage the phases of their project.

- Research questions should have some social relevance and originality.

- When recommending a particular qualitative method, consider the demand on the supervisor, the theoretical background required, and the time-demand on the student (table 1).

- Provide access to previous high quality qualitative projects and indicate examples of relevant published qualitative research.

- Consider using staff with experience in qualitative research as project consultants and/or limiting the types of qualitative method offered in order to use elements of group supervision.

Data collection

- Where access to participants is difficult or inappropriate, consider using archive material (including media texts). The selection and sifting of these should be substantial enough to be considered a form of data collection.

- When deciding how much (interview) data students should collect, refer to guidelines associated with particular methods (table 1).

- Require students to notify someone of their whereabouts when collecting data outside university premises.

- Have informed consent obtained before and after data collection and, if appropriate, again once the transcript has been approved by the participant.

- If interviewing, require students to conduct a pilot in order to check the student's reaction to the research topic, their interpersonal sensitivity, and skills in using an enquiring technique.

Post data collection

- Check an early sample transcript for anonymisation. Participants could be invited to do this, with the right to withdraw potentially identifying details.

- Analysis should move beyond description, not reflect too closely the questions asked of participants, and there should be a serious effort to be reflexive.

- Reports should show sophisticated understanding of the differences between qualitative and quantitative research, ground the method theoretically and epistemologically, be written in the first person where appropriate, and develop a coherent narrative about the research as a whole.

- After the project has been marked, monitor the destruction of non-anonymised data, audio-tapes, and files, and the return of signed consent forms to the department for confidential storage.

Box 1: Guidelines for the supervision of undergraduate qualitative projects

Method of analysis	Suggested minimum amount of data*	Demanding of supervisor	Needs strong theoretical background	Demanding of student time
'INDUCTIVE'				
Interpretative phenom-enological analysis	5 hours			
Grounded theory	5 hours	✓		✓
'DISCURSIVE'				
Discourse analysis	3-4 hours	✓	✓	✓
Narrative analysis	3-4 hours	✓	✓	✓
Free association narrative interviewing	3-4 hours	✓	✓	✓
Conversation analysis	1-2 hours	✓	✓	✓
'STRUCTURED'				
Repertory grids	5 grids & elaborations	✓	✓	
Attributional analysis	6-8 hours	✓	✓	
Q methodology	5 sessions (sort task & interviews)	✓	✓	✓

*Hours of interviewing, unless otherwise stated

Table 1: Evaluation of methods relevant to undergraduate qualitative projects

References

British Psychological Society (2002). Membership and Qualifications Board, Board of Examiners for the Qualifying Examination. <u>Revised syllabus for the qualifying examination</u>. BPS: Leicester, UK.

Drew, P. (2003). Conversation analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), <u>Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods</u> (pp. 132-158). London: Sage.

Economic and Social Research Council (2004). <u>Specification: Demonstrator scheme for qualitative data sharing and research archiving</u>. http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCContent/researchfunding/QUADS_Spec.asp

Elliott, R., Fischer, C. T., & Rennie, D. L. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. <u>British Journal of Clinical Psychology</u>, <u>38</u>, 215-229.

Fransella, F., & Bannister, D. A. (1967). Validation of the repertory grid technique as a measure of political construing. <u>Acta Psychologica</u>, <u>26</u>, 97-106.

Hollway, W. (2002, April). <u>Teaching qualitative research to undergraduate psychologists</u>. Keynote address. LTSN workshop: Developing guidelines for the supervision of undergraduate qualitative research in psychology. School of Psychology, University of Leeds, 12th April 2002.

Hollway, W. & Jefferson, T. (2000). <u>Doing qualitative research differently: Free association, narrative, and the interview method</u>. London: Sage.

Krahn, G. L., Hohn, M. F., & Kime, C. (1995). Incorporating qualitative approaches into clinical child psychology research. <u>Journal of Clinical Child Psychology</u>, <u>24</u>, 204-213.

Madill, A., Stratton, P., Gough, B., Hugh-Jones, S. & Lawton, R. (2001). <u>Doing qualitative projects: Some advice</u>. School of Psychology, University of Leeds. http://www.psyc.leeds.ac.uk/research/qual/QualProjectsAdvice.doc

McMichael, P. (1992). Tales of the unexpected: Supervisors' and students'

  perspectives on short-term projects and dissertations. Educational Studies, 18,

  299-310.

Parker, I. (2004). Criteria for qualitative research in psychology. Qualitative Research

  in Psychology, 1, 95-106.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes

  and behaviour. London: Sage.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (2002). Subject benchmark

  statements: Academic standards – Psychology. QAAHE: Gloucester, UK.

Reicher, S. (2000). Against methodolatry: Some comments on Elliott, Fischer and

  Rennie. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39, 1-6.

Smith, J. A. & Osborn, M. (2004). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In G.

  Breakwell (Ed.), Doing social psychology (pp. 229-254). Oxford: Blackwell.

Stratton, P. (1997). Attributional coding of interview data: Meeting the needs of long-

  haul passengers. In N. Hayes (Ed.), Doing qualitative analysis in psychology (pp.

  115-142). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and

  procedures for developing grounded theory (2nd ed). London: Sage.

Swager, S. L. (1997). Faculty/student interaction in an undergraduate research

  program: Task and interpersonal elements. Dissertation Abstracts International,

  58(2-A), Aug 1997, 0400, US: University Microfilms International.

Wilkinson, S. (1994). Editor's introduction: Passionate projects: Students' views.

  Feminism & Psychology, 4, 425-429.