IAT 801 Qualitative Research Methods - Standards of Validation and Evaluation, Week 10

Instructor: Ron Wakkary (rwakkary@sfu.ca)
Introduction

- Glossary
- Review of Chapter 10 (Creswell)
- Discussion
Glossary
Review of Chapter 10 (Creswell)
Review of Chapter 10

Two Questions

• Is the account valid and by whose standards?
• How do we evaluate the quality of qualitative research?
Review of Chapter 10

- Perspectives on Validation
- Validation Strategies
- Reliability
- Evaluation Criteria
- Validation and Evaluation of Four Traditions
### Perspectives on Validation

**Table 10.1 Perspectives and Terms Used in Qualitative Validation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LeCompte &amp; Goetz (1982)</td>
<td>Use of parallel, qualitative equivalents to their quantitative counterparts in experimental and survey research</td>
<td>Internal validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln &amp; Guba (1985)</td>
<td>Use of alternative terms that apply more to naturalistic axioms</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisner (1991)</td>
<td>Use of alternative terms that provide reasonable standards for judging the credibility of qualitative research</td>
<td>Structural corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consensual validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referential adequacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ironic validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lather (1993)</td>
<td>Use of reconceptualized validity in four types</td>
<td>Paralogic validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhizomatic validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Situated/embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluptuous validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolcott (1994b)</td>
<td>Use of terms other than &quot;validity,&quot; because it neither guides nor informs qualitative research</td>
<td>Understanding better than validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angen (2000)</td>
<td>Use of validation within the context of interpretive inquiry</td>
<td>Two types: ethical and substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittemore, Chase, &amp; Mandle (2001)</td>
<td>Use of synthesized perspectives of validity, organized into primary criteria and secondary criteria</td>
<td>Primary criteria: credibility, authenticity, criticality, and integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary criteria: Explicitness, vividness, creativity, thoroughness, congruence, and sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson &amp; St. Pierre (2005)</td>
<td>Use of a metaphorical, reconceptualized form of validity as a crystal</td>
<td>Crystals: Grow, change, alter, reflect externalities, refract within themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perspectives on Validation

LeCompte & Goetz (1982)

• Propose qualitative equivalents to quantitative “canons of reliability and validation”
  - *Internal validity*
  - *External validity*
  - *Reliability*
  - *Objectivity*
Perspectives on Validation

Lincoln & Guba (1985)

- Propose alternative terms more in accord with *naturalistic* research
- Establish “trustworthiness”
  - Credibility (*prolonged engagement, triangulation*)
  - Transferability (*thick description*)
  - Dependability (*methods, investigators*)
  - Confirmability
Perspectives on Validation

Eisner (1991)

• “We seek a confluence of evidence that breeds credibility, that allows us to feel confident about our observations, interpretations, and conclusions”

• Researchers formulate a “compelling whole”
  - Structural corroboration (multiple types of data)
  - Consensual validation (agreement and opinions of competent others)
  - Referential adequacy (the importance of criticism)
Perspectives on Validation

Lather (1991 & 1993)

- Post-modern reconceptualization of the concept of validation: admissions of situatedness and partiality

- Four frames of validation:
  - Ironic (research presents truth as problematic)
  - Paralogic (uncertainty, limits, complexities)
  - Rhizomatic (questions proliferate across study without underlying structures)
  - Voluptuous (understand more than one can know and writes to the unknown)
Perspectives on Validation

Angen (2000)

- Validation is “a judgment of the trustworthiness or goodness of a piece of research”
  - Ethical Validation: research questions moral assumptions and political/ethical implications. Practical and generative questions and answers
  - Substantive Validation: discursive approach in which interpretive accounts are co-constructed with other previous accounts and possible new accounts
Whittemore, Chase, and Mandle (2001)
• Synthesis of 13 papers on validation
  - Credibility (are the results an accurate representation of the participants’ meaning?)
  - Authenticity (are different voices heard?)
  - Criticality (is there a critical appraisal of all aspects of the research?)
  - Integrity (are the investigators self-critical?)
Validation Strategies

Creswell’s 8 procedures
1. Prolonged engagement and persistent observation
2. Triangulation of multiple and different sources, methods, investigators, and theories
3. Peer review or debriefing to provide an external check
4. Negative case analysis, disconfirming evidence
5. Clarifying research bias
Validation Strategies

Creswell’s 8 procedures (cont’d)
6. Member checking
7. Rich, thick description
8. External audits
Reliability Perspectives

See Creswell intercoder agreement process (pp. 209–211)
Evaluation Criteria

Validation is concerned with the *valid* nature of the research; evaluation is concerned with the *quality* of the research.
Evaluation Criteria

Methodological perspective: Howe & Eisenhardt (1990) propose 5 standards:

1. Can the research questions drive the data collection and analysis rather than the reverse?

2. The extent to which the data collection and analysis technique were competently applied.

3. The degree to which the researcher’s assumptions are made explicit
Evaluation Criteria

Methodological perspective: Howe & Eisenhardt (1990) propose 5 standards:
4. Does the overall study have warrant, i.e. is it robust, use respected theoretical explanations, and discusses disconfirming explanations
5. The study has value (so what?) and protects confidentiality of participants (ethical)
Evaluation Criteria

Postmodern perspective: Lincoln (1995)
- Three main commitments:
  - Emergent relations with respondents
  - Commitment to a set of stances
  - A vision of research that enables and promotes justice
- See in detail Lincoln’s 8 standards (pp. 212–213)
Evaluation Criteria

Interpretive perspective: Lincoln (2005)
- Substantive contribution
- Aesthetic Merit
- Reflexivity
- Impact

• See details pp. 213
Four Traditions

Review and discuss each of the four traditions pp. 215–219
Discussion
Questions?

Ron Wakkary (rwakkary@sfu.ca)