

– AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

**Special Interest Group**  
**Qualitative Research**

Newsletter Highlights:

- p. 2 History Matters
- p. 3 Methods News and Notes
- p.4 Outstanding Book Award Report
- p.7-9 Spotlight on new qualitative texts
- p.11 Tech Tools

**Welcome to the Summer 2015 Edition of the QR SIG AERA Newsletter**



I hope everyone's end of the semester was smooth and you are now enjoying summer. In this addition of the newsletter, you will find some helpful information about Chicago's AERA including the Outstanding Book Award Report. Also, we have two Spotlight on new qualitative research texts and the methods news and notes that you should add to your summer reading list! Also, be sure to check out Francesca Whites' Tech Tools column and thought-provoking poem by Ana María De La Portilla.

As always, we are looking for new submissions, so if you have a new idea for a column, please email me! Cassie Quigley, Newsletter Editor for QR SIG @ [cassieq@clemsun.edu](mailto:cassieq@clemsun.edu)

**A Message from the Chair**



It is hard to believe that another academic year has come and gone and that summer is well under way. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of you who contributed to the success of the 2015 annual meeting and for the outstanding program that was put forward by the Qualitative Research SIG. Please consider contributing next year in the following ways: proposal submissions for the annual meeting, mentoring opportunities, contributions to the newsletter, and nominations for the awards that the SIG presents (Qualitative Dissertation, and Book Award). Additionally, look for a call in the early fall for committee and leadership elections. My wish for you all is a summer that affords you time to enjoy the things that sustain you!

Lisa Mazzei, Chair of AERA QR SIG

# History Matters:

## Have Mercy on the Methodologist

**By: Valerie J. Janesick, University of South Florida**

### **On the importance of the role of the qualitative methodologist**

I have been thinking about the role of the qualitative methodologist on dissertation committees lately mainly because many of us often serve in that role officially on the dissertation committee of numerous students. Unofficially we also often end up as the dissertation chair for any number of reasons. I suspect that this is also true for my colleagues in the quantitative methodologist's role as well. Thus I ask that you have mercy on the methodologist. Because we give substantial, authentic, and responsible feedback to students they are eternally grateful and in most cases the dissertation is improved. However, as a methodologist you are regularly the only member giving substantial feedback and that may not endear you to others. As methodologists we serve the entire college and university community in terms of assisting those members in our classes who need extra help in design, analysis and interpretation of data in any given study. I have been perplexed about how to address this. The lethargy of academia and the changing nature of the professoriate I am sure contribute to the extra work heaped on the methodologist's shoulders. Nonetheless, some strategies that may assist all of us might include the following:

1. Advocate and require students to take qualitative methods classes **before** they write a proposal for the dissertation. It is astounding to me that many students who have taken no qualitative classes whatsoever decide that they now wish to do a qualitative study. They inform their chair of the committee and the chair sends them to the methodologist. In order to truncate this, it seems much better to have doctoral students complete a series of qualitative inquiry courses prior to the proposal writing stage. By not understanding qualitative inquiry, or for that matter inquiry in general, how can a person conduct a study?
2. Advocate and actively create high quality, demanding, thought provoking qualitative methods courses. Here I mean not the generalist let's look at five or six different approaches model. Really delve into the philosophies and practices of the qualitative researcher. I believe the overview approach has resulted in very bland studies overall. Almost a cookie cutter approach rather than an approach that captures the lived experience of a person or persons.
3. Start a writing group to practice narrative writing in all its forms including fiction and poetry with the same set of data such as a transcript. Share your writing with one another. Critique one another's writing. Then rewrite. Step back and then rewrite and come up with a serviceable explanation for the inquiry.
4. Attend conferences where you are challenged to think in new ways and to approach your design and method with an enlightened eye and a deep understanding of some theory to put into practice.
- 5.

I am sure we can all think of many strategies and have been reading inspiring books. I found two book to be really helpful to me and my students and which I recommend here. Have mercy on the methodologist!

#### **Suggested qualitative inquiry books:**

Pascale, C. (2011) *Cartographies of knowledge: Exploring qualitative epistemologies*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Vagle, M. D. (2014) *Crafting Phenomenological Research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.



This section of the newsletter titled *Methods News and Notes* will be dedicated to highlighting, distributing, and sharing one or more SIG member's methodological scholarship in qualitative research. If you've had a recently published methodological paper you would like us to briefly describe within this space, please email Research Committee Member, *Dr. Amanda O. Latz* at [aolatz@bsu.edu](mailto:aolatz@bsu.edu)

We look forward to sharing your work! Thank you!

**Anderson, A. W., Smith, P., Schneider, J. J., & Frier, A. (2015). Live! From mount Olympus: Theatricizing two analyses of a multimodal, multimedia composition. *Creative Approaches to Research*, 8(1), 75-96.** Retrieved from [http://aqr.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/CAR8\\_1\\_Full.pdf](http://aqr.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/CAR8_1_Full.pdf)

Researchers Anne Anderson and Patriann Smith had analyzed, separately, a video produced by sixth-grade students. Combining their voices for an article proved difficult, so they assumed the voices of the gods Apollo and Dionysus to debate such issues as: product versus process, aesthetics versus pragmatics, and present value versus future potential. Jenifer Schneider, instructor for the course in which the analyses were written, assumed the role of Zeus, father to both gods, and moderator of the debate. Aimee Frier, also part of the original course, became the Greek Chorus. In this article, we explain how we drew on ethnodrama methods to write and to perform the resulting script. We also discuss how this experience affected our understanding of research and of the students' process/performance/product. A year later, we recreated the performance for the purpose of including a link in the article to a staging of the script (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ywzjAZqwBS8>).

**Brief review:** Anderson et al. (2015) provide a multilayered account of turning the evaluation of a video into a theatrical performance of "conceptual ideas" (p. 78) rather than the dramatizing of research data which they found was more commonly discussed in the literature. Although the methodological approach shared in this article was derived from an instructional activity rather than research, the authors skillfully turn the products of this activity into "data" to be performed, providing details of the procedures they used for scripting and presenting the theatrical production in ways that qualitative researchers interested in dramatizing their work will find relevant. The paper gives 1) a rationale for turning the analysis of a video into a script and the decisions involved in creating the script, 2) the performed script itself juxtaposed with the data it was drawn from (two written reviews of the student videos), and 3) a reflective analysis of what they learned as a result of performing the play at a conference. If you are interested in learning more about the process of creating a dramatization of your research findings or, as Anderson et al. demonstrate, its conceptual framework, you will find much to think about as a result of reading this article. The performance itself achieves multiple aims. First, it performs a dialogic analysis of the 6<sup>th</sup> grade students' video, *Waterbusters*. Second, it shows the tensions inherent in striving to balance education and entertainment. And third, it gives readers an excellent example of how to write up a theatrical script as a journal article without losing its performative qualities. After presenting the actual script, the authors share what they discovered about the challenges of adapting their performance to the available presentation space, the importance of rehearsals as a way to deepen understanding and connection to the material, and the insights they developed turning the evaluation of a video (itself a scripted and performed production) into a scripted and performed production. It is this juxtaposition of the behind-the-scene production talk with the actual performance that makes this piece a nice resource for qualitative researchers interested in integrating performance in their research and/or teaching.

# Stay focused

Ana María De La Portilla  
PhD Candidate  
University of the Incarnate Word  
San Antonio, TX

Complicated, at times  
traumatizing -

the selection of a topic

for research, for  
questions, then writing.

How does it get told?

How does it all come  
together?

Who's telling the story,  
anyhow?

Thinking, "I have it - AHA!"

until I discuss it with him, and  
her, and all of them,

everyone has a  
different thought

of this, and that, and  
everything in between.

Impossible - though their  
voices make sense,

I close my eyes to take  
it all in.

Why NOT this, or that, or  
something else?

Their ideas makes sense....

for them, that is.

Now, I am more confused  
than ever,

How do I bring it all together?

Again, I'm asked, "What is your  
topic?"

and I proceed to answer ---  
wah, wah, wah.

"Oh, yeah, excellent, great  
pick."

Their mouths open to offer input  
of this, and that, and everything  
in between -

UGH...cut - cut - cut.

Click, click, click...start over.

So as I'm driving my *carruch*<sup>1</sup>  
along the highway

my eyes attentive to the  
vehicles

weaving across the lanes.

"*Hijole*<sup>2</sup>....what was that? *Horale  
buey*<sup>3</sup>?"

Someone cut me off...

What the - HEY? HEY??  
HEY???

I think I get what is happening  
here.

You see, as I'm formulating my  
research topic

(I'm driving along).

People ask me about it  
adding their views, their  
perspectives

(vehicles weaving in and  
out).

Others, like those

"*horale bueys*" who cut me off,  
they're warnings to focus.

If I know my destination,

I will stay on course

with minimal distraction.

"Oh no, now what? Really?"

Yes officer, I must've been  
daydreaming.

I didn't realize how fast I was  
going."

Stay focused, my friends.

---

<sup>1</sup> Slang for car (car x coach =  
*carruch*)

<sup>2</sup> Slang for car "hey"

<sup>3</sup> Slang for "come on dumb ox"

## **Report from the 2015 AERA Qualitative Research SIG Outstanding Book Award committee**

Members of the *Outstanding Book Award* committee, Vicki Vescio, Mary Gardiner, Jenny Gordon, and Kathy Roulston reviewed nine nominations for eight books for the Outstanding Book award this year. It was a truly difficult decision to consider all nominations and select one winner. All books were of high quality and contribute in unique ways to the larger field of qualitative research. The committee first decided on five short-listed books, all of which they read and discussed. After much animated debate, the committee decided to award the *2015 AERA Qualitative Research SIG Outstanding Book Award* to Django Paris and Maisha Winn's edited collection, *Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry With Youth and Communities*.

In the introduction of the text, Paris and Winn (2014) discuss the importance of exploring what it means to be a "worthy witness" (p. xiii) as researchers simultaneously navigate tensions between the process of conducting qualitative inquiry and engaging in projects that foster social justice and equity. These editors also indicate that a foundational goal for the text is to move "toward a stance and methodology of research that acts against the histories and continuing practices" (p. xvi) that serve to perpetuate inequitable schooling and life outcomes for some while advantaging others. The committee members felt that while the 12 chapters contributed by authors working in North and South America eloquently achieved this goal, a second major contribution of this text is the possibility it offers for pushing the limits of how researchers work to critically engage the existing canon of qualitative research. The result is a collection of chapters focusing on research with youth and communities that push the reader to be deeply reflective about every layer of the research process – who benefits, who does not, what assumptions about others undergird the work, and in what ways does the work humanize or dehumanize participants?

The book is organized into four distinct parts. In part 1, *Trust, Feeling, and Change: What We Learn, What We Share, What We Do*, the chapters deal with issues of researcher proximity to the projects being studied. The goal of these chapters is to "open the research space to relationships where respect is central" (p. 2). In doing this, Paris and Winn suggest that the authors explore issues of humanizing research in ways that jointly benefit researchers and participants.

The chapters in part 2, *Navigating Institutions and Communities As Participatory Activist Researchers: Tensions, Possibilities, And Transformations*, investigate the ethical responsibilities researchers encounter when conducting qualitative inquiry in spaces that traditionally serve to dehumanize participants. A central question explored is what does a commitment from researchers to help alter these dehumanizing spaces look like.

Part 3, *The Complex Nature of Power, Relationships, and Responsibilities*, examines ethical issues associated with the research process. Specifically these chapters examine the complex nature of human relationships within multifaceted layers of institutional structures, and what that means for conducting qualitative inquiry aimed at social justice.

In the final section of the book, part 4, *Revisiting Old Conversations Toward New Approaches In Humanizing Research*, the chapters focus on reconceptualizing a vision of qualitative inquiry in a manner that allows the authors to actively engage in the research process while simultaneously making a commitment to foster change that supports humanizing the people and places where their research is conducted.

Taken together, the authors of the chapters included in this book provide readers with much to consider about why, how, with whom, and for what purpose we conduct qualitative research. Each chapter concludes with reflective questions for readers' consideration that provide useful prompts for qualitative researchers and instructors. Overall, Paris and Winn's edited collection pushes us to be intentionally reflective of the very process of qualitative inquiry so that we can collectively move in the direction of engaging in research that more fully humanizes participants and researchers alike.

## QR SIG Officers' Breakfast in Chicago



Officers beginning at the bottom left and moving clockwise:

Lisa Loutzenheiser, Melissa Freeman, Lisa Mazzei, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Fran Huckaby, Brianna Kennedy-Lewis, Kathy Roulston, Mariam Mazboudi, Jessica Lester, Jennifer Wolgemuth, and Madeline Ortiz-Rodríguez

### Office Hours, Success!

You may have seen them, established qualitative scholars meeting one-on-one with newer scholars at AERA in Chicago. They connected in hotel lobbies, coffee shops, conference rooms, via Skype, and during long walks along Michigan Avenue to talk about navigating the academy as qualitative researchers; teaching qualitative research; getting published; writing qualitative dissertations; selecting qualitative designs; issues of methodology, ethics, and validity; and more. Three months before the AERA meeting, the QR SIG Mentoring Committee reached out to established qualitative scholars to ask if they might host one to two office hours at the 2015 AERA. Seventeen scholars enthusiastically agreed. Next the Mentoring Committee sent the list of established scholars to QR SIG members asking interested graduate students and early career faculty to sign-up. The response from these new scholars was overwhelming. Quite literally for the Mentoring Committee who worked long hours to ensure new scholars could meet with at least one of their top choices until all Office Hours slots were filled. A total of 44 new scholars signed-up. We thank the scholars who hosted AERA 2015 Office Hours! Lucy Bailey, Mindy Blaise, Gaile Canella, Kathleen deMarrais, Robert Donmoyer, Melissa Freeman, Valerie Janesick, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Aaron Kuntz, Lisa Loutzenheiser, Joseph Maxwell, Lisa Mazzei, Wanda Pillow, Jerry Rosiek, Gregory Tanaka, Eve Tuck, and Mark Vagle.

Informal and formal feedback (we sent out an electronic survey, ~50% response rate from established and new scholars) clearly revealed both groups enjoyed and valued the Office Hours. One new scholar said: "The mentoring experience was a total highlight for me this year at AERA. Not only did I obtain fabulous advice and guidance regarding my future as a qualitative scholar, but I really enjoyed chatting with such a lovely, caring, brilliant person. Again, best experience at the conference!" An established scholar echoed: "Greetings-- I primarily had a great experience meeting with QR 'mentees'. I appreciated the opportunity and creativity of incorporating this personal touch in to the mammoth AERA experience, and I think mentees did too. I found it so much more productive than any of the mentoring roundtables I participated in with other SIGs. I would happily participate next year. I found it productive to touch base in advance of the meeting so that we could make the most of our time together, and we covered a lot of territory in short space. Despite working efficiently, in 3 cases, we needed even more time, and one has followed up afterwards. I found the questions folks asked particularly interesting as well as revealing of contemporary higher education issues, so I am sure that information will be helpful in my own institutional context." The foil of this success story was something most people, including the QR SIG Mentoring Committee members, referred to as 'logistics.' Scheduling conflicts, last minute changes in travel plans, uncertain meeting times and places, technology and scheduling problems for those attempting to connect via Skype, 30 minute time slots, and lack of advance preparation for the meetings, were some of the reasons new and established scholars said prevented them from getting together in the first instance or from making the most of their meetings when they did. The keys to successful mentoring sessions seemed to be 1) email contact between the new and established scholars prior to the conference to arrange the meeting locations and times and exchange phone numbers, 2) communication prior to the meeting about what the new scholar might wish to discuss, 3) new scholars who came to the meeting prepared, both in terms of knowing the expertise of their mentor scholar and the questions they planned to ask, and 4) meetings that went longer than the allotted 30 minutes or that included plans to connect at a later time. The QR SIG Mentoring Committee will co-ordinate the Office Hours program again for AERA 2016. Expect to hear from us in February 2016. We expect to make some changes based on the feedback and hope next year will be even more of a Success!

**Mentoring Commitee:** Jennifer R. Wolgemuth (Chair), Sarah Bridges-Rhoads, Candace Kubly, Alonzo Flowers, & Judith Munter



Spotlight on a  
new qualitative  
research text



Janesick, V. J. (2015)  
*Contemplative Qualitative  
Inquiry: Practicing the Zen of  
Research*. Walnut Creek, CA:  
Left Coast Press. 183pp.

<http://www.lcoastpress.com/book.php?id=549>

ISBN: 978-1-61132-956-8 (paperback)

ISBN: 978-1-61132-761-8 (consumer ebook)



### Why write a book on Zen and Contemplative Qualitative Inquiry?

I wrote this book to offer another way to view qualitative inquiry by using Zen as a metaphor to deepen our understanding of the theory, techniques, and practice of qualitative research methods. Since there is a growing movement toward a more contemplative approach to qualitative methods (Fahlberg & Fahlberg, 1991; Duerr 2004; Neal & Biberman, 2004) Zen is one solid contemplative approach to living and has many useful facets for the qualitative researcher. Particularly helpful for example is the Zen Koan, or short lesson statement from a teacher to a student in which a question is posed. Zen Koans present a question so that imbedded in the question is the answer. This question is usually posed by a student who asks a teacher that question. Bear in mind that in the Asian tradition teachers are revered. It is a part of the Asian culture to learn from a teacher and to follow in a tradition. I was always struck by the koan nature of constructing good questions for research interviewing. So yet another reason to write about this became clear for me. In addition, I am currently studying yoga and meditation and recently one of my meditation teachers says to the group, "I do not teach meditation, I only do research". I knew it was time to write about the power of lessons we might consider from the practice of meditation.

I want to introduce the metaphor of thinking with a Zen mindset for coming to a deeper more contemplative understanding of qualitative work. Thus we cross the border into Zen thinking about Impermanence, Non-Self and Nirvana. The well known Buddhist teacher Hanh (2001) captures three major qualities of Buddhism in his numerous books.

## ***Impermanence, Non Self, and Nirvana***

*Impermanence, Non Self, and Nirvana* are the three aspects of Zen that contain the architectural structure for the book. *Impermanence* is a cornerstone of Zen. Many writers claim that if you want to understand Buddhism, just remember that *everything changes*, thus the notion of impermanence. In our fast paced cluttered world we often fall into a mindset that expects things not to change. Impermanence is an accurate description of this major tenet of Buddhism. I couldn't help but wonder at the connections between impermanence and the fact that all findings are tentative in any research project but certainly so in qualitative projects. Likewise, the idea of *non-self* appears in every part of writing and practice of Zen. The notion of impermanence leads us to non-self. When you look deeply into yourself, you see that you have everything already within you. This is sometimes referred to as the mystery of inter-being or the one contains everything. It is a strong notion from the East and often difficult for Western thinkers to realize. Non-self basically means there is no such thing as separate existence. We exist in the universe connected to others. Again, I couldn't help but wonder at the resonance to qualitative work for the researcher is the research instrument in qualitative work. How much more connected can one get to a research project? Finally, the notion of *nirvana*, in the sense that nirvana is about coming to peace with the universe as it is in the present, is the third major quality of the essence of Zen. *Nirvana* is the extinction of all concepts and all pain due to the fact that one realizes that there is no need to fear suffering since we have all manifestations of life within us. Our ancestors are in us. The people in our lives are also with us. Eventually, we become the ancestors. Thus, *nirvana* becomes a powerful way to understand the importance of the Zen mind. And by extension in qualitative research projects when the researcher and research participant /s are in complete understanding one might say that nirvana has been achieved.

The book closes with the final chapter on Satori (understanding), Zen Energy as Zenergy or intuition, and qualitative analysis. I argue for the use of Zen principles as a way to analyze qualitative data in its many forms. Zen contemplative approaches can open up our repertoire of approaches to qualitative inquiry. It is a compassionate approach and as researchers our compassion requires a pedagogy of anti- oppressive approaches to research.

## **References**

- Duerr M. , (2004) The contemplative organization, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 17 Iss: 1, pp.43 – 61
- Fahlberg L. and L. A. Fahlberg (1991) Exploring Spirituality and Consciousness with an Expanded Science: Beyond the Ego with Empiricism, Phenomenology, and Contemplation. *American Journal of Health Promotion*: March/April 1991, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 273-281.
- Hanh, T. N. (2001) *You are here: Discovering the magic of the present moment*. Boston Shambala.
- Neal J. & J. Biberman, (2004) Research that matters: helping organizations integrate spiritual values and practices, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 17 Iss: 1, pp.7 - 18.



**A New Publication: *Critical Qualitative Inquiry: Foundations and Futures* by Gaile S. Cannella, Michelle Salazar Pérez, Penny A. Pasque (Editors): Left Coast Press.**

*Critical Qualitative Inquiry: Foundations and Futures* by Gaile S. Cannella, Michelle Salazar Pérez, Penny A. Pasque (editors, Left Coast Press) is a comprehensive volume of contemporary articles that locate critical inquiry in its historical context, describes the contemporary landscape of critical research, and considers the future of this turn. Specifically, this book demonstrates how the postmodern revolution in research, and the scholarship connected to that revolt, has made possible an academic environment that can/has reconceptualize(d) science critically.

The book provides new and seasoned scholars, alike, with 1) a feel for the broad and deep history of critical qualitative scholarship, 2) an overview of the types of inquiry that are currently practiced, and 3) possibilities for future critical qualitative work that would address both contemporary neoliberal conditions and unimagined futures. *Critical Qualitative Inquiry* includes contributions from some of the leading qualitative researchers on three continents including: Norman Denzin, Lucy Bailey, Mary Margaret Fonow, Jenny Ritchie, Maggie MacLure, Aaron Kuntz, Penny Pasque, Michelle Salazar Pérez, Mark Nagasawa, Beth Blue Swadener, Yvonna Lincoln, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Jasmine Ulmer, Gaile Cannella, and Harry Torrance.

The editors and authors of this book invite you to a day with the Coalition for Critical Qualitative SIG at the International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry on Wednesday, May 20, 2015 in Urbana-Champaign, Illinois. This day will include interdisciplinary interactive sessions on Research as/and Provocative Activism for Critical Purposes; Critical Qualitative Research: International Complexities; Critical Qualitative Methodologies: Reconceptualizations and Emergent Constructions – A Panel Discussion of Research Possibilities; and a business meeting. Participants are invited to envision the future of the CCQI SIG and a yet un-imagined future of critical qualitative inquiry.



For more information on the paperback, hardcover, or e-book, please see

## A Picture to Ponder this Summer...



**About the photographer.** Bob Remedi is currently teaching a variety of Biology and basic science courses at College of Lake County in Grayslake, Illinois, where he has been a full-time faculty member since 2002. He is the recipient of the Two-year College Biology Teaching Award from The National Association of Biology Teachers and has received the Outstanding Faculty Teaching Award by the Illinois Community College Trustees Association. For the 2015-2016 school year, he was awarded a sabbatical from College of Lake County to investigate how outstanding college faculty develop and improve rapport with students, for his dissertation in Adult and Higher Education from Northern Illinois University.

The American White Pelican pictured here is one of the largest birds in North America, with a wingspan of 9 feet and a weight of over 16 pounds. Spending summers along rivers, lakes and marshes, these birds eat primarily fish, amphibians and crayfish. Unlike their close relative the Brown Pelican however, they do not plunge dive for food, preferring to paddle along the water with their powerful webbed feet and dunk their head or dive down from the surface to find food. These birds nest in colonies on small islands to protect their young from mammalian predators, leaving them vulnerable to changing water levels due to droughts or floods. Fortunately, the population of American White Pelicans is generally stable with some areas of local concern.

This particular bird was photographed on a cold winter day near Fulton, Illinois at Lock and Dam 13 on the Mississippi River. It is unclear why it did not migrate south to the usual wintering grounds in Central America and Southern North America. It did not appear injured and was observed making short flights and catching fish.

The photograph was taken handheld, with a Canon 50D using an EF 100-400 zoom lens at 400mm with an exposure of 1/1250 second set at F10 and ISO 400.

## Tech Tools: Using ATLAS.ti Mobile Android

By Francesca White, Graduate student at Indiana University

ATLAS.ti, one of three major computer-assisted qualitative data analysis (CAQDAS) software packages, has recently developed mobile applications for iPhone/iPad and Android platforms. While learning how to use the desktop version of ATLAS.ti, I explored the ways in which ATLAS.ti Mobile for Android could support the research process across spaces - from the field to the desk. With access for users with mobile devices across platforms, I introduce the possibility of using ATLAS.ti mobile for collecting interviews in participatory action research projects, creating a researcher reflexivity project, and for work in remote areas without access to desktop versions.

Product reviews and literature about ATLAS.ti can be a great starting point to make sense of the underlying assumptions, methodological considerations, and functionalities of the package (Paulus, Lester, & Dempster, 2014). The ATLAS.ti Mobile video tutorial (<http://youtu.be/bB8oPtdbgOs>) provides a brief introduction with screen shots of example projects. Here, I focus four functions to explore primarily data collection and preliminary analysis: 1) recording audio files to create primary documents, 2) creating segments or quotations, 3) coding the data, and 4) writing memos.

ATLAS.ti Mobile is equipped with an audio recorder included, with potential to be used to record interviews or reflexive audio notes. These files are filed as primary documents and ready to use to segment into quotations. Shortened audio clips can be produced in two ways: while the interview being recorded live or after the final recording. For either way, a quotation can be created at the press of a button. Once the segments are created, researchers can comment, write memos, and start the coding process.

Preliminary coding ATLAS.ti Mobile can serve as a first layer of analysis with the coding feature. While this application may not be intended for in-depth analysis, researchers may choose to review quotations and created new preliminary codes while listening. Much like the desktop software, open coding or predetermined codes can be used for this process at the researcher's discretion. The codes can be assigned color labels and used across primary documents. This can be helpful to make sense of some of preliminary ideas and common items discussed in field interviews.

The Memo tab provides a space to write reflexive notes about the interviews immediately after finishing. The memos are not linked directly to files, but connected to the project as a whole. After listening to the audio files, users may write initial understandings of the interview responses. Once finished with segmenting, coding, and writing memos, a mobile device can connect with a USB cord to import the file the ATLAS.ti desktop version. Once imported, project files are all available, coded, and filed ready for in-depth, robust analysis. The entire process, start to finish made apparent some affordances and constraints.

Saloman's (1993) notion of "perceived and actual properties of a thing, primarily those functional properties that determine just how the thing could possibly be used" (as cited in Conole & Dyke, 2004a) helped me to identify affordances and constraints. As a newcomer to ATLAS.ti, the app is very easy to use and closely linked to the desktop version. The application allows researcher opportunities to collect data 'in the field,' start reflexivity and early analysis while still in the field. ATLAS.ti also can centralize

To contribute to Tech Tools, please submit to  
Jessica Lester @ [jnlester@indiana.edu](mailto:jnlester@indiana.edu)

## QRSIG officers and committee chairs 2015-2016

**Chair:**

Lisa A. Mazzei, University of Oregon: [Mazzei@uoregon.edu](mailto:Mazzei@uoregon.edu)

**Past-Chair:**

Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Arizona State University: [Mirka.Koro-Ljungberg@asu.edu](mailto:Mirka.Koro-Ljungberg@asu.edu)

**Program co-chairs:**

Jessica Nina Lester, Indiana University: [jnlester@indiana.edu](mailto:jnlester@indiana.edu)

Eric Archer, Western Michigan University: [eric.archer@wmich.edu](mailto:eric.archer@wmich.edu)

**Secretary:**

Brianna Kennedy-Lewis, University of Florida: [bkennedy@coe.ufl.edu](mailto:bkennedy@coe.ufl.edu)

**Treasurer:**

Lisa Loutzenheiser, University of British Columbia: [lisa.loutzenheiser@ubc.ca](mailto:lisa.loutzenheiser@ubc.ca)

**Webmaster:**

Madeline Ortiz Rodríguez, Inter American University of Puerto Rico:

[madeline.ortiz@fajardo.inter.edu](mailto:madeline.ortiz@fajardo.inter.edu)

**Newsletter editor:**

Cassie Quigley, Clemson University, [cassieq@clemson.edu](mailto:cassieq@clemson.edu)

**Outstanding book award committee chair:**

Kathryn Roulston, University of Georgia: [roulston@uga.edu](mailto:roulston@uga.edu)

**Speaker committee chair:**

Mark Vagle, University of Minnesota: [vagl0006@umn.edu](mailto:vagl0006@umn.edu)

**Dissertation award committee chair:**

Francyne Huckaby, Texas Christian University, [f.huckaby@tcu.edu](mailto:f.huckaby@tcu.edu)

**Mentoring committee chair:**

Jennifer Wolgemuth, University of South Florida: [jenni.wolgemuth@gmail.com](mailto:jenni.wolgemuth@gmail.com)

**Research committee chair:**

Melissa Freeman, University of Georgia: [freeman9@uga.edu](mailto:freeman9@uga.edu)

**Membership committee chair:**

Mariam Mazboudi, University of Illinois, Chicago: [mmazbo2@uic.edu](mailto:mmazbo2@uic.edu)