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Abstract: It must be emphasized that the qualitative Method, throughout its long history, has not received the same attention as it did during the past few years, as a result of the social work specialist’s feeling of the importance of Using qualitative method techniques in social work researches and studies because it provides researchers with various means of collecting data such as interview, observation, case study and CVs, in addition to all types of questionnaires, audio, video, digital recording methods, documents, texts, and other advantages that have contributed to exploring new horizons in social work researches and studies in addition to being able to study many issues about which little is known or those issues that are characterized by sensitivity, and then The interest of researchers in this research in the techniques of Using qualitative curricula in social work researches and studies. The research was applied to a sample of faculty staff at Aswan University in the Arab Republic of Egypt.
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Introduction

The term of qualitative methods is relatively new. There is no single definition, although they share features in common, that is, flexibility, holism, naturalism, and insider perspectives. Epistemological debates continue among qualitative researchers, and the diverse methodological approaches often reflect the influence of constructivist critiques. The basic methods ethnography, grounded theory, case studies, phenomenological, and action research are described along with the fundamentals of data collection and analysis, the role of theory, standards for rigor, ethical issues, and social work values. Rapid growth in the popularity of these methods ensures that they will Make a vital role in the profession's knowledge growth in the future. (Padgett, 2013).

Qualitative methods are best for addressing many of the why questions that researchers have in mind when they develop their projects. Where quantitative approaches are appropriate for examining who has engaged in a behavior or what has happened and while experiments can test interventions, these techniques are not designed to explain why certain behaviors occur. Qualitative approaches are typically used to explore new phenomena and to capture individuals’ thoughts, feelings, or interpretations of meaning and process (Given, 2008, p. A).

Some social work students are initially attracted to qualitative research because qualitative methods seem easier than quantitative methods; after all, there are no numbers, so that means no statistics, right? This is not a good rationale for the use of qualitative methods! As we present in the qualitative data analysis section, qualitative methods are not any easier than quantitative methods, and in many ways can be even more challenging due to the voluminous data generated. What then is a good rationale for employing qualitative methods? When are such methods indicated in research? The answer is simple: when the research question requires it. If, for example, the research question involves comparing outcomes for two different groups—perhaps clients who receive an intervention featuring solution-focused therapy and clients who receive an intervention featuring motivational interviewing—quantitative methods are warranted. If, however, the research question centers on participants’ perceptions, impressions, or experiences of involvement in one of those groups, qualitative methods are called for. The following questions are qualitative in nature: What is it like to experience solution focused therapy? How do social workers describe the development of a therapeutic alliance when using motivational interviewing? (Bonifas, 2010, p. 101).

However, scholars, and professionals who are new to qualitative research typically need guidance in defining the boundaries of this type of work, including guidance in selecting specific methods, knowing what types of data are appropriate for qualitative studies, identifying theoretical frameworks for projects (Given, 2008, p. A). Morse and Richards detail five reasons for using qualitative methods (Morse & Richards, 2002): 1. When very little is known about a topic and initial exploration is needed to even begin to know what to study.
2. When understanding is sought regarding a complex situation that is constantly changing.
3. When there is interest in studying participants’ reactions to a natural setting or process (as opposed to a laboratory setting) to determine their experience of it, the meaning they ascribe to it, or their interpretation of it.
4. When the goal is to develop new explanatory theory that is grounded in reality or the lived experience.
5. When the research aim is to cultivate a deep understanding of certain human phenomenon.

Qualitative research methods are highly applicable to social work due to our interest in the nuances of peoples’ lives and what it is like to experience certain phenomenon, such as living in poverty, leaving an abusive relationship, or coping with multiple sclerosis (Bonifas, 2010).

**FIGURE 1.1 Contrasting Emphases in Quantitative and Qualitative Methods**  
(RUBIN & BABBIE, 2016, p. 49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aims</td>
<td>Precision Generalizability Testing hypotheses</td>
<td>Deeper understandings Describing contexts Generating hypotheses Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Structure</td>
<td>Research procedures specified in advance</td>
<td>Flexible procedures evolve as data are gathered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Setting for data gathering</td>
<td>Office, agency, or via mail or Internet</td>
<td>Natural environment of research participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Theoretical approach</td>
<td>Deductive</td>
<td>Inductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sample size likely or preferred</td>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>Smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Most likely timing in investigating phenomena</td>
<td>Later, after familiarity with phenomenon has been established</td>
<td>Early, to gain familiarity with phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Emphasis on objectivity or subjectivity</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nature of data emphasized</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Depth and generalizability of findings</td>
<td>More superficial, but more generalizable</td>
<td>Deeper, but less generalizable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Richness of detail and context</td>
<td>Less contextual detail</td>
<td>Rich descriptions with more contextual detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nature of data-gathering methods emphasized</td>
<td>Various, but highly structured</td>
<td>Lengthier and less structured observations and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Types of designs and methods commonly used</td>
<td>Experiments Quasi-experiments Single-case designs Surveys</td>
<td>Ethnography Case studies Life history Focus groups Participatory action research Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data-gathering instruments emphasized</td>
<td>Closed-ended items in questionnaires and scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Labor intensiveness of data collection for researchers</td>
<td>Less time-consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Labor intensiveness of data analysis</td>
<td>Less time-consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Data analysis process</td>
<td>Calculate statistics that describe a population or assess the probability of error in inferences about hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paradigms emphasized in appraising rigor</td>
<td>Contemporary positivist standards for minimizing bias, maximizing objectivity, and statistically controlling for alternative explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ease of replication by other researchers</td>
<td>Easier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of this research is to address the question of quality and applicability as it relates to qualitative research in social work. A growing literature base stemming from qualitative research studies produce findings of relevance to social work practice. However, a recent study reviewing master’s level social work syllabi found content regarding qualitative methods was “generally very limited” (Drisko, 2008, p. 89) suggesting many social workers receive limited education about evaluating qualitative methods. To help overcome this limitation, this research seeks to provide social work practitioners some guidance when assessing the methodological quality of studies that employ qualitative methods (Lietz & Zayas, 2010). and Using Techniques of Qualitative Methods in Researches and Studies of Social Work literature review

A study of social work research literature for information about qualitative methods would turn out to be a brief venture. The late Howard Goldstein’s decade-old comment is, as Gould has observed, both true and untrue.1 Somewhat paradoxically, while there is a very large qualitative literature in social work journals, and evidence of a strong upward trend in the use of qualitative methods on social work doctoral research, the impression remains in the majority of student texts on social work research, that qualitative research is an exotic minority pastime (Goldstein, 1991).

This study was conducted to describe strategies used by social work researchers to enhance the rigor of their qualitative work. A template was developed and used to review a random sample of 100 articles drawn from social work journals listed in the “2005 Journal Citation Reports: Science and Social Sciences Edition.” Results suggest that the most commonly applied strategies were use of a sampling rationale (67%), analyst triangulation (59%), and mention of methodological limitations (56%); the
least common were negative or deviant case analysis (8%), external audit (7%), and specification of ontology (6%). Of eight key criteria, researchers used an average of 2.0 (SD = 1.5); however, the number used increased significantly between 2003 and 2008. The authors suggest that for this trend to continue, social work educators, journal editors, and researchers must reinforce the judicious application of strategies for enhancing the rigor of qualitative work (Barusch, Gringeri, & George, 2011).

This study by Sarah Dykeman, Allison Williams and Valorie Crooks in Canada illustrates the value of a qualitative approach for addressing very practical, policy-focused issues. In a paper entitled: Pre-implementation knowledge tool development for health services providers: A qualitative study of Canadian social workers, the authors focus on the low uptake of Canada’s Compassionate Care Benefit (Dykeman, Williams, & Crooks, 2013).

This study explores the epistemological foundations of qualitative social work research. A template-based review was completed on 100 articles from social work journals. Reviewers examined five things: (1) the purpose or aims of the research, (2) the rationale or justification for the work, (3) the populations studied, (4) the presence of four epistemological markers (addressing theory, paradigm, reflexivity, and power dynamics), and (5) the implications presented. Results underscore the exploratory nature of qualitative social work research; authors were most likely to use the word "explore" and least likely to use the term "understand" to describe their aims. The most common rationale given for the research was a gap in the literature (77%), followed by the severity or extent of the problem (50%). Authors emphasized the perspectives of respondents, who were most likely to be social work practitioners (39%) or clients (28%). Among the epistemological markers examined, authors were most likely to mention use of theory (55%) and a research paradigm (51%) and least likely to apply reflexivity (16%) or acknowledge power dynamics inherent in research (7%). Finally, authors were most likely to identify practice implications in their work (90%), followed by research (60%), theory (38%), and policy (29%) (Gringeri, Barusch, & Cambron, 2013).

Three main themes surfaced from this analysis: qualitative research as a means to sustain social workers’ identities in academia, qualitative research as intimately aligned with the core values of social work, and the importance of elevating qualitative research in social work. Many participants who have been enmeshed in academia for longer periods of time, particularly faculty members, noted that collecting qualitative data allowed them to feel as though they were still performing social work, rather than only being academics. They elaborated on how techniques they utilized in direct practice were conducive to better research encounters. Most participants cited that their motivation to engage in qualitative research was influenced by core social work values, particularly social justice, dignity and worth of the person, and the importance of human relationships. This notion proposes that both elevating their participants’ voices, as well as producing data that correct social problems and inequalities is best suited to qualitative research. Several participants suggested that in order to advance Social Work as a unique field, qualitative research should be a key feature in methods curricula within our field (Gomez, 2019).
the professional practice of social work with clinical micro-units (individual, family, and group) approach uses qualitative research methods in the process of data collection, analysis and interpretation to achieve the desired change. Qualitative research methods seek to examine the intrinsic nature of human phenomena as they are, so that they are based on the subjective dimension of human experience which is constantly changing according to the facts of time and space. This research indicates that when the clinical social work begins in terms of the client, it looks at the client as part of the environmental context in which he exists, and this corresponds to the qualitative research approach which is based on understanding the human phenomena (psychological and social) in their normal environment. This study is also trying to clarify by comparing the similarities and differences between the methods of qualitative research and the professional techniques used by the social worker in the professional practice of clinical social work. As well as, the results of this study can contribute to the provision of alternative criteria for the standards of quantitative approach and more effective in studying the psycho-social phenomena (Bader, 2020).

Quantitative research methods attempt to produce findings that are precise and generalizable. Qualitative research methods emphasize depth of understanding, attempt to subjectively tap the deeper meanings of human experiences, and are intended to generate theoretically rich observations.

**Background:**

Qualitative research tends to use data in the form of words rather than numerical information. It seeks to explain social phenomena through understanding the ways in which individuals make sense of their social worlds and sees knowledge as historically and culturally situated (Crotty, 1998).

Qualitative researchers usually work with small samples of people, nested in their context and studied in depth unlike quantitative researchers, who aim for larger numbers of context stripped cases and seek statistical significance. Qualitative samples tend to be purposive rather than random. Samples in qualitative studies are usually not wholly prespecified but can evolve once fieldwork begins. The initial choices of participants lead you to similar and different ones; observing one class of events invites comparison with another; and understanding one key relationship in the setting reveals facets to be studied in others (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014, p. 49).

Qualitative research is a research strategy that usually emphasizes words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data. As a research strategy it is broadly inductivist, constructionist, and interpretivist, but qualitative researchers do not always subscribe to all three of these features. (Bryman, 2012, p. 380)

Quantitative research is generally more valued by governmental bodies as it focuses more on the ‘what works’ agenda and is more easily generalizable, whereas social work research has tended to favour qualitative approaches. The majority of recent government-funded research has been qualitative research but this is at least partly influenced by the lack of capacity within social work to undertake quantitative research. More recently, there has been a trend towards combining these
methodologies and these traditional distinctions have become blurred. (Whittaker, 2012, p. 9)

**Reasons for Doing Qualitative Research:**

It might seem unnecessary to rationalize the need for qualitative research in this research featuring these methods, but there are reasons that stand out. Below are a few scenarios where qualitative methods are an obvious choice (Padgett, Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research, 2017, pp. 47-48)

1. You are exploring a topic about which little is known—especially from the “inside” perspective. This approach is the hallmark of qualitative methods.
2. You are pursuing a topic of sensitivity and emotional depth. Social workers and other human service professionals routinely encounter human crises and dilemmas that require empathy and understanding.
3. You wish to capture the “lived experience” from the perspectives of those who live it and create meaning from it.
4. You wish to get inside the “black box” of practice, programs, and interventions.
5. You are a quantitative researcher who has reached an impasse in explaining or understanding.
6. You are seeking to merge advocacy with research.
7. You wish to study complex social processes.

**STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH:**

Like all research methods, qualitative research has distinctive strengths and weaknesses. Let’s take a look at some of them now (Rubin & Babbie, 2017, pp. 446-448).

**Depth of Understanding:**

Qualitative research is especially effective for studying subtle nuances in attitudes and behaviors and for examining social processes over time. the chief strength of this method lies in the depth of understanding it permits. Whereas other research methods may be challenged as superficial, this charge is seldom lodged against qualitative research.

**Flexibility:**

Flexibility is another advantage of qualitative research: You may modify your research design at any time. Unlike most quantitative research, you often can be prepared to engage in qualitative research whenever the occasion arises, whereas you could not as easily initiate a survey or an experiment.

**Cost:**

Qualitative research can be relatively inexpensive. Other social scientific research methods may require expensive equipment or an expensive research staff, but qualitative research typically can be undertaken by one researcher with a notebook and pencil or with a good-quality audio or video recorder. This is not to say that qualitative research is never expensive. The nature of the research project, for example, may require a large number of trained observers. Expensive recording equipment may be needed.
Generalizability

Qualitative research also has several weaknesses. First, being qualitative rather than quantitative, it seldom yields precise statistical statements about a large population.

Generalizability One of the chief goals of science is generalization. Social scientists study particular situations and events to learn about social life in general. Generalizability is a problem for qualitative research. It crops up in three forms. First, as we’ve already suggested, the personal nature of the observations and measurements made by the researcher can produce results that would not necessarily be replicated by another, independent researcher. If the observation depends in part on the particular observers, then it becomes more valuable as a source of insight than as proof or truth.

Second, because qualitative researchers get a full and in-depth view of their subject matter, they can reach an unusually comprehensive understanding. By its very comprehensiveness, however, this understanding is less generalizable than results based on rigorous sampling and standardized measurements. You study the Generalizability is a problem for qualitative research. It crops up in three forms. First, as we’ve already suggested, the personal nature of the observations and measurements made by the researcher can produce results that would not necessarily be replicated by another, independent researcher. If the observation depends in part on the particular observers, then it becomes more valuable as a source of insight than as proof or truth.

KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH:

Most qualitative researchers agree that there is no specific definition of qualitative research. It can be viewed more as a group of methods that often contain certain key characteristics, such as studying research participants in their natural settings, interpreting events through the meaning ascribed to them, and interpreting the data with an open-minded viewpoint. (Yegidis, Weinbach, & Myers, 2018, p. 126)

Anastas (2004) defines the key characteristics of qualitative research: (Anastas, 2004)

1. Flexibility of method and procedure during the conduct of the study, often in response to findings as they emerge.
2. The collection of relatively unstructured data to describe the phenomena of interest in the words or actions of those who live them.
3. A scope of study that includes the observational context of the study, usually the one in which the phenomenon of interest naturally occurs, as well as the decisions made during the conduct of the study.
4. A scope of study that includes the subjective experiences of the researcher and the research participant as data while also describing and analyzing them. (p. 58)
5. Many qualitative researchers advise locating a qualitative study within a specific epistemological tradition because there are significant differences among them. Five epistemological frameworks found in qualitative evaluation are post positivism, pragmatism, phenomenology, interpretivism or constructivism, and critical, normative science. (p. 59)
Values and Social Responsibility in Qualitative Research

Qualitative methods have an inherent appeal to practitioner-researchers because they are rapport-driven and do not presume value-free inquiry. It is no accident that a growing number of researchers in social work are attracted to qualitative methods as compatible with their political and personal values (Padgett, 2009).

In qualitative research, respect for human agency is manifested in the ways that human actions are observed and interpreted, in the questions asked, and in the interpretation and presentation of the findings. One does not manufacture strengths if they do not appear to exist.

Reasons for choosing to combine qualitative and quantitative methods include: 1) to use one set of methods to illustrate cases or provide numbers for the findings of the other set; 2) to use one set to initiate ideas or techniques that subsequently can be pursued by the other set; and 3) to see if the two sets of findings corroborate each other. (RUBIN & BABBIE, 2016, p. 57).

Data Analysis Techniques

Content analysis uses both qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze the content included in literature, interview transcripts, client logs, and many other types of information on a selected topic. In qualitative research, content analysis looks for patterns in the data, then for contradictions to the patterns in order to redefine the patterns or identify new patterns. Content analysis can be used to transform qualitative data into quantitative data by identifying, categorizing, and counting certain responses, ideas. Content analysis is a versatile form of secondary analysis, analyzing various types of pre-existing data sets. It can be used in predominantly qualitative studies, for example, in analyzing CD or DVD recordings of interviews in studies that use grounded theory methods (described below). Content analysis is cross-sectional since the data are examined at one point in time. Yet, if those data were accumulated over a long period of time, they can be used to identify changes that occurred during the time that they were being accumulated, a feature associated with longitudinal research. Data sources may include: (Yegidis, Weinbach, & Myers, 2018, p. 130)

1) DVD or CD recordings of in-person interviews or focus groups.
2) client logs.
3) personal journals.
4) oral histories.
5) documents such as newspaper articles, professional journals, or congressional records.
6) movies or television programs.
7) minutes of meetings.
8) films or DVD recordings of social gatherings.
9) photographs.
10) recorded phone conversations.
11) e-mail or text messages.

Considering heightened expectations Rigorous qualitative research can offer important implications for social work practice. The purpose of this research is to
provide students some concepts to help frame their evaluation of the trustworthiness of qualitative research. As practitioners become more confident regarding their understanding of qualitative methods, they can better ascertain the applicability or usefulness of qualitative studies in their practice settings.

**Method**

A cross-sectional, non-probability convenience sample was used (N = 25) to explore staff attitudes and perceptions on interprofessional collaboration. Data were collected from staff in faculty of social work in Egypt in order to understand their experiences in the field and classroom. The researchers received approval to conduct this study.

As mentioned previously, the research aims include understanding the factors that may be associated with staff attitudes and perspectives on interprofessional collaboration. The study first provides descriptive information regarding social work staff attitudes toward interprofessional practice, their experiences in training in interprofessional practice, and their perspectives on interprofessional practice collaboration. This research further explores if there a relationship between (a) demographic characteristics (e.g., age and gender) and staff perspectives on interprofessional practice collaboration; (b) staff attitudes and interprofessional practice collaboration; and (c) training and interprofessional practice collaboration. In addition, the research examines: what are the multiple factors associated with perspectives on interprofessional practice collaboration?

**Measures:** The self-administered survey developed for this study included five major sections: (1) demographic data; (2) education, training and experience in the field; (3) attitudes toward interprofessional practice; (4) perspectives on interprofessional practice collaboration; and (5) perceptions of other professionals.

**Demographic data:** Demographic information was collected by asking participants questions concerning: (1) age at last birthday; (2) gender; and (3) marital status.

**Discussion:** The findings from the current research to make it sure that importance the qualitative methods in researches and studies of social work.

**Quantitative research methods** Research methods that typically seek to produce precise and generalizable findings. Studies using quantitative methods typically attempt to formulate all or most of their research procedures in advance and then try to adhere precisely to those procedures with maximum objectivity as data are collected.

**Qualitative research methods** Research methods that are more flexible than quantitative methods, that allow research procedures to evolve as more observations are gathered, and that typically permit the use of subjectivity to generate deeper understandings of the meanings of human experiences. and the benefits of combining them in mixed methods research.

Echoing the debates about the robustness of qualitative methods in general, the critique of the use of image-based methods falls into a number of categories primarily relating to validity. These categories include authenticity, rigour, trustworthiness, neutrality, objectivity, reliability, and transferability to name but a few! There is much
discussion in the literature on research methods as to the existence of and reason for attaining quality standards in qualitative research. This dialogue seems now to be more accepting of the opinion that such standards are possible, are necessary and that they should form part of the process of doing the research. Furthermore, that ensuring such quality of research is a responsibility of the researcher. The discussion about the quality of qualitative research has centered on a difference in, and rejection of, terminology and, in turn, accepted benchmarks usually associated with quantitative research where it has hitherto been accepted that ways of ensuring these standards rely upon having set rules and ways of measuring.

In addition, they illustrate the diversity of methodological approaches that make qualitative research so celebrated. That all authors have included substantial discussion of theoretical and methodological choices renders this collection particularly useful for the novice and experienced scholar alike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Evaluation</th>
<th>Qualitative Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To measure intervention outcomes in a numeric manner that</td>
<td>To measure intervention outcomes using a non-numeric approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows for quantification of results, analysis of success,</td>
<td>that allows for the description of outcomes in subjective,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and demonstrated level of change</td>
<td>individual, narrative, and nonquantifiable ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and post-tests, standardized instruments,</td>
<td>Interviews, client satisfaction instruments, narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveys, questionnaires, external review</td>
<td>evaluation tools, self-evaluation, and report by client/client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Evaluation</th>
<th>Outcome Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To measure the intervention process in terms of fidelity,</td>
<td>To measure the results of the intervention process in terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the stages of planned change, monitoring and adapting of</td>
<td>of level of success, achievement of goals and objectives,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives, and completion of intervention effort</td>
<td>and changes over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion rates, assessment of fidelity to intervention</td>
<td>Pre- and post-tests, standardized instruments, surveys,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model, process recordings</td>
<td>questionnaires, goal attainment scaling, logic model, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>longitudinal studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Social Work Performance</th>
<th>Evaluation of Client/Client System Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To measure the quality and level of</td>
<td>To measure the quality and level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance of a social worker,</td>
<td>progress of a client/client system, which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization, or social program in</td>
<td>is the target of change in terms of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving intervention goals and</td>
<td>achievement of intervention goals and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives</td>
<td>objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory feedback, self-assessment,</td>
<td>Pre- and post-tests, standardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality assurance, peer review,</td>
<td>instruments, achievement of goals and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external review, agency compliance</td>
<td>objectives, goal attainment scaling, self-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with standards, program evaluation,</td>
<td>evaluation and report of client/client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client satisfaction instruments,</td>
<td>system, observation, level of functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisory board input</td>
<td>scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, there are many sound reasons to do qualitative research—some or all of the aforementioned scenarios may give rise to a particular study. There are also reasons not to pursue qualitative research. Foremost among these is that the topic of interest is better served by quantitative designs such as experiments or surveys. Second, anyone seeking qualitative research as “the easy way” should be forewarned—the intensive labor and immersion required are reason enough to think twice.

Accordingly, in both qualitative and quantitative research, the review of existing knowledge is used to develop well-articulated, focused research questions. In quantitative studies, it often allows the researcher to develop research hypotheses as well. In all types of research, existing knowledge helps the researcher make decisions about how the research should be conducted, what is generally referred to as the research design.

As reported earlier in this research, many evaluations are qualitative in nature or at least have qualitative components. They may collect data using open-ended questions, in-depth interviews, focus groups, unstructured observations, or existing data sources. Three qualitative data analysis strategies are especially relevant for such evaluations: case studies, reducing responses to fewer general categories, and theme analysis.

Findings

The participants’ narratives highlighted that their professional learning can be constituted of three components: Experience, Opportunity, and Reflection. Here, I would like to place special emphasis on the fact that these components are not entirely distinct from each other. Professional learning should be seen as a holistic experience with each component inextricably interwoven. Before describing each component, I consider how the participants saw their learning experiences, which they felt had significantly affected them over their careers. Through the particular learning experiences, all participants described themselves as finding different perspectives on something associated with practice, though those key experiences were referred to in different ways: experiences of ‘eye-opener’, ‘perspective-alerting’ and ‘turning point’ among others. The findings show that they regarded those experiences as some kind of a ‘trigger’ that allowed them to see things from different perspectives to the past one they had, though such perspective changes varied widely depending on their learning situation.

Conclusion

The future of social work research, and perhaps ultimately the profession, depend on the competence of future scholars. If we train our future scholars, those who will become “the academy” to value qualitative inquiry, we will build a system where the qualitative research traditions obtain the same privilege as quantitative research traditions. This can broaden the tools researchers practice to maximize their research abilities, provides learning opportunities that can challenge assumptions about what academia considers “real” research, a notion with main implications for social work. and other experiential education pedagogies allow instructors to learn the content and utility of qualitative research in an organic fashion. If they ascribe positive value to qualitative inquiry, the culture of academia should follow suit because we will, in time, be “the academy.”

The most important problem facing research and studies in social work according to the results of the current research is its failure to use the methodology that allows researchers to start their studies away from theoretical restrictions and quantitative tools that do not enable researchers to a realistic picture of the phenomena and
problems that are concerned with studying social work, hence The current research discusses the techniques of using qualitative approaches in social work research and studies, through:

- Defining qualitative methods, their objectives and the justifications for calling for their use in social work studies and research.
- Clarifying the differences between qualitative and quantitative approaches in social work research and studies.
- Presenting some research studies and literature.
- Research background on qualitative approaches.
- Justifications for adopting qualitative approaches.
- Emphasis on values and social responsibility in qualitative research.
- Techniques of data analysis.

And through the results of the current research, which was applied to a sample of (25) samples, faculty members of the College of Developmental Social work - Beni Suef University in the Arab Republic of Egypt, the following points can be drawn:

1) Despite the importance of qualitative methods in social work research and studies, its application suffers from multiple difficulties, and this may be due to a variety of reasons that may be psychological, cultural or organizational, and most notably of these reasons and factors is that the use of qualitative methods techniques requires the availability of a scientific environment supported by social and economic circumstances that concern By achieving intellectual creativity.

2) Some academics understood qualitative methods as not proceeding according to the precise steps of scientific research, as the research design, its hypotheses and its variables are not defined, and the researcher goes to the field without clear research questions, which makes it difficult for the junior researchers' task and pushes them to use quantitative approaches, but it must be clarified that the difference Qualitative approaches about quantitative methods does not mean that they are without steps or that they are not scientific. Qualitative methods have their own techniques, which we use, which are methods of scientific accuracy, but in a different way to what is known in quantitative methods.

The results concluded that the need to direct researchers and academics to make use of qualitative approaches in social work research and studies.
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