NVivo-Formatted Full Academic Output

FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS

METHOD – BASED ON – Ritchie & Spencer (1994)

Contents

Introduction

This dummy study was designed to demonstrate the full workflow and outputs of a hybrid Framework Analysis conducted using NVivo-equivalent procedures. The study explores young adults' views on regulating children's social media use, an applied and policy-relevant topic well suited to framework-based qualitative analysis. A simulated dataset comprising semi-structured responses from 15 participants was used, with each participant responding to a fixed set of predefined research questions. The study adopts a hybrid analytic approach in which the research questions provide the overarching analytic framework, while allowing for inductive subthemes to emerge within each question. The purpose of this dummy study is not to generate substantive empirical claims, but to illustrate, step by step, how Framework Analysis can be systematically applied, documented, and reported in a manner consistent with best practice and NVivo-style qualitative workflows. If you order our qualitative Framework Analysis service, this report is an example of what you would receive.

MODULE 1. Familiarisation with the data

Familiarisation (Hybrid, Question-Oriented)

(Client- and report-ready version; no coding yet)

Purpose of familiarisation in Framework Analysis

In Framework Analysis, familiarisation serves a different purpose than in purely inductive approaches. Rather than open-ended exploration, familiarisation is **directed toward understanding how participants respond to predefined research questions**, while remaining alert to unanticipated issues that may warrant inductive expansion within those questions.

In this hybrid approach, familiarisation is used to:

- Develop an overview of responses to each research question

- Identify early patterns and contrasts across cases

- Sensitise the analyst to potential **emergent subthemes** without formal coding

Dataset overview

The dataset comprised **15 cases**, each representing an individual participant. All participants responded to the same four research questions concerning children's social media use:

1. Perceived risks

2. Perceived benefits

3. Views on regulation and management

4. Perceived responsibility for regulation

Each case was treated as a single unit of analysis, with responses organised by research question to support structured comparison across participants. Participants varied by **role** (student, working young adult, parent) and **orientation** (restrictive, conditional, permissive), enabling later cross-case and subgroup analysis.

Familiarisation process

All cases were read in full, with attention given to:

- The content and tone of responses within each research question

- Differences in emphasis between restrictive, conditional, and permissive orientations

- Consistencies and divergences across participant roles

Initial notes were recorded at the level of **research questions**, rather than across the dataset as a whole. This ensured that familiarisation remained aligned with the analytic framework while allowing flexibility for inductive insight.

No formal indexing, coding, or categorisation was undertaken at this stage.

Initial observations by research question

(Pre-analytic; descriptive only)

Research Question 1: Perceived risks

Responses to perceived risks were present across all orientations, though the **type and framing of risk varied**. Commonly referenced risks included psychological impacts (e.g., anxiety, self-esteem), exposure to inappropriate content, and social comparison. Some participants framed

risks as inherent to platform design (e.g., algorithms), while others emphasised children's developmental vulnerability.

Notably, even permissive participants acknowledged the existence of risks, though they often contextualised these as manageable or exaggerated.

Research Question 2: Perceived benefits

Perceived benefits were discussed less consistently than risks and varied substantially across cases. Benefits most frequently related to social connection, inclusion, and the development of communication or digital skills. Several participants questioned whether such benefits were necessary or appropriate for children under 16, particularly when compared to offline alternatives.

These variations suggest potential **sub-dimensions within perceived benefits** that may warrant inductive elaboration at later stages.

Research Question 3: Views on regulation and management

Responses indicated a broad range of regulatory preferences, from strong restriction or delayed access to supervision-based or education-focused approaches. Many participants expressed nuanced positions that resisted simple binaries, favouring graduated or conditional access.

This research question appears particularly amenable to **inductive subtheme development**, given the diversity of regulatory mechanisms proposed.

Research Question 4: Responsibility for regulation

Responsibility was rarely attributed to a single actor. Participants variously identified parents, social media platforms, schools, and regulators as responsible, often in combination. This distribution of responsibility suggests that responsibility functions as a **relational and shared concept** rather than an individual one.

Differences across participant roles were evident and will be explored in later cross-case analysis.

Suitability for hybrid Framework Analysis

The familiarisation process confirmed that the dataset is well suited to a **hybrid Framework Analysis** approach. The predefined research questions provide a clear analytic structure, while the variability within responses indicates sufficient depth for inductive expansion within each framework category.

The data allow:

- Systematic indexing against fixed research questions

- Inductive identification of subthemes within each question

- Cross-case and cross-group comparison using matrices

Below is **Framework Analysis – Module 2**, written as a **report-ready section** and aligned with a **hybrid (deductive–inductive) Framework Analysis** approach. This mirrors what a careful NVivo user would document before building the framework matrix or indexing any data.

MODULE 2: Analytic Orientation and Framework Design (Hybrid Approach)

Methodological orientation

This analysis follows a **Framework Analysis** approach, adopting a **hybrid analytic design** in which predefined research questions provide the overarching analytic framework, while allowing for **inductive subthemes to emerge within each framework category**. This approach is particularly appropriate for applied qualitative research where the study is guided by specific questions but seeks to remain sensitive to unanticipated issues raised by participants.

The analytic orientation is therefore **primarily deductive at the framework level** and **inductive at the subcategory level**, ensuring both structure and analytic flexibility.

Role of the research questions as the analytic framework

The four predefined research questions function as the **primary framework categories**. Each research question delineates a bounded analytic domain within which all data are indexed and analysed.

The framework categories are:

1. **Perceived risks of children's social media use**

2. **Perceived benefits of children's social media use**

3. **Views on regulation and management of use**

4. **Perceived responsibility for regulation**

These categories were treated as **fixed and non-negotiable** for the duration of the analysis. No data were coded outside of these domains, ensuring that the analysis remained tightly aligned with the study aims.

Hybrid inductive component: subtheme development

Within each framework category, **inductive subthemes** were permitted to emerge during indexing. This inductive component was constrained by explicit rules to prevent analytic drift:

- Subthemes must be conceptually nested within a single research question

- No subtheme may span multiple framework categories

- Subthemes must be grounded in multiple cases, not isolated comments

- Subthemes must add analytic value beyond simple repetition of the research question

This approach allows the analysis to capture nuance and variation without undermining the clarity and comparability central to Framework Analysis.

Unit of analysis and unit of indexing

The **unit of analysis** was defined as the **individual participant** (one case per participant). Each participant provided responses to all four research questions.

The **unit of indexing** consisted of meaningful segments within each response that addressed a specific aspect of the relevant research question. Indexing was applied at the level of ideas or propositions rather than entire responses, allowing multiple indexed segments within a single research question response where appropriate.

Indexing rules and analytic discipline

To maintain consistency and transparency, the following indexing rules were applied:

- All data segments were indexed to one (and only one) framework category

- Overlapping indexing across framework categories was not permitted

- Inductive subthemes were created only when multiple data segments addressed a similar issue within the same research question

- Descriptive summaries were preferred over verbatim quotations at later stages

These rules reflect standard Framework Analysis practice and align with NVivo's framework matrix logic.

Quantification and comparison

Quantification was used **descriptively**, not inferentially, to support systematic comparison across cases and groups. Counts of indexed cases and references were used to identify distribution patterns within framework categories and subthemes. These counts were used to inform charting and cross-case analysis but were not treated as indicators of importance or prevalence beyond their descriptive function.

Audit trail and transparency

All analytic decisions made at this stage—including the confirmation of framework categories, the rules governing inductive subtheme development, and the definition of indexing boundaries—were documented to support transparency and replicability. This audit trail forms the basis for subsequent framework construction, indexing, and charting.

Output of Module 2

At the conclusion of this module:

- The analytic framework was formally defined and locked

- Rules for inductive subtheme emergence were established

- Units of analysis and indexing were confirmed

- The dataset was approved for framework construction and indexing

No coding, indexing, or charting was conducted at this stage.

MODULE 3: Construction of the Initial Analytical Framework (Framework v1)

Purpose of framework construction

The purpose of this stage was to construct an **initial analytical framework (Framework v1)** that would guide systematic indexing and subsequent charting of the data. In Framework Analysis, the framework functions as the primary organising structure, replacing an open-ended codebook as the central analytic device.

In line with the hybrid approach adopted in this study, the framework was **deductively structured around predefined research questions**, while remaining open to **inductive subthemes** that could emerge during indexing.

Basis for framework categories

The four framework categories were derived directly from the study's research questions. Each category represents a **bounded analytic domain**, ensuring that all data could be consistently classified while maintaining comparability across cases.

The framework categories were designed to:

- Be mutually exclusive at the top level

- Capture all relevant data without overlap

- Align directly with the structure of the findings chapter

Initial Analytical Framework (Framework v1)

The table below represents Framework v1, formatted to mirror the structure typically used in NVivo's Framework Analysis environment.

Framework Category	Linked Research Question	Category Definition	Scope of Included Data	Explicit Exclusions
Perceived Risks	RQ1: What risks do young adults associate with children's social media use?	References to any negative consequences, dangers, or harms associated with children under 16 using social media.	Psychological or emotional harm, exposure to inappropriate content, social comparison, bullying, algorithmic influence, developmental concerns.	Benefits of use; regulatory strategies; responsibility attribution.
Perceived Benefits	RQ2: What benefits, if any, do young adults perceive?	References to positive outcomes or advantages associated with children's social media use.	Social connection, inclusion, communication skills, self-expression, digital literacy, preparation for modern life.	Risk-focused content; regulation strategies; responsibility attribution.
Regulation and Management	RQ3: What forms of regulation or management do	References to proposed rules, limits, strategies, or approaches to	Bans, supervision, time limits, gradual access, education-based	Evaluations of risks or benefits without reference to management;

Framework Category	Linked Research Question	Category Definition	Scope of Included Data	Explicit Exclusions
	young adults support?	managing children's social media use.	approaches, platform-specific controls.	responsibility attribution.
Responsibility for Regulation	RQ4: Who do young adults believe should be responsible for regulating children's social media use?	References to actors or institutions identified as responsible for managing or regulating children's social media use.	Parents, social media platforms, schools, governments, regulators, shared responsibility models.	Descriptions of regulation strategies without attribution; general risk or benefit statements.

Rules governing inductive subtheme development

Within each framework category, inductive subthemes were permitted to emerge during indexing, subject to the following rules:

- Subthemes must be clearly nested within a single framework category

- Subthemes must reflect a recurring issue across multiple cases

- Subthemes must add analytic specificity beyond the framework category label

- Subthemes may not cut across multiple research questions

At this stage, **no subthemes were formally defined**. The purpose of Framework v1 is to establish the analytic scaffold, not to pre-empt inductive findings.

Relationship between framework and data structure

Each participant response was already organised by research question, allowing direct alignment between:

- Framework categories

- Data segments to be indexed

- Future framework matrices (cases × categories)

This alignment ensures that later charting and cross-case comparison can be conducted efficiently and transparently.

10

Methodological discipline at this stage

To preserve analytic rigor:

- No indexing or coding was conducted during framework construction

- No frequency counts or summaries were generated

- No interpretive claims were made

All decisions at this stage were structural and preparatory.

MODULE 4: Indexing the Data (Applying the Framework)

Purpose of indexing in Framework Analysis

Indexing is the process through which data are systematically classified according to the predefined analytical framework. In Framework Analysis, indexing replaces open-ended coding and serves to **assign data segments to framework categories** in a disciplined and transparent manner.

The purpose of indexing at this stage was to:

- Systematically apply **Framework v1** across the full dataset

- Ensure all data were consistently classified within the appropriate framework category

- Prepare the dataset for subsequent charting into framework matrices

Indexing was conducted prior to any abstraction, synthesis, or interpretation.

Indexing procedure

Each case was reviewed in full, with attention given to responses under each research question. Meaningful segments of text were indexed to the corresponding framework category based on content and analytic intent.

Indexing followed a **question-aligned structure**, such that:

- Responses to RQ1 were indexed under *Perceived Risks*

- Responses to RQ2 were indexed under *Perceived Benefits*

- Responses to RQ3 were indexed under *Regulation and Management*

- Responses to RQ4 were indexed under *Responsibility for Regulation*

No data were indexed outside of these categories.

Unit of indexing

The **unit of indexing** was defined as a meaningful segment of text within each response that expressed a distinct idea relevant to the framework category. In many cases, a single response contained multiple indexable ideas and was therefore indexed into multiple segments within the same framework category.

Importantly:

- Each indexed segment was assigned to **one framework category only**

- Cross-category indexing was not permitted

- Entire responses were indexed only where they addressed a single idea

This approach ensured conceptual clarity and analytic discipline.

Handling of inductive subthemes

During indexing, attention was paid to **recurring patterns within framework categories** that suggested the emergence of inductive subthemes. These potential subthemes were noted analytically but were not formalised at this stage.

Consistent with the hybrid approach:

- Subthemes were only noted when similar ideas appeared across multiple cases

- No subthemes were created unless they were clearly nested within a single framework category

- No redefinition of framework categories occurred during indexing

Formal subtheme development is reserved for the charting and comparison stages.

Indexing consistency and transparency

To support consistency:

- Framework category definitions and inclusion/exclusion criteria (Module 3) were applied uniformly across all cases

- Ambiguous segments were resolved by reference to the linked research question

- Indexing decisions were documented to maintain an audit trail

This process mirrors NVivo's framework indexing logic, where clarity of assignment is prioritised over analytic breadth.

Completion of indexing

All 15 cases were successfully indexed across the four framework categories. Each case contributed data to multiple categories, reflecting the multi-dimensional nature of participants' views.

At the conclusion of indexing:

- All data were classified within Framework v1

- No data were excluded or left unindexed

- The dataset was ready for charting into framework matrices

No summaries, matrices, or interpretations were produced at this stage.

Indexed Dataset Aligned to Framework v1

(NVivo-equivalent output)

What this output represents (brief clarification for the reader)

This table presents the **indexed dataset**, showing how each case has been systematically aligned to the four framework categories derived from the research questions.

In NVivo terms, this corresponds to:

- Data being indexed to **framework nodes**, prior to matrix charting

- A transparent record of **what content sits under each framework category**, by case

At this stage:

- Data are **not yet summarised**

- No abstraction or interpretation has occurred

- Content is presented in **condensed but still data-proximal form**

Indexed Dataset by Framework Category (Pre-Charting)

CaseID	Perceived Risks (RQ1)	Perceived Benefits (RQ2)	Regulation & Management (RQ3)	Responsibility for Regulation (RQ4)
P01	Exposure to harmful content; negative effects on confidence and mental health	No clear benefits identified beyond entertainment	Strong restriction or no access under 16	Parents primarily; platforms should enforce age limits
P02	Bullying and peer influence	Social connection, especially for isolated children	Supervision and strict time limits	Parents primarily; schools also involved
P03	Lack of emotional maturity; vulnerability to content	Benefits not evident for young children	Support for banning most platforms	Platforms and government intervention required
P04	Comparison culture and appearance pressure	Social inclusion with peers	Gradual, rule-based access	Parents guide; platforms provide safer versions
P05	Risks acknowledged but viewed as exaggerated	Digital and communication skill development	Education rather than restriction	Shared responsibility (parents and schools)
P06	Exposure to inappropriate content	Social media not necessary for socialising	Delayed access as long as possible	Parents stricter; platforms prevent underage use
P07	Anxiety and low self-esteem impacts	Easier connection for shy children	Supervision and time limits	Parents key; platforms design risks
P08	Online bullying harms children	Friendship support when monitored	Shared accounts and clear boundaries	Parents lead; schools support
P09	Risks viewed as part of wider life risks	Belonging and self-expression	Responsible use education	Shared societal responsibility
P10	Algorithm-driven exposure to harmful content	Few perceived benefits	Platform-level access restrictions	Platforms and regulators most responsible

CaseID	Perceived Risks (RQ1)	Perceived Benefits (RQ2)	Regulation & Management (RQ3)	Responsibility for Regulation (RQ4)
P11	Intense online peer pressure	Maintaining friendships	Limited daily access	Parents monitor; guidance for children
P12	Constant comparison damages self-esteem	Benefits outweighed by risks	Strong restrictions necessary	Parents with regulatory support
P13	Risk varies by child maturity	Educational and social benefits possible	Case-by-case supervised access	Parents decide; platforms provide tools
P14	Validation-seeking encouraged by platforms	Benefits not applicable to under-16s	Most platforms inappropriate	Shared responsibility (parents & platforms)
P15	Risks acknowledged but manageable	Preparation for modern communication	Education over restriction	Schools should play a greater role

Why this table matters

This table:

- **Is the indexed dataset**

- Makes indexing decisions **visible and auditable**

- Shows how raw responses are **systematically organised** before abstraction

- Is exactly what examiners, supervisors, and methods reviewers look for

Without this table, Module 4 would be **procedural only**.
With it, Module 4 is now **evidential**.

MODULE 5: Charting Data into Framework Matrices

Purpose of charting in Framework Analysis

Charting is the process through which indexed data are **summarised and organised into framework matrices**, allowing systematic comparison across cases and categories. Unlike

indexing, which remains close to the original data, charting involves **analytic summarisation** while preserving traceability to source material.

In Framework Analysis, charting represents the transition from data management to analytic comparison.

Principles guiding charting

Charting was conducted in accordance with established Framework Analysis principles:

- Data were **summarised**, not quoted verbatim

- Summaries remained faithful to the indexed content

- Each cell reflected the key points made by a given case within a framework category

- No interpretation or explanation beyond summarisation was introduced

Each case contributed one charted entry per framework category.

Framework Matrix 1: Cases × Framework Categories

Framework Matrix (Charted Data)

CaseID	Perceived Risks	Perceived Benefits	Regulation & Management	Responsibility for Regulation
P01	Psychological harm and exposure to harmful content	No meaningful benefits identified	Strong restriction or exclusion	Parents lead; platforms enforce age limits
P02	Bullying and peer pressure	Social connection for isolated children	Supervised access with time limits	Parents primarily; schools support
P03	Emotional immaturity and vulnerability	Benefits not evident	Ban most platforms	Platforms and government
P04	Appearance-based comparison	Peer inclusion	Gradual, rule-based access	Parents guide; platforms adapt
P05	Risks acknowledged but minimised	Skill development	Education-based approach	Shared (parents/schools)
P06	Inappropriate content exposure	Social media unnecessary	Delayed access	Parents and platforms

CaseID	Perceived Risks	Perceived Benefits	Regulation & Management	Responsibility for Regulation
P07	Anxiety and low self-esteem	Support for shy children	Supervision and limits	Parents and platforms
P08	Online bullying	Friendship support if monitored	Shared accounts and boundaries	Parents lead; schools assist
P09	Risks part of wider life	Belonging and expression	Education over restriction	Shared societal responsibility
P10	Algorithm-driven exposure	Few benefits	Platform-level restrictions	Platforms and regulators
P11	Intense peer pressure	Friendship maintenance	Limited daily use	Parents with child guidance
P12	Constant comparison	Risks outweigh benefits	Strong restrictions	Parents with regulation
P13	Risk varies by maturity	Educational/social benefits	Case-by-case supervision	Parents decide; platforms support
P14	Validation-seeking culture	No clear benefits	Most platforms unsuitable	Parents and platforms
P15	Risks manageable	Preparation for modern communication	Education-focused	Schools have major role

Framework Matrix 2: Categories × Orientation (Summarised Comparison)

To support cross-group comparison, a secondary matrix was developed using participants' orientation toward children's social media use.

Framework Categories × Orientation (Analytic Summary)

Orientation	Perceived Risks	Perceived Benefits	Regulation & Management	Responsibility
Restrictive	Emphasised harms and vulnerability	Benefits largely rejected	Bans or strong restrictions	Parents, platforms, regulators

Orientation	Perceived Risks	Perceived Benefits	Regulation & Management	Responsibility
Conditional	Risks acknowledged but contextualised	Limited, conditional benefits	Supervision and limits	Shared responsibility
Permissive	Risks normalised or minimised	Stronger emphasis on benefits	Education over restriction	Societal or institutional sharing

This matrix supports structured comparison while remaining grounded in charted case data.

Handling of inductive subthemes during charting

During charting, recurring distinctions within framework categories became apparent (e.g., different types of risks or regulatory approaches). These were noted analytically but were not yet formalised as subthemes.

Formal identification and refinement of inductive subthemes are reserved for the next stage of analysis.

MODULE 6 - Pattern Identification and Cross-Case Comparison

Purpose of pattern identification in Framework Analysis

Following charting of the data into framework matrices, the next stage involved **systematic identification of patterns across cases and groups**. In Framework Analysis, this stage focuses on **describing regularities, contrasts, and configurations** within and across framework categories, without yet moving to explanatory or interpretive claims.

The purpose of this module was to:

- Identify recurring patterns within each framework category

- Compare patterns across participant orientations and roles

- Prepare the analytic ground for interpretive synthesis

All observations at this stage remain **descriptive and comparative**, not interpretive.

Approach to cross-case comparison

Patterns were identified through:

- Horizontal comparison (across cases within a single framework category)

- Vertical comparison (across framework categories within individual cases)

- Group-based comparison using case attributes (orientation and role)

Comparisons were grounded directly in the charted framework matrices produced in Module 5.

Pattern identification by framework category

1. Perceived risks of children's social media use

Across cases, perceived risks clustered around **three dominant types**:

- Psychological and emotional harm (e.g., anxiety, self-esteem)

- Exposure to inappropriate or harmful content

- Social comparison and validation-seeking

Restrictive cases tended to frame risks as **inherent and severe**, while conditional cases acknowledged risks but emphasised **context and manageability**. Permissive cases did not deny risks, but frequently normalised them as comparable to offline risks.

This pattern suggests systematic variation in **risk framing**, rather than simple presence or absence of concern.

2. Perceived benefits of children's social media use

Benefits were less uniformly distributed across cases. Where benefits were identified, they clustered around:

- Social connection and inclusion

- Development of communication or digital skills

- Preparation for participation in modern social environments

Restrictive cases largely rejected the relevance of these benefits for children under 16. Conditional cases acknowledged benefits selectively, often tying them to supervision. Permissive cases articulated benefits more confidently and broadly.

This pattern highlights **benefit recognition as a key differentiating factor** across orientations.

3. Regulation and management of use

Clear patterning emerged in preferred regulatory approaches:

- Restrictive cases favoured bans, delayed access, or strong limitations

- Conditional cases emphasised supervision, time limits, and gradual access

- Permissive cases prioritised education and skill-building over restriction

Notably, very few cases advocated completely unregulated access, indicating a general consensus that **some form of management is necessary**, even among permissive participants.

4. Responsibility for regulation

Responsibility was consistently framed as **distributed rather than singular**. Across cases, responsibility was attributed to:

- Parents

- Social media platforms

- Schools and educational systems

- Regulators or government bodies

Restrictive cases more frequently emphasised platforms and regulation, while conditional and permissive cases highlighted shared responsibility models. Parents were mentioned across all orientations, but rarely as the sole responsible actor.

This pattern indicates a shared understanding of regulation as a **collective task**.

Cross-category patterning

When examined across framework categories, several recurring configurations emerged:

- High risk emphasis + strong restriction preferences

- Risk acknowledgement + conditional regulation + shared responsibility

- Risk normalisation + benefit emphasis + education-based regulation

These configurations were not interpreted as typologies at this stage but were documented as **recurrent analytic patterns**.

Group-based comparison (orientation)

Comparison by orientation revealed systematic differences:

Orientation	Risk Framing	Benefit Recognition	Regulation Preference	Responsibility Attribution
Restrictive	High, severe	Low or absent	Bans/restrictions	Parents, platforms, regulators
Conditional	Moderate, contextual	Selective	Supervision and limits	Shared
Permissive	Normalised	High	Education-based	Societal/institutional

This table summarises descriptive patterns only and does not imply causality.

MODULE 7: Interpretation and Explanatory Synthesis

Purpose of interpretive synthesis in Framework Analysis

The purpose of this stage was to develop an **explanatory account** of the patterns identified through framework matrices and cross-case comparisons. In Framework Analysis, interpretation is explicitly linked to the study's predefined research questions and is designed to generate **applied, policy-relevant insights** rather than abstract theory.

Interpretation was therefore grounded in:

- The charted framework matrices (Module 5)

- Systematic pattern identification (Module 6)

- Explicit comparison across cases and orientations

A clear distinction is maintained between **descriptive findings** (what was observed) and **interpretive explanations** (what these observations suggest).

Step-by-step process to produce Module 7

Step 1 — Gather the evidence pack (inputs)

Before writing anything, pull together:

- **Framework Matrix (Table 5.1)** (cases × categories)

- **Group comparison matrix** (e.g., Table 5.2: category × orientation)

- **Pattern notes** from Module 6 (within-category patterns and configurations)

Output of Step 1: a short working list of:

- the dominant patterns per RQ

- notable differences by role/orientation

- any exceptions/contradictions

Step 2 — Create "Pattern Statements" (still descriptive)

For each research question, write 3–6 bullet statements that describe what the matrix shows.

Rules:

- Use neutral language: "Participants commonly…" "Several cases indicated…"

- Do **not** explain why yet

- Anchor each statement to evidence (cases or group pattern)

Template for pattern statements

- Pattern 1: [What appears] + [where/for whom]

- Pattern 2: [Variation] + [contrast groups]

- Pattern 3: [Exception] + [what makes it different]

Output of Step 2: a set of descriptive pattern bullets per RQ.

Step 3 — Convert patterns into "Interpretive Claims"

Now interpret, but constrain it.

For each pattern statement ask:

- What does this suggest about underlying assumptions, values, or beliefs?

- What does it imply about how participants frame the issue?

- What model of childhood / risk / responsibility seems to sit behind it?

Guardrails (non-negotiable)

- Each interpretive claim must map to **at least two cases** or a clear group trend.

- Label interpretive language clearly ("This suggests…", "This may indicate…").

- Avoid causal wording unless the data explicitly supports it.

Output of Step 3: 2–4 interpretive claims per RQ, each tied to 1–2 descriptive patterns.

Step 4 — Write the RQ narrative in a standard structure

For each research question, write the interpretation in the same repeatable structure:

Standard RQ write-up structure

1. **Headline finding** (1–2 sentences)

2. **Evidence summary** (what the matrix shows; reference group differences)

3. **Interpretive explanation** (what this suggests; why it matters)

4. **Boundary conditions** (exceptions/contradictions)

5. **Mini-conclusion** (1 sentence linking back to the RQ)

This keeps the output consistent and "NVivo-reportable".

Step 5 — Add cross-RQ synthesis (optional but strong)

Once all RQs are written, add a short synthesis that answers:

- Which ideas connect across RQs?

- Do certain orientations produce consistent configurations across RQs?

- What underlying dimensions explain the patterning across the whole framework?

Tip: Use 2–3 "integrative propositions" rather than long prose.

Step 6 — Add applied implications (optional, depending on your product)

If the client is writing a thesis/article, include implications as **conditional** statements:

- Implication for policy: …

- Implication for education: …

- Implication for parents/platforms: …

Keep them grounded and avoid prescriptions unless requested.

Step 7 — Quality check (your internal checklist)

Before finalising Module 7, confirm:

- ✅ Every interpretive claim is grounded in matrix evidence

- ✅ Description and interpretation are clearly separated

- ✅ No new categories appear (only those in framework/subthemes)

- ✅ Language matches applied Framework Analysis (not exploratory thematic writing)

- ✅ You have at least one exception/negative case noted somewhere

MODULE 8: Reporting and Presentation of Findings

Purpose of reporting in Framework Analysis

The purpose of this module is to present findings in a **structured, transparent, and question-aligned format** suitable for theses, dissertations, research articles, and applied reports. Reporting in Framework Analysis prioritises **comparability, traceability, and clarity**, using matrices and concise narrative to answer predefined research questions.

Findings are reported in three layers:

1. **Framework outputs (tables/matrices)**
2. **Descriptive summaries linked to those outputs**
3. **Interpretive synthesis (already developed in Module 7)**

Overview of reporting structure

- Findings are organised **by Research Question** (RQ1–RQ4)

- Each RQ includes:

  o A **framework table or matrix**

  o A **descriptive summary** (what the data show)

  o A brief **interpretive signpost** (linking to Module 7)

This structure mirrors how Framework Analysis is commonly written up in applied research.

Core Framework Tables (NVivo-equivalent outputs)

Table Final Framework Categories and Case Coverage

Framework Category	Linked RQ	Number of Cases (n=15)
Perceived Risks	RQ1	15
Perceived Benefits	RQ2	10

Framework Category	Linked RQ	Number of Cases (n=15)
Regulation & Management	RQ3	15
Responsibility for Regulation	RQ4	15

Note: All cases contributed to RQ1, RQ3, and RQ4; perceived benefits were not identified by all participants.

Table Framework Matrix (Condensed Reporting Version)

(Condensed version of the charted matrix presented in Module 5; suitable for results chapters)

Orientation	Risks (RQ1)	Benefits (RQ2)	Regulation (RQ3)	Responsibility (RQ4)
Restrictive	Severe, inherent risks	Benefits largely rejected	Bans or strong limits	Parents, platforms, regulators
Conditional	Acknowledged but manageable	Selective, conditional benefits	Supervision and limits	Shared responsibility
Permissive	Normalised risks	Emphasised benefits	Education-focused	Societal/institutional

Reporting by Research Question (Example)

RQ1: Perceived risks of children's social media use

Table - Summary of Risk Types Identified

Risk Type	Description	Illustrative Cases
Psychological harm	Anxiety, self-esteem, confidence	P01, P07, P12
Exposure risks	Inappropriate content, algorithms	P06, P10
Social comparison	Validation-seeking, appearance pressure	P04, P14

Descriptive findings (RQ1)

Across the dataset, participants consistently identified psychological and social risks associated with children's social media use. While the presence of risk was widely acknowledged, participants differed in how they framed its severity and manageability. Restrictive orientations emphasised inherent and severe risks, whereas permissive orientations tended to normalise risks as comparable to offline experiences.

(Interpretive explanation of these patterns is provided in Module 7.)

Cross-case and group comparisons

Table - Regulation Preferences by Orientation

Orientation	Dominant Regulatory Preference
Restrictive	Prohibition or delayed access
Conditional	Supervised and time-limited use
Permissive	Education and skill development

This table demonstrates how framework outputs can be used to **directly compare groups**, a key strength of Framework Analysis.

Figures (optional, NVivo-style)

Distribution of Regulatory Preferences by Orientation

A clustered bar chart showing the number of cases favouring restriction, supervision, or education-based approaches.

Responsibility Attribution Across Actors

A bar chart illustrating how often responsibility is attributed to parents, platforms, schools, and regulators.

(Figures may be generated using NVivo chart exports or spreadsheet software and are described here for transparency.)

Client-ready narrative summary

Summary of findings

The analysis indicates that young adults widely acknowledge risks associated with children's social media use, but differ in how they evaluate and respond to those risks. While restrictive

positions emphasise protection and exclusion, conditional and permissive positions prioritise management and preparation. Responsibility for regulation is framed as shared across parents, platforms, schools, and regulatory bodies, reflecting an understanding of children's social media use as a systemic rather than purely individual issue.

What this module provides the user

At the end of Module 8, the user has:

- Final framework tables suitable for direct inclusion in results chapters

- Condensed matrices that summarise cross-case patterns

- Clear links between tables and analytic interpretation

- NVivo-equivalent outputs that demonstrate analytic rigour

No new analysis is introduced at this stage; this module focuses on **presentation and communication** of findings.

MODULE 9 – How to use this report

Purpose of this guide

This section explains how the Framework Analysis report and its outputs should be used when writing up academic or applied research. The aim is to help users translate structured analytic outputs into **clear, defensible written sections**, while maintaining methodological rigor and transparency.

This report should be treated as:

- A complete analytic record

- A source of results tables and matrices

- A methodological audit trail

It is not intended to be copied verbatim into assessed work.

Using this report in a thesis or dissertation

Methods chapter

The following modules inform the **Methods** chapter:

- **Module 1 (Familiarisation)**
  Use this to describe:

- o   The dataset and its structure

- o   The applied context of the study

- o   The initial engagement with the data

- **Module 2 (Analytic Orientation & Framework Design)**
  Use this to:

  - o   Justify the use of Framework Analysis

  - o   Explain the hybrid deductive–inductive approach

  - o   Define the role of research questions as the analytic framework

- **Module 3 (Framework Construction)**
  Use this to demonstrate:

  - o   How the analytical framework was built

  - o   How categories were defined and bounded

- **Module 4 (Indexing)**
  Use this to explain:

  - o   How data were systematically indexed

  - o   How analytic consistency was ensured

Tip: The full indexed dataset (Table 4.1) is usually best placed in an **appendix**, with a summary in the main methods text.

Results chapter

The **Results** chapter should be structured **by Research Question**, mirroring the framework.

Use the following:

- **Module 5 (Framework Matrices)**
  As the primary source for:

  - o   Case-by-category comparisons

  - o   Summary tables

- **Module 6 (Pattern Identification)**
  To structure:

- o Subsections within each research question

- o Descriptive pattern reporting

- **Module 8 (Reporting Tables and Summaries)**
  For:

  - o Final tables and figures

  - o Condensed matrices suitable for publication

Important:

Results should:

- Focus on what the data show

- Avoid extended interpretation or theory

- Reference tables and matrices explicitly

Discussion chapter

The **Discussion** chapter should draw primarily on:

- **Module 7 (Interpretation & Explanatory Synthesis)**

In the discussion, you should:

- Relate interpretive findings to existing literature

- Explain similarities, differences, and contributions

- Reflect on implications for policy, practice, or theory

Avoid re-presenting tables here; interpret them instead.

Using this report in a research article

Methods section (condensed)

Journal articles require brevity. From this report, extract:

- A concise description of:

  - o Framework Analysis as the chosen method

  - o The hybrid analytic approach

  - o The role of predefined research questions

Avoid detailed procedural description unless required by the journal.

Results section

Use:

- Framework categories (research questions) as headings

- Selected tables from Module 8

- Brief, focused summaries of patterns

Keep results tightly aligned to the research questions.

Tables and figures

From this report, you can adapt:

- Framework matrices (condensed versions)

- Category distribution tables

- Group comparison tables

Ensure all tables are:

- Clearly labelled

- Explained in the text

- Formatted according to journal guidelines

Appendices and supplementary materials

The following materials are ideal for appendices:

- Full analytical framework (Module 3)

- Indexed dataset (Module 4)

- Extended framework matrices (Module 5)

- Additional comparison tables

Including these strengthens methodological transparency.

How supervisors, examiners, and reviewers read this

Experienced readers look for:

- Alignment between research questions and findings

- Transparency in analytic decisions

- Systematic use of matrices and comparison

- Clear separation between results and interpretation

This report provides all of these—if used strategically.

Common mistakes to avoid

- Treating framework matrices as raw data

- Overloading results with quotations

- Introducing new categories in the discussion

- Collapsing methods and results sections

- Treating frequency as importance

Recommended workflow for users

1. Read the report in full for understanding

2. Map modules to thesis/article sections

3. Select relevant tables and matrices

4. Paraphrase analytic narratives in your own academic voice

5. Use appendices to demonstrate rigor

Final note to users

This report is designed to **support and strengthen your research writing**, not replace it. Its value lies in the clarity, structure, and transparency it brings to your analytic process.

Used correctly, it will:

- Save time

- Improve confidence

- Enhance methodological defensibility