Module 3 Analyzing qualitative data

Many of the collection methods noted above are associated with specific analytical tools and techniques. Interviews, for example, typically involve transcription and coding. But some analytical techniques can be applied to data collected in a variety of different ways.

Qualitative analytical techniques and concepts include (drawing on the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis and other sources):

1. Theory of qualitative data analysis (Maxwell and Chmiel)
2. Sampling strategies (and choice of cases)
3. Comparative methods: Qualitative comparative analysis (Kahwati) Configurational comparative analysis (Rihoux) and set theoretic methods (Schneider)
4. Real World Research (Pawson) and Interpretive policy analysis (Yanow)
5. Interpretation and analysis (Willig) and reflexivity (May and Perry)
6. Induction, deduction, and abduction as strategies (Reichertz)
7. Content analysis / analysis of documents (Coffey; Schreier)
8. Analysis of interviews (Roulston) focus groups (Barbour) and discourse (Willig)
9. Grounded theory and theoretical coding (Thornberg and Charmaz)
10. Phenomenology (Eberle) see also Marshall and Rossman, Bohnsack
11. Narrative analysis and construction (Esin, Fathi, and Squire)
12. Exegesis, hermeneutics, and dialogue (Wernet)
13. Analysis of observations (Marvasti)

1.Theory of Qualitative Data Analysis (similarity and contiguity)

Maxwell, J. and Chmiel, M. (2014) Notes Toward a Theory of Qualitative Data Analysis, Chapter 2 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis.

- Any theory which serves as a starting point for research has important implications for the way in which a researcher attempts to analyse the data collected, for example, discourse analysis relies on three characteristics of discourse: it is action-oriented, situated, and constructed. These characteristics shape the questions that discourse analysis is designed to answer.
- A theory, for Maxwell and Chmiel, is a conceptual model or understanding of some phenomenon that not only describes by explains the phenomenon and clarifies why the phenomenon is the way it is. All theories are partial or incomplete.
- "Although there are many prescriptive accounts of how qualitative data should be analysed, very little has been done to develop an explicit, general theory of what qualitative researchers actually do when they analyse their data, and why: the 'theory-in-use' (Argyris and Schoen, 1992) or 'logic-in-use' (Kaplan, 1964) of qualitative data analysis, rather than its espoused theory or reconstructed logic. Anselm Strauss's statement that 'we have a very long way to go yet in understanding how we do qualitative analysis and how to improve our analysis' (1988: 99) still seems accurate."

- "In the remainder of this chapter, we present an outline of such a theory (for a more detailed presentation of this theory, see Maxwell and Miller, 2008, and Maxwell, 2011) and use this theory in discussing some prominent approaches to qualitative data analysis. A key component of this theory is the distinction between two types of relationships: those based on similarity, and those based on contiguity (Jakobson, 1956; Lyons, 1968: 70–81; Saussure, 1986 [1916]); we begin by explicating this distinction. We then apply the distinction to qualitative data analysis, arguing that two major types of strategies for analysis, which we call categorizing and connecting strategies, are respectively based on the identification of similarity relations and contiguity relations."
- Similarity and contiguity: "The distinction between similarity and contiguity, generally credited to Saussure, was first explicitly stated by David Hume in his A Treatise of Human Nature (1978 [1739]). Hume defined three ways in which ideas may be associated: by resemblance (similarity), by contiguity in time or place, and by cause and effect. He then argued that causation is a complex relation based on the other two, leaving resemblance and contiguity as the two primary modes of association."
- What do these mean in practice? Smith (1979: 338) describes his process: "I usually start … at the beginning of the notes. I read along and seem to engage in two kinds of processes – comparing and contrasting, and looking for antecedents and consequences … The essence of concept formation [the first process] is … 'How are they alike, and how are they different?' The similar things are grouped and given a label that highlights their similarity. … In time, these similarities and differences come to represent clusters of concepts, which then organize themselves into more abstract categories and eventually into hierarchical taxonomies. Concurrently, a related but different process is occurring. … The conscious search for the consequences of social items … seemed to flesh out a complex systemic view and a concern for process, the flow of events over time. In addition, it seemed to argue for a more holistic, systemic, interdependent network of events at the concrete level and concepts and propositions at an abstract level. … At a practical level, while in the field, the thinking, searching, and note recording reflected not only a consciousness of similarities and differences but also an attempt to look for unexpected relationships, antecedents, and consequences within the flow of items."
- Categorizing strategies: "The most widely used categorizing strategy in qualitative data analysis is coding. In coding, the data segments are labeled and grouped by category; they are then examined and compared, both within and between categories. Many qualitative researchers have treated coding as the fundamental activity in analysis (e.g., Bogdan and Biklen, 2003; Ryan and Bernard, 2000; van den Hoonaard and van den Hoonaard, 2008: 187), and the only one that involves manipulation of actual data."
- Types of coding categories: Organizational, substantive, and conceptual. "An important distinction among types of categories is that between organizational, substantive, and theoretical categories (Maxwell, 2012b: 107–8). These are not absolute distinctions; many actual coding categories can be seen as involving aspects

of more than one type, or as being intermediate between two types. However, we believe that the conceptual typology is valuable."

- o "Organizational categories are broad areas or issues that are often established prior to data collection. McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 469) referred to these as topics rather than categories, stating that 'a topic is the descriptive name for the subject matter of the segment."
- o "Substantive categories are primarily descriptive, in a broad sense that includes descriptions of participants' concepts and beliefs; they stay close to the data categorized, and do not inherently imply a more abstract theory.
- o "Theoretical categories, in contrast, place the coded data into an explicit theoretical framework. These categories may be derived either from prior theory, or from an inductively developed theory (in which case the concepts and the theory are usually developed concurrently). They often represent the researcher's concepts (what are called 'etic' categories), rather than denoting participants' own concepts."
- Working with categories: "The categories generated though coding are typically linked into larger patterns; this subsequent step can be seen as contiguity-based, but the connections are made between the categories themselves, rather than between segments of actual data. In addition, using connecting techniques only on the categories, rather than the data, results in an aggregate account of contiguity relationships, and can never reconstitute the specific contextual connections that were lost during the original categorizing analysis. This strategy imposes a uniform account on the actual diversity of relationships in the data, obscuring the complexity of such relationships in order to emphasize the most prevalent connections (Maxwell, 1996; 2011: 49–51, 64–6)."
- "Ayres argued that thematic analysis (which for her is broader than simply thematic coding) incorporates connecting as well as categorizing strategies. Thus, 'as identification of themes progresses, the investigator also considers the relationship among categories. In this way, data that have been decontextualized through coding retain their connection to their sources' (2008: 868)."
- "Most qualitative researchers are aware of the dangers of decontextualization in using categorizing techniques. Works on qualitative methods often warn about context stripping and the need to retain the connection of coded data with their original context."
- "Perhaps the most common strategy for retaining contextual information in qualitative research is the 'case study.' In this approach, the data are interpreted within the unique context of each case in order to provide an account of a particular instance, setting, person, or event. However, case studies often employ primarily categorizing analysis strategies (e.g., Merriam, 1988; Weiss, 1994; Yin, 2003: 101–11), and their main advantage is that the categorizing (coding, thematic analysis, etc.) occurs within a particular case rather than across cases, so that the contextual relationships are harder to lose sight of."
- Connecting strategies: "What we call connecting strategies for analysis are designed not just to retain, but to analyse, connections among segments of data within a

specific context. This is generally done by identifying key relationships that tie the data together into a narrative or sequence."

- "The most detailed description that we have found of a connecting approach to analysis is that of Gee (2011: 126–35), who provided a 'toolkit' of 27 analytic strategies for doing discourse analysis (see Willig, Chapter 23, this volume). Many of these strategies involve identifying relationships among segments of data in a text; here, we will describe one particular strategy that Gee called the 'connections building tool.' He stated that this tool leads the analyst to 'ask how the words or grammar being used in the communication connect or disconnect things or ignore connections between things' (2011: 126)."

- Displays as categorizing and connecting strategies: "Displays (Miles and Huberman, 1994), as techniques for data analysis, can also be divided into similarity-based and contiguitybased forms. Miles and Huberman described a wide variety of displays, but most of these fall into two basic types: matrices (tables), and networks (figures); Maxwell (2012b: 54ff.) referred to the latter as 'maps,' and provided additional examples of both types."

[see also Rietjens discussion of matrices and network diagrams as means of finding patterns]

2.Sampling strategies (and choice of cases)

Rapley, T. (2014) Sampling Strategies in Qualitative Research, Chapter 4 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis.

- "Put simply, sampling really matters. It matters in relation to an array of issues, for the whole trajectory of the analytic process, from initial questions asked about a phenomenon to the presentation of your work. Given that the claims that qualitative researchers want to make are routinely based on working closely with relatively small numbers of people, interactions, situations or spaces, it is central that these are chosen for good analytic reasons. Above all, sampling should never be the product of ad hoc decisions or left solely to chance. It needs to be thoughtful and rigorous."

- Qualitative approaches to generalizability: "Qualitative research has recently grown in popularity and shifted in focus beyond documenting the unique and particular, in part due to funding from evaluation and policy-orientated sources. In this context, considerations about sampling, alongside considerable debate and discussion, have become more central (Ward Schofield, 1993). As Dingwall notes: The one-off case study, conceived and executed in magnificent isolation, has no place in modern social science and little more than anecdotal value to a policy maker trying to understand how an organisation works. (1992: 171) In this context, in part as a reaction against the positioning of qualitative research as less vital and relevant given its refusal to undertake random sampling with large numbers – due to a fundamental asymmetry in goals (e.g. Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and inability in practical terms, given time, resources and funding (e.g. Hammersley, 1992) – alternative understandings have emerged. Various authors have argued, to various degrees of success, that qualitative research is bounded by different epistemological and ontological orders. As such, alternatives have emerged, for example: For the

naturalist, then, the concept analogous to generalizability (or external validity) is transferability, which is itself *dependent upon the degree of similarity (fittingness) between two contexts*. The naturalist does not attempt to form generalizations that will hold in all times and in all places, but to form working hypotheses that may be transferred from one context to another depending upon the degree of "fit" between the contexts. (Guba, 1981: 81)" [emphasis added; see Pawson on the importance of context in evaluating mechanisms and outcomes]

- Rapley goes on to describe an initial round of sampling, n=3, negotiated with the providers of the cases (medical practitioners).
- Note on purposive sampling strategies: "If you look at the literature on sampling, you can soon be overwhelmed by the diversity of approaches people write about. So, for example, Sandelowski (1995) refers to three approaches – maximum variation, phenomenal variation and theoretical variation – all described as purposeful. 2 Gobo (2004) refers to four: purposive, quota, emblematic and snowball. Patton (2002) refers to 16 different types – including critical case, stratified purposeful, snowball and convenience – all again described under the label purposeful. Personally, I find Patton's list very useful to think with. He presents you with 16 different labels to work with, to think about, and this is incredibly useful as a way to sensitize your sampling strategy. It enables you to realize that you have choices, that you should be making choices and that those choices can have an impact. However, the issue is not that you have been able initially to sample five 'typical cases' of rapid referral, but rather that you have got five cases and you have thought through issues of how typical are they, what connects them, what divides them. As Sandelowski notes:
  o These determinations are never absolute; depending on the purpose, analytic frame, and phase of an analysis, any one case can be a case of and about more than one thing and can, therefore, be analytically (re)located among other cases. (1996: 527)
- "So being able to call a case 'typical' is useful. Initially, you might know from some other source, say statistical data, the funder, colleagues or even other respondents, that a specific site is 'typical'. However, you need to question such a position – it might be 'typical' in the way that others have understood the issue, but your research might render the phenomenon in a different way. Thinking about and categorizing your sampling strategies does not always occur prospectively or over different rounds of sampling. For example, Draucker et al. (2007), after an initial recruitment flyer, discovered they had 110 calls from people interested in taking part in their study. … They looked again at their data set through various sampling approaches, and in one area, when conducting 'extreme or deviant case sampling', re-interviewed one of the participants."
- Rapley goes on to describe a series of exploratory samples after the initial sample of n=3. They look at the phenomenon in no particular order (n=14), then through another researcher's order (n=11) then building ideas and challenging assumptions (n=17). Key to the sampling process is knowing what you are sampling for:

- "What are the sampling units (or combination of units) that should guide your sampling? Rather than solely focus on the classic socio-demographic units, like age, ethnicity, etc., we need to think about more social, relational and conceptual units. For example, we could consider structuring our sampling to focus on other issues:
    o Actions – specific acts, processes, behaviours, intentions and motivations.
    o Interactions – activities, formats, consequences and outcomes.
    o Identities – roles, types, categories.
    o Events – situations, rituals, ceremonies, temporal orders or trajectories.
    o Settings and spaces – spatial (or conceptual) locations, organizations, milieu.
    o Objects – devices, artefacts, electronic and paper texts.
- Exploring the phenomenon is key, not being able to say 'I observed X number of men and X number of women'."
- Theory and Sampling: "…there appear to be two main approaches to using theory to inform sampling.
- "First, following the tradition of theoretical sampling in grounded theory (in whatever version, see e.g. Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Strauss and Corbin, 1990), after an initial round of sampling (driven by a priori ideas) to generate ideas, your next choice of person, site or situation is driven by the need to develop and elaborate on your emerging conceptual ideas. In grounded theory terms, you undertake theoretical sampling to help develop codes and categories, to understand variation in a process, to saturate properties of categories and to integrate them. In this way, your sampling decisions are emergent, progressive and inductive. Your task is artfully to choose a next case in order to progress the development of your emergent conceptual ideas. The focus here is not to demonstrate empirical generalizability, in terms of choosing cases that might show others that you have sought variation to represent the population in some way. The focus is on developing the shape – the robustness – of your emergent categories and substantive theory. In this way, the demonstration of adequacy is understood in the transportability of the theoretical ideas.
- "Second, another tradition exists – one that receives less attention, but is potentially equally useful to consider. This is where the initial and often subsequent sampling decisions are driven by a priori theoretical ideas. This can take multiple forms. In such circumstances you may be exploring, testing and refining the ideas of an existing theory. Silverman notes that:
    o "in a case-study, the analyst selects cases only because he [sic] believes they exhibit some general theoretical principle. His account's claim to validity depends entirely on demonstrating that the features he portrays in the case are representative not of the population but of this general principle. (1985: 113)"

3.Qualitative Comparative Methods
Comparative methods: Qualitative comparative analysis (Kahwati) Configurational comparative analysis (Rihoux) and set theoretic methods (Schneider)

- Qualitative Comparative Analysis: "This is a revised version of analytic induction using Boolean logic (this logic is based on dichotomous reasoning such as "present or absent"). It is a type of comparative case method or between case analysis. The method uses a small number of cases (e.g., 7–15) already reasonably comparable with each other. Each case is viewed as a combination of causal conditions linked to a particular outcome. The idea is to examine each case and determine whether causal conditions and outcomes are either present or absent, thus producing a matrix specifying the configurations of causes that produced the outcome." (Sage Dictionary, 255)

Rihoux, B., & Ragin, C. C. Eds (2008). Configurational comparative methods: Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) and related techniques (Vol. 51). Sage Publications. [$75]
　　"*Configurational Comparative Methods* paves the way for an innovative approach to empirical scientific work through a strategy that integrates key strengths of both qualitative (case-oriented) and quantitative (variable-oriented) approaches. This first-of-its-kind text is ideally suited for "small-N" or "intermediate-N" research situations, which both mainstream qualitative and quantitative methods find difficult to address. Benoît Rihoux and Charles C. Ragin, along with their contributing authors, offer both a basic, comparative research design overview and a technical and hands-on review of Crisp-Set QCA (csQCA), Multi-Value QCA (mvQCA), and Fuzzy-Set QCA (fsQCA).
Key Features
- Discusses existing applications in many different fields and disciplines along with state-of-the-art coverage of the strengths and limitations of these techniques
- Demonstrates further inventive ways of using QCA techniques
- Provides advice on how to develop a comparative research design (case and variable selection) as well as a specific technique called MSDO/MDSO (most similar, different outcome/most different, same outcome).
- Shows how to perform the technical operations linked to three specific QCA techniques: csQCA, mvQCA, and fsQCA
- Includes a glossary, an extensive bibliography, and a detailed list of good practices at every stage of the research process
Intended Audience
　　A must for any student or researcher who wants to engage in systematic cross-case comparison in the social and behavioral sciences, the book is ideal for use in upper-level undergraduate and graduate-level social science research methods courses.

Kahwati, L. C., & Kane, H. L. (2018). Qualitative comparative analysis in mixed methods research and evaluation (Vol. 6). SAGE Publications.
- See also mixed methods research, incorporating qualitative and quantitative methods. QCA basically combines systematic comparison with a small number of case studies using Boolean logic

	Qualitative methods	Quantitative methods	QCA
Analytic Orientation	Case oriented	Variable oriented	Case oriented
Analytic foundation	Iterative complex reasoning through inductive and deductive interpretation of nonnumeric data	Statistical methods, correlation, regression	Set-theory, formal logic
Types of data	Non-numeric - key informant interviews - focus groups - ethnographic observations - documents - case studies	Numeric - survey data - public health surveillance data - economic data - test scores - biologic measures - data transformation commonly employed	Numeric or nonnumeric - data transformation commonly employed
Uses	- identifies similarities and differences in narrative case and comparative studies - does cross case comparison - generates hypotheses	- estimates the magnitude and direction of effects of an explanatory factor - develops prediction models - tests hypotheses with statistical methods	- identifies different and multiple combinations of factors that are necessary or sufficient for an outcome - conducts systematic cross-case comparison
Generalizability	Purposive case selection - generalizability limited to types of cases included in sample	Dependent on sampling method employed but typically generalizable to a larger population	Purposive case selection - generalizability limited to types of cases included in sample
Strengths	- Provides holistic deep understading of complex phenomena - examines explicit causal connections - can derive meaning from small numbers of cases	- allows precise estimation of net effects - can derive meaning from large numbers of observations - is a replicable process -provides parsimonious results	- preserves cases as holistic units throughout the analysis - identifies causally complex relationships - transparency of analytic decisions
Weaknesses	- Can lack systematic definitions of concepts - analytic process often not transparent or replicable	- has limited ability to analyze complex social phenomena - requires large sample sizes to meet underlying statistical assumptions	- application limited to addressing configural research questions - limited utility as a stand-alone analysis

Kahwati and Kane, 2018, Table 1.1

Data transformation: converting data from one format or structure into another, e.g. defining categories in the analysis of cases, 1=victory, 2=defeat, 3=ambiguous outcome

Configural research questions: questions about how the presence or absence of a combinations of factors affects outcomes.

Schneider, C. Q., & Wagemann, C. (2012). *Set-theoretic methods for the social sciences: A guide to qualitative comparative analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

"Arguments about set relations are pervasive in the social sciences, but this is not always obvious. Take, for example, Brady's (2010) intriguing deconstruction of the widely debated claim that, in the 2000 US Presidential Election, George W. Bush lost about 10,000 votes because Al Gore had been declared the winner before the closure of the polling stations in those western counties of Florida that are on Central Standard Time (i.e., the Panhandle). This claim is made by Lott (2000), who arrived at this inference by estimating a "'difference-in-differences' form of regression analysis, based on data-set observations" (Brady 2010: 238). Using causal-process observations, Brady cogently shows that this inference is "highly implausible" (241) and that, instead of 10,000 lost voters, a more adequate estimate would be a maximum of 224 or, even more realistically, 28 to 56 voters (NB: total voters, not percentage!). Brady successfully frames his debate of Lott as an argument in favor of causal-process observations – "diagnostic 'nuggets' of data that make a strong contribution to causal inference" (Brady 2010: 237). Brady's argument is set-theoretic in nature (Goertz and Mahoney 2012). In essence, he claims that the set of voters not voting for Bush due to the premature announcement of Gore as the winner (Y) can only be very small because membership in this set requires simultaneous membership in several other sets. Such allegedly lost Bush voters must, of course, also be members of the set of registered voters in the Panhandle counties (P), who are also members of the set of voters who had not yet voted (V), and the set of voters who had received the news through the media (M). Using plausible arguments about the rough percentage of voters that tend to vote late and the percentage of voters listening to the media, Brady shows that the sets of P, V, and M are small…This example illustrates that many arguments in the social sciences can be (re-)framed in terms of relations between sets." (1-2)

"Qualitative Comparative Analysis, commonly known under its acronym QCA, is the methodological tool that is perhaps most directly associated with set theory. QCA distinguishes itself from other set-theoretic approaches by the combined presence of the following features. First, it aims at a causal interpretation. This is not necessarily true for other set-theoretic approaches – just think of concept formation or the creation of typologies, which typically do not include any reference to an outcome (for two exceptions, Elman 2005 and George and Bennett 2005). Second, QCA makes use of so-called truth tables. This allows researchers to visualize and analyze central features of causal complexity…"

"Large sections of this book are dedicated to explaining QCA, for it is arguably the most formalized and complete set-theoretic method. It requires more of a proper and systematic introduction in basic concepts from formal logic, set theory, and Boolean algebra than other set-theoretic methods. In addition, QCA can, and should, be performed with the help of specialized computer software."

"Notions of set theory are also useful for those more ambitious social science practices that are designed to give a causal interpretation to patterns found in the data. Prominent examples are John Stuart Mill's methods (see, e.g., Mahoney 2003). The

possibility of interpreting them in a set-theoretic manner is an aspect that has not received enough attention so far (Mahoney 2007: 134)." [Note: Mill's method refers to most similar and most different systems analysis]

"QCA's two main variants are crisp-set QCA (csQCA) and fuzzy-set QCA (fsQCA). They differ in the type of sets on which they operate. csQCA operates exclusively on conventional sets where cases can either be members or non-members in the set. Their set membership score is either 0 or 1. In fsQCA, by contrast, cases are allowed to have gradations of their set membership. A case does not necessarily have to be a full member or a full non-member of a set, but can also be a partial member. The membership scores can fall anywhere between the two extremes of full membership value of 1 and full non-membership value of 0. A country can be a partial member of the set of democracies as indicated by a fuzzy-set membership score of, say, 0.8. This value indicates that this case can be seen as more of a democracy than a non-democracy, but that it falls short of fulfilling all the criteria for a full-fledged democracy. Such a differentiation is useful for many, if not most social science concepts." (12-13)

"The challenge in understanding set-theoretic methods is not so much in grasping the math that is behind them. In fact, in terms of standard mathematical operations, not much more is required than simple subtraction and division of natural numbers. It is not even required to delve too deeply into the more complex intricacies of formal logic and set theory. The three rather simple logical operators (AND, OR, and NOT) and the notion of subsets and supersets suffice for denoting any possible result that can be obtained using QCA. Yet understanding and correctly using set-theoretic methods is challenging. Our experience from teaching students with a wide range of different disciplinary and methodological backgrounds has revealed that the biggest challenge rests in capturing the far-reaching consequences that are triggered when shifting the aim of social research to identifying set relations rather than correlations." (16)

4. Real World Research (Pawson) and Interpretive policy analysis (Yanow)

Pawson, Roy. 2006. Evidence-Based Policy: A Realist Perspective. London: Sage

From citations, this may be one of the seminal recent treatments, perhaps because it is ideologically compatible with real-world policy needs. See also the supporting web site: www.leeds.ac.uk/realistsynthesis

Ch 1: systematic reviews are the main vehicle for pursuing evidence based policy, because they mobilize a larger research community than post-program evaluation research (p. 9, fig 1.1) concludes with the need to find a new way of piecing evidence together.
Ch 2 argues that "realism" offers the best foundation for practical social science. The basis of realism is a common understanding of causality, social structure, behavioural regularities, etc (p. 18).

- To answer the question, "what works?" you have to work in the generative model of causation (21): within a context, a mechanism produces an outcome (22).
- Interventions are theories, are active, and intervention chains are long and thickly populated, nonlinear, and sometimes reverse (22-29), and embedded in multiple social systems (30), they are "leaky" and prone to be borrowed, cross-fertilizing (32).

Ch 3 is the critical element of the book. Pawson criticizes the meta-analysis of the Cochrane collaboration, because socially constructed knowledge (given the problems outlined in Ch 2) can't approximate the bio-medical model, and results in simplification and obfuscation when applied to complex social problems (42). '
- See his online: "Assessing the quality of evidence in evidence-based policy" (52). While biomedical models can be expected to be consistent, social policies applied in different circumstances can have the reverse impact (59).
- See online "Evidence-based policy: in search of a method" (63) Social programs typically have dramatic outcome swings, variable reach, and short shelf-life (71).

Ch. 4 provides the guidance for our effort on EDG – protocols for systematic review: synthesis is theory building (73-78).
Steps are:
- (stage 1) identify the review question (79);
- (stage 2) search for primary studies (82);
- (stage 3) quality appraisal (87), relevance, rigour, see online "digging for nuggets, how bad research yields good results";
- (stage 4) extract the data – annotation, collation, reportage;
- (stage 5) synthesizing data – synthesis to question program theory integrity (94), synthesis to adjudicate between rival theories (95), synthesis to compare settings (95), synthesis to compare expectations (96);
- (stage 6) disseminating the findings.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 provide detailed examples of evidence-informed policy implementation: Ch 5 on Megan's law in the US; Ch 6 on youth mentoring (see online, "Mentoring Relationships: An Explanatory Review"); Ch 7 on reviewing outer context – naming and shaming policies.

Yanow, D. (2000) Interpretive Policy Analysis. Sage.
- "Dvora Yanow introduces a qualitative complement to the quantitive family of policy analytical techniques. Rather than asking the question "What are the costs of a policy?" the practitioner of interpretive policy analysis asks instead "What are the meanings of a policy?"
- A traditional quantitative policy analysis would start from a cost-benefit or input-output analysis. An interpretive policy analysis looks for the meanings of the policy with the various constituencies the policy seeks to address. "Policy analysis seeks to inform some audience—traditionally, the policymaker—about an anticipated policy: what its impact

will be on a target population, whether it is likely to achieve the desired outcome, whether it is the right policy to address a specific problem."

- So a quantitative policy analysis can tell you whether the policy gives good value for investment, but an interpretive policy analysis can tell you whether it is likely to be perceived as the right policy by its stakeholders.
- "Interpretive methods are based on the presupposition that we live in a social world characterized by the possibilities of multiple interpretations. In this world there are no "brute data" whose meaning is beyond dispute. Dispassionate, rigorous science is possible—but not the neutral, objective science stipulated by traditional analytic methods (as represented by the scientific method). As living requires sensemaking, and sensemaking entails interpretation, so too does policy analysis."(4)
- Communities of meaning and policy frames form the architecture of policy arguments: "Through a process of interaction, members of a community—whether a community of scientists or environmentalists or some other group—come to use the same or similar cognitive mechanisms, engage in the same or similar acts, and use the same or similar language to talk about thought and action. Group processes reinforce these, often promoting internal cohesion as an identity marker with respect to other communities: the familiar "us-them" phenomenon. Although the language of "community" has its roots in a geographic locale—connoting similarities of position deriving from shared property-based interests, political views, race-ethnicity, class, religion, or other commonalities—it is borrowed into a policy context with broader reference points, which are not place-specific: "location" within an organizational structure, professional training and membership, sex and gender, and myriad other possible dimensions lead to a set of values, beliefs, and feelings that can bind people together in communities of meaning." (9)
- One way of understanding the phenomenon of protest in response to the George Floyd killing is to see police restraint tactics as enactment of a policy, which is analogous to a "text". This "text analogue" is read differently based on tacit knowledge in different communities. "We complicate the picture further if we consider not only public policies as texts that are interpreted as they are enacted by implementors, but also those enactments themselves as "texts" that are "read" by various stakeholder groups: clients, potential clients, legislators, other agency personnel, other citizens, and, at times, "foreigners" as well. It is helpful here to borrow some concepts from literary theory and criticism, which have long been concerned with how texts convey meaning. Reader-response theory—a literary theory of textual meaning developed since the 1970s—refutes earlier theories that the meaning of a text derives from the text alone (its language, form, or both) or from its author's intentions. Rather, a text's meaning derives also from what the reader brings to it (see, e.g., Iser, 1989). In one view, meaning resides not in any one of these—not exclusively in the author's intent, in the text itself, or in the reader alone—but is, rather, created actively in interactions among all three, in the writing and in the reading." (17)
- Symbolic artifacts can be language, objects, or acts. They have different meaning to different interpretive communities.
- Steps in interpretive policy analysis therefore include:

(1) Identify the artifacts (language, objects, acts) that are significant carriers of meaning for a given policy issue, as perceived by policy-relevant actors and interpretive communities

(2) Identify communities of meaning/interpretation/speech/practice that are relevant to the policy issue under analysis

(3) Identify the "discourses": the specific meanings being communicated through specific artifacts and their entailments (in thought, speech, and act)

(4) Identify the points of conflict and their conceptual sources (affective, cognitive, and/or moral) that reflect different interpretations by different communities

- Interventions/Actions then include

(5a) Show implications of different meanings/interpretations for policy formulation and/or action

(5b) Show that differences reflect different ways of seeing

(5c) Negotiate/mediate/intervene in some other form to bridge differences (e.g., suggest reformulation or reframing)

- Chapter 2 addresses accessing local knowledge in order to identify interpretive communities and policy artifacts.
- Chapter 3 describes methods of understanding symbolic languages. This includes metaphor analysis, category analysis, narrative analysis. One that Yanow doesn't address, but which police and peacekeepers will be familiar with is the problem of anniversary activities as part of symbolic languages, e.g. the marching season in Northern Ireland, anniversary demonstrations and calendar events.
- Chapter 4 addresses symbolic objects, which can be invested in meaning by communities. Built spaces to implement policies include buildings like schools, community centres, clinics, or in the military context, barracks, bases, posts, and camps. Props for the meaning of these built spaces include their design, their decorations and iconography, their names, the people or events involved in opening them. All this becomes part of the symbolism surrounding the policies of which they are a part. Programs are similarly complex networks of meaning.
- Chapter 5 addresses symbolic acts, which can be analyzed in terms of connection to myth and connection to ritual.
- "The first step, then, in ritual analysis in a policy context is the recognition of a pattern: the identification of a regularly repeated, situation-specific set of acts, often in a specialized space (one not used for "normal" acts) and/or at a special time." (77)
- "From an anthropological rather than a literary approach, myths may be seen as explanations constructed in the face of puzzling parts of their organizational or policy contexts. We create myths as an act of mediating contradictions, such as those that arise when we are faced with accommodating in daily life the mandates of two (or more) irreconcilable values. Myths direct our attention away from such incommensurables, from the puzzling aspects of policy and agency realities, suspending them in a temporary resolution and (at least temporarily) masking the tensions between or among incommensurable values." (80)

5.Interpretation and analysis (Willig) and reflexivity (May and Perry)

Carla Willig (2014) Discourse and Discourse Analysis, Ch. 23 in Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis.
- If your research involves interpretation of the meaning of language, then you can't take language itself for granted. Discourse analysis provides tools to understand the meaning of language based on the way it is used by those generating the data you are analyzing.
- "Discourse analysis is concerned with the ways in which language constructs and mediates social and psychological realities. Discourse analysts foreground the constructive and performative properties of language, paying particular attention to the effects of our choice of words to express or describe something. Discourse analysis involves the careful examination of talk and texts in order to trace the ways in which discourses bring into being the objects and subjects of which they speak. Discourse analysis is based on the premise that the words we choose to speak about something, and the way in which they are spoken or written, shape the sense that can be made of the world and our experience of it. Discourse analysts are acutely conscious of the power of discourse, and they consider our social and experiential worlds to be the product of our discursive construction of them."
- "A discourse analytic approach challenges the idea that the accounts people provide of their thoughts, feelings and experiences are comparable to a mirror image of what is going on inside of them, in their hearts and minds. Such an approach is the intellectual product of what is often referred to as 'the turn to language', itself a consequence of a philosophical reappraisal of the role of language in human interaction and experience. This reappraisal involved considering the social effects of language, its action orientation and its constitutive power. Ludwig Wittgenstein (1953) and John Austin (1962) are perhaps the most wellknown early proponents of this perspective on language. Wittgenstein's (1953) argument that the meaning of words is constituted by their function in particular 'language games' and Austin's (1962) assertion that speech is a form of action and that we 'do things with words' have been enormously influential within this context." (341)
- "One way of generating a discursive reading is to approach the data with a set of questions in mind, and to interrogate each line of text as well as the text as a whole with the help of these questions. Helpful questions with which to approach a text include the following (see also Holt, 2011): • What sorts of assumptions (about the world, about people) appear to underpin what is being said and how it is being said? • Could what is being said have been said differently without fundamentally changing the meaning of what is being said? If so, how? • What kind of discursive resources are being used to construct meaning here? • What may be the potential consequences of the discourses that are used for those who are positioned by them, in terms of both their subjective experience and their ability to act in the world? • How do speakers use the discursive resources that are available to them? • What may be gained and what may be lost as a result of such deployments?" (344)

- **Limitations of discourse analysis**: "Discourse analytic research focuses on the role of language in the construction of social and psychological phenomena. It is concerned with the effects of discourse rather than with human experience as such, and it constitutes a profoundly non-cognitive form of social psychology. Discourse analytic research has been criticized for privileging discourse over 'the person' and for failing to theorize subjectivity (e.g. Langdridge, 2004; Burr, 2002; Butt and Langdridge, 2003; Nightingale and Cromby, 1999) including our sense of self, intentionality, self-awareness and autobiographical memory."
- "From an ethical standpoint (see Mertens, Chapter 35, this volume), one could question the acceptability of analysing research participants' accounts through a discursive lens when their accounts were provided in good faith with the participants, assuming that the interviewer was genuinely interested in the nature of their experiences rather than in how they deployed discursive resources."
- What this means to me is that after we do a field interview, we dissect the discursive meaning of the interview and in doing so we may not respect the intended meaning of the interview subject. For example, the combatant who tells the researcher about atrocities doesn't expect to have that description reframed as an inter-ethnic discourse.

Tim May and Beth Perry (2014) Reflexivity and the Practice of Qualitative Research, Chapter 8 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis
- Reflexivity is commonly used in two senses. The first is that words, texts, or accounts are not just *about* something, they also *do* something. A history of Canada that doesn't mention women or first nations isn't just about Canada, it also reflects a particular view of Canada and has conscious and unconscious effects on people reading it. The second sense is that qualitative researcher uses their own point of view to conduct an analysis, and needs to reflect on that point of view to ensure that they understand the lenses through which they are analyzing a text or account. See Schwandt in the Sage Dictionary for the full definition and key references.
- It is mainly in the second sense that May and Perry use the term, and they illustrate how language and meaning can become a useful object of research. Examples are the construct of national security, and the process of securitization.
- "Calls to reflexive social inquiry do not maintain a simple separation between subject and object or between the knower and the known. Reflexivity involves turning back on oneself in order that processes of knowledge production become the subject of investigation. It thus recognizes that: 'Inquiry is practice of a deeply cultural sort, which can become reflexive only by investigating these relationships through inquiry itself' (Hall, 1999: 255). This same impulse is apparent at an individual level in terms of the dynamic between self and society: 'Inner consciousness is socially organized by the importation of the social organization of the outer world' (Mead, 1964: 141).
- "For Max Weber (1949), the practice of social inquiry could not simply be about the collection of social facts, but 'idea of ideas' (Albrow, 1990: 149). His 'ideal type' thereby served as an analytic instrument for the ordering of empirical reality within an approach which supported a view that we cannot know the social world, but only our representations of that world. As researchers, there is no view we can derive that is free

- from social position given our participation in the social world. Instead, we should take our participation as a good starting point and learn from mediating between different cultures of inquiry." (110)
- "…the mediation of first- (everyday meanings) and second-order (representation of those meanings) constructs became a topic of reflexive concern. Authors argued that a commonsense stock of knowledge orientates people to apply meaning to their own actions, those of others and the events that they encounter. The life world exhibits the basis for a primary experience that enables people to orientate their actions through taking its self-evidence, or prereflexive constitution, for granted. Through the study of 'lay' reflexivity, the analytic focus of research therefore moved towards a representation of everyday life and meaning production, providing a spur to qualitative inquiry (Moustakas, 1994).
- A difference between the knower and known was apparent in the work of Schutz through the mediation of first- and second-order constructs. Harold Garfinkel took these insights, yet refused to differentiate between everyday theorizing and social science (Garfinkel, 1967). By attending to the ways in which everyday life was being produced through the work of interpretation by lay actors as both a starting and finishing point of social analysis, the context dependence of action and meaning became the focal point. Reflexivity thereby was seen to contribute to social order, displayed through situated and public activities that are open to various forms of qualitative analysis (ten Have 2007; Heath and Hindmarsh, 2002 – see also Eberle, Chapter 13, Toerien, Chapter 22, and Knoblauch et al., Chapter 30, this volume).
- Alvin Gouldner took aim at ethnomethodology for attracting those who wished to engage in a 'non-violent revolt' against the status quo because they could not, or would not, challenge dominant social structures (Gouldner, 1971: 394–5). His reflexive aim was more concerned with social change and the 'background assumptions' of social inquiry. He argued that normalizing 'unpermitted worlds' that threaten stability reproduces the status quo while allusions to value neutrality enable an existential distance to be maintained from the consequences of research work and the subjects of investigation. An overemphasis upon technical approaches to research also denies the significance of practice in social contexts (Gouldner, 1971: 484–8).
- Reflexive understanding in social inquiry was now directed towards how the researchers' praxis and their role and social position related to the product and process of their work. Reflexive processes were seen to deepen self-awareness of the production of valid and reliable 'bits of information', strengthen a commitment to the value of this awareness and generate a willingness to be open to 'hostile information' (Gouldner, 1971: 494). [A note on hostile information – that's when your text or informer tells you that *you* are the oppressor, and your cherished symbols and meanings are offensive and alien.]

6.Induction, deduction, and abduction as strategies (Reichertz)

Jo Reichertz (2014) Induction, Deduction, Abduction, Chapter 9 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis

- "Induction, deduction and also abduction are forms of logical reasoning that are used in every type of research (qualitative and quantitative alike). Together with observation, they create the basis of all research. These forms of thinking are not concepts, nor are they methods or tools of data analysis, but means of connecting and generating ideas. Because they represent the intellectual building blocks of research, they are method neutral. Researchers are therefore compelled to take a close look at the logic of the logic of their thought processes – if they are to avoid falling victim to their own scientific common sense."
- "Contrary to a widely held belief, logic and logical conclusions do not simply fall from the sky. Syllogisms neither apply universally, to every being in the Universe, nor have all humans on Earth always reasoned the same way. What today is known as logical reasoning is, in one respect, the outcome of historical debate, the most important milestones of which are the work of Aristotle, the Port Royal School, Gottlob Frege, and finally the writings of Charles Sanders Peirce. The latter in particular showed logic and logical thinking to be deeply human, rooted in the human constitution, and ultimately arising from human needs."
- "That being so, this chapter begins by describing the anthropological conditions and historical development of 'good' and creative reasoning and goes on to introduce the different forms of thinking in detail and consider their usefulness to research. It then concludes by showing how induction, deduction and abduction are not separate, unconnected entities, but actually three stages of research."
- **Anthropological premise**: humans have largely abandoned instinctive behaviour; faced with new situations they must make decisions – they are, by nature, problem solvers. As they solve problems, they construct ideas about the reality around them (Berger and Luckman, 1967), so we are left with a socially constructed reality. This is crucial to qualitative research, and Berger and Luckman are a classic starting point for that reason.
- Reichertz argues that these are the fundamental premises of European anthropology and American pragmatism in qualitative research.
- **From induction to deduction and the abductive turn**: The basic form of construction is inductive – generalization from observation. But in the history of science, hypotheses arrived at through induction or intuition had to be rigorously tested through deductive logic and falsification (Popper, Reichenbach).
- Abduction, or relating observations to theory in a plausible narrative, is the essential activity of qualitative research:
- "From the beginning, qualitative social research vehemently rejected separation of the context of discovery and the context of justification and, in some cases explicitly referring to the work of Peirce, regarded the operation of discovery, namely abduction, as logic: 'It must be remembered that abduction, although it is very little hampered by logical rules, nevertheless is logical inference, asserting its conclusion only problematically or conjecturally, it is true, but nevertheless having a perfectly definite logical form' (Peirce CP 5.188–, 1905)."
- "If we are now to make a serious attempt, in (qualitative and quantitative) research, to analyse collected data, in other words to typologize them according to particular features and orders of features, the question very soon arises of how we may bring a

little order to the chaos of the data. This is only to a very small extent a matter of work organization (sorting of data) and much more a question of how the unmanageable variety of the data may be related to theories: either pre existing or still to be discovered. In this undertaking (following the ideas of Peirce), we may, in ideal terms, distinguish between three procedures, and in what follows I subdivide the second procedure into two subgroups; not because there are fundamental differences between the two, but rather because in this way the difference we have already spoken of between abduction and hypothesis or qualitative induction can be made clearer (for a fuller discussion of this, see Reichertz, 2003, 2010)." (125-126)

- **Abduction is a reasoning habit**. Research begins with an unpleasant feeling: surprise, doubt, anxiety…a problem, not with a theory or a hypothesis. Research becomes necessary when old beliefs no longer suffice to answer questions. Abduction begins as the process of connecting the problem to possible theories to make predictions… what if? What would happen? What then? The starting point for abduction is empirical data, which scientists interpret by decontextualizing and recontextualizing (shuffling facts around) it to arrive at new ideas. Abduction begins observations without any theoretical predisposition, but then tries to connect the observations to plausible theories as the first step in research. It can be a subconscious and unstructured process. But abduction is not guesswork – it comes from absorbing the widest possible range of data and matching it to reason. Good research demands observation plus reason. Abduction is the logical form of creating new ideas. (127)
- **Deduction**. Reichertz begins his discussion of deduction with the idea of subsumption: "Subsumption proceeds from an already known context of features, that is from a familiar rule (e.g. 'all horses make a clattering noise with their hooves when they run') and seeks to find this general context in the data (e.g. the case in question is a horse), in order to obtain knowledge about the individual case (e.g. the horse in question makes a clattering noise with its hooves). The logical form of this intellectual operation is that of deduction: the single case in question is subordinated to an already known rule. Here a tried and trusted order is applied to the new case. New facts (concerning the ordering of the world) are not experienced in this way. Deductions are therefore tautological, they tell us nothing new. But deductions are not only tautological, they are also truth conveying: if the rule offered for application is valid, then the result of application of the rule is also valid."
- "The general logical form of the deduction (i.e. (1) Y is true for all X. (2) Z is a proper subset of X. (3) Therefore Y is also true for Z.) is the formal description of a truth-conveying inference operation, yet it is essentially made up of tautological transformations of the original premise. This characteristic of deduction can be demonstrated particularly clearly using a deduction from geometry as an example of all forms of mathematical deduction. The example is as follows: (1) Any space having three and only three corners is called a triangle. (2) Space X has three and only three corners. (3) Therefore we call space X a triangle. It is important to stress here that deductions of this kind are nothing more than tautological transformations of definitions that are turned into new statements with the aid of formal logic; these new statements are 'true' if the transformations are made deductively." (128)

- Reichertz distinguishes between quantitative and qualitative induction. Quantitative induction: "summarize: if quantitative induction makes inferences about a totality from the quantitative properties of a sample, qualitative induction (by contrast) supplements the observed features of a sample with others that are not perceived. It is only in this sense that this form of induction transcends the borders of experience; that is, only the experience of the sample in question. This inference only extends knowledge to the extent that it proceeds from a limited selection to a larger totality. Qualitative induction is not a valid but only a probable form of inference, although it does have the advantage of being possible to operationalize (albeit with difficulty). Qualitative induction is the basis of all scientific procedures that find, in collected data, only new versions of what is already known."
- "'If you hear the clatter of hooves in Helsinki, think horse not zebra', was deliberately chosen because it makes clear the difficulties with the different forms of induction and abduction and their embeddedness in a situation. When is the conclusion 'horse' justified for the clatter of hooves, and when 'zebra'? Both are qualitative inductions, but they differ in terms of their probability in a particular situation (depending on whether I am in Cape Town or in Helsinki, at the zoo or in a street). This conclusion is nevertheless not an abduction, since it is not necessary to create a new idea to answer the question (who is making the clattering noise?), but to draw on an old one."
- "Inductive inferences are tenuous, since they are not truth conveying but only more or less probable. A good example of the logical form of an inductive inference and the problems associated with it was provided by Bertrand Russell: We know that all these rather crude expectations of uniformity are liable to be misleading. The man who has fed the chicken every day throughout its life at last wrings its neck instead, showing that more refined views as to the uniformity of nature would have been useful to the chicken. … The mere fact that something has happened a certain number of times causes animals and men to expect that it will happen again. Thus our instincts certainly cause us to believe the sun will rise tomorrow, but we may be in no better a position than the chicken which unexpectedly has its neck wrung. (Russell, 1912: 54ff.)" (130)
- "…deduction begins with a valid law and asserts that something will behave in a certain way. Induction observes individual parts of the unique diversity of the world and attempts to determine rules and laws to order its infinite manifestations…. While deduction has the unresolved problem of the as yet still unproven rule, inductions have the handicap of not being able to consider all the data in their infinite diversity. Both share the impossibility of creating new knowledge. The one generalizes what is already known, the other subsumes everything to it. Only abduction, which creates hypotheses and conjectures from the interpretation of perception and ideas, is capable of bringing a new idea to life." (130)
- The logic of research unfolds in three stages:
    - (1) abduction searches for a meaningful rule, expressed as a linguistic hypothesis which can be tested. The hypothesis is the link between discovery and testing
    - (2) a prediction is formulated from the hypothesis. The prediction is in the form of a theory or generalization

> (3) From this theory, predictions are deduced in order to be tested by observation for verification or falsification

- Abduction searches for theories (stories about relationships between variables)
- Deduction searches for predictions
- Induction searches for facts
- "Yet, however extensively an abductively derived hypothesis is tested, that is by deducing consequences from it and confirming them by induction, and then repeating the three stages ad infinitum, it is still not possible to achieve certainty as to its validity: It must then find confirmation or else shift its footing. Even if it does find confirmations, they are all partial. It still is not standing upon the bedrock of fact. It is walking upon a bog, and can only say, this ground seems to hold for the present. Here I will stay till it begins to give away. Moreover, in all its progress, science vaguely feels that it is only learning a lesson. (Peirce CP 5.589–, 1898)" (131)
- Karl Popper came to the same conclusion in his theory of the logic of falsification.

7.Content analysis / analysis of documents (Coffey; Schreier)

Amanda Coffey (2014) Analysing Documents, Chapter 25 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis

- Most qualitative research takes place in documented settings. Both texts and non-textual artifacts can be considered "documents": organizational artifacts like the name board in front of an elevator with different fonts for positions of varying importance is an example of a text. Records, minutes, data cards, agendas, letters, cards, testimonials, meeting notes, etc are all texts or documents worthy of analysis.
- **Analytical Strategies**: not just the content of the documents, but how they are produced and constructed: "A useful starting position for the analysis of documents in social research is that documents are socially defined, produced and consumed. Thus in looking at documents analytically, we need to examine the processes of production and consumption – be they technical, linguistic or conceptual – as well as the content contained within documents. In that sense we might think of documents as resources (i.e. as information repositories, telling us about a setting, an organization, an event, or a person), but also as artefacts for exploration in their own right. A document in and of itself can tell us something about the social setting. If we understand documents as accomplishments, as products with purpose, then it naturally follows that analysis should seek to locate documents within their social as well as textual context. Documents then are resources to be 'mined' but also topics to be studied." (370)
- "Thus it is important that we bring to bear analytical strategies that enable the meaning-making of documents to be subjected to critical scrutiny – analytical approaches that recognize documents themselves as ways in which social actors make sense of social worlds.
- "…we also need to be concerned with intended meanings (and thus with the authorship and function of documents) and received meanings (recognizing the importance of readership and audience, and the ways in which documents are interpreted by intended and unintended audiences).

- "Documents, as social artefacts, have narrative structures and are imbued with cultural ways of telling (see Esin et al., Chapter 14, and Winter, Chapter 17, this volume). They draw upon and conform to various genres, in terms of style, structure and language. They employ visual signs, literary devices and other symbols to present and display meaning.
- Documents are also rarely, if ever, produced and read in isolation from other documents. In adopting this more semiotic approach to documents we can explore relationships and meanings within a text and in relation to other texts. It is helpful here to distinguish between (1) what documents 'look like' (i.e. language and form), (2) what they 'do' (i.e. purpose or function) and (3) how they are related (i.e. intertextuality between documents)."
- **Language and Form**. "Documents will constitute and conform to particular genres with specific styles and conventions. These are often marked by quite distinctive use of language and structure. Documents may use specialized language (which might be referred to as a linguistic register) associated with particular domains of everyday life, and will draw on culturally recognized ways of telling (what we might refer to as narrative structures – see Esin et al., Chapter 14, this volume). Occupations, for example, often have distinctive language (with specialized vocabularies and narrative forms), as do particular kinds of organization or cultural activity." [One of the hazards of insider research is that from inside the organization we are studying, we don't hear the unique accent or recognize the differences that an outsider might see.]
- The first task is to understand how documents are constructed as distinctive artifacts; pay attention to textual organization of documents, semiotic and narrative qualities within the document. What reality is the document creating? How does it accomplish that task? Apply narrative analysis (see Esin) Discourse analysis (see Willig)
- What is the document's *register* (i.e. specialized use of language for a particular domain)
- We are interested in language, words, phrases, ordering and structuring of the text
- What is the look and feel of the document?
- What is the social setting or social practice that generates the document?
- **Studying the function of documents**. How is the document used in everyday life? [e.g. we might study doctrine as a document, and then find that no-one reads it or is even aware of it]
- "What purpose is the document intended to serve by the author or authors, and how is the document read, understood and used by audiences or readers? As well as asking analytical questions in relation to 'how' the document is 'constructed', it is therefore also appropriate to ask how documents 'function' in everyday activities and thus how they help to construct everyday realities in their procurement and usage. In other words, what is the document doing?
- "A way of approaching this kind of question is to think in terms of what the linguistic philosopher John L. Austin described as speech acts. This refers to the fact that language does not merely describe events or states of affairs. It also creates or performs them. When you make a promise or utter a threat, you are not using language to describe something else; you are using the language to accomplish the act itself. In just the same way documents can be seen not (just) as describing an event, organization, emotion or

state of affairs, but also as helping to create them (see Toerien, Chapter 22, this volume). In doing so documents deploy discursive or rhetorical devices – to create plausible accounts and to construct believable versions of reality; in other words, documents persuade. Rhetoric in this context is not being referred to in a negative way, nor does it imply wrongdoing. Rather it is an acknowledgement that a document can be conceptualized as an act of persuasion – and as such, and in line with any other act of persuasion, depends on rhetorical devices to describe, explain and justify."

- "This focus on the functions of documents can be usefully developed and illustrated by exploring the ways in which documents do various kinds of 'work'. Consider for example what a school or university prospectus is setting out to achieve, or a social work case report, school report or suicide note. We might usefully use terms such as 'to persuade', 'to validate', 'to justify'. A classic example of this is Garfinkel's seminal commentary on the analysis of clinical hospital records (Garfinkel, 1967; also see Eberle, Chapter 13, and Bohnsack, Chapter 15, this volume). Garfinkel's actual starting point was the use made of clinical records by social researchers, who appeared to be able to make practical use of clinical records as data in order to make sense of how hospital clinics work. Garfinkel argued that the researchers were only able to make sense of those records by 'reading into' them what they had already come to understand about clinics as particular kinds of organization. The clinical records themselves were messy documents, but culturally competent readers of these records – for example, clinicians, administrators or indeed researchers – were able to make sense of them by bringing to bear prior assumptions and cultural understandings. In this way documents can be seen to presuppose a community of readers and writers who share a common stock of knowledge and taken-for-granted assumptions." (373)

- **Intertextuality and Authority**. Documents seldom exist in isolation; they refer to other domains and realities. Analysis must therefore look beyond the documents to their context [e.g. doctrine or operations orders are written in a particular way. Why?]

- Like any system of signs, documents make sense because they have relationships with other documents.

- "we can pay attention to the intertextuality of documents: that is, their relational qualities and what these can reveal about the setting under investigation. The concept of audit is useful here. If we consider the basic mechanics of audit, then it starts to become quite easy to grasp the point and significance of systematic relations between documents. One of the root metaphors of an audit is that of the audit trail. Conventionally defined audits, for example of firms and organizations, carried out by accountants or auditors, place great emphasis on the audit trail. Audit trails trace each document and statement presented in organizational accounts to other documents contained in the audit file (the preparation of papers for an audit). There is an assumption that references can and should be made to other documents; indeed it is through these references and trails that decisions, accounts and everyday practices are documented and justified. An auditor's task is to establish the extent of these relationships and intertextualities, in order to account for and make sense of the process and practice of the organization. These relationships between documents are usually based on elementary – but significant – principles. They include the principles of

- sequence and hierarchy, which form part of the constitutive machinery whereby organizations produce and reproduce themselves." (374)
- "We can analyse such documentary realities in various ways. The term 'intertextuality' derives from contemporary literary criticism and is used, in that context, to refer to that fact that literary texts (such as novels) are rarely free-standing pieces, nor do they just or only refer to a fictional world. Literary texts, in their very nature, refer to other texts, albeit sometimes implicitly. This can include other texts of the same genre, or other kinds of textual product (such as journalism or biography)."
- "Documentary sources can hasten time, slow time, 'trouble' time and even suppress time – lifting events out of the flow of lived experience, and recording them in decontextualized language and formats of a documentary record. Intertextuality thus alerts us to the fact that documents are usually part of wider systems of distribution and exchange. Documents circulate through social networks and organizations, and in doing so help actively to construct those networks and organizations." [what does it mean to 'suppress time'? It can be explicit—"these are my commandments for all time"—or it can be implied—"these are the rules" (and there's no mention of expiration date).]
- "Documents move, flow and exchange because they can be used to decontextualize and recontextualize events. We can transform things, events, activities and lives by incorporating them into texts. By writing an event, activity or life in a documentary format, we translate them from the specific and the local, and make of them 'facts' and 'records' which take on an independent existence. Some texts become 'official', and can become 'proof' of events and roles. This is an argument that was made by Latour and Woolgar (1986) in relation to the production of scientific facts and findings through the production of scientific papers."
- **Limitations and new possibilities in working with documents**.
- "Working with documents in social research means paying careful attention to the ways in which documents are classified and conceptualized." (377)
- Scott (1990) distinguishes between primary, secondary and tertiary documents: "Primary documents are materials produced by those experiencing events or settings first hand, secondary documents are constructed as a representation of an event (by others), and tertiary documents include such things as catalogues, references and the grey literature. Another useful classification might be private and public documents – distinguishing aspects of the intended purpose and function of documents, though not necessarily accessibility for social research."
- "reality. Thus it is important that we ask appropriate questions about documents and what they can and cannot reveal about the social world. Rather than ask whether a document offers a 'true' account, or whether it can be used as 'valid' evidence about a research setting, it is more fruitful to ask questions about the form and function of documents themselves. We should also examine documents for their formal properties."

Margrit Schreier (2014) Qualitative Content Analysis, Chapter 12 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis

- "Qualitative content analysis is a method for systematically describing the meaning of qualitative data (Mayring, 2000; Schreier, 2012). This is done by assigning successive parts of the material to the categories of a coding frame. This frame is at the heart of the method, and it contains all those aspects that feature in the description and interpretation (see Willig, Chapter 10, this volume) of the material.
- **Three feature**s characterize the method: (1) qualitative content analysis reduces data, (2) it is systematic, (3) and it is flexible.
- Unlike other qualitative methods for data analysis which open up (and sometimes add to) data, qualitative content analysis helps with reducing the amount of material. It requires the researcher to focus on selected aspects of meaning, namely those aspects that relate to the overall research question. There can be many such aspects – some coding frames contain well over 100 categories and subcategories – but ultimately the number of aspects is limited by the number of categories a researcher can handle. Also, when defining the categories, one will usually go beyond the specifics of any particular passage. Instead, the meaning of the passage will be taken to a higher level of abstraction, resulting in categories that apply to a number of concrete, slightly different passages." (170)
- Qualitative content analysis originated with the quantitative version from the behaviouralist period of the mid-twentieth century, which used word counts, and counts of sentence forms.
- In Europe, especially Germany, quantitative and qualitative methods merged by applying quantitative tools to qualitative problems, but the reverse was true in the English-speaking world (172).
- "There is no sharp dividing line between qualitative and quantitative content analysis (Groeben and Rustemeyer, 1994), and the two methods share many similarities. Both versions of the method are concerned with the systematic description of data through coding. To do so, they follow a predefined series of steps. In both cases this involves (1) making use of a coding frame, (2) generating category definitions, (3) segmenting the material into coding units, and (4) distinguishing between a pilot phase and a main phase of analysis. Quality criteria used in qualitative content analysis, notably consistency (to assess reliability) and validity (see Bar) bour, Chapter 34, this volume), are derived from the quantitative version of the method, although they are often applied less strictly. As in quantitative content analysis, presenting the findings of qualitative content analysis can involve frequency counts." (173)
- "Qualitative content analysis shares many features with other qualitative research methods, such as the concern with meaning and interpretation (see Willig, Chapter 10, this volume) of symbolic material, the importance of context in determining meaning, and the datadriven and partly iterative procedure. But the method also incorporates elements from the quantitative research tradition and in these respects it differs from other qualitative methods. Because the process of assigning units of meaning to the categories of the coding frame is termed 'coding' and because a 'coding frame' is at the heart of the method, qualitative content analysis is easily confused with (inductive) coding in particular (on coding, Gibbs, 2007; see also Thornberg and Charmaz, Chapter 11, this volume). But whereas inductive coding allows for assigning any number of codes

to a piece of text, qualitative content analysis is more restrictive here (see below on the requirements of unidimensionality and mutual exclusiveness for coding frames). In inductive coding, code development and application go hand in hand, whereas they have to be performed separately and consecutively in qualitative content analysis, and the coding frame can no longer be changed during the main analysis phase."

- **How do you do qualitative content analysis?** Here are the basic steps in sequence:
  - 1. Deciding on a research question.
  - 2. Selecting material.
  - 3. Building a coding frame.
    - 3.1 select material
    - 3.2 structure and generate categories
    - 3.3 defining and describing
    - 3.4 revise and expand the frame
  - 4. Segmentation.
  - 5. Trial coding.
  - 6. Evaluating and modifying the coding frame.
  - 7. Main analysis.
  - 8. Presenting and interpreting the findings.
- "The coding frame is at the heart of the method. It consists of at least one main category and at least two subcategories. Main categories are those aspects of the material about which the researcher would like more information, and subcategories specify what is said in the material with respect to these main categories." (174)
- "Qualitative research often involves large amounts of material. Because of this and to avoid 'cognitive overload', typically only a part of the material is used in building the coding frame. Therefore, the first step in building a frame is to select a suitable amount of material. The most important criterion here is to <u>select the material so that it reflects the full diversity of data sources</u>. If the data consist of interviews with different stakeholder groups, at least one interview from each group should be selected. If the material consists of newspaper articles from three different time periods, all three time periods should be represented in the selection." (175)
- "But even if only part of the material is used, it is best to build the frame not in one step, trying to cover the material all at once. It is better to break the material down into smaller 'chunks' and to build the coding frame for one 'chunk' after another, for example according to source or (if interviews were used for data collection) according to topic. The two strategies can also be combined, and in fact this is what we did in our study on setting priorities in health care. We started out with the patients and what they had to say on one topic, such as the case of Terri Schiavo. We then moved on to what the physicians had to say about this case, including one group of participants after another. Once we had finalized the coding frame for this one topic, we moved on to another case vignette, again starting with the patients, and so on, until we had finalized a first version of the entire coding frame."
- "<u>Structuring and generating</u> are the next steps in building the coding frame, where structuring refers to creating the main categories and generating to creating the subcategories for each main category. These steps can be carried out in a concept- or in

a data-driven way. But it is not a good idea to generate all categories in a concept-driven way. A key objective of qualitative content analysis is to provide a good description of the material. Conceptdriven categories alone, however, may leave part of this material unaccounted for. This is why concept-driven categories are usually combined with data-driven categories. One way to do this is to create main categories in a concept-driven way and to add subcategories in a data-driven way. Working in a concept-driven way means basing the categories on previous knowledge: a theory, prior research, everyday knowledge, logic, or an interview guide (Schreier, 2012: ch. 5). In our study on setting priorities in health care, for example, we used our interview questions for generating main categories, such as: the participants' opinion on terminating Terri Schiavo's life support, their reasons why they considered this justified or unjustified, or other information they would have liked about the case before coming to a decision. When working in a data-driven way, there are again several strategies to choose from (Schreier, 2012: ch. 6). The most important among these are subsumption and progressive summarizing; these strategies largely correspond to the structural (subsumption) and the summative (progressive summarizing) types of qualitative content analysis developed by Mayring (2010: section 5.2.4). Subsumption is a useful strategy for generating subcategories in a data-driven way once main categories have been decided upon. It involves examining one passage after another, going through the following steps:

      1. Reading the material until a relevant concept is encountered.

      2. Checking whether a subcategory that covers this concept has already been created.

      3. If so, mentally 'subsuming' this under the respective subcategory.

      4. If not, creating a new subcategory that covers this concept.

      5. Continuing to read until the next relevant concept/passage is encountered.

- Defining and describing: "Category names should provide concise descriptions of what a category refers to; they should be neither overly long nor overly short and cryptic."
- "Descriptions can consist of two parts: a definition and indicators. The definition is a mandatory part of the category description. It states what is meant by a given category and what features are characteristic of the category. It helps to think of definitions as instructions in a code book, telling the coders when a given category is applicable. A frequent mistake is to make definitions too narrow by limiting them to the instances of the category in the material that is used for building the coding frame. But of course, the category should be more comprehensive than those specific instances and be applicable to the entire material."
- "Extensive definitions, including a name, description, example, and decision rules if needed, should be generated for all subcategories in the coding frame. With main categories, a brief description of the scope of the category is usually enough."(177)
- Revising and Expanding: "Once all categories have been generated and defined, it is time to take a step back, look at the structure of the coding frame once again, and 'tidy up' any loose ends. If subcategories are very similar, it might be best to collapse them. Some subcategories may be much more comprehensive than others and might be

better conceptualized as main categories. These and other considerations may lead to a revision of the structure of the frame."

- Segmentation: "Coding consistency, that is applying categories to the entire material in a consistent manner, is an important quality criterion in qualitative content analysis. It is assessed by comparing two rounds of coding that are carried out either by two independent coders or by one coder at two points in time. But comparing two rounds of coding only makes sense if the codes are applied to identical parts of the material each time. Because of this, the material has to be segmented into units before any coding is done."
- "Segmentation involves dividing the material into units in such a way that each unit fits into exactly one (sub)category of the coding frame. These coding units are those parts of the material that can be interpreted in a meaningful way with respect to the subcategories, and their size can vary from an entire book to a single word. This definition shows that segmentation is in fact closely related to developing the coding frame and meeting the requirement of mutual exclusiveness. The size of segments or units should be chosen so as to match the definition of the categories.
- "Dividing the material into units of coding requires a criterion that specifies where one unit ends and another one begins. There are two such types of criteria: formal and thematic (Rustemeyer, 1992). Formal criteria draw on the inherent structure of the material. They are formal units such as words, sentences or paragraphs in a legal text. Formal units make segmentation easy because they are usually very obvious. However, unless the category definitions match the internal structure of the material, formal criteria may not result in meaningful units. Especially in qualitative research, a thematic criterion will often be more useful. This involves looking for topic changes, and one unit essentially corresponds to a theme. What constitutes a theme will vary with the coding frame and main categories. Thematic criteria are much less clear cut than formal criteria, but they often provide a better fit with the coding frame." (178)
- **The Pilot Phase**: "In the pilot phase, the coding frame is tried out on part of the material. This is crucial for recognizing and modifying any shortcomings in the frame before the main analysis is carried out. The pilot phase consists of the following steps: selecting material; the trial coding; evaluating and modifying the coding frame."
- Selecting and preparing material. Ensure that the pilot covers all types of material, and can be tested on all the main categories in the coding frame, e.g. text, interviews, etc.
- Trial coding. The key to the pilot phase is the trial coding.
- "The categories from the coding frame are applied to the material during two rounds of coding, following the same procedure that will be used during the main coding. This can be done by two coders working independently of each other or else by one person coding and recoding the material within approximately 10 to 14 days. Frames that consist of more than 40 categories should be divided into parts that are applied consecutively, else coders are likely to make mistakes. An obvious way to do this is to divide the frame by main categories, that is to start out by applying all subcategories for this one main category, then move on to the next main category, and so on. All codings should be entered into a coding sheet, where the coding units are the rows and the

main categories are the columns. The subcategory to which each unit of coding is assigned is entered into the cells." (179)
-   Evaluating and modifying the coding frame. "Evaluating the coding frame involves examining the results of the trial coding in terms of consistency and validity (see Barbour, Chapter 34, this volume). If the definitions of subcategories are clear and straightforward and if the subcategories are mutually exclusive, units of coding will usually be assigned to the same subcategories during both rounds of coding. In other words, the higher the consistency between the two rounds of coding, the higher the quality of the coding frame. This is why it is important to identify those units of coding that were assigned to different subcategories during the two rounds. If the coding was done by two coders, it is helpful to have them sit down together and discuss their reasons for assigning a coding unit to different subcategories. It can also be helpful to quantify the degree of coding consistency by calculating a coefficient of agreement (Neuendorf, 2002: ch. 2; Schreier, 2012: ch. 9)."
-   **Main analysis phase.** This is where all material is coded. At this stage, you can't modify the coding frame, but you no longer need to double code each unit. You decide how much double-coding you need to do to keep on track – this depends on the results from the pilot phase. A high coefficient of agreement means you'll need less effort to double-code as a check.
-   **Presenting results.** The Coding frame itself might be the main result. If the coding results are key, you need a good graphic way to present them; try text matrices. You can also present them in a quantitative style.

8.Analysis of interviews (Roulston) focus groups (Barbour) and discourse (Willig)

Kathryn Roulston (2014) Analysing Interviews, Chapter 20 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis
-   "For researchers to go beyond the metaphor of interviews as transparent windows to each other's 'thinking, and souls and hearts and minds' in ways suggested by Judith Preissle, by what processes are interview data transformed into findings?"
-   "Social researchers are held accountable for how research is conducted and the processes of data analysis and representation of findings. Qualitative researchers' studies encompass a broad array of intellectual projects from those that seek to represent peoples' lived experiences, perceptions, opinions, and beliefs, to those that aim to contribute to social justice work, to projects that trouble our understandings of topics. Thus, approaches to the design and conduct of qualitative interviews and data analysis are diverse. In discussing the analysis of interview data, I work from four assumptions about qualitative interviews:
    1. Analysis of interview data is theoretically informed.
    2. There are many forms of 'qualitative interview.'
    3. There is no one right way to analyse qualitative interview data.
    4. The criteria for assessment of quality differ in relation to various communities of practice." (297)

- **Theoretical backdrops to working with interview data** (298): Roulston discusses neo-positivist, romantic, constructionist, dialogic, post-modern, and decolonizing methods and preconceptions, each of which might use interviews in different ways or perceive the data to have different value or validity. To situate yourself in this list, ask, "what are the theoretical assumptions upon which a research project is based? What are the analytic possibilities and representational strategies implied?" (298)
- **Preparing data for analysis**: "…in order to prepare data for analysis, researchers must align the theoretical assumptions about interviewing with the kind of research design and interview methods used to generate data. In cases where the substantive content or topic of talk is the focus of analysis, data are usually transcribed (see Kowal and O'Connell, Chapter 5, this volume) to include words spoken. Researchers commonly punctuate transcriptions in order to transform spoken utterances to a written text. Transcriptions frequently omit utterances that are seen not to contribute to the topics of talk (e.g., 'um,' 'uh,' 'yeah,' and so forth). In my own practice, I have found it helpful to include these sorts of utterances in initial transcriptions. In cases in which data are analysed for topical content, to respect participants who are frequently reluctant to have the stumbles and slips that take place in everyday interaction included in representations of findings, I edit transcripts for reports with an emphasis on readability for particular audiences, letting readers know how transcripts have been edited, for example:
    > "Excerpts have been edited for clarity. Words such as 'you know,' 'um,' and 'like' have been deleted, and word repetitions have been removed and replaced with …. Words added for clarification are noted by use of square brackets [ ]. Stressed words are noted by underlining (e.g., <u>very</u>)."
- [Transcription is an important part of the process, but the kind of information you want from the interview will determine the kind of transcription that is required]
- **Theoretical and methodological influences on interview analysis**: "In broad terms, analysing interview data includes the phases of (1) data reduction; (2) data reorganization; and (3) data representation. There is a good deal of variation among researchers as to how these phases are described and enacted…. Approaches to research that have substantially influenced how interview data are commonly analysed and interpreted include hermeneutics and phenomenology, and grounded theory, ethnographic, and narrative methods."
- Roulston discusses hermeneutic, phenomenological, grounded theory, ethnographic, and narrative influences. "Among numerous theoretical and methodological influences, analytic approaches to interview data have been influenced by hermeneutics, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, and narrative inquiry, and there is overlap between procedures used to analyse interview data. Across these various approaches three phases in the analytic process are discernible: (1) data reduction or 'meaning condensation' (Kvale, 2007); (2) data reorganization; and (3) interpretation and representation."
- **Practical steps for analyzing and presenting interview data**:
- <u>Reduce data to locate and examine what's interesting</u>. "One challenge faced by qualitative researchers is that of reducing data sets in order to interpret and distill the

'essence' or meaning of participants' descriptions. In grounded theory approaches, gaining an understanding of the main ideas is accomplished by applying codes to transcripts that are opened up conceptually via extensive reflection and memo writing. In phenomenological traditions, researchers reduce data by eliminating repetitive statements and data irrelevant to the phenomenon being examined. For narrative researchers aiming to represent participants' stories, interviews are edited to represent the central ideas discussed. Similarly, the data reduction phase for an ethnographer is guided by the purpose of research…"

- <u>Organize, classify, categorize data</u>. "In this phase of analysis researchers generate assertions about topics by reassembling and reorganizing the data, codes, categories, or stories. Findings might be assembled through sorting and comparing data, codes, and categories, and considering the links between these via memo writing. By developing the codes through an iterative process involving reading, focused coding, reflection, writing, and rereading, researchers make connections between ideas, collapse codes into larger ideas (variously called themes or categories), and begin to develop assertions concerning the phenomenon of interest. Although researchers may vary in their theoretical approach, what is common in this phase of analysis is that researchers discern the key concepts concerning the topic of study, reflect on prior understandings and initial assertions, and search iteratively through the data set to check, recheck, and revise preliminary ideas about the topic of study. An important step in this phase is to search for data that might discount preliminary assertions. Some researchers make use of tables, diagrams, and charts to represent initial understandings and developing interpretations (e.g., Miles and Huberman, 1994; Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, 2014; Spradley, 1979)." (305)

- <u>Interpreting and writing up findings</u>. "In this phase, researchers consider assertions and propositions in light of prior research and theory in order to develop arguments. Researchers develop stories that convey the main ideas developed in data analysis and present data excerpts or stories to support assertions (see Denzin, Chapter 39, this volume). Qualitative researchers use a wide range of methods to represent data, including themes supported by direct quotations from interview transcripts; descriptions and models of processes that may include diagrams and visual representations of key concepts; and narratives that represent participants' experiences and perspectives. Researchers commonly construct stories as first- or thirdperson accounts. A growing body of work draws on the arts to use poetry, fiction, theater, readers' theater and performance texts to represent findings to audiences (Cahnmann-Taylor and Siegesmund, 2008; Kouritzin et al., 2009). The generation of themes via coding (see Thornberg and Charmaz, Chapter 11, this volume) and categorization (see Schreier, Chapter 12, this volume) is arguably the most common analytic approach taken by qualitative researchers using interviews (e.g., Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009; Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Coding practices described in the methodological literature (e.g., Bernard and Ryan, 2010; Braun and Clarke, 2006; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2013) draw extensively on strategies detailed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), while making few distinctions between interview data and other data sources (e.g., documentary data, memoirs, field notes of observations)."

- **Challenges of analyzing interview data**: "stumbling blocks that routinely occur in relation to analysing interview data… include managing data, forcing data into preconceived categories, discovering methodological problems in data generation, and anxiety about using the 'right' method 'correctly.'"
- Data management and reduction. Keep good records, keep backups, keep the information secure, and use data management software to avoid losing data. A one-hour interview can generate a 20-page transcript and an interview project can generate hundreds of pages of data. Reducing an interpreting this takes time. Often only illustrative examples actually make their way into the final report.
- Forcing conclusions (306) If you sift through interview data looking for evidence to support your conclusion, you're doing it wrong. See also the sections on reflexivity.
- Failed interviews. (307) [You may be looking for specific information or forms of response in your interviews, and fail to find it, e.g. you are looking for opinions and rich, thick descriptions, and you get thin, yes-no answers. When you feel as if an interview has failed, go back and reassess it. Can you read anything between the lines? Can you go outside the interview itself to the context and explain the absence of data in the interview, e.g. the subject was uncommunicative, but his boss was in the room with a gun on the table]
- Getting it 'right'. (307) "Novice researchers often experience anxiety about whether they have applied an analytic procedure 'correctly.' For researchers experimenting with an approach for the first time, it is useful to reflect that all researchers began with a first project. Researchers learn from practice, reviewing the substantive and theoretical literature, and reading others' accounts of practice. For qualitative analysts, analysis of interview data is never really complete, since data may always be subject to analysis from a different theoretical perspective, or may focus on different aspects. Thus any analysis is a partial representation of the data set. This partiality and ambiguity may be experienced as deeply disturbing by researchers pursuing a definitive conclusion. Yet, these facets of qualitative analysis may also be liberating – in that no single interpretation is taken as representing an all-encompassing portrayal of a phenomenon. Since researchers must withstand the scrutiny of others in order to have their work deemed credible, the actions of continued reflection, demonstrations of a reflexive practice, and participation in collaborative data analysis with other researchers are practical ways to 'keep going' (Wolcott, 2009), in an effort to 'not get it all wrong' (Wolcott, 1994: 347)."
- **Judging Quality**. "Given paradigm proliferation (Lather, 2006), there are no generic ways to judge the quality (see Barbour, Chapter 34, this volume) of the analysis and interpretation (see Willig, Chapter 10, this volume) of interview data (Freeman et al., 2007). Rather, as discussed earlier, the criteria for assessing quality must be considered in relation to various theoretical conceptualizations of interviews (Roulston, 2010b) and disciplinary conventions. To use Stephen Toulmin's (Toulmin et al., 1984) terminology concerning the construction of arguments, in assessing the quality of research reports, readers examine claims or assertions, grounds or foundations upon which an argument is constructed, warrants for assertions, and backing for the argument presented. As Toulmin argues, the specifics of how arguments are constructed differ both in and

across fields. Therefore, researchers must attend to the conventions of various communities of practice, and craft research reports for specific audiences." (308)

Rosaline Barbour (2014) Analysing Focus Groups, Chapter 21 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis

Carla Willig (2014) Interpretation and Analysis, Chapter 10 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis
- "Interpretation is the challenge at the heart of qualitative research. Without interpretation, we cannot make sense of our data. As qualitative researchers, we aim to find out more about people's experiences, their thoughts, feelings and social practices. To achieve this aim, we need to ask questions about their meaning and significance; we need to make connections between different components and aspects of the data in order to increase our understanding. In other words, we need to make the data meaningful through a process of interpretation. This chapter aims to reflect on the process of meaning-making in qualitative research and to offer guidance in relation to the conceptual, practical and ethical dimensions of interpretative practice in qualitative research." (136)
- **Origins of Interpretation**:
- **Approaches to Interpretation:**
- **'Suspicious' interpretation**:
- **'Empathic' interpretation**:
- **Relation between suspicion and empathy**:
- **Ethical challenges**

9.Grounded theory and theoretical coding (Thornberg and Charmaz)

Robert Thornberg and Kathy Charmaz (2014) Grounded Theory and Theoretical Coding, Chapter 11 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis
- "Grounded theory (GT) is a research approach in which data collection and analysis take place simultaneously. Each part informs the other, in order to construct theories of the phenomenon under study. GT provides rigorous yet flexible guidelines that begin with openly exploring and analysing inductive data and leads to developing a theory grounded in data. Induction starts with 'study of a range of individual cases and extrapolates patterns from them to form a conceptual category' (Charmaz, 2006: 188). Nevertheless, instead of pure induction, the underlying logic of GT actually moves between induction and abduction. Abduction means selecting or constructing a hypothesis that explains a particular empirical case or set of data better than any other candidate hypotheses, as a provisional hypothesis and a worthy candidate for further investigation. GT was originally developed by sociologists Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss (1967), and has since then been further developed in different versions, such as Glaserian GT (e.g., Glaser, 1978; 1998; 2005), Straussian GT (Strauss, 1987; later developed in collaboration with and furthered by Corbin, see Corbin and Strauss, 2008;

Strauss and Corbin, 1990; 1998), constructivist GT (Bryant, 2002; Charmaz, 2000; 2003; 2006; 2009; Thornberg, 2012; Thornberg and Charmaz, 2012), Clarke's (2003; 2005) postmodern version called situational analysis, and Multi-GT (Goldkuhl and Cronholm, 2010). This chapter emphasizes constructivist GT." (153)

10.Phenomenology (Eberle) see also Marshall and Rossman, Bohnsack

Thomas Eberle (2014) Phenomenology as a Research Method, Chapter 13 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis
- "Phenomenology is a philosophy that called for an analysis of 'the things themselves'. It has developed new methods of analysis and produced findings that proved very seminal for the methodology of the social sciences. The phenomenological method is not just a method of data interpretation; phenomenological analysis begins before empirical data are even constituted. It is therefore inevitable to describe phenomenology at a much more fundamental level than as a mere strategy of data analysis. As phenomenology has greatly contributed to the methodology of qualitative research, the aim of this chapter is to elucidate several crucial aspects: phenomenology as an epistemology; as a protosociological foundation to the methodology of the social sciences; as a sociological paradigm; and as an empirical research procedure." (184)

11.Narrative analysis and construction (Esin, Fathi, and Squire)

Cigdem Esin, Mastoureh Fathi and Corinne Squire (2014) Narrative Analysis: the Constructionist Approach, Chapter 14 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis
- "Narrative analysis is an analytical method that accommodates a variety of approaches. Through these approaches, social researchers explore how people story their lives. This is also a process through which researchers understand the complexities of personal and social relations. Narrative analysis provides the researcher with useful tools to comprehend the diversity and the different levels involved in stories, rather than treating those stories simply as coherent, natural and unified entities (Andrews et al., 2004). It is this approach to narrative analysis, which we shall call the constructionist approach to narrative analysis, that we aim to explain in the chapter that follows.
- "Constructionism has a strong recent history within social sciences (Burr, 2003; Holstein and Gubrium, 2008; Sparkes and Smith, 2008). What we describe as a constructionist approach is very often adopted, in many of its features, by contemporary narrative researchers. The approach is distinct, first, as Holstein and Gubrium (2008) suggest, because of its critical take on naturalism, and in consequence its attention to the diversity, contradictions and failures of meaning, research participants' own generations of meaning, and to the mutual constitution of meanings between participants, researchers, the research context and the wider context – where 'context' refers to many different levels and complex relations of power. However, the constructionist

approach has also a great deal in common with narrative frameworks that rely on analyses of social positioning, or performance, or some variety of complexity theory.
- "In this chapter, we start by providing a brief overview of the contemporary place of narrative research, and summarizing the epistemological arguments involved with a constructionist view of narratives and narrative analysis. We examine the place of audience, the positioning of subjects within narratives, and the significance of power relations in stories, from within the constructionist perspective. We then proceed to describe, via examples, three analytical sites in which multiple, interconnected elements in the construction of narratives might be examined. The chapter ends with a brief discussion on the range and limitations of the constructionist approach to narrative analysis." (204)

12. Exegesis, hermeneutics, and dialogue (Wernet)
- Heremeneutics and exegesis have their origin in biblical studies in medieval and reformation Europe. Scholars sought to understand the original word of God. If the bible was written by God or inspired by God, then how would we come to know the true substance and intent of the text?

Hermeneutic Method (Schwandt, 2014, 137)
- "Where the act of interpreting an utterance, text, or action is defined as a kind of **exegesis** (a clarification and subsequent explication of meaning that at first appears strange and puzzling), we imagine it to be a kind of critical analysis or explanation using the method of the **hermeneutic circle**. The method involves playing the strange and unfamiliar parts of an action, text, or utterance off against the integrity of the action, narrative, or utterance as whole until the meaning of the strange passages and the meaning of the whole are worked out or accounted for. (Thus, for example, to understand the meaning of the first few lines of a poem, I must have a grasp of the overall meaning of the poem, and vice versa.) In this process of applying the hermeneutic method, **the interpreter's self-understanding and sociohistorical location neither affects nor is affected by the effort to interpret the meaning of the text or utterance**. In fact, in applying the method, the interpreter abides by a set of procedural rules that help ensure that the interpreter's historical situation does not distort the bid to uncover the actual meaning embedded in the text, act, or utterance, thereby helping to ensure the objectivity of the interpretation." [in other words, the heremeutic analyst consciously ignores context]
- "When we speak of *Verstehen* [understanding] as the method of the human sciences, it is this conception of hermeneutic method that is operative. In other words, defenders of Verstehen as method argue that because human action is intentional, it requires a special method to be understood (a method different from the method of explanation characteristic of the natural sciences). This idea that understanding proceeds by and is the result of the application of method—in this case, the hermeneutic method that is most appropriate to making sense of intentional speech or action—is repudiated in philosophical hermeneutics and deconstructionism."

   See also other Schwandt entries on hermeneutics

Andreas Wernet (2014) Hermeneutics and Objective Hermeneutics, Chapter 16 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis

- "Hermeneutics as the art of understanding has its origin in the problem of exegesis. And as the basic point of reference of exegesis is the text, hermeneutics initially is textual exegesis (Ricoeur, 2004 [1969]). It deals with the question of the 'true meaning' of texts. This strong textual orientation clearly accounts to the fact that the authors of antique and sacred, religious texts (to mention the historically most important objects of exegesis) are not in reach. They cannot be questioned whether the interpretation of their texts (see Willig, Chapter 10, this volume) corresponds to their intentions (Baumann, 1978)."

- "This scriptual orientation finally comes to an end with the hermeneutic conceptions of Schleiermacher and Dilthey. Their interest is not a philological one, but a philosophic interest in the question of understanding as such. For Dilthey, the distinction between the natural sciences and the 'Geisteswissenschaften' [humanities] is built upon the aim of 'understanding' in the field of human affairs in contrast to the search for 'explanations' of natural phenomena. Hermeneutics no longer only deals with the narrow topic of textual understanding but widens to the question of understanding as a fundamental principle of human action and everyday life encounters."

- "Philosophical hermeneutics seeks to formulate a theoretical concept of understanding as a basic principle of the constitution of the human world and as a necessity of scientific investigation of this world (Grondin, 1994). The idea of the one and only adequate interpretation is rejected in favour of a notion of understanding that emphasizes the role of tradition, prejudice and different subjective horizons (Freeman, 2008). The hermeneutical approach is a biased one. The process of interpretation therefore involves a 'self-examination' of the interpreter. Interpretation is no longer seen as the result of a distanced view of a scientific interpreter that leads to an unbiased understanding, but as a dialogue, in which different perspectives meet."

    See also other Schwandt entries on hermeneutics

13. Analysis of observations (Marvasti)

Amir B. Marvasti (2014) Analysing Observations, Chapter 24 in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Analysis

- "Observation is the foundation of science. Specifically, to the extent that empirical evidence is used to test theories or advance knowledge, observation is the backbone of all scientific research. Observational methods emerged alongside scientific methods; in fact, the two are often used interchangeably. The history of observational methods parallels the history of sciences as a whole. Lorraine Daston and Elizabeth Lunbeck nicely describe the overall importance of observations in the introduction to their edited book Histories of Scientific Observation:

    "Observation is the most pervasive and fundamental practice of all modern sciences, both natural and human. It is also among the most refined and

variegated. Observation educates the senses, calibrates judgment, picks out objects of scientific inquiry, and forges "thought collectives." Its instruments include not only the naked senses, but also tools such as the telescope and the microscope, the questionnaire, the photographic plate, the glassed-in beehive, the Geiger counter, and a myriad of other ingenious inventions designed to make the invisible visible, the evanescent permanent, and the abstract concrete. Where is society? How blue is the sky? Which ways do X-rays scatter? Over the course of centuries, scientific observers have devised ways to answer these and many other riddles. (2011: 1)"

- "While a full treatment of the history and nature of 'scientific observation' is beyond the scope of this chapter, two things are worth noting here. First, it took centuries for what we now consider 'scientific observation' to be separated from wisdom, experience, intuition, feeling, and divine knowledge. Second, 'scientific observation' could refer to a wide array of data collected in the course of empirical research. In the social sciences, this means observations can be based on surveys, in-depth interviews (see Roulston, Chapter, 20, this volume), focus groups (see Barbour, Chapter 21, this volume), and participant observation, to name a few examples. For the purpose of this chapter, I especially focus on the analysis of ethnographic observations (whether they are heard or seen in the field).