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Abstract

Qualitative Secondary Data Analysis remains severely underutilized in the field of Human Development and Family Studies and within the wider social sciences. In this paper, we revisit the topic of using qualitative data for secondary analysis, exploring complications, possibilities, and opportunities. Foregrounding the importance of multilogicality, secondary qualitative data analysis fundamentally moves away from linear, unidimensional, and restricted analyses and understandings. With few exceptions (e.g., Radina & Downs, 2005), little published discussion exists about philosophical considerations and analytical tools that could be used for qualitative secondary data analysis within HDFS. In response to this deficit, we offer ideas and share concrete examples of qualitative secondary data analyses from our own datasets. By re-opening this can of words, we hope to generate more discussion and encourage a greater number of HDFS scholars to re-use and re-engage with existing qualitative datasets.
Reopening a Can of *Words*: Conducting Secondary Analysis with Qualitative Data

In this paper, we reopen a can of *words*. Borrowing from the idiom “opening a can of worms,” which refers to discussing difficult, complex, or unpleasant matters—matters that might be best avoided, we seek to resurrect the topic of using qualitative datasets for secondary data analyses in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS). We are specifically interested in qualitative databases comprised of interview transcripts --filled with the words of participants and interviewers.

For well over two decades, many social scientist methodologists have pointed to the innovative potential of secondary analysis of qualitative data (e.g. Hammersley, 1997; Heaton, 2008; Fielding, 2004; Radina & Downs, 2005; Thompson & Corti, 2004). Yet, the reuse of qualitative datasets remains rare. Scholars have repeatedly debated ethical concerns, contextual and access issues, and methodological challenges, including the lack of widespread knowledge about analytical techniques for secondary analysis. Mruck (2005, p. 1) synthesized the issues in her editorial remarks for a special issue featuring qualitative secondary data analysis, when she wrote:

> Many researchers are not sufficiently informed about possible methods and technical means for archiving and [conducting] secondary[qualitative] analysis. In most countries, qualitative data and resource centers still do not exist to support researchers…

> Also, the methodological implications of secondary analyses need to be discussed in more detail. This refers to questions of anonymization, confidentiality and ethics as well as to valid, creative and resource saving ways of how to ask, "new questions from the old data.

Within HDFS, discussion and debates about qualitative secondary analysis are virtually
nonexistent. In the *Journal of Marriage and Family* decade review of methodological issues in 2005, Hofferth considered the use of secondary data in Family Studies. In her paper of 18 pages, she devoted one paragraph to qualitative datasets. She wrote:

Some of the newer data sets have qualitative components, as well as quantitative ones, and this presents a challenge. If the analyst did not participate in the collection of data and new data cannot be collected from the same participants, the deductive positivistic method is likely to apply to these data as well even though they may have been collected using a more inductive approach.

The aforementioned paragraph may be indicative of the state of affairs of using qualitative data in secondary analyses in HDFS. The discussion has been brief, lacking depth, and more stifling than expansive. We think the author of the methodological review article missed an opportunity to engage more with secondary qualitative datasets and to encourage innovative thinking about analyses with existing qualitative datasets. For example, the author might have done well to explore the possibility of secondary qualitative analysts establishing a new reflexivity as the foundation for another inductive round, or addressed the great diversity of qualitative approaches that could be implemented in a second look at a dataset.

In the same year the methodological review was published, Radina and Downs (2005) wrote a two-page supplement about qualitative data analysis in the *Sourcebook of Family Theory and Research*. In this “spotlight” piece, they argued that qualitative secondary data analysis has important potential for family scholars. They listed four approaches to qualitative secondary analyses and identified ethical, methodological, and rigor concerns of reusing qualitative data.

More than a decade has passed since Radina and Down’s (2005) urge for more qualitative secondary data analysis and since that time there has been little further discussion of the issue
within the HDFS community (see Sharp et al., 2014 for review of all HDFS qualitative conceptual articles in the past several decades). Compared to the high numbers of quantitative data analyses in HDFS journals, few family scholars have published studies utilizing qualitative data in their secondary analyses.

The literature is clear that several overlapping issues act as barriers for qualitative secondary data analysis, including: (a) lack of access for public qualitative datasets; (b) lack of understanding of how to respond to IRB and other ethical concerns, especially when using another scholars’ datasets; (c) lack of knowledge about analytical possibilities (including ontological and epistemological commitments and methodological techniques) to conduct secondary data analysis; (d) few explicit examples of published studies based on reuse of qualitative datasets. To this last point, according to Heaton’s (2008) review, it is highly likely that more HDFS qualitative scholars are engaging in secondary data analysis but not labeling the analysis as such (e.g., see: Lloyd, Emery, & Klatt, 2009; Sharp, 2016).

Although the discussion of the first two issues (a and b) have been taken up in the wider social sciences, we engage briefly with both of these issues in the next section. Our major focus, though, is the latter two issues (c and d). As a way to move the field forward in an incisive way, we devote the largest portion of our paper to broad conceptual issues of analytical possibilities and specific analytical ideas for secondary data analysis. As we discuss philosophical issues, we encourage the concept of multilogicality—drawing on multiple lenses and multiple contexts in order to yield multiple logics (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008). Engagement with secondary qualitative data analysis moves scholars away from linear, unidimensional, tidy, and restricted understandings.

An Issue of Access: Lack of Public Qualitative Datasets
Although the last two decades have seen an increase in the sharing of qualitative data, and the housing of qualitative data in “formally archived datasets,” it is not consistently or reliably available to secondary data analysts (Heaton, 2008). For example, a search for qualitative data sets within the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) database (www.icpsr.umich.edu) yields more than 400 studies. However, when delving into individual data sets, it becomes clear that the qualitative data is often restricted and not easily available for analysis. For example, ICPSR’s 2006 dataset stemming from the “Chicago School Staff Social Network Questionnaire Qualitative Interviews” includes a rich interview protocol to be used in interviews with Literacy Leaders. Questions include important open inquiry, including open ended questions about school turning points and “Do you consider the responsibilities of your position to be leadership for literacy instruction? How so? Or Why not?” The data file’s access notes indicate that the restricted-use qualitative data can become available through an online application and IRB approval, but that “This data collection may not be used for any purpose other than statistical reporting and analysis.” These instructions appear to preclude any kind of inductive approach to analysis.

Similarly, ICPSR’s 1996-1999 dataset “Justice in the Delivery of Government Services [United States]: Decision Norms of Street-Level Bureaucrats in Select Southwest and Midwest U.S. Cities” provides immediately downloadable quantitative questionnaire data, but there are “No downloadable data files available” for the qualitative interview and narrative data. Upon further examination, this qualitative interview and narrative data, though “restricted from general dissemination,” may become accessible after completing multiple steps of access application, including an Agreement for the Use of Confidential Data, the reasons for the request, and documentation of IRB approval or notice of exemption. These restrictions may indeed protect
the dataset’s participants and maintain allegiance to the original purpose of the research. However, they may or may not allow for the opportunity for a new reflexivity and consequent multilogicality in data analysis. Such allowances depend on the perspectives of the gatekeepers of the data.

Perhaps due to the complications and restrictions involved in using a stranger’s or even a colleague’s qualitative data, Heaton (2008) found in her review of qualitative secondary analyses that the majority of such studies involved researchers re-using their own data (about 86%). The benefit of such a practice is that the original reflexive positioning of the researcher would be maintained, which is essential for trusting the motivation and analytical lens of the researcher. At the same time, this practice is limited in that new perspectives from other scholars is missing. Although we encourage the overall practice of re-analyzing other scholars’ datasets and think this is an important direction forward, we realize that it is most realistic for HDFS scholars to re-engage with their existing datasets and/or to share their datasets with colleagues they know. In the next section, we share ideas for scholars to consider for their own datasets and offer examples of how to collaborate with others on one’s original qualitative datasets.

**Ontological Possibilities for Qualitative Secondary Analysis: Critical Indigenous Pedagogy and the Affective Turn**

Few researchers within the HDFS community have made significant efforts to engage deeply and present the value of and the ontological possibilities for conducting secondary data analysis with qualitative research. Indeed, best approaches seem to elude researchers across discipline areas (Heaton, 2008). Below, we explore broad conceptual issues to help situate the importance of qualitative secondary data analysis and provide readers with overriding frameworks to consider as they contemplate re-using qualitative data.
Critical Indigenous Inquiry

One potential solution is to consider critical indigenous inquiry. Critical indigenous pedagogy foregrounds the value of multilogicality that, we argue, includes secondary data analysis, to the extent it is valuable to communities implicated in the research (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008). The emancipatory nature of critical methodology includes more than one lens in the process of data collection and analysis, in order to capture values of participatory action, subversion of hegemonic norms, openness to critique, and maintenance of open-endedness in conclusions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008a; Lather, 2007). Consideration of the value of multiple lenses in qualitative research, including secondary analysis, is closely tied to valuing relationships, community and reciprocity in practices that are widely discussed within HDFS contexts, including parenting, caregiving, families, and communities (Munly, 2015; Munly, Tilley-Lubbs, & Sheusi, 2016; Noddings, 2010).

Denzin and Lincoln (2008a) opened up the concept of multiple researcher lenses to an ongoing participation, subversion and open-endedness through data performance, with the greater purpose of social justice, conversations and revelations lead by oppressed groups, and open conversations toward positive and critical social change.

To summarize, we believe that the performance-based human disciplines can contribute to radical social change, to economic justice, to a utopian cultural politics that extends localized critical (race) theory and the principles of a radical democracy to all aspects of decolonizing, indigenous societies. (Denzin & Lincoln 2008a, p. xi)

Denzin and Lincoln (2008b) define a “merger of indigenous and critical methodologies” as “critical indigenous pedagogy,” with an implicit understanding that “all inquiry is both political
and moral” and that critical indigenous qualitative research necessarily includes dialogue and community, implicating multiple lenses and ongoing evolutions in evaluative efforts (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008b, p. 2).

In their portrayal of community-based participatory research, Mayan and Daum (2014) describe the social justice value of—and even an imperative for—what could be seen as an ongoing opportunity for secondary qualitative data analysis even within a single project.

Partners do not invite one story but multiple stories, which credits multiple realities that we accept ontologically as qualitative researchers. By working in partnership, everyone is obliged to see an issue from many angles. In particular, when lay stories and knowledge are presented that do not match dominant models of understanding, we cannot ignore them. As partners’ stories confirm and collide with each other, and against dominant understanding, the complexity of the issue is developed and illuminated. (p. 78)

Altheide (2008) wrote about the epistemological underpinnings necessitating multiple lenses in research, which would include opportunities for secondary qualitative data analysis.

“Ultimately, evidence is bound up with our identity in a situation. I agree that the multiple memberships we hold in various epistemic communities are contextually and situationally shuffled and joined for a particular purpose (e.g., when an assumption or value is challenged or called into question)” (p. 138). Altheide describes epistemic communities as influenced by their social locations, including race/ethnicity, religion, gender, age, class, education and occupation, and urban or rural status. Other influences described by Altheide include emotions surrounding the issue, informing sources and media, frames and themes imposed on the data, and the researcher’s interpretive stance. These influences “provide an evidentiary narrative through
which people define, create, share, recognize, and reject information as relevant for a purpose at hand, including a topic that might be considered” (p. 143). It would seem important to allow space for these influences (e.g., social locations and others) through secondary analysis of qualitative data.

In Heaton’s (2008) review of debates presented by researchers and institutions questioning the use of qualitative data in secondary analysis, she found conflation of inductive and deductive approaches (e.g., “problem of verification”) and a rigidity in conceptualizing qualitative design (e.g., “problem of data fit” and “problem of not having been there”) (Heaton, 2008, p. 40). These matters may be compounded by questions of how to acquire consent from research participants for ongoing analyses by different researchers (Heaton, 2008). Such issues may provide the foundation for IRBs to contest efforts to use qualitative data in secondary analyses. The global need for multiple voices in offering interpretation and solutions for social concerns, however, should override these logistical obstacles and push the research community to a new paradigm of shared use. The evolving possibilities of inquiry through critical methodology often include multiple voices as part of the value of multilogicality, which necessarily involves including more than one lens in the process of data analysis and presentation (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008; Lather, 2007). Mayan’s call for flexibility through qualitative methods certainly extends to a call for flexibility in encouraging the re-use of qualitative data in secondary analyses:

We qualitative researchers must use creativity, sensitivity, and flexibility as we try to make sense of life as it unfolds. Consequently, we are not concerned with the control of particular variables within a setting but instead invite context,
complexity, and ‘confounding variables.’ This requires patience and the ability to live with enormous amounts of ambiguity. (2009, p. 11).

Multiple lenses from numerous researchers or research teams would seem to achieve Mayan’s description of qualitative responsibility:

….qualitative researchers aim not to limit a phenomenon—make it neat, tidy, and comfortable—but to break it open, unfasten, or interrupt it so that a description of the phenomenon, in all of its contradictions, messiness, and depth, is (re)presented. (2009, p. 11)

St. Pierre (2017) provided hope with regard to the possibility of breaking open methods themselves, offering a pathway for the less conventional secondary analysis of qualitative literature and consequent richness of findings.

It appears to me that the playing field of the next generation of researchers is incredibly open, as (1) IRBs forgo their disciplinary, determining role that too often impoverishes inquiry; and (2) social science researchers reach toward philosophy and the humanities to invigorate the human sciences and perhaps to deconstruct those categories altogether. I strongly believe that clinging to any ‘methodology’ invented to study a particular kind of being and human being will only limit the possibilities for new work after the ontological, material, and empirical turns that refuse both. (St. Pierre, 2017, p. 45)

Even in light of the value of multilogicality, there are complex and conflicting values for conducting secondary analysis of qualitative data. Mayan’s (2009) instruction to analyze data simultaneously with its collection (except in the case of semi structured interviews, with many participants and standardized questions), would seem to eliminate the possibility for secondary
analysts, as they would not be present to analyze at the time of collection. As Heaton (2008) discussed, this is “a problem of not having been there” (p. 40). However, Mayan also suggests that going back to fundamentals of qualitative research has the potential to solve any methodological quandaries. “You can sort out most qualitative issues, including the most controversial ones, by being attuned to and always going back to your ontological, epistemological, and theoretical allegiances” (Mayan, 2009, pp. 23-24). Perhaps if the secondary analysts are careful to establish these fundamentals before beginning analysis of another’s data, the new reflexivity will provide clarity of lens, and consequent transparency and trustworthiness.

Affective Ontologies: Turning to Embodiment

Another framework ripe for consideration is affective ontologies. The affective turn in the social sciences places emphasis on affect—emotions, sensations, moods and the body. As Bakko and Merz (2015) argued, “Affect Theory has reignited and augmented writings on the body, the everyday, relationality, cognition, and emotion in relation to, but also attempting to go beyond the dominant epistemological parameters of the linguistic turn…” (p. 7).

Sharp (2014) re-analyzed her qualitative dataset of brides, focusing on affective dimensions of pain and pleasure accompanying brides’ performance and embodiment of bridal femininity. In so doing, she brought into focus affective conditions of being a bride which had been missing in her initial analysis of the data. Her initial analysis has focused on stress and the role perfectionism played in stress. Showcasing multilogicality, both the initial analysis and re-analyses of the data illuminate the value of multiple lens and analyses from the same dataset. Arguably, as a result of the initial engagement and re-engagement with the data, scholars have a keener sense of bridal femininity for modern brides.
Below, to help illustrate context and the findings from re-analysis, below we share a portion of the abstract of the paper, entitled: “When Bridal Play Becomes Work: The Tenuous Balance between Princess and Bridezilla” (Sharp, 2014):

It is a well-known trope that little girls’ dream about their weddings, playing out fantasies of being a beautiful and happy bride. Young girls’ wedding play reflects fairy tales of romance, filled with princesses, princes, as well as evil stepmothers, stepsisters, and witches. Of all the various characters, little girls are exposed to in their play, the role of princess is the most desirable of all. In this paper, I play with ideas about how childhood notions of princesses (and the adult manifestation thereof) map onto real-life experiences of performing the role of a bride. Within focus groups and individual interviews, 18 newly married women living in the Southwestern US discussed their wedding days and their transitions to becoming wives. Their accounts showcased stressful and complicated experiences -- differing widely from the 'effortless perfection' that is the hallmark of typical cultural portrayals of the ideal wedding. These would-be wistful brides were confronted with a series of contradictions on the supposedly perfect, happiest day of their lives and forced to strike a balance between being the princess in the spotlight and bridezilla ruining the wedding. The pleasure of childhood play comes into conflict with the reality of the bridal performance, triggering identity negotiations tinged with pain. The tension between the two fairytale impossibilities (the ideal, pleasant and demure princess, and the evil, selfish, demanding sister/mother/witch) mirrors the tension brides feel as they attempt to perform the tightrope stretched between bride and bridezilla.

In the above example, Sharp drew on St Pierre’s (2007) and other scholars’ encouragement of creativity and flexibility in analysis and more closely engaged with wider cultural ideologies of fairy tales, brides, and fantasies. By focusing on affective and material
conditions, she was able to illuminate conditions of stress and perfection that were not pronounced in her initial analysis.

**Secondary Qualitative Data Analytical Approaches and Ideas**

Integrating some of the broad conceptual considerations we already discussed, in this section, we put the focus on specific analytical ideas and share concrete examples as way to offer the reader practical approaches in an effort to encourage more analysis of secondary data analysis. We re-visit four analytical approaches Radina and Down’s (2005) identified and then offer some additional analytical tools. Throughout this section, we share ideas and practices we have engaged in or are considering engaging in with our own datasets.

*Retrospective Introspection*

Radina and Downs (2005) described retrospective introspection as revising as the researcher re-examining “…the data with questions arising from the original study that were not thoroughly investigated at the time” (p. 63). To better understand this technique, we may consider Munly’s (2015) research with 26 Adult Foster Care providers in North Carolina. Adult Foster Care providers may focus their caregiving in homelike settings on specific subsets of adults, such as adults with dementia, serious mental health challenges, cognitive disabilities, or mobility challenges. In this research, Munly conducted semi-structured interviews and engaged in grounded theory data analysis, exploring how providers perceive and navigate their role as gatekeepers between the state regulatory system and the Adult Foster Care residents. The study design was guided by 1) literature reviewing practices and findings in Adult Foster Care, the disabilities context of Adult Foster Care, and a similar but distinct practice, Child Foster Care; 2) a theoretical framework incorporating intersectionality, theories of power, difference, and hierarchy; and care and relational reciprocity; and 3) by her reflexivity, drawing on her own
experiences in care work. Findings included providers’ multiple dimensions of investment and experience of dialectics of gain and loss, such as financial loss, but relational gain, or simultaneous relational gain and loss. In returning to her dataset with a retrospective introspection analytical approach, she and her collaborators, Roberto and Allen, with the original study’s foundation of understanding of caregivers’ strategies and contexts for navigating care, may better seek to understand, for example, how nuances in funding mechanisms influence the approach to care. As an alternate example, they might also return to the dataset to understand the role of resident diagnoses with caregiver strategies to care.

We posit that retrospective introspection also includes re-analyzing qualitative datasets with a new (fresh) theoretical lens from the theory initially used in analysis. An excellent example of this within HDFS is Lloyd, Emery, & Klatt’s (2009) chapter in the Handbook of Feminist Family Studies. After being exposed to a provocative book chapter inspiring new ideas, drawing on Foucault’s concepts, and examining broader cultural messages about intimate violence, the researchers share their process of re visioning and re-examining their dataset of narrative interviews and share their new findings. It is important to note that although Lloyd et al described their work as a re-analysis, they did not explicitly label the study as a “secondary data analysis.” We discuss this issue later in the paper.

Outside of HDFS, several qualitative scholars have recently made a strong push for qualitative scholars to expand and deepen their theoretical explorations when analyzing qualitative data. In particular, Alecia Jackson and Lisa Mazzei’s Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research (2012) book has been put forth as an important resource. Their book moves beyond mechanistic coding and restricted theme analysis to open up the power of thinking with
theory. They re-analyze two qualitative interviews with six different post structural theorists (i.e., Derrida, Spivak, Foucault, Butler, Deleuze, and Barad).

Inspired by the possibilities that a different theory than the initial theory used in the study might hold, Sharp re-analyzed her dataset focusing on new wives through a post-structural lens. In her feminist constructivist grounded theory study, her initial analysis focused on the labor of being a new wife, including physical and emotional labor and identify work. She titled that paper, “Once you take the veil off, it is still work”: The Process of becoming a Wife. (note: The italicized words in the title are a direct quote from one participant in the study.)

In her re-analysis, she foregrounded historical context and analyzed her data alongside data from Betty Friedan’s interviews with housewives in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s. Her exploration led to new insights and offered a much-needed critical questioning of the pervasive, lingering and powerful ideologies of the 1950’s housewife that still influence contemporary women’s experiences of being a new wife. Below is the abstract for her paper published in *Journal of Family Issues* entitled, “Betty Crocker versus Betty Friedan: Meaning of Wifehood in a Post-Feminist Era” (Sharp, 2016):

In this article, deploying Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* and the fictional American icon Betty Crocker within a post structural feminist analysis, the author analyzes a social science data set investigating how 18 contemporary wives think about wifehood. Crocker and Friedan are emblematic of the cultural DNA that make up wifehood: The mythical Betty Crocker represents the happy, traditional housewife of the 1950s, and Betty Friedan offers a critique of the happy, traditional housewife figure. Thinking about historical trends, in the 1950s to 1960s, femininity and families were rigidly prescribed and, thus, largely unquestioned. In the 21st century, with the influx of
post feminism, prescriptions for femininity and families are thought to be less rigid—but are they? Contemporary wives’ identity negotiations mapped onto both Betty Crocker and Betty Friedan but remained anchored in the Betty Crocker image. (p.1)

The re-analysis using post-structural theory foregrounds the impossible binary of Betty Crocker versus Betty Friedan young wives straddle. Whereas, the initial analysis focused on the multiple dimensions of the “labors of love” new wives engage in, both knowingly and unknowingly. In this example, we can see the potential in re-working one’s data. Also, it should be noted that, like Lloyd et al., (2009), Sharp did not explicitly identify her study as a “qualitative secondary data analysis.” Heaton (2008) has argued that this omission of explicitly labeling qualitative data analysis is common and can be problematic in moving the field forward. In the case of HDFS, it is possible there are more qualitative data analysis already published but they have not been labeled as such. We encourage scholars to consider this issue and, when possible, explicitly label their analysis as secondary.

**Subset Analysis**

In addition to re-examining datasets with new questions and new theories, another technique to consider is subset analysis. Subset analysis involves the researcher selecting “a subset of data from the original study based on some similarity between the cases and analyzes only these cases as a data set” (Radina & Downs, 2005, p. 63). Sharp engaged in this type of secondary analysis with one of her single women datasets. The initial constructivist grounded theory study examined identity negotiations of women in their 20’s and 30’s who were resisting conventional familial ideologies. Her dataset included 35 single women participants aged 25-40 years old. In her subset analysis, she restricted the analytic sample to participants who were aged 28-34 years old (n =9). Women aged 28 to 34 years old were consider in a “limbo” period,
according to prior research). In engaging in this subset analysis, Sharp was able to illuminate social norms dictating that singlehood is temporary (especially in late 20’s & early 30’s). As one participant explained, being single is seen as “transitionary phrase and it is not an identity you can claim... if you are a single person, it’s not just sort of thing or status that describes where you’re are right now, but it’s actually who you are.” This participant’s comments set the backdrop for the rest of the analysis.

Additionally, Munly (2015) proposes implementing a subset analysis in her research with Roberto and Allen on Adult Foster Care providers by bringing an intentional focus to any number of subsets, such as 1) the Adult Foster Care providers who live in their care homes; 2) the providers who own more than one home; 3) the care providers who solely care for residents with dementia; 4) the care providers who work with residents with serious mental health challenges; 5) the care providers who only take private pay residents; and 6) the care providers who have only Medicaid-funded residents. For example, providers giving care to residents with dementia are tasked with developing unique strategies to support person-centered values simultaneously with safety and constraints common to dementia contexts, such as resident fear of and forgetfulness about bathing. One care provider, Dan, stated that his residents with dementia are always given choices, even in the context of bathing. Wanting to promote choice, resident comfort, and person-centeredness, and understanding that residents would not volunteer to bathe, Dan shared that providers would encourage the residents through positive statements such as “You know, today would be a great day to take a shower. Why don’t we work that in today?” (Munly, 2015). It would be meaningful to look more closely at these kinds of strategies for working with a group that tends to be vulnerable to being marginalized, despite more prominent person-centered values in elder care.
Analytic Expansion and Supra Analysis

Analytic expansion is when “the researcher uses existing qualitative data as a pilot study in order to refine research questions and methods in future work” (Radina & Downs, 2005, p. 63). In Munly’s (2015) research with Roberto and Allen, her initial findings revealing practice restraints or capacity related to Medicaid- and private-pay funded residents, have underlined the importance of gathering more financial information and other resources, including Adult Foster Care providers’ other means of income, their pay per resident, in-kind supports and how the pay differs between private paying residents and Medicaid-funded residents. For example, the provider Shelli described the value of in-kind supports: “[Representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services] tell you how you may take your resident, you know somewhere that's to get glasses because Medicaid doesn't pay for glasses, unless you have an existing problem with your eyes” (Munly, 2015). This additional information on financial information and other supportive resources will allow Munly, Roberto and Allen to expand their analysis on how payment mechanisms play a role in Adult Foster Care providers’ strategies for providing care within system constraints.

Beyond expanding analytical threads in the dataset, other scholars have identified “supra analysis” which “aims and focus of second study transform the original research” (Heaton, 2008, p. 39). Sharp had experimented with this type of analysis in her project with choreographer; the project is entitled Ordinary Wars. In the project, Sharp turned over two of her datasets and worked with a choreographer to create a dance performance (see Durham DeCesaro & Sharp, 2016; Sharp & Durham DeCesaro, 2015). We share some of the analysis from the project below.

Unit of Analysis Modification
Another way to re-examine qualitative data is through unit of analysis modification. Radina and Downs (2005) illustrated the approach of modifying the unit of analysis with an example of reanalyzing a dataset originally asked at a family level of analysis at an individual level of analysis. In Munly’s study (2015), she initially worked with Roberto and Allen to examine the experiences of 26 Adult Foster Care providers; however, this dataset could be reexamined in terms of the 26 Adult Foster Care homes, including data collected about residents living in each home. This modification of the unit of analysis would allow for a greater understanding of the care systems at work, similar to examining family systems. Each home was unique: sometimes the main provider responsible owned the home, lived in the home, had multiple homes; served individuals with diverse chronic conditions, cognitive disability, and mental health challenges; worked with other family members; worked as more of an administrator than a direct care provider; had more or less interactions with biological family; and functioned on diverse funding sources, whether private pay, Medicaid, or a combination along with other supplemental income.

**Kinesthetic Analysis**

In additional to analytical tools already identified in the HDFS literature, we offer two additional ideas: kinesthetic analysis and rejection analysis. In Sharp’s project with a choreographer, Sharp “surrendered” her qualitative datasets to the choreographer so that the choreographer could analyze/interact with the initial datasets. As we discuss in another publication, the decision to give the choreographer the entire dataset is rare among arts-social science collaborations (Sharp & Durham DeCesaro, 2015).

In the project, the choreographer conducted a kinesthetic analysis. According to the choreographer, a kinesthetic analysis “draws on an affective and bodily engagement with
original qualitative data” (Sharp & Durham DeCesaro, 2015; Durham DeCesaro & Sharp, 2016, p. 23). The choreographer responded to transcript data …”by journaling about the content she read and describing kinesthetic reactions to it.” (p. 23) …Below is an example from the choreographer’s journal:

There is a great sadness to [the data]. It makes me think of shoulders pressed down and upper body curved. Like a woman crushed under the weight of it all. There is a great story here about finding freedom only to discover the freedom was an illusion, or at least that the freedom is much different than expected. (p. 23)

The journal entry illustrates the choreographer’s affective response (i.e., “sad”) and then depicts how this is a jumping off point to her bodily reactions – she physicalized the idea of sadness with the additional context of being weighed down by social expectations. She took these ideas and began creating a dance, working to develop movement “motifs” using her physical descriptions of the data to guide her. As the choreographer has written before, “Motifs are movements or movement sequences that form the backbone of a dance. Motifs are often repeated throughout the dance, though are manipulated from their original form” (p. 23).

Another kinesthetic analysis the choreographer engaged in was to select specific words and phrases from transcripts to create choreographic motifs. In one dance, the main motifs for were created using six distinct statements. The statements the choreographer chose included:

1. It’s a lot harder than what I thought it was going to be.
2. The yellow roses were gorgeous.
3. So, I wasn’t like giddy or blissful or anything like that and I’m not sure why exactly I just wasn’t.
4. You can tell that I was happy in the pictures, you know it’s not a fake smile.

5. As soon as we were married, my love for him increased greatly and I don’t know why I guess.


Upon discovering that all six statements were from one participant (out of 18 participants), Sharp raised a host of questions and experienced a crisis with her collaborator (see Durham DeCesaro & Sharp, 2016). The crisis led to discovering another analytical possibility – that of analyzing “rejected” data (i.e., data not used in the analysis). Although this approach may be best classified as analysis of analysis or might fit under the category of a “subset analysis,” we included as a separate idea in order to engender discussion and to showcase the multilogicality presumed in Sharp and Durham DeCesaro’s ideas to juxtapose their respective rejected data. We expand on these ideas in the next section.

Rejection Analysis

In the dance-social science project, the choreographer indicated that she was “unable” to use large portions of the data due to its lack of “kinesthetic transferability.” In other words, the choreographer did not think the data were useful as choreographic stimuli. Sharp and Durham DeCesaro realized that the choreographer’s kinesthetic rejection was, at times, linked with her ideological rejection. Sharp’s questioning of Durham DeCesaro’s rejection patterns made her question her own rejection choices. Sharp started thinking more carefully about her relationship with the dataset and recalled her physiological reactions to some of the data --- she became nauseous a few times when reading the new wives’ perspectives on intimacy. After experiencing
this adverse reaction, she stopped analyzing the data. She did not engage with the dataset again until her project with the choreographer—nearly two years later.

Sharp and Durham DeCesaro (2013) argued that “mining our shared aversion to data has the potential to inform and re-form the ways in which researchers understand subjectivity, analysis, and representation.” (p.4). In this publication, they “created a table to delineate [their] process of reanalyzing our own analytic processes, including [their]pauses and rejections” (p.) By persisting with analysis of content that does not initially resonant with one’s reflexive stance, Sharp and Durham DeCesaro foregrounded the practice of mutlilogicality.

The Can of Words is Open: Now What?

Responding to Radina and Down’s (2005) and many other social scientists’ calls to discuss and explore reusing qualitative datasets, we intended for this paper to rejuvenate interest in the topic. In particular, we wanted the paper to generate discussion about the importance of multilogicality and the ways qualitative secondary data analysis can help establish a new reflexivity. In our attempt to re-engage with primary barriers interfering with secondary qualitative data analyses, we simultaneously considered broad philosophical issues and specific, accessible tools. Ultimately, by re-opening this can of words, we hope to encourage other HDFS scholars to take some risks through conducting secondary analysis with qualitative datasets.
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The accumulation of documented and available qualitative data resources has thus encouraged the take-up of secondary analysis. Greater re-use of data also reflects some of the efforts invested in promoting or re-packaging data collections to meet researchers', teachers' and students' needs. And, as resources grow and the promotional machines grind into action, so experiences of secondary research have begun to find their place in social research literature, as the reflections in this FQS Special Issue on Secondary Analysis of Qualitative Data testify (CORTI, WITZEL & BISHOP Her interest in secondary analysis of qualitative data developed through the intersection of these two roles. For her doctoral work she is re-analysing data from studies on which she worked as a primary researcher, focusing on the 'temporal imperatives' which characterise the discourses surrounding contemporary hospital discharge policy and practice. Secondary analysis involves the use of existing data, collected for the purposes of a prior study, in order to pursue a research interest which is distinct from that of the original work; this may be a new research question or an alternative perspective on the original question (Hinds, Vogel and Clarke-Steffen 1997, Szabo and Strang 1997). Secondary data (data collected by someone else for other purposes) is the focus of secondary analysis in the social sciences. Secondary qualitative data is usually found in the form of social artifacts, like newspapers, blogs, diaries, letters, and emails, among other things. Such data is a rich source of information about individuals in society and can provide a great deal of context and detail to sociological analysis. This form of secondary analysis is also called content analysis. Validating Secondary Data Before Using It. To conduct meaningful secondary analysis, researchers must spend significant time reading and learning about the origins of the data sets. Through careful reading and vetting, researchers can determine: The purpose for which the material was collected or created. This presentation summarizes qualitative data analysis methods in a brief manner. Read and use for your qualitative researches. Preparing transcriptTranscribe word by word (verbatim)Consider non-verbal expressionsTry to do the transcribing yourselfBe patient-Time consuming Preparing Metadata(Log)Project/research titleDate of data collectionPlace of data collectionID-code of informant(s)Research teamMethod of data collectionDocumentation type: Tape recorder, notes and observations Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) involves the process and procedures for analyzing data and providing some level of understanding, explanation, and interpretation of patterns and themes in textual data. Just to recall that qualitative data is data that can't be expressed as a number. Qualitative data consist of words, pictures, observations, and symbols, not numbers. For more details see our post qualitative vs quantitative data. Generally, QDA has 4 main steps