Book Section:
Hughes, K orcid.org/0000-0002-5711-0353 and Tarrant, A (2021) Qualitative data re-use and secondary analysis: researching in and about a crisis. In: Kara, H and Khoo, S-M, (eds.) Qualitative and Digital Research in Times of Crisis: Methods, Reflexivity, and Ethics. Policy Press: Bristol University Press . ISBN 978-1447363798

Qualitative data re-use and secondary analysis: researching in and about a crisis

Dr Anna Tarrant (University of Lincoln) and Dr Kahryn Hughes (University of Leeds)

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic is the biggest global crisis of an era, rewriting norms and expectations woven into the social fabric of everyday life. Perhaps unsurprisingly, questions about the differential economic, social, and relational impacts of this crisis have preoccupied social science researchers, policy makers and service providers across the globe in 2020. The pandemic, and various forms of lockdown imposed in most majority and minority world contexts, has dramatically altered our lives, albeit in different ways. Like other times of crisis, such as the 2008-2012 global economic recession, these unfolding dimensions of rupture and change preoccupy socio-historical researchers now and will do so long into the future.

Social scientists have a unique and imperative role in advancing knowledge of the unfolding impacts of COVID-19 including how these new social conditions are affecting people's lives, needs, attitudes and behaviours. Yet the changes wrought by the crisis have also simultaneously altered the conduct of social sciences research, placing new restrictions on how new knowledge may be produced. In this chapter, we consider how the re-use of qualitative data and its preservation has become especially pertinent as part of an important repertoire of research methods. Our position entails a more nuanced ethical sensibility towards the archiving and reuse of existing research data in the context of capturing the evolving and uneven impacts of crises and understanding the social contexts from which they emerge. We therefore argue for, and raise awareness of, the tremendous value and potential for qualitative data re-use via the associated methodology of qualitative secondary analysis (or QSA) and make a case for data preservation and archiving.

We are prompted to write this chapter because, while there has been significant innovation in methods of qualitative data re-use and QSA over the past two decades, these have not traditionally been considered as part of the 'go to' methodological repertoire for qualitative, depth engagement (e.g., interviews, participatory methods). In the early stages of the national lockdown, there was a proliferation of work newly engaging with the various potentials of digital research methods and resources for research. We contribute to these developments to ensure that sidelining of valuable and relevant resources can be avoided in the post-pandemic research landscape through the promotion of methods of qualitative data reuse. Now, more than ever, there is a need to address the under-use of existing qualitative data, particularly as lockdown and social distancing continues to complicate, and even confound, face-to-face fieldwork for the foreseeable future.

To develop our discussion, we organise this chapter around four main sections and aims. We begin by reflecting on adaptations to research methods following the imposition of lockdown and enforced social distancing in March 2020. We do so to position data re-use and secondary analysis alongside primary forms of research that often take place face-to-face, or increasingly, via digitally mediated forms of engagement. Second, we report on the multiple ways that we have engaged with existing qualitative data to generate new substantive and methodological knowledge in the formulation of new research directions. While the work we discuss pre-dates the pandemic and social distancing policy measures, recent events have illuminated the 'added value' of working with existing data for researchers working at a 'remove'. Indeed, existing data provide essential context to the pandemic and an important baseline to emergent COVID-19 specific data that is currently being generated. Third, we outline some of the opportunities and challenges that secondary analysts must consider when working with existing qualitative data and make a case for an ethical sensibility towards data

re-use and preservation. We conclude with useful links to established datasets and archives both in the UK and worldwide, that provide access to baseline resources for work of this kind.

Adapting social research methods in a crisis

Opportunities for re-using existing qualitative data went largely unnoticed in the early days of the pandemic. National lockdown and enforced social distancing (e.g., in the UK context, this included a minimum of two metres between people in any social context beyond the home; mandatory masks in shops and indoor public spaces) placed unique restrictions on primary research methods, affecting how social sciences research could be conducted and knowledge produced. Meeting with participants face-to-face was prohibited, and so was ethnographic immersion in communities. Qualitative researchers, who typically travel to field sites and meet people face-to-face to generate their data and establish and maintain research connections, were pushed to consider ways that they could modify their methods. As the lockdown extended beyond a few weeks, there was a rush to produce resources to support all social researchers whose data collection and research designs were affected. Deborah Lupton's crowd-sourced document is an excellent example of collated materials that was quickly produced and widely distributed (2020). The Nippon Foundation Ocean Nexus Centre at the University of Washington, or EarthLab (2020), has also compiled a detailed list of resources suggesting alternatives for conducting primary research online. These include document and/or media and social media analysis and the use of online platforms or telephone for data generation. These new resources identify physically distant modes of connection and connectivity using mediated forms (Lupton, 2020). Qualitative data re-use is a conspicuous omission from both lists (see also Chawla, 2020; Tarrant and Hughes, 2020) and discussion among researchers more generally.

Notwithstanding the rapidity at which the research community has had to respond to these new conditions, discussions about how to conduct research have also been accompanied by newly invigorated ethical questions. These have centred on research/er burden, including whether (or not) we should conduct research at all at a time of crisis (e.g. Nuffield Council on Bioethics, 2020; Fitzgibbon, 2021, this volume). Such questions were important to consider as our initial understanding is that the differential impacts of COVID-19 are falling along existing lines of inequality (we address this in more detail later in the chapter). These, and related debates, are reflective of the core set of ethical principles that underpin much social sciences research. This includes research involving marginalised and vulnerable groups, such as in our own work, where due consideration must be given to the potential impacts research engagement may have on researched communities (Emmel et al, 2007; Garthwaite et al, 2020). Given the pace of change, as well as rapid responses by funding councils to enable research about the crisis, these were, and remain, important considerations. We return to the ethical dimensions of social research in a crisis later in the chapter, albeit with an alternate focus on data preservation and archiving as imperative to a broader ethical sensibility towards participants.

How, then, are we to research those individuals and groups disproportionately affected by the impacts of COVID-19 (economic, health and well-being, etc.), where face-to-face research is both dangerous physically, as well as entailing a potentially damaging level of research/er burden? The prioritisation of how and whether researchers should adapt their primary research designs and methods, has meant that data re-use and secondary analysis, which by their very nature can also practically be conducted in a socially distanced manner, were rarely addressed or suggested as an alternative. In part, we suggest, this is linked to the relatively

under-utilised and -valued nature of qualitative data re-use and secondary analysis more generally, including prior to COVID-19. This underutilisation might be prompted by a number of factors. First, it may in part be to do with a sense of what is *lost* when researchers are not involved in the formative contexts of research. We have elsewhere (Hughes et al, 2020) made the case that 'being there' — involved directly in the formative generation of data — offers distinctive insights potentially not recoverable through 'secondary' analysis. Tacit experiential and 'felt' understanding, sensory perceptions, participation in what we might describe as knowledge collectives (i.e., all the stakeholders involved in any research endeavour) are integral to formative research contexts (Hughes et al, 2021). Additionally, there are also challenges at working at a temporal remove, whereby researchers may feel historically 'out of step' with the timescapes of their participants. Second, the neoliberalisation of the academy has been orientated towards 'big qual', alongside a corresponding drive towards quantifiable evidence (Edwards and Holland, 2020). 'Big qual' refers to the analysis of large volumes of qualitative data and larger than that that would be feasible for an individual research or small research team to generate (Jamieson and Lewthwaite, 2019). Finally, the requirement to archive data by research funders is relatively recent, as are the technological developments producing the necessary resources for inter/national opportunities to undertake QSA. We seek to remedy this oversight by explaining the possibilities for innovation that might be afforded by data re-use and QSA as key methodological tools, both for researching in and about the crisis.

Qualitative data re-use and secondary analysis

Simply put, the secondary analysis of qualitative data involves the re-use of existing data generated for previous research studies, for new purposes (Bishop and Kuula-Luumi, 2017).

Although qualitative data has become more accessible (see below), its re-use continues to be a contested methodological field that has stimulated vigorous debate. Early debate coalesced around questions of ethics, epistemology and practical concerns related to engaging with data that had been gathered by other people. Qualitative research data were argued to be distinctive in that they could be understood to be co-constructed in the interaction between the researcher and researched (Hammersley, 2010). This approach raised ethical and epistemological questions about whether it is even possible to fully understand data as a 'secondary user' (Mauthner et al, 1998), a static framing of researchers that has since been critiqued through consideration of what it means to work at a 'remove' from data. The ethics of qualitative data re-use represents a complex analytic terrain (Hughes and Tarrant, 2020b) involving a settlement between extending the value and insights of otherwise expensive resources to produce, while also considering participant concerns, both retrospectively and prospectively (see also Neale, 2013). In 2007, Jennifer Mason significantly moved debate forwards by reconciling these questions. She advocated a shift beyond questions of whether we *should* re-use qualitative data, to questions of *how* we can. Moreover, and in the same special issue as Mason's introductory paper, the distinction between primary and secondary analysis was challenged, as was the idea that the 'construction' of data occurred solely within the researcher/researched interaction (Moore, 2007; Hughes et al, 2020). Advancing an 'investigative epistemology', Mason's intervention paved the way for greater innovation and creativity in methods of qualitative data reuse (ibid, 2007).

Developments in both infrastructure and increased investment in data resources have been integral to the burgeoning of this methodological terrain. Over two decades ago, the Qualitative Data Archival Resource (originally named QUALIDATA, and now the UK Data Service) was established, requiring researchers to make qualitative data available for re-use

at a national scale for the first time (Moore, 2007; Bishop and Kuula-Luumi, 2017). As part of the global digital revolution, the last twenty years have seen large scale international investments in archives and repositories making it possible to access a 'tsunami' of these newly configured data. The digitisation of research data, alongside an increasing imperative to reuse it by major European and UK funding councils[1] has stimulated a more concerted and self-conscious engagement with the methodological complexities of reusing data, including those with which researchers have had no prior relationship (James, 2012). This increasing imperative has been driven by a growing recognition that existing data resources were expensive to produce and have continuing utility, especially large-scale panel studies which may ask similar questions across different international contexts, thereby providing both nationally specific findings and offering opportunities for international comparison. The re-use of qualitative data also fits with the increasing emphasis by funding councils for researchers to ensure that before they generate any additional primary data, they make themselves aware of any existing data on their topic. While QSA has been relatively overlooked in discussions of best methods to use in a crisis, in fact it is the research direction of the future for reasons we now go on to discuss.

Increased availability of qualitative research data, and the recognition of data re-use as a viable and accepted research direction, has underscored the growth of a vibrant and creative methodological field in recent years, especially in rapid innovations in methods of qualitative secondary analysis (or QSA). Such innovation includes bringing new questions to research data; developing new interpretations by analysing existing datasets; gaining new

[1] A comprehensive list of archives and international resources is provided at the end of this chapter.

methodological insights by bringing existing studies into analytic conversation; using existing research data to inform the design of new empirical studies; or any combination of these (e.g. Irwin and Winterton, 2011; Tarrant, 2017; Davidson et al, 2018; Jamieson and Lewthwaite, 2019; Edwards et al, 2020; Hughes et al, 2020; Hughes and Tarrant, 2020a; Tarrant and Hughes, 2020; Hughes et al, 2021). While impossible to do justice to the breadth and richness of creativity in the field, it is worth mentioning here notable interventions that demonstrate the huge potential for substantive and theoretical advance, knowledge production, and methodological development. As part of the Timescapes programme of research (Neale and Holland, 2012) for example, Sarah Irwin et al, (2012) explored the potential of several strategies that involved working across differently constituted datasets that had been prepared for archiving in the new Timescapes Archive. These include an example of working between survey data and one qualitative dataset; working together as primary researchers to reinterrogate their data within a new conceptual framework; and working across multiple, linked qualitative datasets generated by other researchers (ibid, 2012). Ros Edwards and colleagues (2020) are also defining the virtues and developing techniques of 'big qual' or breadth-and-depth analysis for the purposes of amalgamating qualitative datasets in a programme of work which has attracted attention both in the UK and internationally (Davidson et al, 2019).

Our shared work demonstrates how data accrue value and relevance over time rather than lose it. With Jason Hughes, we elaborate three major approaches to QSA; continuous, collective, and configurative, that demonstrate how we may harness the value of different forms of 'remove' from the data (Hughes et al, 2021, see also Hughes et al, 2020). We illustrate these modes of QSA with empirical examples below, but briefly, c*ontinuous* QSA

involves asking new questions of existing datasets to (re)apprehend empirical evidence and develop continuous samples in ways that principally leverage epistemic distance from the formative contexts of the research, bringing new questions to existing data for the purposes of new investigations, and generating new questions for future research from these datasets. *Collective* QSA involves linking across research teams and studies generating research dialogues and thus principally harnessing the analytic affordances of working in new research teams, while drawing on the different knowledge and insights new team members may have about the various datasets. *Configurative* QSA considers approaches to bringing data into conversation with broader sources of theory and evidence, principally harnessing temporal distance, where foregrounding researchers' temporal 'remove' from the formative contexts of research builds in opportunities for longitudinal engagement and comparison (Hughes et al, 2021).

Building on the strategies of Irwin et al, (2012), Anna developed what we describe as *continuous* QSA in a depth-to-breadth approach involving the use of sub-samples of two datasets stored in the Timescapes Archive in her Leverhulme funded study 'Men, Poverty and Lifetimes of Care' (Tarrant, 2021). In this study, she developed a new empirical research design; tested new methodological techniques; theoretically sampled from datasets in collaboration with existing research team members (Tarrant and Hughes, 2020); and brought new questions to new samples to generate new insights. An example of our shared *collective* QSA, is where we engaged in depth analyses of small samples of data from two datasets, to advance new substantive and theoretical agendas made possible through a depth-to-breadth approach to analysis (Tarrant and Hughes, 2019). Finally, we revisited a dataset comprised of interviews with internet gamblers conducted in 2007, in a form of *configurative* QSA. We

explored the possibilities for enhanced methodological and substantive insight offered by working at a temporal 'remove' from the original study (Hughes et al, 2020). Although we do not describe these methodologies in depth here, we anticipate that they provide a starting point for those who may wish to follow up on the kinds of strategies defining this new phase of qualitative data re-use and QSA. We expect the broad panoply of methodological advances in this field to prove foundational for social researchers in the later phases of the pandemic and post-pandemic context.

In what follows, we consider engagements with existing qualitative data as vital for establishing the key contexts to social crises and our ongoing understanding of their impacts and consequences.

The role of QSA in researching in and about social crises

As already stressed, data re-use and QSA support continued fieldwork in a world where face-to-face research is currently prohibited. These methodological approaches also facilitate greater comprehension of the dynamics of the social world as it unfolds through changing socio-historical contexts. Popular and political discourse often frames the COVID-19 pandemic as an isolated, 'unprecedented', moment. However, by building on much longer research histories, aggregating existing findings and expertise across interdisciplinary collectives, we are better able to interrogate and contextualise its distinctive facets and uneven impacts while also producing a baseline for future events.

Our contributions to methods of QSA build out of involvement in qualitative longitudinal studies spanning several decades that investigated the longitudinal dynamics of poverty and inequality as expressed in family contexts over time. These studies enabled socio-historical

insight into how crises and shocks, like the global recessions of 2008 and 2012 and the subsequent political imposition of austerity, rendered low-income families and households vulnerable (e.g. Hughes and Emmel, 2011; Emmel and Hughes, 2010; Tarrant and Hughes, 2019). National policy responses varied globally, and previous research with vulnerable families in the UK observed how austerity politics exacerbated existing inequalities, additionally creating new and asymmetrical vulnerabilities and hardships (Emmel and Hughes, 2010; Tarrant, 2018; Hall, 2019). These qualitative data provide both *historical* evidence for how families manage 'shocks' to their households engendered through such austerity policies, as well as connection with how the *present* impacts of such policies continue to shape inequalities in experiences of the current COVID-19 crisis. In this way, legacy data provide enhanced *explanatory potential* for researchers seeking to account for the disproportionate impacts of COVID-19 on individuals and groups, thus enabling researchers to avoid analytical retreat to simplistic, present-centred descriptions of these. Our work demonstrates how access to, and analysis of, existing data resources and 'data histories' increasingly preserved in archives, enhances how we address important sociological questions about the extent of continuity and change engendered by 'moments' of crisis like the pandemic.

Such an approach may also aid understanding of what is currently seen as an anomalous disproportionate representation of Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) individuals and groups in the death rates from COVID-19. All too frequently, the 'higher than average' death rates for BAME communities are treated as almost inexplicable. However, there is considerable evidence across the social sciences that demonstrates the importance of the intersections of race and class in ways that render BAME people as disproportionately deprived and therefore

more at risk of contracting the virus, and more likely to become ill from it (Nganizi, 2020; Marmot/Highfield, 2020). Thus, while we may need to be creative in how and which data we draw upon to explore these present trends, there are long social science histories which support a critical interrogation of common-sense understanding via investigation of such questions.

Finally, data do not need to be 'historical' to inform on long-term historical processes. Even in the present there are opportunities for data sharing and collaboration on data that have only recently been generated. The unprecedented *speed* at which social crises are unfolding, present new and important questions about how and whether we can capture the diverse impacts of the crisis, not only in real time, but in ways which can inform social science understanding and knowledge in generations to come. Currently, funding is being made available much more quickly by funding councils, speedier publishing is being facilitated by academic publishers (although this in itself has exacerbated existing inequalities in the academy too), and many of the classic delays around collaboration (e.g. between researchers and non-academic partners) are being cast aside in favour of rapid response. This imperative of 'rapid response' research, in rapidly changing contexts, produces a new impetus to work collaboratively. Not only is there a necessity to research the pandemic as a new phenomenon, but this is also a moment that is catalysing anticipated change (what we might currently consider unusual, and what will become the 'new normal'). To engage with the 'unprecedented' as it becomes normalised, a breadth response is essential to capture social impacts and social change in the round. Shared and amalgamated data and findings are a key resource here for researchers, ensuring they can connect with existing scholarship. Furthermore, interdisciplinary collaboration is essential in order that research can be as comprehensive as possible, and also to maximise its relevance across societies. The UK Data

Service 'Data Dive'[2] event hosted in October 2020, which supports data producers, policymakers and charities to link and share recently generated and related datasets to address critical questions about the impacts of the pandemic, is one such example.

Through this section, we have looked at the value of retrospective as well as contemporary research and engagement. We would also suggest that fundamental to recognising the explanatory power of methods of QSA using existing data to develop and support analyses of new questions, is the acknowledgment of the need and value for prospective thinking and planning in research. In effect, engaging with questions of reuse prospectively is a persuasive reason for encouraging contemporary social researchers to prioritise data preservation for the purpose of future re-use. In this way we are not only engaging with questions of current concern, but through this, provide for longer histories of research engagement and future generations of researchers.

Data preservation and archiving as ethical sensibility

We conclude that building what we describe as an *ethical temporal sensibility* into the research mindset, one which ensures the capture of the lived experiences of those most vulnerable to being excluded or erased from social histories, can foster a collective responsibility that extends and enhances the value of our socio-historical research both now and in future (Hughes and Tarrant, 2020a; Tarrant and Hughes, 2020b).

In this context, the significance of preserving the voices of vulnerable and/or marginalised families and communities, namely those least likely to be captured via traditional forms of political engagement and representation, is *ethically* vital in order that they are retained as

[2] https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/news-and-events/eventsitem/?id=5679

part of the social record of these times (Hughes and Tarrant, 2020b; Tarrant and Hughes, 2020b). Generating and archiving data, both from and with these populations is essential for the preservation of more holistic and socially comprehensive historical records. Endeavours towards the digital storage and curation of research data becomes more urgent in a context where participants' voices and experiences should be retained rather than silenced. The experiences of these participants are least likely to be captured, yet these are individuals who are also most likely to be further disadvantaged by social crises. A pragmatic commitment towards data preservation and curation can therefore ensure the social histories of those with least access to digital participation.

Where can I access (and archive) qualitative research data?

At the end of this chapter we provide a list of data resources that begin to represent the great diversity and wealth of social research data already 'out there' (Hughes and Tarrant, 2020) that could be used during the crisis and as a baseline. Briefly, in the UK, principal collections include:

- the UK Data Service,
- the Mass Observation Archive,
- the National Social Policy and Social Change Archive, University of Essex,
- the Irish Qualitative Data Archive and Northern Ireland Qualitative Archive (NIQA),
- the London School of Economics Archive, and
- the Timescapes Archive, University of Leeds

There has also been a flourishing of international qualitative data archives including:

- The Australian Data Archive (ADA),

- the Qualitative Data Repository at Syracuse University, USA,
- the Henry A. Murray Research Archive at Harvard, and
- the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (IUCPS) in the USA.

For COVID-19 specific resources, the UK Data Service have a dedicated page, listing datasets providing social context to the pandemic. These are likely to appeal to researchers across social science disciplines in their diverse thematic coverage of issues such as (un)employment, food, finance, ageing, welfare, crime and deviance, health, policy change and so on. The 'Data Dive' workshops mentioned earlier, are also exemplars of opportunities for researchers to engage in the secondary analysis of recently generated crisis-specific data. Collaborative secondary analysis opportunities are also being supported in the context of rapidly funded research studies, including the Nuffield funded 'Covid Realities' project (Patrick et al, 2020) which, with the support of a consortium of research studies across the UK, is examining the unfolding impacts of the pandemic and policy change on low-income families. In the UK, COVID-19 related data are also being generated and preserved via the national longitudinal panel studies. A COVID-19 specific, Longitudinal Research Hub called CLOSER[3] has been set up in this regard to support researchers, policy makers and parliamentarians to access data, both now and in future.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have sought to render qualitative data re-use and qualitative secondary analysis (QSA) more visible as relevant and innovative forms of fieldwork that can be conducted 'at a remove' (Hughes et al, 2020). These methods are not only suitable for crisis contexts where physically distanced approaches to fieldwork may be necessary but are also

[3] https://www.closer.ac.uk/

innovative methodologies with capacity to inform on the social impacts and effects of crises as they unfold over time.

Our ambitions to raise the profile and visibility of qualitative data availability, re-use and secondary analysis, are also underscored by concern for the future of research methodology and knowledge production. At the time of writing, social researchers are racing to document and understand the complex and wide-ranging impacts of the pandemic, linked policy responses, and their unequal impacts on lived experience. Not only has the COVID-19 crisis brought the under-use of existing qualitative data into sharp relief, but it has also demonstrated a renewed imperative for preserving diverse data resources for the socio-historical record. Regardless of whether researchers decide to engage with these methodologies in future, the crisis has especially emphasised how data concerns, including data sharing, curation and preservation, must be carefully attended to by all researchers as part of a broader ethical sensibility among the social research community (Tarrant and Hughes, 2020b). Such an approach is likely to foster and underscore greater efforts among social researchers, enabling us to forge ground-up policy responses building out of longer and broader empirical and theoretical histories, via a collective translation of evidence. We also make a case for creating new interdisciplinary data legacies. It is our hope that, if there is any positive learning and change to come out of this crisis for the academy, we continue to recognise the potentialities (and also learn from the challenges) of working more closely together. This is not just for the benefit of developing a better understanding but also to positively influence a dynamic social world. Through the production of new data histories as a collective, we also become stewards of evidence from a contemporary crisis that will become foundational to social history.

Finally, returning to present concerns, we acknowledge that re-using and working with data generated between others is not an obvious replacement for primary research and the face-to-face encounters that make fieldwork so enjoyable and insightful. Where online methods may go some way to enabling face to face engagements and modes of connectivity with participants, this is not a key feature of data re-use or qualitative secondary analysis. Nevertheless, data re-use can be both a rewarding and immersive experience, (and, we acknowledge, sometimes distressing and traumatic), ethically rooted and engendering its own unique forms of emotional connection with participants (Weller, 2020). Secondary analysts gain privileged insights into the diverse social worlds of participants in the communities and localities of interest, observe methodological approaches employed by other researchers, and develop a real sense of how particular experiences are lived and given meaning. As the COVID-19 pandemic unfolds in the longer-term, we argue that opportunities for this kind of immersive work need to be foregrounded both for its own value and, indeed, to enhance face-to-face and primary forms of fieldwork.

References

Bishop, L. and Kuula-Luumi, A. (2017) 'Revisiting qualitative data reuse: A Decade On', *Sage Open,* 7 (1).

Chawla, P. (2020) Research Methods to Understand the 'Youth Capabilities & Conversions': The Pros and Cons of Using Secondary Data Analysis in a Pandemic Situation, In Kara, H. and Khoo, S. (eds) *Researching in the Age of COVID-19, Vol 1: Response and Reassessment.* Bristol: Policy Press

Davidson, E., Edwards, R., Jamieson, L. and Weller, S. (2019) 'Big data, qualitative style: a breadth-and-depth method with large amounts of secondary qualitative data', *Quality & Quantity,* 53: 363-376.

Edwards R & Holland R., (2020) Reviewing challenges and the future for qualitative interviewing, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 23:5, 581-592, DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2020.1766767

Emmel ND, Hughes K, Greenhalgh J & Sales A (2007) Accessing socially excluded people—trust and the gatekeeper in the researcher-participant relationship. *Sociological Research Online* 12(2) March http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/2/emmel.html

Emmel, N. and Hughes, K. (2010) '"Recession, it's all the same to us son": the longitudinal experience (1999-2010) of deprivation', *Twenty-First Century Society,* 5 (2): 119-124.

EarthLab (2020) *Adapting Research Methodologies in the COVID-19 pandemic,* https://earthlab.uw.edu/2020/07/adapting-research-methodologies-in-the-COVID-19-pandemic/

Garthwaite, K., Wright, K., Patrick, R. and Power, M. (2020) 'Researching poverty in the pandemic: thinking through ethical issues and challenges', http://www.social-policy.org.uk/spa-blog/researching-poverty-in-the-pandemic-thinking-through-ethical-issues-and-challenges-by-kayleigh-garthwaite-et-al/

Hammersley, M. (2010) 'Can We Re-Use Qualitative Data via Secondary Analysis? Notes on Some Terminological and Substantive Issues', *Sociological Research Online,* 15 (1).

Hall, S-M. (2019) *Everyday Life in Austerity: Family, Friends and Intimate Relations*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke.

Hughes, K. and Tarrant, A. (2020a) *Qualitative Secondary Analysis,* London: Sage.

Hughes, K. and Tarrant, A. (2020b) 'The ethics of Qualitative Secondary Analysis', In Hughes, K. and Tarrant, A. (eds.) *Qualitative Secondary Analysis,* London: Sage.

Hughes, K. and Tarrant, A. (2020c) 'Resources for Qualitative Secondary Analysis', https://timescapes-archive.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/47/2020/04/Resources-for-QSA.pdf

Hughes, K., Hughes, J., and Tarrant, A. (2020) 'Re-approaching interview data through qualitative secondary analysis: interviews with internet gamblers', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 23 (5): 565-579.

Hughes, K., Hughes J., and Tarrant, A., (*2021, in press)* **'**Working at a Remove: Continuous, Collective, and Configurative Research Engagement through Qualitative Secondary Analysis', *Quality and Quantity***.**

Irwin, S. Bornat, J. and Winterton, M. (2012) 'Timescapes secondary analysis: comparison, context and working across data sets', *Qualitative Research,* 12 (1): 66-80.

James, A. (2012) Seeking the analytic imagination: reflections on the process of interpreting qualitative data, *Qualitative Research,* 13 (5): 562-577.

Jamieson, L. and Lewthwaite, S. (2019) 'Big Qual – Why we should be thinking big about qualitative data for research, teaching and policy', LSE blog, https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2019/03/04/big-qual-why-we-should-be-thinking-big-about-qualitative-data-for-research-teaching-and-policy/

Lupton, D. (2020) *Doing Research Methods in a Pandemic,* https://nwssdtpacuk.files.wordpress.com/2020/04/doing-fieldwork-in-a-pandemic2-google-docs.pdf

Marmot, M. and Highfield, R. (2020) 'Coronavirus: Why ethnic minority groups suffer more', https://www.sciencemuseumgroup.org.uk/blog/coronavirus-why-minority-ethnic-groups-suffer-more/

Mason, J. (2007) '"Re-using" qualitative data: On the merits of an investigative epistemology', *Sociological Research Online*, 12 (3).

Mauthner, N.S., Backett-Milburn, K. and Parry, O. (1998) 'The data are out there, or are they? Implications for archiving and revisiting qualitative data', *Sociology*, 32(4): 733–45.

Neale, B. (2013) 'Adding Time into the Mix: Stakeholder Ethics in Qualitative Longitudinal Research', *Methodological Innovations,* 8 (2): 6-20.

Nganizi, S. (2020) 'COVID-19 and the role of race in health inequality', *Young Fabians,* http://www.youngfabians.org.uk/covid_19_and_the_role_of_race_in_health_inequality

Nuffield Council on Bioethics (2020) 'Developing an ethical compass', In: Research in Global Health Emergencies (eds.), https://www.nuffieldbioethics.org/publications/research-in-global-health-emergencies/read-the-short-report/developing-an-ethical-compass

Tarrant, A. (2017) 'Getting out of the swamp? Methodological reflections on using qualitative secondary analysis to develop research design', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 20 (6): 599-611.

Tarrant, A. (2018) 'Care in an age of Austerity: Men's care responsibilities in low-income families', *Ethics and Social Welfare,* 12 (1): 34-48.

Tarrant, A. and Hughes, K. (2019) 'Qualitative secondary analysis: building longitudinal samples to understand men's generational identities in low income contexts', *Sociology,* 53 (3): 538-553.

Tarrant, A. and Hughes, K. (2020a) 'The re-use of qualitative data as an under-appreciated field of social sciences innovation and knowledge', LSE Impact blog, https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/06/08/the-re-use-of-qualitative-data-is-an-under-appreciated-field-for-innovation-and-the-creation-of-new-knowledge-in-the-social-sciences/

Tarrant, A. and Hughes, K. (2020b) 'Developing a temporal ethical sensibility for preserving and curating research data', Digital Curation Centre Research blog, https://dcc.ac.uk/blog/developing-temporal-ethical-sensibility-preserving-and-curating-research-data

Tarrant, A. (2021) *Fathering and Poverty: Uncovering men's participation in low-income family life,* Bristol: Policy Press.

Weller, S. (2020) 'Collaborating with original research teams: Some reflections on good secondary analytic practice', http://bigqlr.ncrm.ac.uk/2019/03/06/post26-dr-susie-weller-collaborating-with-original-research-teams-some-reflections-on-good-secondary-analytic-practice/

Wright-Mills, C. (1950) *The Sociological Imagination,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Links to Qualitative Secondary Archives and Other Resources

Timescapes Archive https://timescapes-archive.leeds.ac.uk

Big Qual Analysis Resource Hub: https://bigqlr.ncrm.ac.uk

UK Data Service: https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/

IQDA (2015) *IQDA Resources for Students*, Irish Qualitative Data Archive, University of Maynooth. Available at: www.maynoothuniversity.ie/iqda/data-resources/resources-students

Examples of Qualitative Data Resources, UK and worldwide at all scales

1970s British Cohort Study: https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/1970-british-cohort-study/

Adam Matthew Digital collection: https://www.amdigital.co.uk/

Gender: Identity and Social Change

Australian Data Archive – https://ada.edu.au

Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/access/

Aylesham Community Archives and Heritage Group –
_www.communityarchives.org.uk/content/organisation/aylesham

The Council of European Social Science Data Archives (CESSDA) – _www.cessda.eu

Austria: WISDOM,

Czech Republic: The Czech Sociological Data Archive (SDA),

Denmark: The Danish Data Archive (DDA)

Finland: The Finnish Social Science Data Archive (FSD)

France: beQuali, Reseau Quetelet.

Germany: GESIS Data Archive for the Social Sciences

Hungary: Voices of the 20th Century - Archive and Research Center

Ireland: The Irish Qualitative Data Archive, Irish Social Science Data Archive (ISSDA)

Lithuania: The Lithuanian Data Archive for Social Sciences and Humanities (LiDA)

Northern Ireland: The Northern Ireland Qualitative Archive

Poland: Archiwum Danych Jakościowych

Slovenia: Archiv Druzboslvnih Podatkov

Switzerland: The DARIS (Data and Research Information Services)

The Feminist Archive North – _https://feministarchivenorth.org.uk

The Feminist Archive South – _http://feministarchivesouth.org.uk/

Henry A. Murray Archive, Harvard University – _https://murray.harvard.edu

Hertfordshire Cohort Study, https://www.mrc.soton.ac.uk/herts/

Inter-University Consortium of Political and Social Research – _www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/

Irish Qualitative Data Archive – _www.maynoothuniversity.ie/iqda

Kirklees sound archive in West Yorkshire, which houses oral history interviews on the woollen textile industry.

Lesbian Herstory Archives – _www.lesbianherstoryarchives.org

The London School of Economics Archive – _www.lse.ac.uk/library/collections/collection-highlights/collections-highlights

Mass Observation Archive – _www.massobs.org.uk

Millenium Cohort Study, UCL, https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/millennium-cohort-study/

The National Child Development Study, https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/1958-national-child-development-study/

National Survey of Health and Development, https://www.nshd.mrc.ac.uk

The Northern Ireland Data Archive on Conflict and Ageism – _www.ark.ac.uk/qual/

Qualitative Data Repository, Syracuse University; www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=qualitative+data+archive+america&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8

Southampton Women's Survey, University of Southampton, https://www.mrc.soton.ac.uk/sws/

UK Data Service – _www.ukdataservice.ac.uk

UK Data Service, International Qualitative Archives – _https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/other-providers/qualitative/european-archives.aspx

The World Listening Project – _www.worldlisteningproject.org

Understanding Society, https://www.understandingsociety.ac.uk

Wirral Child Health and Development Study, https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/institute-of-life-and-human-sciences/schools-and-departments/department-of-psychological-sciences/research/first-steps/