

Qualitative Health Research

<http://qhr.sagepub.com/>

Being a Qualitative Researcher

Immy Holloway and Francis C. Biley

Qual Health Res 2011 21: 968 originally published online 25 January 2011

DOI: 10.1177/1049732310395607

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://qhr.sagepub.com/content/21/7/968>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Qualitative Health Research* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://qhr.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://qhr.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://qhr.sagepub.com/content/21/7/968.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jun 21, 2011

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Jan 25, 2011

[What is This?](#)

Being a Qualitative Researcher

Qualitative Health Research
21(7) 968–975
© The Author(s) 2011
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1049732310395607
http://qhr.sagepub.com



Immy Holloway¹ and Francis C. Biley¹

Abstract

This article, from a keynote address, is the result of some of the things which I learned about qualitative research during my many years of doing and teaching it. The main point I make is that qualitative researchers should present a good story which is based on evidence but focused on meaning rather than measurement. In qualitative inquiry, the researchers' selves are involved, their experiences become a resource. Researchers cannot distance themselves from the other participants, although they cannot fully present their meaning and experience. I also discuss voice, paradigm, and innovation as potentially problematic issues in qualitative research. These are terms often used but not always examined for their meaning in qualitative inquiry. If researchers are aware and sensitive, rather than overemotional or self-absorbed, qualitative research can be enlightening, person-centered, and humanistic.

Keywords

narrative inquiry; reflexivity; research, qualitative

Introduction: Trying to Capture the Essence of Immy

Francis C. Biley

As the newest and most junior member of the Centre for Qualitative Research (CQR) at Bournemouth University in the United Kingdom, it was a great honor to have been given the opportunity to introduce Professor (Irmgard) Immy Holloway, the most senior and founding member of the CQR, before her keynote address on the eve of her retirement at the *8th Biennial International Qualitative Research Conference*, held September 6–8, 2010.

It would have been too easy to simply enumerate her multiple achievements and publications in a brief, potted biography, as would be the norm on such occasions. Instead, I wanted to somehow grasp and be able to quickly communicate much more of the “qualitative,” the person, the “essence,” of Immy to the audience. I wanted the audience to be able to “know” Immy, rather than just “know of” Immy. I was setting myself quite a task.

After giving the task some thought, I came across the idea that I needed to ask Immy a number of questions, unusual questions, perhaps, that might reveal some of that essence, some of the unknown, some of the “private,” even. In the United Kingdom, we have a daily newspaper that, each Saturday in a column called “Q+A,” asks a celebrity a series of such questions, aimed at, perhaps, trying to somehow get at that “essence.” I thought I might be able to use similar questions in an interview with Immy. So I rang her. The following is what emerged from

our conversation, or at least it approximates to what I was trying to achieve in my introduction because, in the same way that I would never be able to fully reveal Immy's essence, I will never be able to fully and entirely, accurately describe my loosely structured but otherwise essentially spontaneous introduction. But here goes . . .

Immy was born in Germany really quite a good number of years ago, and received her initial education at the University of Freiburg, having lectures from, among others, Heidegger and Jaspers. (About the former, and somewhat reassuringly for me, she said that she never understood a word of what he was saying.). Later, in the early 1950s, she studied in Grenoble before travelling to Manhattan, New York, where she lived with her husband Chris during the late 1950s and 1960s. I asked Immy, “What is your earliest memory?” “Gazing up into the trees,” she replied. I asked Immy, “What does love feel like?” “A warm blanket,” she replied. I asked Immy to tell me a secret. “I have none,” she replied. Resisting the urge to interrogate or interpret these answers, in the hope that the audience would spontaneously get a feel for that essence, I progressed quickly with my questions. “What would you change about your past?” “I would be less

¹Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author:

Immy Holloway, Centre for Qualitative Research, School of Health and Social Care, Bournemouth University, Royal London House, Christchurch Rd., Bournemouth BH1 3LT, United Kingdom
Email: ihollowa@bournemouth.ac.uk

strict with my children, but they forgive you if you love them.” “What is your greatest achievement?” “To work well into my older age,” replied Immy. I asked, “What would be the one thing that would improve your quality of your life?” “Wheels on my feet,” replied Immy. “I think we’re starting to get a real sense of the real Immy,” I thought to myself.

There were some questions that were not so easy to ask. “When did you last have sex?” I asked, but I can’t give you her reply here. “What music would you like to be played at your funeral?” “Dvorak’s ‘New World Symphony’ [the 5th Symphony],” Immy replied immediately, as if she might even have given it some prior thought. I forgot to ask which movement. We were about half way through the questions. “What was your biggest disappointment?” I asked. “I’ve never been completely disappointed,” she replied. “What makes you unhappy?” I asked. “When somebody experiences loss,” she replied. “What is your most unappealing habit?” I asked. “Being too noisy and loud,” she replied. I asked her to tell me a joke; any joke would do, but “I’m not good on jokes,” she replied. I asked Immy where she would like to live. “By the dockside in Bristol,” she replied (which is where she does actually live). “What was your most embarrassing moment?” I asked. “When I fell flat on my face when I was showing off and trying to be graceful,” she replied. And finally I asked, “What is your most treasured possession?” “A simple wooden bowl by the artist Paul Caton,” she replied.

Dwell on these answers a little, and I think you might get to the heart of Immy, beyond and deeper than the activities and the awards and the accolades and the achievements. At least that was the aim of this short piece. Have I achieved that? Only you can tell me that.

Keynote Address

Immy Holloway

I would like to explore what it is like to be a qualitative researcher. The sections of my session will cover some important aspects of qualitative inquiry, the problems one might encounter, and their potential solutions. This presentation will be about some of the things I learned in my years of doing and teaching inquiry, supervising PhD students, and working with colleagues. It includes a discussion of the choices we make as qualitative researchers and the balance we have to find, though when I reread it I felt I should perhaps have called it “The Trouble With Qualitative Research.”

Storytelling

When I did my sociology degree many decades ago, I learned about research methods. We heard all about measurement, questionnaire design, controlled trials, scales,

and other issues, mainly connected with numerical measurement. I told my tutor that I was getting quite bored, although I clearly saw the value of these very rigorous ways of doing research. He gave me a little volume and asked me to read a particular piece of research, and I reported back to him that the book was wonderful, a good story, but not really research. He laughed and contradicted me. The book was *Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School*, written by Howard Becker and his coresearchers on the socialization of medical students (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961). I’ve never forgotten the thrill of reading this, and as I became a qualitative researcher I saw what my tutor meant. Being a qualitative researcher means, among other things, being able to tell a good story and focus on meaning over measurement.

A Good Story. This is how I learned my first lesson about qualitative research. Each account or report needs a good story. The researcher adds all the human touches that make the story interesting to others, and the account at the end also fulfills the human desire for storytelling. Most of us are natural storytellers and try to make sense of what we know by phrasing and rephrasing it until we have extracted meaning from our knowledge and experience. Storytelling makes us human.

Writers such as Polkinghorne, Brody, Mattingley, and many others emphasize the narrative nature of human beings. Of course, storytelling has its roots in the oral tradition, but it can be translated into writing a text or presenting a performance. Storytelling in research accounts, however, has listeners and readers; it requires participation and interaction with the audience as an important communication device. Morey (2010) cites Clark (2007) on authoring plays, which fits qualitative writing: Good stories should grab the attention of the audience, they should develop the interest of the reader; they should make the reader care about the participants. All this is important for qualitative research accounts. In a good piece of qualitative research all the elements of story exist, but the story should be credible, too. I shall elaborate on the questions that Hay and White (2005) posed:

1. What is happening? If you remember, early grounded theorists already asked the question about happenings in the field. This is about what people do, how they behave.
2. How do we know? There has to be evidence and witnesses to what happened. The story demonstrates the evidence for the researcher’s knowledge. There must be evidence for the story to be trustworthy and reflect the social world of the participants, and it should have fit with the data.
3. What does it mean? There are various levels of meaning. What is the meaning to the participants,

the researcher, and the readership or audience? The story is an interpretation of meaning so that readers and the audience can make sense of it. There is a need for both insider (informant) and outsider (researcher) voices to be heard.

Both Alasuutari (1995) and Frank (2004) compare qualitative accounts with a mystery or detective story whose readers become involved with the people within it. Tension and interest in outcomes are essential traits for qualitative inquiry: They make the story readable and its contents communicable, and communication of the findings is, after all, the aim of all research. Caulley (2008) gave fitting advice for writing qualitative research accounts. He demands the elements of “realism, truth, authenticity and authority” (p.432), but also to use some of the techniques of fiction to make the report more interesting and clearer to the reader.

Not Just a Story. Because of storytelling, qualitative research has often been criticized as “journalistic.” It is interesting to look at one of the comments Atkinson made as early as 1992 about good work in both ethnography and journalism: “It is based on thorough research ethically and conscientiously conducted, with a systematic review of sources and evidence, and conveyed to the reader through coherent written texts” (p. 4). Of course, he also warns that bad journalism and research share negative traits which are the opposite of the above. Smart (2010) adds her view and distinguishes between research story and fiction writing, and I would like to stress the differences between them. One of these is that a story has major and minor characters, while the characters in a research account are usually of equal importance. Also, the research story is not imagined but based on presented evidence. Qualitative evidence is distinctive, as Morse (2006) suggests; it lies within the humanistic arena, and the experiential and behavioral nature of the context in which it occurs is of major importance.

Qualitative researchers are scientists. Science involves the production of systematic knowledge which the researcher collects, transforms, and interprets. They are also artists. Smart (2010, p. 4) compares data with wet clay that has to be shaped into something recognizable. And, like a child, the researcher has to play with the material. All too often in my experience, beginning qualitative researchers focus too early in their study and don't play around with ideas. If they do the latter, the final story will be more lively and rich. The story itself need not only reflect the complexity of what went on in the field, and how that can be transformed into a scholarly piece of work, but also has to be something interesting and original as well as contribute to the area of research. Qualitative researchers, as Smart says, do not “simply capture reality, they condense it and represent it” (p. 6). They translate it

and develop arguments about the knowledge generated through the research.

Qualitative researchers do not only write a story, they are also story analysts. No amount of drama and interesting narrative can be a substitute for analysis and theorizing. Webster and Mertova (2007) advise the researcher against “smoothing”—trying to demonstrate good and desired results, regardless of what the data indicate, or, I would add, make the data fit to provide a good tale. The researcher should not invent or embellish what was observed and heard. On the other hand, qualitative researchers need be open to alternative interpretations and explanations, or the study will suffer from a rigid framework alien to qualitative inquiry. It isn't easy to write a good story and to present a scholarly account. Thorne (2009, p. 1183) speaks of “blurry lines between formal scholarship, journalism or studiously crafted stories.” Occasionally qualitative researchers overdramatize the tale by making it into a moral story. They often stress, inappropriately, how much better and more personal qualitative research is compared to quantitative inquiry. That seems arrogant and inappropriate, as we know that different approaches address different problems and questions.

Being a qualitative researcher means being accountable—for the choice of data and for their interpretations—to the participants and to the readers of the story. It also entails recognizing emotions and some of the motives of all participants—both their own and those of the people with whom they do the research. Emotions of the participants are important, and they have to be valued during data collection and writing up. Qualitative researchers need to reflect these emotions in the research account. Some of us focus more on the cognitive, others on feelings, depending on our personalities. Ezzy (2010) suggests that we need “detached concern,” which expresses elements, involvement, and a small measure of detachment. However, it is difficult to be evocative and show the emotions of the participants without being sentimental, difficult to be creative and imaginative without generating fiction, difficult to be poetic without sounding overly romantic. Much qualitative research suffers from its overly romantic presentation.

The Self and Others

Storytelling will make the reader relate to the experience of others through intersubjectivity and reciprocity. One of the elements that make the story interesting is the personal involvement and the subjectivity of the researcher who writes an account which is not objective and neutral. This is one of the reasons why qualitative research is interesting and readable, but it can also become a problem. It helps qualitative researchers to be really interested

and involved in the area of study, particularly when not too much is known about it. I recently read some notes on the Internet where it was suggested that the researcher should look for a topic which was well researched—a comment with which I entirely disagreed. For qualitative research, an underresearched topic is most appropriate—as Stern (1980) called it three decades ago researching in “uncharted waters,” because these need to be explored.

Involvement of the Self. This takes me to the place of the self in research. I would suggest that qualitative researchers need huge interest and enthusiasm for an area without being overengrossed and obsessive about it. If researchers have experience of the topic and the phenomenon which they research, they might be able to share the language of the participants and add data from their own experience to those of other participants. Prior experiences and background obviously shape ideology and even influence the choice of data used.

The self is always present in fieldwork. This is stated not only by feminist researchers and academics such as Coffey (1999). I read a thesis recently which delved deeply into the feelings which the researcher had about caring for a relative with Alzheimer’s disease while researching the topic of caring (Morey, 2010). In it she used her own experiences as additional data when discussing her participants’ perspectives. This gave her a valuable source of inside knowledge.

Qualitative research is reflexive, and hence contains autoethnographic elements. Researchers cannot exclude themselves from data collection, analysis, and reporting of the research. Walshaw (2009) calls this performing the self, writing oneself into the research. This, however, might lead to narcissism and self-absorption. Many of us struggle to find the balance between including the self and being other-oriented by focusing mainly on the participants’ perspectives. Researchers are involved by being reflective and reflexive, a distinction made by Finlay (2002). Reflectivity means that they take a critical stance to their work when they have completed it. Reflexivity is about the researchers’ own reactions to the study, their position and location in the study, and the relationships encountered, which are reciprocal.

Qualitative research is usually influenced by the feelings and experiences of researchers and their standpoint. Bourdieu’s notion of habitus, as explained in 1978, is important here, as human beings have learned and internalized orientations; that is, schemata of perceptions which are influenced by their social location and context. Foucault, for instance, strongly stressed that writing about the self is one of the earliest traditions in Western culture (1977). There are, however, both negative and positive aspects to subjectivity (Hegelund, 2005). Researchers draw on their own experience and the meanings they attribute to it, and they believe this helps them better

understand the participants. On the other hand, they might let their own nonevidenced assumptions influence the research, and this might make it skewed or create bias.

As qualitative researchers we do not wish to distance ourselves from the people with whom we do the research. Not only that: Researchers are not “tabula rasa”—blank slates without any assumptions but, like the other participants, they come with their own backpack of preconceived ideas, usually rooted in their experiences and culture. The self is always an integral part of any study. Writing the self into the research is only the beginning, not its end nor its purpose. Ultimately, “moving beyond oneself” (Madison, 2005) is demanded of the qualitative researcher. And the qualitative researcher then remembers that “research is not therapy” for oneself (one of the occasional failings of qualitative research). Indeed, Probyn (1993, p. 4) warns that an overemphasis on the self of the researcher and a lack of appropriate theory might lead to writing “in which the ontological is impoverished.”

Intersubjectivity. The concept of intersubjectivity is of importance here. I want to stay away here from the philosophical realm, but discuss the sociological. In a culture which researchers often share with the participants, they have similar, if not the same definitions of the situation. Schütz (1967) speaks of reciprocity of perspectives that are accessible to the members of a particular culture. There is also the common humanity which researchers and participants share. That means in simple terms that researchers can have empathy with the participant, although they can never fully understand the participants or, as Gadamer states somewhere, that a person cannot wholly grasp the mind of another. On a more pragmatic level, often qualitative researchers assume that other people see the social world in the same way that they do.

Insider–Outsider Perspectives

Some writers advise that being a researcher should be like being a person from Mars, but that is difficult, as we are also part of what is being studied. How much we should be part of it is a question both interesting and problematic.

My next tale concerns something that many qualitative researchers do. One of my students had epilepsy. She was passionately interested in the topic and decided to do research on the experience of epilepsy; although she was advised to be careful of this topic, she was determined to research it. Initially she was so overenthusiastic that she asked leading questions of the participants until she learned to take a step back. As an insider in the culture of people who have epilepsy, she had not yet learned to “walk the hyphens of the Self and Other,” which Rosaldo advised researchers to do (1989).

The researcher can indeed become an important resource for the inquiry. This is exemplified in the research of one of my colleagues (Shipway, 2010) who, as a long-distance runner, investigated the world of other runners. He understood their feelings, their camaraderie, and their thoughts, and indeed used his own experience as a resource without taking his assumptions for granted. Indeed, the relationship between the researcher and the other participants needs critical analysis. It is difficult to have both a truly emic as well as an etic perspective, an insider and an outsider view. In a sense, being a qualitative researcher means both. Our own experiences and knowledge are a resource and source for exploring the ideas of others. Schütz (1967) makes this distinction between first- and second-order constructs: First-order constructs are the participants' own practically oriented interpretations of their reality, while second-order constructs consist of the more abstract, theoretical ideas with which the researcher translates everyday meanings into scientific knowledge. Is the insider-researcher able to develop second-order constructs? Certainly being a cultural member permits access to the meanings of others, while it might prevent the researcher from taking some distance from the research and its participants. On the other hand, the participants might be more forthcoming and open when an insider speaks to them.

I remember when interviewing a group of which I was part for my master's degree some decades ago, they used to stop in mid-sentence and say, "Well, you know what I mean," and I thought I did. On exploration though, it became obvious that often I assumed what they meant. Being outsiders means that we can take a new look through the lenses of our participants' eyes, and it also helps us to theorize.

The Problem of Voice

This brings us to the problem of voice. Voice encompasses the spoken word, the written text, and other types of expression. Voice is not a simple concept but is complex, ambiguous, and has many dimensions. Are we as qualitative researchers most competent and best placed to speak for the other? There is the assumption among researchers that they give voice to the participants and truly represent them. Qualitative researchers tend to stress the theme of "voice," especially when the participants are vulnerable, marginalized, or powerless, and state that they speak for them, "giving voice to the voiceless" (Lather, 2009).

One of the problems occurs at the data collection phase, for instance: In the process of listening we might distort the meanings of the participants. They not only speak through words but also through silences, as Mazzei (2009) claims. Some of these silences are intentional, others are not. What do the silences mean? The qualitative researcher

needs to give the participants a chance to open up these silences. Second, there are a number of participants in any study. Whose voices do we give more or less weight? Those of the vocal individuals? The quiet participants? Those we like more, or those who seem to be more honest? As qualitative researchers, you have experienced these dilemmas yourselves.

Research students in particular, but even experienced researchers often rely on their first hearing in their eagerness to proceed, rather than listening to these voices over and over again. In any case, voice is only one source of data; another is the behavior by participants. Just by choosing some of the participants' words for our research and leaving out others, by describing some behaviors and not including other actions, we have already taken control and shown our power. We choose from the narratives, interviews, or observations that which we think will advance the research and often that which confirms our own ideas. This might be dangerous, and some manipulation and censorship is inherent in this. Mazzei (2009), in particular, advises qualitative researchers not just to echo their own voices, which they might be tempted to do.

Some qualitative research tries to be "advocacy research." McWilliam, Dooley, McArdle, and Pei-Ling Tan (2000) maintains that researchers sometimes are "stuck in the missionary position," because they state that they present their powerless and voiceless participants, forgetting that speaking for others in itself implies control and privilege, and might neglect accountability to participants. McWilliam and colleagues (2009) call this speaking for others a "fantasy." One might also query the concepts of tactical and catalytic authenticity, which Guba and Lincoln (1989) demand for qualitative research, meaning that qualitative research should empower and enhance the decision making of the participants. While qualitative researchers can change participants' lives occasionally and long term, "voice-centric" strategies are not always useful, nor are good intentions always effective. Patti Lather (2009) criticizes the "romantic aspirations of giving voice to the voiceless" and "sentimentalising empathy." Gary Shank (2005) calls this one of the many sins of the qualitative researcher: "the sin of sentimentality."

Qualitative researchers usually interpret and move to a different level of abstraction from the participants. During this process some of the meaning that participants give to their experience may be lost. Also, sometimes we hear the obvious rather than the hidden. On the other hand, when we focus on hidden meaning, the chance for misinterpretation and "misimagination" is even greater. We are translators. I don't know if any of you have seen Brian Friel's play, *Translations* (1980), which shows the problems of different language and meanings between two sides, even if similar words are used; even if researcher and participant use the same language, they might understand

words in different ways. Qualitative researchers, in any case, are translators who grasp the sense rather than give a literal translation; in translators' jargon, as literal as necessary and as free as possible.

As qualitative researchers, I've said before, we cannot forget, however, that the participants, the readers, and the researcher together shape the text, all of whom are, in Denzin's words, "meaning makers and theorizers" within a dialogical context (1997, p. 36). The voice of the participants is presented through the reflective and discursive lens of the researcher and the reader. As Mazzei says, we "reframe, reshape and re-imagine it" (2009, p. 52).

Paradigm Talk

One of the areas about which I'd like to speak will be the overuse and misuse of the word *paradigm*. Donmoyer (2006) speaks of paradigm proliferation, while I would like to talk of the proliferation of the word *paradigm* itself. Indeed it is now devoid of meaning because of its overuse, not only in research but also in business organizations and other areas. We have come so far as to use the term *paradigm* for quantitative research, qualitative research, and even mixed methods research; Guba and Lincoln (1994) even state that competing paradigms in qualitative research exist. They suggest that *paradigm* means world view or belief system. Many others use the term very loosely for *framework*, *model*, *perspective*, *approach*, *exemplar*, or *pattern*, for instance. Others use it for *theory*, *methodology*, *heuristic*. But if we feel it is one or some of these, why do we use the term *paradigm*? Can we give the name *paradigm* to competing qualitative research methods when researchers who use these have very similar (though perhaps not the same) belief systems? For qualitative researchers it has almost become obligatory, a buzzword when we want to sound academic. So I would agree with those who say that the word is often abused. Almost any way of researching, any standpoint, is now called a *paradigm*, and when ideas change, the approach is called a *paradigm shift*. This might be inappropriate terminology, and even pretentious.

Of course, we all know that the concept as used today in the social sciences originates with Thomas Kuhn (1962), who maintained that there is at any one time a dominant way of "doing science," practices that define a discipline, an agreement about aims within a community of scientists. They adhere to similar rules and are socialized into ways of thinking which they share. A *paradigm shift* is a revolutionary change in the assumptions that underlie a *paradigm* and the guidelines that rule it. But Kuhn wrote about the natural sciences and used the concept of *paradigm* to make clear the core differences between the natural and social sciences. Indeed, he

claimed that the term *paradigm* is inappropriate in the social sciences. In the social sciences there is no "disciplinary matrix"—which is what he calls it—because social scientists do not even have an initial *paradigm* in which they share assumptions, rules, and aims as the natural sciences do. So, how can there be a *paradigm shift*? Indeed tensions, controversies, and conflicts are endemic in the social sciences (this is discussed in greater detail by Weed, 2009). Why then do we use the term *paradigm*? First of all, qualitative researchers act as though it exists because through using the term, it is easier for them to delineate their ideas from those of others. *Paradigmatic* behavior clarifies and simplifies approaches.

I shall not dwell on this, and instead quote Coulehan (2009), who says—in a different context—that the notion of *paradigm shift* has resulted in "creeping grandiosity, vanishing humility and word inflation." One approach does not replace another; it does not create a completely new culture in which a *paradigm shift* occurs. Qualitative research is just a different way of seeing and using new forms of language. It illuminates different corners of research areas.

Innovation

Being a qualitative researcher, for many, means hunting for the new, the "cutting edge" when collecting data and presenting research. Indeed, innovation has become another catchphrase for qualitative researchers. I'm not speaking of the application of methods to new topics or areas, as researchers have always done this as it is part of the essence of qualitative inquiry. Wiles, Pain, and Crow (2010) state that most innovations or claims for innovative research are linked to new designs, new strategies, or new adaptations of older methods, and different forms of dissemination, in particular.

It is interesting that qualitative researchers use the term much more often than those in the quantitative arena (Travers, 2009, p. 165). Strategies for collecting data such as focus groups, roving focus groups, or mobile methods (mentioned in one of the latest research forum newsletters) have been around for some time, though not always formally in research. They are variations on older methods. Using cameras for collecting and presenting data isn't new, though in the last decade, in particular, performative social science has contributed to our understanding of research and the participants in it, and has added originality and creativity. Children and adults have been "drawing the data," "enacting the data" in disciplines other than research, but these methods of data collection and presentation have now found a home in qualitative inquiry. Theatrical and film performances to disseminate data have also been around for decades. I remember sociology

conferences in the 1970s where the findings were enacted on stage. Travers, in his skeptical view of innovation, sees it as a marketing device, as there is a link to marketing a product. I would suggest that calling our research innovative can sometimes help in getting funding.

What is new and enhances and develops qualitative research is the use of interesting technologies, which opened up exciting possibilities in the last decades, but newness does not free qualitative researchers from paying attention to rigorous analysis. Innovation is more than new technologies: Holloway and Todres (2007) suggest that qualitative researchers can learn from artistic and literary endeavors, as well as acquire multimedia skills. Nevertheless, Morse (2004) believes that these ways of collecting and disseminating data do not replace orthodox ways of researching, but are complementary to them. We should demonstrate that we are scientists, otherwise we harm our cause and will not be taken seriously. The relentless pursuit of innovation might lead to superficiality.

I saw an unconventional play by Caryl Churchill recently (2000). Afterwards, there was a discussion by the director, actors, and audience about the play. They suggested that the play changed the shape and form of the usual plays, and that it showed a new way of seeing, in which audience, writer, and director are all of importance. Perhaps it is like this with innovation in qualitative research. It is not so important that something is "new" or cutting edge, but that there are perceptions that make the familiar surprising and create new language. And, media methods can be useful, in particular to get to those who are "hard to reach" (Burgess, Moles, & Smith, 2009).

Conclusion

I have presented these notes about qualitative research to highlight only some of the issues that we might overlook. While one might deplore the self-absorption, overemotionalism, and almost religious missionary spirit of some qualitative researchers, I fervently believe that qualitative inquiry is still the most humanistic and person-centered way of discovering and uncovering thoughts and action of human beings.

Authors' Note

This keynote address was presented by Immy Holloway at the 8th Biennial International Qualitative Research Conference, Bournemouth University, September, 2010, with the introduction graciously offered by Francis Biley.

References

- Alasuutari, P. (1995). *Qualitative method and cultural studies*. London: Sage.
- Atkinson, P. (1992). *Understanding ethnographic texts*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. L. (1961). *Boys in white: Student culture in medical school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1978). Sport and social class. *Social Science Information*, 17(6), 819-840. doi:10.1177/053901847801700603
- Burgess, S., Moles, K., & Smith, R. (2009). Methodological challenges of researching communities. *Qualitative Researcher*, 11, 1.
- Caulley, D. N. (2008). Making qualitative reports less boring: The techniques of creating nonfiction. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(3), 424-449. doi:10.1177/1077800407311961
- Churchill, C. (2000). *Far away* [Stage play].
- Clark, L. (2007). *Practical playwriting: A guide to writing for the stage*. New York: Longman.
- Coffey, A. (1999). *The Ethnographic self: Fieldwork and the representation of identity*. London: Sage.
- Coulehan, J. (2009). The case of the proliferating paradigms. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19, 1379-1382. doi:10.1177/1049732309348371
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Donmoyer, R. (2006). Take my paradigm, please! The legacy of Kuhn's construct in educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 11-34. doi:10.1080/09518390500450177
- Ezzy, D. (2010). Qualitative interviewing as an embodied emotional performance. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(3), 163-170. doi:10.1177/1077800409351970
- Finlay, L. (2002). 'Outing the researcher': The provenance, process and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12, 531-545. doi:10.1177/104973202129120052
- Foucault, M. (1997). Writing the self. In A. Davidson (Ed.), *Foucault and his interlocutors* (pp. 234-247). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frank, A. W. (2004). After methods, the story: From incongruity to truth in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14, 430-440. doi:10.1177/1049732303261955
- Friel, B. (1980). *Translations* [Stage play].
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hay, T., & White, J. (2005). *The teacher writer: Narrative theory, storytelling and research*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Association of Research in Education, University of Western Sydney.
- Hegelund, A. (2005). Objectivity and subjectivity in the ethnographic method. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15, 647-668. doi:10.1177/1049732304273933
- Holloway, I., & Todres, L. (2007). Thinking differently: Challenges in qualitative research. *International Journal of*

- Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 2(1), 12-18. doi:10.1080/17482620701195162
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lather, P. (2009). Against empathy, voice and authenticity. In A. Y. Jackson & L. A. Mazzei (Eds.), *Voice in qualitative inquiry* (pp. 17-26). London: Routledge.
- Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Methods, ethics and performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mazzei, L. A. (2009). An impossibly full voice. In A. Y. Jackson & L. A. Mazzei (Eds.), *Voice in qualitative inquiry* (pp. 45-62). London: Routledge.
- McWilliam, E., Dooley, D., McArdle, F., & Pei-Ling Tan, J. (2009). Voicing objections. In A. Y. Jackson & L. A. Mazzei (Eds.), *Voice in qualitative inquiry* (pp. 63-75). London: Routledge.
- Morey, O. (2010). *Loving care for a person with dementia: From phenomenological findings to lifeworld theatre*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bournemouth University.
- Morse, J. M. (2004). Alternative modes of presentation: There are no shortcuts. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14, 887-888. doi:10.1177/1049732304267062
- Morse, J. M. (2006). Reconceptualizing qualitative evidence. *Qualitative Health Research*, 16, 415-422. doi:10.1177/1049732305285488
- Probyn, E. (1993). *Sexing the self: Gendered positions in cultural studies*. London: Routledge.
- Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: Remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Schütz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern Press (originally written as *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt*, 1932, G. Lehnert, Trans.).
- Shank, G. D. (2005). *Qualitative research: A personal skills approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shipway, R. (2010). *On the run: Perspectives on long-distance running*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bournemouth University.
- Smart, C. (2010). *Disciplined writing: On the problem of writing sociologically*. NCRM Working Paper Series. Manchester, UK: ESRC National Centre for Research Methods.
- Stern, P. N. (1980). Grounded theory methodology: Its uses and processes. *Image: The Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 12(1), 20-23. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.1980.tb01455.x
- Thorne, S. E. (2009). Is story enough? *Qualitative Health Research*, 19, 1183-1185. doi:10.1177/1049732309343951
- Travers, M. (2009). New methods, old problems: A sceptical view of innovation in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 9(2), 161-179. doi:10.1177/1468794108095079
- Walshaw, M. (2009). The performance of self in the art of research. *Educational Insights*, 13(1). Retrieved from www.ccfi.educ.ubc.ca/publication/insights/v13n01/articles/walshaw/index.html
- Webster, L., & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method*. London: Routledge.
- Weed, M. (2009). The structure of (social) scientific contradictions: A commentary on the problem of paradigmatic behaviour by social scientists. *Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*, 1(3), 312-321. doi:10.1080/19398440903192365
- Wiles, R., Pain, H., & Crow, G. (2010). *Innovation in qualitative research methods: A narrative review*. Southampton, UK: ESRC National Centre for Research Methods.

Bios

Immy Holloway, BEd, MA, PhD, is a professor emeritus at Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, United Kingdom.

Francis C. Biley, RN, PhD, is an associate professor at Bournemouth University in the United Kingdom and an adjunct professor at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey, USA.