



LEEDS  
BECKETT  
UNIVERSITY

---

Citation:

Clarke, NJ and Willis, MEH and Barnes, JS and Caddick, N and Cromby, J and McDermott, H and Wiltshire, G (2014) Analytical Pluralism in Qualitative Research: A Meta-Study. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12 (2). 182 - 201. ISSN 1478-0887 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2014.948980>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/2485/>

Document Version:

Article (Accepted Version)

---

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Qualitative Research in Psychology* on 19 Aug 2014, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/14780887.2014.948980>

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on [openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

## **Analytical Pluralism in Qualitative Research: A Meta-study**

### **Abstract**

Recent interest in analytical pluralism – the application of more than one qualitative analytical method to a single data set – has demonstrated its potential to produce multiple, complex and varied understandings of phenomena. However tensions remain regarding the commensurability of findings produced from diverse theoretical frameworks, the practical application of multiple methods of analysis and the capacity of pluralism to contribute to knowledge in psychology. This study addresses these issues, through a critical interpretation of existing qualitative studies that utilised analytical pluralism. Using a meta-study design, we examined the use of theory, application of methods and production of findings in studies that had adopted qualitative analytical pluralism. Following comprehensive database searches, 10 articles were included in the analysis. Epistemological and ontological considerations, the influence of decisions made in the practical application of pluralism and approaches to interpreting findings produced from multiple analyses are discussed, and implications for future research are considered.

Key words: Pluralistic approach, multiple methods, polyvocal, qualitative data analysis, methodology, theory, psychology.

## 19                                    **Analytical Pluralism in Qualitative Research: A Meta-study**

20                    In seeking to explore the diversity and complexity of our social world, psychologists  
21 are increasingly turning to pluralistic methods of research. Indeed, *Qualitative Research in*  
22 *Psychology* devoted a special issue to the theoretical and practical considerations of pluralism  
23 in qualitative research (Frost & Nolas, 2011). There are many possible kinds of pluralism,  
24 including the use of multiple methods, data sources, theories, or researchers. However, the  
25 focus of this paper reflects a burgeoning interest in analytical pluralism; the combination of  
26 multiple methods of qualitative data analysis within the same study. For the purposes of this  
27 analysis, pluralism is defined as the application of more than one qualitative analytical  
28 method to a single data set. Put simply, analytical pluralism recognises that “a data set can  
29 tell us about a number of different things, depending on the questions we ask of it” (Willig,  
30 2013, p. 19). It offers researchers an alternative to the orthodox approach of adopting a  
31 specific, recognised mono-methodology; the uncritical adoption of which can lead to  
32 methodolatry (the reification and privileging of methods) and a reticence to adapt methods to  
33 suit the research context (Chamberlain, 2000; 2011; Chamberlain, Cain, Sheridan, & Dupuis,  
34 2011).

35                    Advocates of analytical pluralism start from the position that different forms of  
36 knowledge produced through diverse methods of analysis may be viewed as complementary,  
37 rather than mutually exclusive, as each can reflect a different aspect of the phenomenon of  
38 interest (Frost et al., 2011). Analytic methods therefore provide tools which enable  
39 researchers to attend to different things in the data. By combining analyses which examine  
40 the data in a variety of ways (e.g. through emphasis of the individual or the social), analytical  
41 pluralism has the capacity to produce richer understandings of phenomena, and avoid  
42 reductionism (Kincheloe, 2001; 2005; Kincheloe & Berry, 2004).

43                    Additionally, some scholars maintain that multiple analytic approaches are

44 appropriate for understanding a plural and complex world and that the variety of human  
45 expression cannot always be adequately represented by one framework alone (e.g.  
46 Chamberlain et al., 2011; Frost et al., 2011; Kincheloe, 2001; 2005). This stance suggests that  
47 the application of more than one analysis can enable researchers to explore the multiple  
48 dimensions of phenomena without being limited to a single perspective, and can allow for the  
49 maximum interpretative value to be gleaned from the data (Coyle, 2010). The potential  
50 benefits of this approach to psychological research are that; findings which may speak to  
51 different audiences can be produced; the strengths of one analytic method can be used to  
52 offset the limitations of another; and reflexivity may be enhanced through an increased focus  
53 on the impact of the researcher's biography, experience and application of technique (Frost et  
54 al., 2010).

55         Although the position and potential advantages of analytical pluralism have been  
56 articulated, there remain tensions and challenges which researchers wishing to adopt this  
57 approach must address. The practice of using multiple analyses within a single study can  
58 involve researchers attempting to mix disparate and sometimes dissonant approaches.  
59 Researchers may choose to pursue an integrated blend of findings, where the boundaries  
60 between different analytic frames are blurry – or to construct separate findings from each  
61 analysis, where the distinctions between methods are clear (Kincheloe, 2001). This demands  
62 that researchers are aware of, and maintain conceptual clarity between, the differences in the  
63 philosophical underpinnings of methodologies (Willig, 2013). This is of pertinence to  
64 research projects which utilise analytic methods imbued with elements from competing  
65 paradigms within the same study.

66         Concerns have been raised that methods of analysis should not be combined when the  
67 paradigms which underpin the methods are incompatible. Paradigms diverge on beliefs about  
68 the nature of existence (ontology), the possibility and character of valid knowledge

69 (epistemology) and the nature of ethics and values (axiology). Thus, if paradigms are upheld  
70 as foundational and mutually exclusive, integrating opposing approaches may render findings  
71 incommensurable and incoherent (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). This therefore requires  
72 researchers to recognise differences and find appropriate ways to engage with multiple  
73 ontological, epistemological and axiological positions to produce coherent theoretical  
74 understandings and explanations of phenomena. The task for researchers then, is to work  
75 creatively to “hold together interpretations that make sense within their own frames of  
76 reference but create epistemological tension when juxtaposed or integrated” (Coyle, 2010, p.  
77 82). It is unclear whether researchers have to date adequately accounted for this issue.

78         Another consideration for pluralistic research is how to judge its quality. The diversity  
79 within qualitative research has led to competing claims as to what counts as quality, and  
80 different paradigms or approaches often have their own criteria for evaluating research (e.g.  
81 Cresswell, 2007; Seale, 1999). Pre-established criteria may present additional problems if  
82 researchers attempt to combine qualitative methods of analysis associated with diverse  
83 quality criteria. Suitable ways to enhance and judge the quality of analytical pluralism  
84 therefore requires further reflection from researchers.

85         Furthermore, the practical application of analytical pluralism to research in  
86 psychology may raise concerns which, due to the novelty of the approach, have not yet been  
87 fully addressed. Coyle (2010) questions how researchers discern which theoretical  
88 perspectives or methods are most suitable to apply to a data set, and how they decide the  
89 number of analyses to be performed within a study; given the aim of generating specific,  
90 meaningful implications, and the financial constraints of projects and word restrictions of  
91 journal articles. Once these decisions have been made, there are further considerations  
92 regarding how researchers undertake pluralistic analysis in practice. For example, whether  
93 data is read by the analyst from one perspective at a time while others are held in abeyance

94 (using a technique similar to that of phenomenological bracketing; Ashworth, 1996) or  
95 whether the analyst moves flexibly within and between analyses (and if so, how rigour is  
96 maintained). Moreover, these decisions are both multiplied and complicated if a team of  
97 researchers performs multiple analyses.

98         There is also the danger that analytical pluralism could become a hollow rhetorical  
99 device if authors fail to convey a clear argument regarding its value within the specific  
100 research project (Chamberlain et al., 2011). Researchers may be tempted to adopt a pluralistic  
101 approach because it is perceived as cutting edge or innovative, without duly considering the  
102 requirements of their particular research aims or the implications of combining potentially  
103 disparate perspectives. Crucially then, researchers must demonstrate whether pluralistic  
104 findings can make a significant contribution to psychology. Whereas pluralism might enable  
105 insights into phenomena that would not otherwise be possible, it could merely reproduce the  
106 outcomes achievable using individual analyses separately – thereby becoming primarily an  
107 exercise in illustrating similarities and differences between analytical frameworks. The power  
108 of multiple analyses to extend or critique existing knowledge, improve practice, empower or  
109 emancipate is as yet undetermined.

110         In summary, analytical pluralism has been increasingly discussed and utilised in  
111 recent years. There are several reasons for adopting a pluralistic approach, including: an  
112 intention to produce diverse but complementary interpretations of phenomena; an aspiration  
113 to do justice to the variety of human expression and/or desire to avoid reductionism; and a  
114 wish to access as much as possible within the data. However, there are a number of  
115 unresolved tensions and unanswered questions – including issues surrounding  
116 commensurability, research quality, contribution to knowledge and the practical application  
117 of pluralistic methods – which this meta-study attempts to address. To examine these  
118 pertinent issues our research question asked; what can we learn from analytical pluralism in

119 qualitative research?

120 **Method**

121 **Meta-study**

122 Meta-study is a form of research involving the analysis of the theory, methods and  
123 findings of qualitative research and the synthesis of these insights into novel ways of thinking  
124 about phenomena (Paterson, Thorne, Canam, & Jillings, 2001). As Paterson and her  
125 colleagues explain:

126 [M]eta-study represents a discrete and distinct approach to new inquiry based on a  
127 critical interpretation of existing qualitative research. It creates a mechanism by which  
128 the nature of interpretation is exposed and the meanings that extend well beyond those  
129 presented in the available body of knowledge can be generated. As such, it offers a  
130 critical, historical, and theoretical analytic approach to making sense of qualitatively  
131 derived knowledge (2001, p. 2).

132 Meta-study is the investigation of the results *and* processes of previous research. It is  
133 ‘the research of research’. In this study we followed the approach described by Paterson et al.  
134 (2001). This involves not only the analysis of primary research results but incorporates  
135 reflection on the perspectives and processes involved in those studies. Of principal concern is  
136 the critical interpretation and synthesis of existing knowledge of the phenomenon of interest,  
137 and the identification of potential directions of future research. We selected a meta-study  
138 analysis as it is suitable for synthesising findings produced from diverse research approaches  
139 and therefore enabled us to compare and contrast the studies that applied pluralism in  
140 different ways, using various analytic methods. It also provided a structure which allowed us  
141 to deconstruct the studies we examined and explore the theoretical, methodological and  
142 analytic components of the papers to decipher what we could learn from them. This was  
143 beneficial given the importance of theory and method for pluralism and the implications of

144 these in the tensions and questions we had identified.

145         Meta-study involves systematic analysis of three components: meta-theory, meta-  
146 method, and meta-data analysis (meta-findings). The purpose of these analyses is to reveal  
147 similarities and differences between studies and extrapolate new theoretical and practical  
148 implications. Meta-theory comprises the study of the theoretical and philosophical  
149 perspectives and assumptions underlying the research design. This involved a critical  
150 exploration of theoretical frameworks and underlying paradigmatic assumptions which  
151 guided each of the studies. We examined how theory was applied within the papers and how  
152 this shaped the research question, the choice of methods and construction of findings. Meta-  
153 method requires researchers to scrutinise the research design, methodologies and methods  
154 adopted within the studies. This meant considering the rigour and epistemological soundness  
155 of research and how methods influenced the findings produced. Meta-data analysis is the  
156 study of the findings of research. This involved a critical examination and reinterpretation of  
157 the analysis and findings presented by the studies. Pluralistic findings were compared across  
158 the papers to identify similarities and differences, and interpreted in terms of our research  
159 question. Finally, meta-study entails a final synthesis stage which brings together the analysis  
160 of theory, methods, and findings to offer new interpretations. For our study this consisted of  
161 combining reflections from across the three analyses to identify implications for future  
162 pluralistic research.

### 163 **Search Strategy**

164         A systematic literature search was undertaken by six members of the research team.  
165 Studies were primarily identified through searching relevant electronic databases: Web of  
166 Science, PsychInfo, PubMed, Science Direct, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The search terms  
167 used for each database were ‘polyvocal’, ‘poly AND vocal’, ‘dual analysis’ (dual analy\*),  
168 ‘multiple analysis’ (multiple analy\*), ‘crystallisation’, ‘crystallization’ and ‘pluralism’



169 (pluralis\*), with additional searches using hyphenated variants where appropriate. Each  
170 search term was utilised twice; initially by itself, then paired with the term ‘qualitative’ to  
171 reduce the number of returns on some searches. Inclusion criteria were established and  
172 comprised: studies written in English; published in peer reviewed journals; undertaken within  
173 the social sciences (including psychology); wholly qualitative in nature; and where one data  
174 set had been analysed using more than one qualitative method. The searches were not limited  
175 by publication dates. In total, 28 relevant articles were identified as a result of the initial  
176 searches. In consideration of the relatively uncommon use of qualitative analytical pluralism  
177 (Frost & Nolas, 2013), the articles were deemed sufficient in number and diversity to allow  
178 for comparisons to be drawn and for the research question to be answered fully (Paterson et  
179 al., 2001).

180 All 28 articles were systematically checked in detail by at least two researchers  
181 against the inclusion criteria. Eight duplicates were subsequently identified and discounted.  
182 Citation searches were undertaken on all identified articles and reference lists checked for  
183 any further studies which met the inclusion criteria. In addition, two key authors from the  
184 identified literature were contacted by e-mail and asked to comment on the  
185 comprehensiveness of the search results and to suggest further articles not identified as a  
186 result of the searches. No additional papers were suggested. The search strategies therefore  
187 resulted in a total of 20 relevant articles.

### 188 **Data Abstraction and Analysis**

189 Data abstraction was directed through the use of a template which facilitated a  
190 detailed examination of each article. This allowed salient aspects of the articles to be  
191 summarised for further analysis. The template – developed in accordance with the three meta-  
192 study components – guided analysis through the following questions:

- 193
- What analyses are employed?

- 194           • Are ontologies and/or epistemologies specified?
- 195           • How does theory inform the paper?
- 196           • How adequately does the paper describe the methods used?
- 197           • Are the analyses/findings adequately supported by data?
- 198           • What discussion is there of the capacity of different methods of analysis to  
199           produce different findings?
- 200           • Are the relations/connections between the findings of the different methods of  
201           analysis adequately discussed?
- 202           • What limitations does the paper acknowledge?
- 203           • What strengths/weaknesses does the paper have?
- 204           • What are the key findings from this paper in terms of analytical pluralism in  
205           qualitative research?

206           Each article was reviewed independently by at least two researchers and through  
207           subsequent discussions a joint summary of the analysis was produced for each paper. These  
208           summaries were then used to inform our meta-theory, meta-methods, and meta-findings. As a  
209           result of this detailed evaluation of the articles and much discussion in group meetings about  
210           what constituted evidence of analytical pluralism, a further 10 papers were excluded from this  
211           meta-study. For example articles which described the application of a pluralistic approach but  
212           did not present an analysis of data were rejected. Notes were kept of each meeting to record  
213           our decisions. The selection procedure is summarised in Figure 1.

214           [Figure 1 about here]

215           In conducting the analysis, three members of the research team worked together on  
216           producing a meta-theory, two on producing meta-methods, and two on meta-findings, using  
217           the article summaries and referring back to the original papers. Regular meetings were held to  
218           reflect upon and engage with any presuppositions that may have formed in the process of

219 deciding to undertake a meta-study of qualitative methodological pluralism. Sharing our  
220 initial findings with the group strengthened the analysis process as members could offer  
221 additional and sometimes alternative interpretations and implications for practice. Although  
222 we aimed to minimise the impact of our personal biases on the meta-study, we acknowledge  
223 that our analysis and implications are derived from our interpretations of the authors'  
224 presentations of pluralistic data. Next, the written analyses were circulated to the entire group  
225 for feedback and additional suggestions. Finally we regrouped for further discussion of our  
226 observations, conclusions and implications for practice, before collaboratively writing this  
227 paper.

## 228 **Findings and Discussion**

### 229 **Meta-theory**

230 This section of the study was guided by the questions: how was theory used within the  
231 articles; and how were ontological and epistemological concerns addressed? The pluralistic  
232 approach was frequently advocated on the basis that complex and varied understandings of  
233 phenomena were produced through the application of different analysis methods to data.  
234 Analytical pluralism was used by authors to extract as much meaning as possible from the  
235 data (Frost, 2009), and to construct holistic, multi-layered understandings, which were deeper  
236 than those which one method of analysis could offer alone (Simons, Lathlean, & Squire,  
237 2008) and greater than the sum of their parts (Wickens, 2011). For example, authors  
238 combined approaches such as thematic and narrative analysis to examine both the content and  
239 form of participants' accounts (Savage, 2000; Simons et al., 2008). Other studies employed  
240 multiple techniques from discursive psychology to explore the function of participants' talk  
241 (Honan, Knobel, Baker, & Davies, 2000; Lyons & Cromby, 2010).

242 It was the adoption of different *theoretical frameworks*, however – not simply  
243 different methods of analysis – that produced the most divergent findings within a study. For

244 example, Frost et al.'s (2011) use of phenomenological and discursive analyses, which put  
245 different emphasis on agency or structure respectively, illuminated the embodied, gendered  
246 and constructed nature of second-time motherhood. Honan et al. (2000, p. 9) illustrated the  
247 "constitutive force of theory" by comparing separate interpretations of a corpus of qualitative  
248 data using discourse theory, feminist poststructuralism, and ethnomethodology. Although  
249 these three approaches shared an interest in language, Honan and colleagues acknowledged  
250 that each perspective enabled different 'work' to be done with the data, and demonstrated  
251 how they produced contrasting versions of their participant's world; as constituted by  
252 discourses, subject positions or interaction. Conversely, Lyons and Cromby (2010) provided  
253 an interesting commentary on the extent to which the multiple discursive frames used to  
254 explore an extract of a transcript where heightened blood pressure was recorded, reflected  
255 different aspects of the embodied nature of social interaction, as the analyses arguably  
256 identified varying conceptualisations of the same discursive work. This suggests that research  
257 can highlight the multi-dimensional nature of phenomena when theories with divergent  
258 assumptions about the social world are employed, and provides our first implication for  
259 researchers applying analytical pluralism.

260         Within the sample of papers there was limited discussion of the relationship between  
261 paradigmatic assumptions and analytic methods, meaning in some cases it was unclear how  
262 paradigmatic tensions had been addressed. Without engaging with the inherent tensions  
263 arising from the inclusion of different perspectives with potentially opposing epistemological  
264 and ontological assumptions in the same study, pluralistic research can be left open to the  
265 challenge of incommensurability. That is, if the philosophical assumptions from contradictory  
266 paradigms are mixed indiscriminately, the coherent simultaneous practice of them becomes  
267 impossible (Lincoln et al., 2011).

268         Despite this, few of the articles in this study directly addressed the matter of

269 commensurability. Some researchers avoided incoherence by employing analytical  
270 techniques underpinned by the same ontological position, for example critical realism  
271 (Robinson & Smith, 2010) or expressivist-constructivist theory of language (Simons et al.,  
272 2008). These papers subscribed to an epistemological pluralism, where multiple methods of  
273 analysis are used to produce different knowledge or perspectives of an object (epistemic  
274 project) without implying a statement about the nature of the object (ontological status). This  
275 is closely related to what (Bhaskar, 1989, p. 13) referred to as the epistemic fallacy – “that  
276 ontological questions can always be reparsed in epistemological form: that is, that statements  
277 about being can always be analysed in terms of statements about our knowledge (of being)”.

278 For example, if a narrative analysis is performed for the purpose of gaining knowledge about  
279 how stories help people to understand the social world (epistemological) and not for the  
280 purpose of imposing the notion that humans are essentially story-telling beings (ontological),  
281 other, alternative analyses can also be accommodated.

282         Alternatively, ontological pluralism (although not a position that any of the articles  
283 we examined explicitly aligned to) foregrounds the assumption that the nature of existence  
284 itself is multiple and plural. This stance rejects the notion that different philosophical  
285 positions are fundamentally incompatible and encourages multiple paradigms to be held  
286 together dialectically, in order to appreciate various understandings of the phenomena being  
287 studied. Endorsing an ontological pluralist perspective, strategies for working with multiple  
288 paradigms within a single study have been proposed, including pragmatism (e.g. Biesta,  
289 2010), crystallisation (e.g. Ellingson, 2009) and dialectical pluralism (e.g. Johnson &  
290 Stefurak, 2014). This may appeal to researchers who feel restricted working within a single  
291 paradigm. However, we caution that this position may tacitly encourage the privileging of  
292 multiple methods over mono-method studies, and introduce the view that pluralism can be  
293 used to access a more accurate representation of reality. Authors of the articles in this study

294 avoided claiming that analytical pluralism was a means of getting closer to a true reality,  
295 instead describing that although findings may overlap they represent different emphases of  
296 meaning (e.g. Savage, 2000).

297         In light of the theoretical considerations discussed here, we outline two  
298 methodological techniques which (in our view) may enable pluralistic researchers who wish  
299 to embrace epistemological pluralism to reconcile theoretical tensions. Firstly, bricolage may  
300 be a useful tool, as Wickens (2011) illustrated in her investigation of power in written texts.  
301 Bricolage involves attempts to “find and develop numerous strategies for getting beyond [the]  
302 one dimensionality of single method research” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 23) and is  
303 perhaps more usually associated with the decomposition of methods than their pluralistic  
304 mixing. Wickens (2011) utilised this technique from within an overarching critical,  
305 poststructuralist stance (avoiding incoherence) to move dynamically and fluidly between  
306 analytic methods, examining the recurring patterns, specific linguistic features and narrative  
307 description within the texts, and their interpretive connections. For Wickens, the bricolage  
308 approach allowed data to become prism-like, meaning it could be viewed from various angles  
309 which each offered a different representation of the data. Here, each prism angle can be  
310 considered as producing different forms of knowledge (an epistemological rather than an  
311 ontological claim). This was similar to the practice used by Simons et al. (2008, p. 129) of  
312 *shifting focus* to analyse interview data from community mental health nurses. This involved  
313 “viewing the same object from the same [theoretical] standpoint but adjusting the lens to  
314 bring into view particular aspects of the phenomenon”, and highlights another potential  
315 technique for researchers aiming to construct multiple ways of knowing. In summary, this  
316 distinction between epistemological and ontological pluralism may help ease the concerns of  
317 some researchers who may view the issue of commensurability as a barrier to pluralism.

318         Other articles in our study did give consideration to ontological and epistemological

319 concerns, but adequate resolutions were not always reached. When research was located  
320 within a particular paradigm, it was sometimes unclear as to whether this was an ontological  
321 or epistemological position, or both, meaning it was difficult to determine the nature of the  
322 knowledge produced in these studies (e.g. Burck, 2005; Lyons & Cromby, 2010).

323 Frost et al.'s (2011) pluralism mixed constructionist, interpretative, and realist  
324 paradigms, arguing that the diversity of human expression cannot be adequately captured by a  
325 single framework. To demonstrate the commensurability of approaches, Frost et al. (2011)  
326 described the similarities between analyses (e.g. a common focus on language, meaning-  
327 making or the identification of themes) and outlined how the findings produced enriched  
328 understanding by reflecting different aspects of the same phenomenon. This assumes that if  
329 analytic techniques can be made commensurable then paradigms can too, which may not  
330 necessarily be the case. A more explicit distinction between analyses and paradigms would  
331 have perhaps been useful here. Nonetheless, the authors acknowledged that their research  
332 lacked an "interpretative integration of the data" (p. 110), which would have required  
333 tensions between the somewhat incommensurate paradigms to be resolved. A fully integrated  
334 interpretation of findings was, however, acknowledged by King et al. (2008) as unachievable.  
335 Although there was a high degree of similarity between the various phenomenological  
336 interpretations of the experience of mistrust, the authors were unable to resolve  
337 disagreements arising from conflicting epistemological positions of the researchers. In  
338 contrast, Savage (2000) did not seek to amalgamate findings produced from different  
339 theoretical stances to avoid the implication that a more accurate representation of the world  
340 would result. Instead, Savage proposed that rather than seeing traditions such as realism and  
341 post-modernism as opposing, they might be more usefully understood as dialectical or  
342 mutually informing, allowing for the "construction of different, and even contrary, versions  
343 of the social world" (p. 1495).

344 Our second suggestion for pluralistic researchers is, therefore, to be reflexive toward  
345 how various epistemological and ontological positions are to be distinguished between,  
346 juxtaposed or creatively combined, in order to explain how knowledge was produced and  
347 maintain what Walsh and Koelsch (2012) refer to as structural integrity. Walsh and Koelsch  
348 recommend that when combining different approaches, qualitative researchers should  
349 explicitly consider how epistemological, methodological, and procedural components adhere.  
350 Pluralistic analysis requires “explicating a coherent rationale that considers the question,  
351 context, and assumptions that presumably hold the study together” (Walsh & Koelsch, 2012,  
352 p. 386).

### 353 **Meta-methods**

354 In this section we consider how qualitative pluralistic analysis has been performed in  
355 practice by exploring: the types of data analysed; the methods of analysis used; the rationales  
356 for the choice of methods; the number of analyses conducted; and the ways in which  
357 pluralistic analyses were applied.

358 In the studies reviewed, analyses were applied to data from interview texts,  
359 ethnographic observations and fictional novels – an encouraging sign that analytical  
360 pluralism can be used with a variety of data. Frost et al. (2011) justified selecting an  
361 interview transcript for pluralistic analysis on the grounds that the data were “rich in coherent  
362 and evolving stories, metaphors, and other linguistic features and included thoughtful self-  
363 analysis” (p. 96). Similarly, Simons et al. (2008) explained that the storied nature of the data  
364 lent itself to narrative analysis. Although this makes practical sense, we question whether this  
365 rationale may marginalise or silence storytellers who are less eloquent or self-reflective;  
366 especially when narrative methods are used. The choice of transcription system may also  
367 preclude some forms of analysis. For example, conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, &  
368 Jefferson, 1974) is best applied when suitable transcription is used. With this in mind, we



369 suggest that researchers might consider the extent to which data is accessible to different  
370 analytic techniques at the onset of the research process, so that appropriate data can be  
371 collected.

372 Table 1 details the variety of analysis methods employed in the studies we reviewed,  
373 illustrating how pluralism was performed using theoretically diverse methods (e.g. grounded  
374 theory with discourse analysis; Burck, 2005) or variants of the same analytic approach (e.g.  
375 phenomenological methods; King et al., 2008). Earlier we observed that the adoption of  
376 different theoretical frameworks produced the most divergent findings. In contrast, Frost  
377 (2009) provided an example of how, instead, multiple analyses can be used within the same  
378 paradigm to do different things and achieve a more nuanced interpretation of data. Frost  
379 (2009) undertook two forms of narrative analysis; the first to identify the temporal structure  
380 and features of narratives within the interview; the second to examine meaning within the  
381 story and how the narrative was spoken, through a closer analysis of the prosodic and  
382 paralinguistic aspects of speech. Presented alongside an analysis of metaphor within the  
383 narrative and reflections on the role of the researcher in co-constructing the interview, Frost  
384 (2009) offered a detailed insight into the identity work, emotional experience and cultural  
385 discourses associated with being a mother. Frost's approach can be contrasted with Robinson  
386 and Smith (2010) who used interpretative phenomenological analysis with an interactive  
387 model analysis in a composite fashion. As the methods were used principally to organise and  
388 synthesise the interview data, there was little variation between the findings produced by the  
389 different techniques.

390 [Table 1 about here]

391 Perhaps unsurprisingly, authors provided different rationales for their selection of  
392 analytic methods. However, their decisions highlight some noteworthy implications for future  
393 research. Most commonly, researchers justified their choice because of the suitability of

394 methods to the research question. For example, Burck's (2005) rationale was rooted in the  
395 pragmatic concerns and interests of systemic psychotherapy research. Burck described at  
396 length the suitability of approaches for exploring data from family therapy and emphasised  
397 how analyses can be used to explore different research questions. In comparison (and as  
398 noted above) Simons et al. (2008) described how the storied nature of data prompted the  
399 deployment of a narrative analysis. This implies that some preliminary reading of the data  
400 must have occurred, and as the influence of the researcher in this initial analysis was  
401 inevitable, we suggest that a data-driven rationale for selecting analytic techniques may be  
402 problematic.

403         Epistemological fit and similarity between analytical frameworks was also cited as a  
404 reason for selecting methods of analysis in pluralistic research. Savage (2000) justified  
405 choosing a thematic analysis as it was consistent with a realist perspective and shared a  
406 common focus on process and meaning with narrative analysis. Similarly, Robinson and  
407 Smith (2010) explicitly presented a comparison of the interpretative phenomenological and  
408 interactive model analyses used to highlight the features common to both methods, reflecting  
409 the authors' commitment to commensurability.

410         Lastly, the authors of the methodological papers included in this meta-study – which  
411 aimed to explicate the capacity of qualitative pluralistic analyses to produce different findings  
412 – selected methods that suited the experience of the researchers, primarily for illustrative  
413 purposes (Frost et al., 2011; Honan et al., 2000; King et al., 2008). Although this may present  
414 a practical solution to the challenge of conducting pluralistic analysis in a research  
415 community which tends to be theoretically and methodologically specialised, we would  
416 encourage researchers to reflect upon the extent to which their methodological expertise both  
417 enables and constrains the research questions that can be addressed. For example, King et al.  
418 (2008) provided a useful description of the authors' individual approaches to

419 phenomenological analysis at the end of their paper, enabling the reader to understand how  
420 the underlying assumptions and biases of the researchers influenced the analysis.

421 Pluralistic researchers must also decide how many analyses should be performed on a  
422 single data set. The articles we studied utilised up to four<sup>1</sup> different techniques, as illustrated  
423 in Table 1. Certainly, the potential of pluralism to construct multiple, complex findings may  
424 lead researchers to conclude that more analyses are better. Although the practical constraints  
425 of this are clear, we would also encourage researchers to reflect upon whether there can be  
426 too many ways to helpfully examine a phenomenon. The assumption that more analyses are  
427 better comes with a risk of producing complicated findings without saying anything of real  
428 consequence; that is, with no significant implications for either theory or practice. Thoughtful  
429 construction of pluralistic research questions may help researchers to negotiate this balance.  
430 Overall, rationales for choosing which analytic methods to include (and how many) in  
431 pluralistic studies were both theoretical and practical. The foremost consideration for future  
432 pluralist researchers is perhaps then, that analyses offer a coherent fit with the research  
433 question and philosophical assumptions of the study.

434 Across the articles in this meta-study, the explanation of how methods of analysis  
435 were applied varied. In some studies, methodological procedures were described in detail  
436 (e.g. Savage, 2000; Simons et al., 2008), whereas in others the analysis process was less  
437 transparent. In light of the growing interest of pluralistic analysis in psychology (Frost &  
438 Nolas, 2011), we recommend that sufficient detail of methodological procedures are reported,  
439 to enable readers to understand how to undertake multiple analyses and how knowledge was  
440 produced. For pluralistic research to demonstrate rigour – a widely accepted criterion for  
441 judging the quality of qualitative research (e.g. Tracy, 2010; Yardley, 2000) – providing  
442 adequate description of the procedures used to select, transform and organise data in the  
443 research paper is advisable. Specifically, we were concerned that in the two studies that used

444 grounded theory analysis, it was not made clear whether a full or abbreviated version of the  
445 method was applied (Willig, 2013). Indeed, we would question whether a full grounded  
446 theory (i.e. using the techniques of theoretical sampling and theoretical saturation) is  
447 achievable with analysis of a single interview transcript.

448         In practice, pluralistic analysis was performed by researchers in a variety of ways. In  
449 four studies a single researcher analysed a data set in multiple ways (Burck, 2005; Frost,  
450 2009; Savage, 2000; Wickens, 2011), whereas three papers used at least two researchers to  
451 undertake multiple analyses together (Lyons & Cromby, 2010; Robinson & Smith, 2010;  
452 Simons et al., 2008). Others used a team of researchers to independently analyse a data set  
453 each in a different way (Honan et al., 2000), or independently followed by a group cross-  
454 analysis (Frost et al., 2011; King et al., 2008).

455         Each approach arguably entailed a different set of advantages and challenges. Using a  
456 team of researchers to independently analyse a data set meant that others with expertise in  
457 different analytic techniques were able to contribute to projects. However, King et al. (2008)  
458 discussed the difficulties involved in the group process of producing a consensual analysis,  
459 reflecting that unresolved tensions were derived from researchers' different epistemological  
460 positions. Reflecting on their involvement in the analysis process, Frost et al. (2010; 2011)  
461 felt that focusing on an interview text alone allowed for a fresh perspective. Conversely,  
462 others described feeling removed from the interview process, noting how they would have  
463 conducted the interview in a manner more aligned to their analytical approach. Using  
464 different researchers may enhance the diversity of interpretations, as each researcher brings  
465 their own subjective stance to the data. However without a group cross-analysis process,  
466 findings may remain separate and disconnected rather than offering fluid, dynamic  
467 understandings of the research topic.

468         For the individual researcher undertaking pluralistic analysis, the ordering of

469 analytical approaches must be considered. Analyses were performed sequentially or  
470 simultaneously by researchers, but little attention was given to the interaction between  
471 methods. It may be possible (for example) that the first analysis could obscure alternative  
472 meanings that might have been available had another analysis been undertaken initially.

473         In articles where analytic techniques were explicitly applied in sequence, some  
474 authors acknowledged the influence of the initial analysis in shaping their later  
475 interpretations. Frost (2009) used the transcript and her experience of the interview to be  
476 guided sequentially from one analytical perspective to another, and described how this  
477 approach allowed for a shift in perspective when she recognised a point of interest in the data.  
478 Lyons and Cromby (2010) used elevated blood pressure readings to direct them to a  
479 particular section of interview text, but discussed whether in the absence of physiological  
480 data, they would have still arrived at the same section of the transcript. Using multiple  
481 analyses simultaneously, Wickens (2011) described using a triple-entry journal to record  
482 excerpts of data, analytic ideas and personal responses to texts. This allowed her to move  
483 fluidly from one analytic method to another and attend to the connections between both  
484 critical and reflexive interpretations of the texts. We suggest, therefore, that pluralistic  
485 researchers working independently reflect upon how analytic methods are sequenced or how  
486 simultaneous analysis should be approached.

487         A challenge facing all pluralistic researchers is how the personal subjectivity and  
488 biography of the analyst(s) influences the research process. Chamberlain et al. (2011)  
489 suggested that “adopting multiple methods and using them creatively and critically demands  
490 and promotes reflexive engagement with every aspect of the research practice” (p. 166). If  
491 pluralism requires researchers to shift between theoretical perspectives in order to represent  
492 the multi-dimensional nature of phenomena, it may be necessary for researchers to reflect  
493 upon their own proclivities. Reflexivity was addressed in five papers (and in a companion

494 paper to Frost et al., 2011; Frost et al., 2010). Exploring the researcher's role in constructing  
495 interview dialogue was one way in which authors demonstrated reflexivity. King et al. (2008)  
496 attended to the researcher's embodied experience of empathy during the interview, and Burck  
497 (2005) and Frost (2009) provided examples of how the interviewer had influenced the  
498 direction of the discussion by closing down or opening up certain topics. Frost (2009), in fact,  
499 explicitly used this reflexive analysis as a method of producing an additional layer of  
500 understanding.

501 Working with multiple data sources, Wickens (2010) used journal entries to reflect on  
502 how interpretations were formed and Honan et al. (2000) highlighted how different  
503 theoretical approaches oriented analysts toward certain types of data to build their case, and  
504 questioned the extent to which the findings reflected their participant or the analyst and their  
505 chosen perspective. Frost et al. (2010) also compared the impact of individual researchers on  
506 the production of findings, noting that the analyst's level of experience and epistemological  
507 stance influenced their use of language. Some analysts distanced themselves from their role  
508 in the interpretative process by selecting to write in the third person, and those with relatively  
509 less experience tended to use a "more authoritative voice" in their accounts than the  
510 "tentative" language used by others (Frost et al., 2010, p. 457). The examples of reflexivity  
511 provided in these studies illustrate how analytical pluralism invites and encourages  
512 researchers to reflect upon their role in constructing data and subsequent (multiple)  
513 interpretations and, as Frost et al. (2010) proposed, may provide a starting point for  
514 enhancing transparency and trustworthiness in research.

### 515 **Meta-findings**

516 For the final part of the meta-study we examined the findings produced by qualitative  
517 pluralistic analysis, by considering the findings that were presented, the ways authors  
518 interpreted them, and their utility and value for psychology.

519 By adopting a pluralistic approach the papers in this meta-study produced multiple,  
520 diverse understandings of the research topics under investigation. However, how authors  
521 presented their findings varied, demonstrating the flexible nature of analytical pluralism.  
522 Eight of the articles we reviewed presented separate findings for each analytic technique  
523 used, which enabled comparisons to be drawn between the interpretations (albeit in different  
524 ways, discussed below). Robinson and Smith (2010) produced fully integrated findings from  
525 a combined analysis, and uniquely King et al. (2008) presented findings from a combined  
526 analysis as well as separate interpretations from each analyst.

527 How authors selected their data inevitably influenced the findings that were produced.  
528 Multiple interpretations of the same piece of data were presented by Frost et al. (2011),  
529 Lyons and Cromby (2010) and Savage (2000), allowing the reader to directly compare the  
530 interpretations derived from each perspective. Alternatively, other authors selected different  
531 extracts of data to illustrate findings, choosing either different sections of the same interview  
532 transcript (King et al., 2008), or selecting data from across a variety of sources (Burck, 2005;  
533 Honan et al., 2000; Simons et al., 2008; Wickens, 2011). Honan et al. explained that using  
534 different data to represent findings from separate analyses was necessary, as each approach  
535 “works with its own vocabulary... and calls on different orders of evidence for its claims to  
536 adequacy” (2000, p. 30); thus highlighting how pluralism can enhance transparency in the  
537 research process.

538 The selection of data and presentation of findings determined the comparisons that  
539 could be made between the multiple and potentially divergent interpretations; providing a  
540 further implication for pluralistic researchers. Authors compared and contrasted the findings  
541 produced by pluralistic analysis in several ways, ranging from a standalone discussion of  
542 each analysis to a fully integrated presentation of several interpretations. Burck (2005) and  
543 Savage (2000) offered little or no comparisons between findings, with interpretations

544 standing side by side, but discussed separately. Exploring how pluralistic analysis could be  
545 used to build up layers of meaning, Frost (2009), Lyons and Cromby (2010) and Simons et al.  
546 (2008) conducted analyses in a sequential manner. An initial analysis was performed to  
547 identify meaning in the data, which then guided the subsequent analyses. In this way,  
548 findings were connected by a common feature or meaning in the data.

549         In contrast to constructing meaning sequentially, some authors worked *across*  
550 findings, comparing explicitly the different interpretations from each analysis. Different  
551 findings were shown on occasion to contradict others (Honan et al. 2000), produce similar  
552 interpretations (for example when the same text was drawn upon to illustrate related themes;  
553 Frost et al., 2011), or even highlight both converging and diverging interpretations of the  
554 phenomenon under study (King et al., 2008). In these three papers, the capacity of pluralistic  
555 analysis to produce multiple possibilities for understanding was demonstrated through the  
556 comparisons between interpretations, as each finding was considered to reflect a different  
557 aspect of the same phenomenon (Frost et al., 2011). For example, Honan et al. (2000)  
558 concluded their article by pulling together the various versions of their participant that were  
559 made available by the different perspectives, commenting that “our interest definitely is not  
560 in which is right or better but rather in when each one could be useful and for what purpose”  
561 (p. 30). This suggests that findings from pluralistic analysis have the potential to be  
562 accessible to a diverse audience, as the most relevant interpretation to the reader can be  
563 extracted (Frost & Nolas, 2013).

564         Furthermore, presenting different readings of qualitative data together allowed for  
565 multiple possibilities of being to be constructed, rather than limiting participants to an  
566 ‘either/or’ ontological status. Frost et al. (2011) presented their participant as a  
567 phenomenological, realist and postmodern agent, recognising that this may change fluidly  
568 depending on her context and situation. Similarly, Honan et al. (2000) described assigning



569 different powers and discursive resources to their participant, by constructing contrasting  
570 versions of her social world. It therefore appears that when multiple interpretations are treated  
571 with equal significance, analytical pluralism offers researchers the potential to honour the  
572 complexity of participants' lives and avoid what Bakhtin (1984 [1963]) referred to as  
573 'finalising' what any individual or group is, or could become.

574         The final approach was to pursue an integrated synthesis of findings, where it was less  
575 clear as to how each form of analysis contributed to the findings produced (King et al., 2008;  
576 Robinson & Smith, 2010; Wickens, 2011). Wickens (2011) argued that the overall emphasis  
577 of her bricolage approach was on creating "a combined picture [that] provides such a rich and  
578 evocative depiction that is more than the sum of its parts" (p. 161). Presenting a combined  
579 interpretation meant that any inconsistencies or contradictions between findings were  
580 overlooked, with the exception of King et al. (2008) who discussed the separate  
581 interpretations produced by individual analysts alongside the integrated synthesis. This  
582 approach provided a detailed, idiographic account of the embodied, relational experience of  
583 mistrust and enabled the reader to see how the individual phenomenological interpretations  
584 varied, depending on the extent to which the analyst considered the participant's words to  
585 reflect their reality.

586         In view of the capacity of analytical pluralism to construct complex, multi-layered  
587 understandings of the phenomena we study in psychology, an advantage of this approach may  
588 be that research questions can be tackled from multiple perspectives. By embracing the  
589 diversity (and limitations) of what different analyses can do, researchers were able to address  
590 different research questions related to the same topic concurrently (e.g. Burck, 2005). A  
591 fundamental aim of research is to produce findings which contribute to knowledge. However,  
592 as many of the papers included in this meta-study declared methodological aims, it was  
593 difficult to judge whether studies using pluralism made a significant contribution to

594 knowledge in their respective areas of research. Six articles did not relate the findings  
595 produced back to existing knowledge of the topic under investigation. Of the remaining  
596 papers, Frost (2009) generated future avenues for research and Simons et al. (2008) provided  
597 implications for nursing practice. Robinson and Smith (2010) proposed a model for  
598 understanding the process of early adult psychological crisis, and Lyons and Cromby (2010)  
599 discussed how discursive analysis may be combined with blood pressure data in order to  
600 develop a more embodied analysis in social psychology. These examples highlight how  
601 analytical pluralism can suggest future directions for research, produce implications for  
602 practice, build theory and develop methodological techniques.

603         However, we suggest that it is the comparison drawn *between* different interpretations  
604 that can offer something more to research in psychology than perhaps traditional mono-  
605 methodological studies can. Whether meaning is built up sequentially from an initial theme,  
606 or derived from comparisons across findings, this form of interpretation encourages  
607 researchers to engage with the creative tensions that arise when different perspectives on the  
608 same phenomenon are brought together within a particular study and emphasises “learning  
609 from difference” (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 686). Moreover, the contrasting of perspectives can  
610 avoid a type of pluralistic methodolatry – the privileging of multiple methods in the belief  
611 that two or more are better than one – by focusing on how different interpretations may both  
612 converge and diverge in their understanding of the research topic of study. Ultimately,  
613 analytical pluralism should be more than simply a parade of the various methods available to  
614 us; it should be used creatively and productively to advance knowledge in psychology.

### 615                                 **Conclusions and Implications for Future Research**

616         Through this meta-study of qualitative analytical pluralism, we have closely examined  
617 the use of theory, application of methods and construction of findings in studies which have  
618 utilised more than one method of qualitative data analysis to explore meaning within a single

619 data set. Analytical pluralism enables researchers to produce rich, varied understandings of  
620 phenomena, and opens up multiple possibilities for interpretation because it avoids  
621 privileging any particular approach or framework over another. This form of pluralism can  
622 offer alternative and interesting ways of approaching psychological research questions.

623         Alongside these advantages, the application of multiple data analysis methods  
624 presents challenges for researchers to negotiate. From our analysis of the papers in this study,  
625 we suggest that analytical pluralism can be used to highlight the multi-dimensional nature of  
626 phenomena when perspectives with divergent assumptions about the social world are  
627 employed. This requires researchers to clarify and distinguish between their epistemological  
628 and ontological positions and illustrate how their research maintains “structural integrity”  
629 (Walsh & Koelsch, 2012). That is, researchers need to find ways to demonstrate coherent  
630 links between theory, method and findings and explain how findings produced from multiple  
631 analyses can remain commensurate or complementary. Our distinction between  
632 epistemological pluralism and ontological pluralism may be useful here, together with  
633 techniques such as bricolage (Kincheloe, 2001; 2005) or shifting focus (Simons et al., 2008),  
634 which allow for different ways of knowing to be constructed within a consistent ontological  
635 perspective. Alternatively, approaches like dialectical pluralism (e.g. Johnson & Stefurak,  
636 2014) offer ways of interacting with paradigmatic tensions.

637         Although the articles in this meta-study did not explicitly discuss the issue of quality  
638 in pluralism, there were examples of ways in which authors sought to ensure rigour in  
639 research. By engaging in reflexivity, researchers described an awareness and critique of their  
640 role in constructing data and multiple interpretations, suggesting that a pluralist approach  
641 may be used to enhance transparency and trustworthiness in research (Frost, 2011; Frost et  
642 al., 2010). Working with multiple analytic frames enabled authors to be sensitive to  
643 polyvocality and to represent the variety and multiplicity of perspectives within their data.

644 This avoided finalizing participants' accounts, an ethical concern for researchers. Comparing  
645 the papers in this study also reinforced the importance of reporting qualitative methodological  
646 procedures in sufficient detail. Although this is not an issue unique to pluralistic studies, we  
647 advise that researchers using this approach provide adequate description of the techniques  
648 used to select, transform and organise data in their research, in order to demonstrate rigour.  
649 Considering the variation in how pluralistic analysis was performed in the papers we  
650 reviewed, we err towards suggesting that studies are judged on their individual merits and  
651 limitations. Therefore, scholars may wish to consider adapting their criteria for what  
652 constitutes good research when evaluating individual pluralistic studies, as universal  
653 indicators may not be appropriate (see Smith & Deemer, 2000 for a discussion of the  
654 problematic nature of fixed criteria). Tracy (2010), for example, proposed eight common end  
655 goals of strong research (including rigour, credibility and meaningful coherence) rather than  
656 universal criteria for the practice of qualitative research, which may be more suitable for  
657 judging the quality of pluralistic research.

658         The purpose of this meta-study was to address the question: what can we learn from  
659 analytical pluralism in qualitative research? On the basis of our analysis, we conclude that  
660 pluralism has the potential to contribute to knowledge production; in particular through an  
661 exploration of the tensions that arise from combining different perspectives within the same  
662 study. Potentially, it is the comparisons drawn between interpretations that can offer  
663 something more to research in psychology, not least through promoting a reflexive critique of  
664 "the social and intellectual unconscious embedded in the analytic tools and operations used"  
665 (Johnson, Long & White, 2000, p. 248). Indeed, for pluralistic research, the differences  
666 between findings may be more relevant than the similarities. There is however, a caveat to  
667 this. Although not a position adopted by any of the authors of the papers in this meta-study,  
668 we caution against a view that places multiple methods of analysis in a hierarchy above

669 traditional mono-method studies. Certainly, the articles we reviewed have begun to illustrate  
670 the capacity of pluralism to produce interesting, polyvocal, sometimes diverging meanings  
671 from the same data set, but this does not mean that mono-methodological work is not also  
672 valuable. As Kincheloe (2001) warns, pluralist researchers must resist complicity in  
673 knowledge production designed to regulate and discipline, as must those advocating mono-  
674 methodological approaches. Instead, we advise that when research questions are carefully  
675 constructed, rationales for a pluralist approach and selection of methods are presented, and  
676 implications of decisions made in the practical application of pluralism are considered, that  
677 analytical pluralism offers a welcome addition to the qualitative researcher's toolbox.

#### 678 **End Notes**

679 <sup>1</sup> We were unable to judge how many forms of phenomenological analysis were performed  
680 by King et al. (2008), as although three separate individual commentaries were presented,  
681 five analysts conducted individual interpretations and six contributed to the consensual  
682 analysis.

#### 683 **References**

684 References marked with an asterisk were included in the meta-study.

685 Ashworth, P 1996, 'Presuppose nothing! The suspension of assumptions in phenomenological  
686 psychological methodology', *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, vol. 27, no. 1,  
687 pp. 1-25.

688 Bakhtin, M 1984 [1963], *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (C Emerson, Trans.), University  
689 of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

690 Bhaskar, R 1989, *Reclaiming reality: A critical introduction to contemporary philosophy*,  
691 Verso, London.

- 692 Biesta, G 2010, 'Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research'  
693 in A Tashakkori & C Teddlie (eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social &*  
694 *behavioural research*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), pp. 95-118, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- 695 \*Burck, C 2005, 'Comparing qualitative research methodologies for systemic research: The  
696 use of grounded theory, discourse analysis and narrative analysis', *Journal of Family*  
697 *Therapy*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 237-262.
- 698 Chamberlain, K 2000, 'Methodolatry and qualitative health research', *Journal of Health*  
699 *Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 285-296.
- 700 Chamberlain, K 2011, 'Troubling methodology', *Health Psychology Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp.  
701 48-54.
- 702 Chamberlain, K, Cain, T, Sheridan, J & Dupuis, A 2011, 'Pluralisms in qualitative research:  
703 From multiple methods to integrated methods', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*,  
704 vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 151-169.
- 705 Coyle, A 2010, 'Qualitative research and anomalous experience: A call for interpretative  
706 pluralism', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 79-83.
- 707 Cresswell, JW 2007, *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five*  
708 *approaches*, (2nd ed.), Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- 709 Ellingson, LL 2009, *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research: An introduction*, Sage,  
710 Thousand Oaks, CA.
- 711 \*Frost, N 2009, 'Do you know what I mean?': The use of a pluralistic narrative analysis  
712 approach in the interpretation of an interview', *Qualitative Research*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp.  
713 9-29.
- 714 Frost, N & Nolas, SM 2013, 'The contribution of pluralistic qualitative approaches to mixed  
715 methods evaluations', *New Directions for Evaluation, Special issue: Mixed methods*  
716 *and credibility of evidence in evaluation*, vol. 138, pp. 75-84.

- 717 Frost, N, Nolas, SM, Brooks-Gordon, B, Esin, C, Holt, A, Mehdizadeh, L & Shinebourne, P  
718 2010, 'Pluralism in qualitative research: The impact of different researchers and  
719 qualitative approaches on the analysis of qualitative data', *Qualitative Research*, vol.  
720 10, no. 4, pp. 441-460.
- 721 \*Frost, NA, Holt, A, Shinebourne, P, Esin, C, Nolas, S-M, Mehdizadeh, L & Brooks-Gordon,  
722 B 2011, 'Collective findings, individual interpretations: An illustration of a pluralistic  
723 approach to qualitative data analysis', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 8, no.  
724 1, pp. 93-113.
- 725 Frost, NA & Nolas, SM 2011, 'Editorial: Exploring and expanding on pluralism in qualitative  
726 research in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 115-  
727 119.
- 728 Garratt, D & Hodkinson, P 1998, 'Can there be criteria for selecting research criteria?—A  
729 hermeneutical analysis of an inescapable dilemma', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 4, no. 4,  
730 pp. 515-539.
- 731 Guba, EG & Lincoln, YS 1989, *Fourth generation evaluation*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- 732 \*Honan, E, Knobel, M, Baker, C & Davies, B 2000, 'Producing possible Hannahs: Theory  
733 and the subject of research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 9-32.
- 734 Johnson, B & Stefurak, T 2014, 'Dialectical pluralism: A metaparadigm and process  
735 philosophy for 'dynamically combining' important differences', *QMIP Bulletin*, no.  
736 17, pp. 63-69.
- 737 Johnson, M, Long, T & White, A 2000, 'Arguments for 'British pluralism' in qualitative  
738 health research', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 243-249.
- 739 Kincheloe, JL 2001, 'Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative  
740 research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 679-692.

- 741 Kincheloe, JL 2005, 'On to the next level: Continuing the conceptualization of the bricolage',  
742 *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 323-350.
- 743 Kincheloe, JL & Berry, KS 2004, *Rigour and complexity in educational research:  
744 Conceptualizing the bricolage*, Open University Press/McGraw-Hill Education,  
745 Maidenhead.
- 746 \*King, N, Finlay, L, Ashworth, P, Smith, JA, Langdrige, D & Butt, T 2008, "'Can't really  
747 trust that, so what can I trust?": A polyvocal, qualitative analysis of the psychology of  
748 mistrust', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 80-102.
- 749 Lincoln, YS, Lynham, SA & Guba, EG 2011, 'Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions,  
750 and emerging confluences, revisited', in NK Denzin & YS Lincoln (eds.), *The Sage  
751 handbook of qualitative research*, (4th ed.), pp. 97-128, Sage, London.
- 752 \*Lyons, AC & Cromby, J 2010, 'Social psychology and the empirical body: Rethinking the  
753 relationship', *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1-13.
- 754 Paterson, BL, Thorne, SE, Canam, C & Jillings, C 2001, *Meta-study of qualitative health  
755 research: A practical guide to meta-analysis and meta-synthesis*, Sage, London.
- 756 \*Robinson, OC & Smith, JA 2010, 'Investigating the form and dynamics of crisis episodes in  
757 early adulthood: The application of a composite qualitative method', *Qualitative  
758 Research in Psychology*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 170-191.
- 759 Sacks, H, Schegloff, EA & Jefferson, G 1974, 'A simplest systematics for the organization of  
760 turn-taking for conversation', *Language*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 696-735.
- 761 \*Savage, J 2000, 'One voice, different tunes: Issues raised by dual analysis of a segment of  
762 qualitative data', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 1493-1500.
- 763 Seale, C 1999, 'Quality in qualitative research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 465-478.
- 764 \*Simons, L, Lathlean, J & Squire, C 2008, 'Shifting the focus: Sequential methods of analysis  
765 with qualitative data', *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 120-132.



- 766 Smith, JK & Deemer, D 2000, 'The problem of criteria in the age of relativism', in NK  
767 Denzin & YS Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, (2nd ed.), pp. 877-  
768 896, Sage, London.
- 769 Tracy, SJ 2010, 'Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative  
770 research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 837-851.
- 771 Walsh, R & Koelsch, LE 2012, 'Building across fault lines in qualitative research', *The  
772 Humanistic Psychologist*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 380-390.
- 773 \*Wickens, CM 2011, 'The investigation of power in written texts through the use of multiple  
774 textual analytic frames', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*,  
775 vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 151-164.
- 776 Willig, C 2013, *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*, (3rd ed.), Open University  
777 Press/McGraw-Hill Education, Maidenhead.
- 778 Yardley, L 2000, 'Dilemmas in qualitative health research', *Psychology & Health*, vol. 15, no.  
779 2, pp. 215-228.