**Illustrative and Analytic Treatment of Data Extracts Exercise**

Read the following excerpts from four published TA papers. Decide for each excerpt whether the data extracts are used illustratively or analytically (or both). As a quick reminder – when extracts are used illustratively, the specific features of the extract are not typically commented on, rather the extract provides a general illustration or example of the analytic claims being made. The extract could be replaced with another and the analytic narrative would still ‘work’. Indeed, the extracts could be removed altogether and the analytic narrative would still be (largely) coherent. With illustrative use, the specific features of an extract *are* commented on and the analysis is developed through the specific extracts selected for presentation in the report. Reflect on why you think the extracts in a particular excerpt are used illustratively or analytically (or both). What details in the excerpt can you point to as evidence of this?

**Example 1: Excerpt from an interview study with key informants involved in the development of cervical cancer prevention policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand**

A number of informants who were supportive of primary prevention *per se* raised concerns about the adequacy of primary prevention information, and not having interventions which had been *proven* effective. As one informant suggested,

*It has to be [a two pronged approach - both primary prevention and screening] to the extent that you’ve got good information for primary prevention* (Former Policy Analyst, Ministry of Women's Affairs)

However, scientific/medical information about cervical cancer and primary prevention is complex, sometimes contradictory, and to some extent unclear: Not all experts agree on the 'facts.' Differing interpretations of available data are possible, and may support contradictory positions. Interpretations may be influenced by experience or ideology. For example, data on the efficacy of barrier contraceptives to prevent cervical cancer is to some extent equivocal.63 Arising from this ambiguity, some authors have promoted the benefits of barrier contraceptives (specifically condoms),6,47,55,64,66 while others have not. 67 Given this situation, the concept of 'good information' on which to base primary prevention becomes more problematic. (See Braun.46)

While many informants were (generally) supportive of primary prevention for cervical cancer, others were cautiously supportive or unsupportive. For example,

*There's been some discussion about whether, as a method of primary prevention, women shouldn't be advised to, for example, start having sexual intercourse later in life, limiting sexual partners, and whether or not cervical cancer shouldn't be included among one of the concerns in terms of sexually transmitted diseases. I personally feel very strongly that this is not an appropriate approach to cervical cancer. I feel that. When it comes to what we can currently do in terms of cervical screening* (Cancer Society Spokesperson)

*In terms of prevention strategies for cervical cancer there is still really only one which we fall back on which is regular routine cervical screening* (Clinical Director, Auckland Sexual Health Service)

These arguments against primary prevention make reference to the pragmatic advantages of screening: The informants cite the efficacy of cervical screening, and potential negative effects that primary prevention approaches might have on this, as a reason for why primary prevention was not a necessary, or even desirable, approach.

**Source:** Braun, V. & Gavey, N. (1998). Exploring the possibility of sexual-behavioural primary prevention interventions for cervical cancer. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 22*, 353-359.

**Example 2: Excerpt from a qualitative survey study of views on pubic hair in Aotearoa/New Zealand**

Theme 1: Choice. One of the most prominent themes was an endorsement of personal choice around pubic hair—but within limits. Choice was evident throughout the data, both at semantic and at latent levels, and was particularly strongly expressed in relation to questions asking about whether people in general, men, or women should remove pubic hair (questions designed to evoke strong responses) or why they might do it. Some simply expressed the view that what one does with one’s pubic hair is personal choice and left it at that. For example, ‘‘It is a personal decision it’s up to them what they do with it’’ (06M[19]); ‘‘Up to them. Personal preference’’ (34M[22]); ‘‘Only if they want to. Personal choice’’ (10M[37]); ‘‘It is an individual decision’’ (11F[37]); ‘‘Don’t really care, it is up to them’’ (45F[no age given]); and ‘‘I don’t think people should remove pubic hair unless they want to’’ (30F[41]). Some explicitly framed their position as a non-judgemental one: ‘‘I think people should do what they feel is right for them. I don’t judge people either way’’ (53M [32]) and ‘‘[Pubic hair removal is] really up to them. If they think they need to then why not? It does not make any difference from my point of view’’ (48M[23]).

Responses like these seem to suggest that pubic hair removal requires only a straightforward and simple personal decision. It is something individuals would simply do if they wanted and not do if they did not want. In such responses, ‘‘choice’’ is rendered straightforward. Because choice was applied in this way to advocate both for and against hair removal, it appeared that it was the enactment of choice that was important, fitting with choice as a fundamental value for individuals in contemporary neoliberal Western contexts (Gill, 2007), so that they are understood as free agents who are free from the pressures of social constraints (e.g., see Gill, Henwood, & Mclean, 2005).

At first glance, it might appear that choice acted as a bottom-line argument (Edwards, Ashmore, & Potter, 1995). However, when this notion of choice was elaborated, it became apparent that choice was often constructed in a conditional manner: Typically, participants initially identified that they supported individual choice, but then did not approve if that choice conflicted with the choice of others. They used that conflict between different people’s choices to advocate for one particular ‘‘choice,’’ which was commonly hair removal. For example, ‘‘[It] should be personal choice—if you don’t want to, you shouldn’t have to—but I don’t want to see someone else’s pubic hair hanging out of togs [swimwear]!’’ (12F[38]); ‘‘It is up to the individual. Except, say, at the beach, if you are wearing togs, pubic hair should not be poking out’’ (63F[39]); and ‘‘Again, it’s a personal choice and depends on how much hair an individual grows. I think most people should groom their pubic areas as part of good grooming and hygiene standards’’ (59F[32]).

**Source:** [Tricklebank, G., Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2013). ‘It shouldn’t stick out from your bikini at the beach’: Meaning, gender, and the hairy/hairless body. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *37*(4), 478-493.](https://journals.sagepub.com/stoken/rbtfl/HTMDOX5ULB7KCN4OPQZ3A/pdf/10.1177/0361684313492950)

**Example 3: Excerpt from an interview study of British men’s experiences of transitioning out of the army**

The second theme generated from the data was built around the motif of ‘translation.’ Both men described experiencing something akin to culture shock when they moved from the army world to the civilian one, where the rules they had come to rely on to make sense of their worlds seemed to have been turned on their heads, or at least were interpreted differently . Often they framed this in terms similar to that of learning a new language; that a person needed to understand the new context well enough to be able to *translate* their ‘native tongue’ for the benefit of those around them:

*And the problem is everything you do in the forces, all the experience you gain, it doesn’t transfer very well to civilian life so you need to sort of adapt all your skills and qualifications into such a way as civilian employers can actually pick up on it and understand (Brian).*

The disjunction between “everything you do in the forces” and approaches used in the civilian world were identified as the biggest obstacles in Brian’s experience of transitioning out of the army ([see also Verey & Smith, 2012](https://owa.uwe.ac.uk/OWA/?ae=Item&a=Preview&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAAAD6JLVVjwhMQbXQeibFN6CkBwABPlfJAGipQZZkvv8PcYWHAAAAQOf0AADKU2fWn2UZS7t5sWWVEWONAI3cLwdRAAAJ#_ENREF_14)). However, what was evident across the interview was his ability to reflect on this issue and make the changes to his ‘style’ - translating his army honed skills into ones that fit ‘civilian’ life. For instance, he commented:

*I’ve mellowed to such an extent and I suppose you have to…in such a way to...you have to sort of change your style. A lot of my work, I train people up...my work is training and I’ve had to adapt my training style to be more civilian friendly than in the military (Brian).*

The relationship between this theme and the previous one is particularly strong in this extract. Here the adaptation in styles is orientated *toward* the civilian style and *away* from the army style. There was a sense that Brian’s army-learnt training style was inherently superior, and simply needed adaptation to be more palatable to his civilian audience ([see also Woodward & Jenkings, 2011](https://owa.uwe.ac.uk/OWA/?ae=Item&a=Preview&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAAAD6JLVVjwhMQbXQeibFN6CkBwABPlfJAGipQZZkvv8PcYWHAAAAQOf0AADKU2fWn2UZS7t5sWWVEWONAI3cLwdRAAAJ#_ENREF_16)). Following this logic, the need to translate is essential to his success, as taking on board the skills and values of the civilian context was rendered unthinkable […]

**Source:** Terry, G. (2016). *Doing thematic analysis.* In Lyons, E. & Coyle, A. (Eds), *Analysing Qualitative Data in Psychology*, 2nd ed. London: Sage.

**Example 4: Excerpt from a qualitative survey study of British lesbian and bisexual women’s clothing practices**

For the women who were lesbian inside and out, their accounts indicated that they weren’t consciously so, their style was not a performance, an act, they were simply being (and expressing) themselves:

*“My hair changed into a lesbian cut before I even realised I was gay so I think it’s a gradual process you don’t often realise is happening.” (British, working class lesbian, aged 19 [P82])*

*“I feel fraudulent in feminine clothes and am becoming more butch again because this has always been my natural garb long before I knew I was gay.” (White, middle class lesbian, aged 35 [P78])*

*“Since a small child I was always the most comfortable in trousers/shorts…” (White, middle class lesbian, aged 50+ [P65])*

Some of these women didn’t label themselves as possessing a masculine, androgynous or ‘dykey’ (visibly lesbian) style or garments but reported somewhat reluctantly that others might: “I guess others would describe it as dykey” (P75); “I guess they are probably ‘lesbian shoes’” (P82). Moreover, their inner dyke often leaked out (note the passive voice in P82’s response - ‘my hair changed’ rather than ‘I changed my hair’) through their styled body before they were ‘consciously aware’ of their sexuality. For the ‘authentic butch’ butchness was “an unmalleable aspect of the self, so essential that it even preceded their awareness of that label” (Levitt & Hiestand, 2004: 609). In the data quoted above, and other similar extracts, there is a delightful contrast between the authentic and honest, and the dishonest and fake, which highlights the over-riding importance of individual authenticity (Eves, 2004, Hutson, 2010, Levitt & Hiestand, 2004).

**Source**: Clarke, V. & Spence, K. (2013). ‘I am who I am’: Navigating norms and the importance of authenticity in lesbian and bisexual women’s accounts of their appearance practices. *Psychology & Sexuality, 4*(1), 25-33.