

Archiving for the future: the archivist as researcher

For Grenoble Conference book on secondary analysis

Libby Bishop, Ph.D.

Senior Research Archivist, Timescapes, University of Leeds
Research Liaison Officer, ESDS Qualidata, University of Essex
18 September 2007

Abstract

There has always been a strong argument for broad and deep collaboration between the research and data archiving communities. This paper argues that one of these forms of engagement—the archivist as active researcher—is an increasingly valuable element for modern data archives. In this paper, I examine several phases of archival processing, from pre-ingest to enabling access to preserved materials. Within each of the phases, I argue that closer linkages between archives and the research community can be enabled by supporting active researchers within the archive, and that the institutional strength of the archive, including its standing in the wider community, can only benefit as a result. In two areas, gaining researchers' trust to handle issues of confidentiality and developing materials to promote reuse, archivist-researcher skills seem to have the greatest benefits. Despite these apparent benefits, the practice is still rather limited. The paper discusses selected reasons for this and then argues that recent changes may be weakening these barriers and increasing the opportunities for archivists as research scholars

Keywords: data archive, research, archival data, secondary analysis, reuse, qualitative

Acknowledgements: This paper benefited from conversations with Sharon Bolton and Jack Kneeshaw, and I owe particular thanks to Roberto Cozatl and Matthew Woollard for their comments on an earlier version.

Introduction

There has always been a strong argument for broad and deep collaboration between the research and data archiving communities. Researchers are usually the key user community of any major data archive. This collaboration can take many forms: archivists sympathetic to research, archivists trained in a research discipline and methods, researchers as depositors, researchers visiting archives for extended use of materials, researchers as “first-movers” who initiate interest in a specific collection, and researchers advising archives in various capacities such as advisory committees, user and focus groups.

This paper argues that one of these forms of engagement—the archivist as active researcher—is an increasingly valuable element for modern data archives. Indeed, the researcher as archivist is integral at all stages of the life cycle of data. The idea of archivists doing research is hardly unique as the examples of F.G. Emmison and Elizabeth Ralph make clear. It is perhaps most typical in humanities archives such as the collections of individual authors. At the Brenner Archive Research Institute in Innsbruck¹, six staff are full-time archivists while 15 both archive and conduct research on the 150 literary estates deposited there.

The practices at other *data* archives are more relevant to the UK Data Archive (UKDA). There are models with research staff, including the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and the Henry C. Murray centre, which recently joined the Harvard-MIT Data Centre. The British Library also comments favourably on the idea of research staff, especially in the social sciences, in its latest strategy document, “Content strategy for the British Library” (British Library, 2006). It notes that given the rapid proliferation of materials, deeper engagement with the research community is vital: “we are currently investing in building up the number of expert staff we have in the social sciences” (British Library, 2006, p.36).

I believe the value of an archivist-researcher usually generalises beyond qualitative data collections and applies to quantitative, historical and other materials. Though I have drawn from my experience at Qualidata, this paper has numerous examples from other areas as well. In some cases, the situation for Qualidata has unique features which I will address. For example, a weaker culture of reusing qualitative data may increase the value of an archivist/researcher. Although this argument generalises to some degree, some caveats still apply. First, this paper in no way slights other forms of researcher and archivist interaction. Collaboration when each group brings to bear its distinct skills and training is also necessary. Nor am I arguing that all archive staff should do research; many have no interest in any case. But in a number of areas, the research trained archivist can engage with the wider research community in ways that contribute to the success of the mission of a data archive

Background

¹ <http://www.digital-heritage.at>

One of Qualidata's founding objectives was to rescue "classic" sociology studies by locating, preserving (sometimes digitising), and disseminating the data and documentation they produced. The motivation was clear: given that so many foundational research projects had been done in 1960s, many of these researchers were retiring or dying, and there was a justified fear that materials would permanently lost.

Input from the research community was certainly needed at this stage and consultations were held. In addition, because of the age of many of these studies, they had already been evaluated and their status codified in journal citations, course syllabi, word of mouth, and so forth. Given the limited resources at the time of Qualidata's founding, there were more than enough collections identified to begin the intake process.

While this rescue effort continues, we are now working equally hard to identify research in progress suitable for archiving. Ideally we hope to locate research in its very early planning stages that will become deserving of preservation. Increasing, the task requires a kind of "archival prescience" that can look forward and decide which research being done today should be preserved. Looking forward, the challenge for Qualidata is to archive for the future.

Without question, the primary judges in this process are contemporary researchers. It is precisely because the involvement and engagement of current researchers is so vital that research competence within the archive is equally essential to enable participation on equivalent footing in these debates and decisions. In this paper, I examine the major phases of archival processing, from pre-ingest to enabling access to preserved materials. Within each of the phases, I argue that closer linkages with the research community can be enabled by supporting active researchers within the archive, and that the institutional strength of the archive, including its standing in the wider community, can only benefit as a result.

Selecting data to be archived

The collections policy of the UKDA is distinct because there is a direct relationship between the funding of research and the selection of data. Researchers funded by the ESRC (and AHDS) are obliged to offer their data for deposit (ESRC, 2000). Although compliance with this policy is far from universal, compliance is good enough to produce large quantities of resources in need of evaluation. As the default has shifted from "chasing data" to automatic offering, difficult choices have to be made. (The UKDA is also offered data not funded by the ESRC, and in addition, some data are explicitly targeted for acquisition, usually based on researcher recommendations or collection strategy.)

There is an argument that because costs of digital preservation are dropping, a different threshold of selection might apply. Although costs have dropped dramatically, they are still real, especially for storage of large audio and video digital materials. And enhancement procedures, whether in the form of "pre-processing" by

converting paper to digital forms, or post-processing preparation of enhanced user guides, collection specific training materials, and teaching data sets, remain very labour intensive. It is still essential to choose wisely.

Both researchers and archivists must participate in these decisions. For some criteria, such as how a new study fits into existing holdings (e.g., augments current strength or expands into new areas), archivists will be better informed. Others, such as potential for future reuse, need input from both. Researchers, especially the most senior with years of expertise in an area, provide critical knowledge helping to assess materials' potential for reuse. Archivists can play a useful role here by helping to counter the vested interest any researcher justifiably has in wanting to see his or her work identified as a future classic. However, archivists can only engage credibly in this conversation if they are, in fact, legitimate participants in the research conversations. The more respect researchers have for archivists' knowledge and skills, the more archivists' judgements will be taken seriously when difficult choices have to be made. (And vice versa for that matter.) It is not surprising, then, that the British Library is seeking to increase its direct engagement with researchers in its decisions about what materials to acquire and how to make them available. Its Content Strategy document notes there is an "...increasing need to validate content strategy with researchers on a regular basis" (British Library, 2006, p. 35).

Willingly offered data – the confidentiality issue

Regardless of official policies requiring data to be offered, many researchers still have deep reservations about depositing their qualitative data, usually related to concerns about confidentiality of that data, adequate anonymisation, and access conditions. It must be pointed out that many still believe, mistakenly, that preservation is equivalent to posting to the web. This is absolutely not the case, but even once depositors understand the extensive security and authorisation systems in place, their concerns are understandable. (Increasingly, the diverse licensing options available to depositors also help to address their concerns.)

Ultimately, researchers will deposit only if they feel materials will be appropriately handled. This trust depends on many factors that vary across researchers, but adequate support and guidance during the period of deposit is vital. This entails getting clear advice about what to deposit, data formats, and clear, non-technical explanations about licence agreements. Then, depositors want to know that "core" archival functions of preservation and security are properly conducted. Although these are not my personal areas of expertise, based on depositor feedback, I believe the UKDA is seen as highly competent and world class in these areas. The forty years worth of experience enjoyed by the UKDA has meant that it is highly respected by the social science community.

The most difficult area, certainly for most qualitative studies, entails provisions for confidentiality. In this area, in particular, I think that researchers preparing to deposit respond well when they can talk in great specificity about both research practices around consent and options available to them within the archive. With greater frequency, we engage with researchers when they create consent forms, and have to advise them as to how to gain consent not just for their own research and publication,

but also for archiving. Not surprisingly, researchers are highly reluctant to do anything that will jeopardise consent. Given challenges of getting proposals through ethics review committees, that is highly understandable. There is published work citing that many, most even, respondents are more willing to have their materials reused than researchers imagine (Kuula, 2005). Nonetheless, for some depositors, discussing consent with someone who has also tried to recruit research participants is critical. (Rarely, a researcher will use the issue of complex confidentiality as a way to avoid depositing data. In these cases, research knowledge is advantageous in detecting when claims of sensitivity might be slightly exaggerated.) Advice on how to negotiate consent forms is more meaningful when the advisor has had similar experiences. For archivists to recommend “get consent for archiving” up front, with no deep intuition into consequences in the field, can be unhelpful. Again, I must stress that not all depositors have such concerns. Many welcome our advice; they had no opposition to consent for archiving, they simply had not considered it. But for some sensitive projects, informed advice is greatly appreciated.

I think that direct, personal experience of the serious and sometimes agonising ethical choices researchers sometimes face, such as whether or not to compromise formal consent policies in order to obtain participation of a potentially critical participant, makes an archivist’s advice more meaningful. Of course, such conversations in no way replace equally substantive ones that address details of anonymisation options, selective archiving, embargoes, and so on. It may be that only a small portion of collections with sensitive materials or cautious depositors, need this degree of interaction. However, in certain sensitive situations where each case has unique features, the ability to speak first hand is irreplaceable.

... my opinion is that I would never have been able to deposit the FMD [Foot and Mouth Disease] material if you had NOT been a researcher. It was absolutely critical. It made all the difference to the formation of trust. I had to come to Essex and see/hear the 'place' where the arch[iv]ing was happening and kind of imbibe where the archivists were coming from, in order to convince myself this was a good idea. So it's personal, I mean about personal knowledge in the Polanyi sense perhaps, AND it's also about what being a researcher (ethnographer/anthropologist?) enables us to bring to the table. A sense of what a mess the world is and how much skill goes into how people (respondents and researchers) make sense of that. A sense that archiving is not always about tidying up that mess. When I visited I was I suppose, surprised to find that sensibility...I don't think Qualidata could work with out this sensibility. (Maggie Mort, Senior Lecturer, Lancaster University, personal email, 2006)

Processing and Preservation

At first glance, many activities in these areas seem the most technically “archival”, that is, where research knowledge would be irrelevant. In fact, this is not the case if one looks closely; here are just three examples to help make the point.

Producing a catalogue record appears to be “straightforward”. The process at the UKDA is to transfer information from the data submission form to the catalogue input

program. The UKDA input programme has drop down menus populated with most frequently used terms. Archivists are able to assign detailed keywords regarding type of data. For qualitative material, this can involve, for example, distinguishing semi- and un-structured interviews, focus groups, and other forms of material. Cataloguers can't rely solely on depositors' categories, though of course this information is used. Firstly, the information might not be provided, so the cataloguer has to use his or her judgment. Secondly, typologies are not always self-evident and, boundaries are blurry. Archivists can often augment a catalogue record in part because they are situating and positioning the incoming collection relative to many others in the UKDA.

Another area where research skill is valuable is in the selection of relevant keywords for indexing. Here, there is real craft involved in integrating the free-text choices often supplied by depositors with the more structured thesaurus terms used within the archive. In many cases, some familiarity with discipline-specific languages is critical, such as associating inequality with stratification in sociology. This is especially true when trying to capture topics that were NOT the focus of the primary researchers and thus not included in their published keyword lists. However, such content identified by the archivist may be of potential value for reuse, and it is vital to capture it in discipline-sensible ways for the catalogue record.

Like processing, at first glance, it might appear that the most technical aspects of archiving, preservation formats, etc., would not need researcher engagement. It is true the benefits for direct collaboration are probably lower here, but they are still present. Preservation requires ample foreknowledge of emerging, innovative research methods where such methods will affect technologies for preservation and dissemination. For example, we are observing a rapid growth in projects using web, network and grid technologies in diverse ways: researching web content (blogs), using the web as a research tool (e.g., Hypermedia Ethnography at Cardiff; <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/hyper>), and using the web for traditional and interactive dissemination (e.g., Inventing Adulthoods, <http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/inventingadulthoods/>). What matters here is that an archive must be in touch with the cutting edge of research technologies and methods. The archive needs to be prepared to preserve innovative formats and it needs this knowledge long in advance, not at end of a research project. Solutions such as archiving project websites in *toto* and disseminating hypermedia may need long lead times to implement suitable preservation solutions. Once again, if archivists can engage with researchers in these areas, benefits are great.

Promoting the reuse of archived data

The primary remit of archives that house unique artefacts or public records is preservation. Although many working in data archives believe the deposits are worthy preserving on their own merits, the remit of a data archive extends beyond preservation to include dissemination, outreach and enabling access to our holdings. Within dissemination, there are a range of strategies, from more passive (“built it and they will come”) to more active promotion (“building user communities”). All data archives benefit from promoting use of their materials. Qualitative materials stand to benefit more than quantitative studies because practices of reusing qualitative data

have, until recently, been more limited and more controversial, at least in the social sciences. (Parry and Mauthner, 2004; Parry and Mauthner 2005).) It is also true that most qualitative datasets are more labour intensive to process. Hence, with more investment in any given collection, there is more to be gained by promoting every deposit.

One of the most effective forms of promotion is to have well known scholars use archived materials and publish in highly regarded journals (Savage, 2005; Savage, 2007). However, this is not always something over which an archive has much control.

As an alternative, archives can develop materials targeted for likely users. At the UKDA, much effort has gone into producing teaching datasets and other guides to support instructors. Such resources are valuable in both further and higher education, but seem to be especially needed in the teaching of post-graduate methods. Developing these materials is a sensible investment for the archive as it helps introduce practices of secondary analysis and reuse early in students' research careers. It also provides publicity and enhances the credibility of the UKDA both among current and future researchers.

Especially in this area of supporting teaching, the experiences with qualitative and quantitative data are very similar. There are many examples of resources developed for users of numerical data: a database of comparable indicators across surveys, thematic data guides, guides on weighting data, and guides on using data analysis software. In producing these guides, research expertise of archivists is useful in two ways. First, expertise is necessary to produce materials sophisticated enough to be valuable for higher education instructors. Second, it is important to get input from prospective users while planning and producing these teaching tools. In one such dialogue, the exchange helped to inform types of variables to be included in teaching data sets when researchers suggested that more continuous variables would be helpful. More than rudimentary research knowledge is necessary for an archivist to engage in such conversations, and others involving the complexities of variable weighting. The tools developed are of higher standards and are more likely to be used if archivists' engage with researchers on equivalent footing.

Qualidata has produced a teaching resource on interviewing. This project, though modest, illustrated a number of avenues for effective researcher-archivist collaboration and the importance of research knowledge within the archive. The resource includes an overview of several types of interviews, with exemplar interviews (or extracts) for each type drawn from our holdings. There are also exercises for in-class use.

The overall framing of the project required knowledge of, and sensitivity to, several debates—often heated—in qualitative methodology. We had to be careful not to be seen as promoting interviews as a preferred method of qualitative research simply because most of Qualidata's holdings are interviews. We had to engage with questions such as whether or not an interview can be classified simply by looking at the transcript. Qualidata was fortunate at the time to have several highly qualified post-graduate students as staff members. As a team, we brought to the project extensive post-graduate expertise in sociology, psychology, and research methods.

One objective of this project was to create a publicly available tool that could be distributed without the need for our usual registration and authorisation processes. This required careful selection of particular interviews, followed by requesting permission for this usage from each depositor. All depositors generously made their materials available and several contributed further by commenting on the introduction, by recommending alternative transcripts to ones we had selected, and by offering to edit and tidy up the extracts chosen.

Was research expertise essential? Could we, for example, have simply invited researchers to help produce this document? We could have tried, but getting such volunteer effort from people immersed in their own work is always difficult, and nearly impossible to get in a timely fashion. With in-house expertise, we produced a credible document that provides a resource distinct from what an introductory methods text can offer. Once depositors had something to react to, our exchanges with them were highly fruitful. For example, we refined our definitions and distinctions between oral and life history interviews. We also improved the quality of anonymisation in two of the extracts. (There was no issue of disclosing confidential content or of compromising the integrity of the interview. Edits were made only to improve readability of text.)

Finally, we engaged a number of faculty members in the Sociology Department at the University of Essex to read drafts. This process improved the quality of the document and served to interest several faculty members in its availability to use in their classrooms. We also solicited comments from other outside readers such as members of various UKDA advisory committees. There have been costs; a project I hoped might take weeks has extended to many months. However, the investment appears to have been worthwhile as response to the resource has been very favourable from students and faculty.

The researcher as archivist (or archivist sympathiser)

The main focus of this paper is the benefits to archives of researcher/archivist interaction, highlighting benefits for the archive. But the exchange can be mutually beneficial. There are a growing number of areas where researchers and archivists are jointly exploring and developing new areas of expertise and institutional collaboration. Within the AHRC, panels reviewing tender applications include archivists who review and assess applications involving digital resource creation.. Moreover, many standard archival treatments of data preparation for archiving are, at root, little more than good data management practices and could benefit any research project and especially large, complex ones. This has been recognised by all the UK Research Councils.

Examples:

1. It is necessary to plan and fund data preparation and preparation for preservation, including confidentiality protection such as anonymisation or aggregation.
2. Archivist expertise on consent and copyright will aid not only data deposit, but also the researchers' own use of the data in publication.

3. All factors need to be considered: data, software, coding tools, documentation, metadata (including systems for back up, security and version control).
4. Attention must be given to file formats, especially with a preference for non-proprietary formats for sharing and making these materials suitable for long term preservation and sustainability.

In sum, the kind of resource management planning and practices that make preservation easier and cheaper also make resource management *during* the research process easier, safer, and more efficient.

Other collaborations become possible by exploring connections between the research and preservation life cycles. For example archivists could develop ideas, or plan research questions, then hand off the project to researchers. Sometimes an archivist is best positioned to identify collections with great promise for reuse. He or she might come to know a small, well-done study by a less prominent depositor where the data are rich with secondary analysis possibilities. Also, the archivist might see potentials for comparative work across collections where others would not. If the archivist is not able to, or interested in, pursuing these projects, collaborations with researchers where such ideas could be handed off might be highly fruitful.

Barriers to archivists as researchers

I hope this paper has effectively argued that archivists as research scholars can enhance core archival activities and processes and should not be considered peripheral to the archive's central mission. However, the practice is still rather limited and I will highlight selected reasons why. These reasons must be considered in a wider institutional context that is complex, involving great variations among archives, staff interests in any given archive, archive management, and funding structures, to name just a few factors. In the following section, I'll take up each point and show how recent changes may be weakening these barriers and increasing opportunities for archivists as research scholars.

First, there is a generic fear that highly trained staff will get bored with core archival work (some of which can be tedious) and leave, possibly for more traditional academic research and teaching posts. This is used to justify not hiring research trained staff (Ph.D.s) and not providing archive staff with research specific training. Archives are not in any way unique in this thinking; it is used to justify not investing in employee skills in many settings.

Second, even when archive management is willing to fund such staff, funders do not always concur. In at least one instance, Qualidata has sought funding for researcher skills and activities but these tenders (or parts of tenders) were not successful. Of course, this section of the proposal could have been failed on its merits. But, it is also the case that the structure of funding in the UK makes it difficult to fund a proposal that both builds infrastructure/ develops resources and also funds research. The ESRC is explicitly divided into two boards, one for Resources and one for Research. The UKDA, and subsequently created service entity, ESDS, have always been funded

by Resources. The only exceptions are individual scholars employed at the UKDA who have been awarded individual research grants. (There is some evidence this is changing, based on recent ESRC awards to UKDA individuals and also to the recently funded qualitative longitudinal project, Timescapes, which includes three distinct strands on knowledge exchange, archiving and secondary analysis (<http://www.esds.ac.uk/qualidata/news/newsdetail.asp?id=1763>).

Finally, despite the best of intentions, Qualidata has not always engaged the research community as effectively as it might have. Qualidata did much consultation and conducted outreach, and to the extent that more was not done, funding limits were no doubt the major factor. The organisation struggled in early years with minimal funding and staff in a difficult environment. And in the early days, critical voices in the qualitative research community were loud. Given the effort needed simply to establish and develop the organisation with limited resources, it is not surprising that there were some tendencies toward isolation. Could and should more be done? Inevitably, the answer is yes, especially in areas such as ingest and the development of teaching data and other promotional materials.

Prospects for a brighter future

Organisations invest vast sums in general training and apparently do not find the investment wasted for many reasons. Investment in training is often found to increase organisational commitment, loyalty and reduce turnover, all which offset the costs of hiring skills or providing training. For example, there are many factors that might deter mobility, even for research-skilled archive staff: some staff are not seeking a different career and might not want full-time research at all. Also, the combination of archiving and research is actually very appealing. Many people interested in research are not interested in teaching, the typical combination available in academia. Given recent changes in many universities with increased teaching loads, Research Assessment Exercise pressures, and more bureaucracy, academic careers are not as appealing as they once were. Archiving offers opportunities in information science, new technologies, project management, and administration, all potentially rich complements to research activity.

One of the biggest shifts that makes engagement with researchers easier and therefore the value of archivist/researchers is that some shift is occurring in the status of secondary analysis of qualitative research in the wider research community (Bishop, 2007). This is not a simplistic matter that “acceptance is growing”. The very definition of what “secondary analysis” means is being rigorously probed. Examples include a special issue of *Sociological Review Online* on reuse of qualitative data (Barbour and Eley, 2007). In addition, the very meaning(s) of context have been explored in another thematic issue of *Methodological Innovations Online* (Coomber, et al., 2006). More generally, there is demonstrated support from the ESRC for qualitative data creation, archiving and sharing, as shown by the Qualitative Archiving and Data Sharing Scheme, a group of five demonstrator projects to advance data sharing (<http://quads.esds.ac.uk/>).

Recently, we have seen evidence from depositors that the cultural norms regarding archiving and reuse are shifting. Two studies were recently deposited where at initiation of each project, the researchers were very opposed to archiving. One study is a on the foot and mouth outbreak in Cumbria in 2001 (Mort, 2006) and the other (still being processed) is a longitudinal study of young adults as they navigated early adulthood (Negotiating the Long View: Archiving, Representing and Sharing a Qualitative Longitudinal Resource; <http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/inventingadulthoods/>). The researchers in both projects at first felt the confidentiality issues were too difficult and that these materials could and should not be archived. Both teams changed their minds during the course of their projects. Many factors were involved, but both came to see that their work had unique public value and should be available to others. In fact, the foot and mouth project documented their experience of preparing their data for preservation (<http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/doc/5407%5Cmrdoc%5Cpdf%5Cq5407userguide.pdf>). In both cases, collaboration with archive staff during the pre-ingest phase was intense and productive. Plans are in place to develop teaching datasets and similar materials for both projects. In this kind of environment, opportunities abound for yet new forms of collaboration.

One vision

If even some of my optimism is warranted, what might Qualidata look like in five years time? How will it be seen by qualitative researchers? How will the archive-research relationship be faring? What will our archivist as researcher scholar be up to?

A key cultural shift will have occurred: depositing data will not be seen as impinging research autonomy, intrusive oversight or irrelevant, and instead will be regarded as an honour, a mark of recognition. No matter how cheap data storage becomes nor how efficient the processing, archiving will always be about choosing, and it should be the best that are chosen (of course acknowledging that “best” is subject to complex criteria including research quality, potential for reuse, fit with existing holdings and processing costs). The possibility of having one’s work reviewed and re-used for research or teaching would be a mark of achievement. Getting a study accepted for deposit at the UKDA or other data archives will be viewed with the same regard that publishing in top journals is today. (Instead of data “acquisitions”, perhaps the UKDA will then have a “submissions” policy.)

With archiving being seen as a desirable goal, projects will seek early engagement with Qualidata staff. Current procedures for early identification of projects likely to be archived will need to be expanded and formalised. Both researchers and archivists would participate in these decisions. With some projects identified early, there will be time for appropriate consent procedures to be worked out so as to obtain permissions for both research and archiving purposes. Other opportunities for researcher-archivist collaboration will emerge, perhaps in innovative technologies such as anonymisation of digital audio and video.

Early interaction between archivists and researchers would also permit innovative approaches to reuse, secondary analysis and fostering communities of (re)users. It is

in fact, quite difficult to predict who might want to reuse any particular data. Nonetheless, primary researchers often have keen insights into this and strategies could be used to develop reusers. For example, rolling cohorts of post-graduate students might be engaged to encourage reuse; their early work with initial data, but later projects might involve reusing data collected earlier. Not all projects will lend themselves to these practices, but large, multi-themed, long-term projects would be more likely to do so.

One example of this promise lies in the area of qualitative longitudinal research. *“Changing Lives and Times: A Qualitative Longitudinal Network (Timescapes)* is a large scale, qualitative longitudinal study set in the UK, that follows people over time to explore the ways in which their personal relationships and identities unfold over the life course. The project is distinctive because it integrates primary research, establishing and sustaining an archive of qualitative longitudinal data, and promoting reuse of that data during the life of the five year project. Already some productive exchanges have taken place, such as the adoption of an XML-ready transcription format by the research teams and efforts by several of the researchers to incorporate consent for archiving into participant consent procedures. Researchers and archivists as research scholars may be well positioned to identify new research questions, possible for the first time, with comparative qualitative longitudinal data. It is a very exciting time indeed to be an archivist-researcher.

References

(All links checked 18 September 2007)

Barbour, S., and Eley, S. (eds.) (2007) 'Refereed special section: reusing qualitative data', *Sociological Research Online* [Online journal], 12(3).

Bishop, L. (May 2007) 'A Reflexive Account of Reusing Qualitative Data: Beyond primary/secondary dualism', *Sociological Research Online* [Online], Special Section on Reusing Qualitative Data, 12(3). Available at:
<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/3/2.html>.

British Library. (2006) *The British Library's Content Strategy: Meeting the knowledge needs of the nation.*

<http://www.bl.uk/about/strategic/pdf/contentstrategy.pdf>

Coomber, R., et al. (2006) 'Making qualitative data more re-usable: issues of context and representation', *Methodological Innovations Online* [Online journal], 1(2).
http://erdt.plymouth.ac.uk/mionline/public_html/viewissue.php?id=2

Corti, L., Witzel, A. and Bishop, L. (eds.) (2005) 'Secondary analysis of qualitative data', *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [Online journal], 6(1)
<http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-e/inhalt1-05-e.htm>

Economic and Social Research Council. 2000. *Data Policy*. ESRC, Research Division, April.

http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Support/research_award_holders/funding_rules/index7.aspx?ComponentId=4957&SourcePageId=5466

Kuula, Arja. (2005) Secondary Analysis in Qualitative Research. Utopia and Perspectives. International Symposium November 3rd & 4th, 2005 - MSH-Alpes Grenoble.

Mort, M., Sr Lecturer, Lancaster University, personal email, 2006.

Mort, M., Health and Social Consequences of the Foot and Mouth Disease Epidemic in North Cumbria, 2001-2003 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], November 2006. SN: 5407.

Parry, O. and N. Mauthner (2005) 'Back to Basics: Who Re-uses Qualitative Data and Why?' *Sociology* Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 337-342.

Parry, O. and N. S. Mauthner (2004) 'Whose Data Are They Anyway? Practical, Legal and Ethical Issues in Archiving Qualitative Research Data.' *Sociology* Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 139.

Savage, M. (2005) 'Working-class identities in the 1960s: revisiting the Affluent Worker Study', *Sociology*, 39(5), pp. 929-946.

Savage, M. (2007) 'Changing Social Class Identities in Post-War Britain: Perspectives from Mass-Observation', *Sociological Research Online* [Online], Special Section on Reusing Qualitative Data, 12(3).
<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/3/6.html>