

8-1-2016

Is it any Clearer? Generic Qualitative Inquiry and the VSAIEEDC Model of Data Analysis

Dawn M. Kennedy Ph.D.
Capella University, dkennedy14@capellauniversity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>



Part of the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Kennedy, D. M. (2016). Is it any Clearer? Generic Qualitative Inquiry and the VSAIEEDC Model of Data Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 21(8), 1369-1379. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2016.2444>

This How To Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Is it any Clearer? Generic Qualitative Inquiry and the VSAIEEDC Model of Data Analysis

Abstract

This article was designed to assist the novice researcher in determining if a generic qualitative research approach is appropriate for their intended research or dissertation. The article is intended to offer clarification of the approach and builds upon Caelli, Ray, and Mill's (2003) call for standardized generic qualitative inquiry guidelines. The article takes the researcher through a process of self-evaluation to determine alignment with the five qualitative traditions. While generic qualitative inquiry has been posited to be an easy route, no experience necessary, its reliance on the method and tools of traditional qualitative methodologies, quickly can lead the novice researcher to a muddled theoretical mess. This article offers a boilerplate generic analysis method to be used when the approach is generic qualitative inquiry, leaving a clear and concise stand-alone path for the novice researcher. The featured model is the VSAIEEDC method created by seminal author Dr. Roland Persson. The VSAIEEDC model is a cognition-based analysis method with seven steps: variation, specification, abstraction, internal verification, external verification, demonstration and conclusion. This article sought to contribute to the critical discussion of the foundation of generic qualitative inquiry and offers an analysis method in alignment with the fundamentals of a generic qualitative approach.

Keywords

Generic Qualitative Inquiry, VSAIEEDC, Qualitative Analysis, Cognition-Based Analysis, Qualitative Methodology, Data Analysis

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge the tremendous contribution to the body of academic knowledge brought forth by Dr. Roland S. Persson MFA, PhD, FCollIT, Professor of Educational Psychology, School of Education & Communication, Jönköping University, and for his continued assistance in the development of the VSAIEEDC method of analysis.

Is it any Clearer? Generic Qualitative Inquiry and the VSAIEEDC Model of Data Analysis

Dawn M. Kennedy
REALTOR University, Chicago, Illinois, USA

This article was designed to assist the novice researcher in determining if a generic qualitative research approach is appropriate for their intended research or dissertation. The article is intended to offer clarification of the approach and builds upon Caelli, Ray, and Mill's (2003) call for standardized generic qualitative inquiry guidelines. The article takes the researcher through a process of self-evaluation to determine alignment with the five qualitative traditions. While generic qualitative inquiry has been posited to be an easy route, no experience necessary, it's reliance on the method and tools of traditional qualitative methodologies, quickly can lead the novice researcher to a muddled theoretical mess. This article offers a boilerplate generic analysis method to be used when the approach is generic qualitative inquiry, leaving a clear and concise stand-alone path for the novice researcher. The featured model is the VSAIEEDC method created by seminal author Dr. Roland Persson. The VSAIEEDC model is a cognition-based analysis method with seven steps: variation, specification, abstraction, internal verification, external verification, demonstration and conclusion. This article sought to contribute to the critical discussion of the foundation of generic qualitative inquiry and offers an analysis method in alignment with the fundamentals of a generic qualitative approach. Keywords: Generic Qualitative Inquiry, VSAIEEDC, Qualitative Analysis, Cognition-Based Analysis, Qualitative Methodology, Data Analysis

It has been proposed in the literature that generic qualitative inquiry is an easier approach to a qualitative research project and maybe suitable for qualitative student dissertations (McLeod, 2001). Although McLeod (2001) underlined reasons for his argument of facility, such as flexibility and no requirement of expertise in a particular approach, generic qualitative inquiry is anything but uncomplicated (Caelli, Ray, & Mill, 2003). Generic qualitative inquiry, by virtue of its lack of allegiance to a particular methodology, may leave the novice researcher without a clear starting point. The lack of academic literature on generic qualitative inquiry, and more importantly the lack of a standard analysis boilerplate, was the impetus for this article. The five qualitative research traditions as defined by Creswell (2009) are (a) ethnography, (b) grounded theory, (c) case study, (d) phenomenology, and (e) narrative. Each of these five traditions adhere to a specific methodology and each methodology is based upon the researcher's world view; how the researcher defines his ontology, epistemology and axiology. As Creswell (2009) suggested each particular methodology, from positivism to phenomenology, are merely points in a continuum of knowing. Where then does generic qualitative inquiry, which espouses no particular view on the creation of knowledge or the existence of truth, fall in that continuum? This article explores the role of generic qualitative inquiry in the research continuum and suggests a meaningful way to approach and analyze data generated from the generic qualitative approach.

The Five Research Traditions

Merriam (2009) asserts that qualitative researchers are primarily interested in “understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their world and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (p. 5). Merriam also stated that, in essence, every qualitative study starts as a basic generic qualitative inquiry and that the chosen methodology (informed by a theoretical framework) is merely an additional “dimension” to the understanding of an experience and its construction. Therefore, to better understand what generic qualitative inquiry is, perhaps the best place to start is defining what it is not. The five recognized qualitative approaches are: ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology and narrative research. Percy, Kostere, and Kostere (2015) offered a simplified definition of four methodologies and their different end goals:

Ethnography- an investigation of the social-cultural experience within a network or social group.

Case Study- an investigation of a singular case or bounded system using multiple sources of data and multiple methods of collection.

Grounded Theory- an inquiry used to generate data to develop an explanation or theory of a process developed over time.

Phenomenology- an investigation of the lived experiences (cognitive processes) of some phenomena; a focus on the internal context not the external content of those experiencing the phenomena (pp. 76-77).

Finally, narrative research – an inquiry to discover the personal life stories of an individual or group combined with the researcher’s perspective in a collaborative and narrative chronology (Creswell, 2009).

Generic Qualitative Inquiry Defined

Percy et al. (2015), then offered this definition of a generic qualitative inquiry: “Generic qualitative inquiry investigates people’s reports of their subjective opinions, attitudes, beliefs, or reflections on their experiences, of things in the outer world” (p. 78). This definition offers clues into the appropriate use of a generic qualitative inquiry: (a) the research centers on subjective opinion (how the participant made sense of this particular experience) and (b) the focus of the research is external. Worthington (n.d.) posited that generic qualitative inquiry must be about more than opinions, beliefs and attitudes as those can be measured in a quantitative study. To add further confusion to the definition, Caelli et al. (2003) stated that without a methodological underpinning generic qualitative research can often become a diluted effort wherein methods used are not congruent with an assumed methodology. Herein lies the problem with *borrowing* methods from various methodologies.

To define or describe generic qualitative inquiry, and to determine whether or not, and subsequently how, the researcher should use it, students must take themselves through a process of awareness. To simply state generic inquiry is easy because students don’t need to take the time to learn and understand the various research traditions (McLeod, 2001) is misleading and does an injustice to the researcher and the participants. Creswell (2013) asserted that to determine the appropriate research design, a researcher must view,

The process of research as flowing from philosophical assumptions, to interpretive lens, and on to the procedures involved in studying social or human problems. Then, a framework exists for the procedures—the approach to inquiry, such as grounded theory, or case study research, or others. (p. 44)

Appropriate Uses of a Generic Qualitative Inquiry Approach

While Caelli et al. (2003) posited that generic qualitative inquiry has no allegiance to a particular methodology or philosophical viewpoint, Merriam (2009) asserted that in order to conduct qualitative research, one must lay a conceptual foundation in accordance with one's view of the world. Researchers must examine their conceptual foundation before deciding on a generic approach. The Caelli et al. (2003) concept of non-allegiance does not negate the necessity of a philosophical viewpoint but merely stated that generic qualitative inquiry is appropriate for more than one world view and that the researcher is not bound to follow certain methodological frameworks. Creswell (2013) categorizes the facets of a philosophical viewpoint thusly: (a) ontology- how does the researcher view the concept of truth/reality (b) epistemology- how does the researcher view how knowledge is created or known (c) axiology- how does the researcher position himself/herself in the study and (d) methodology- how does the researcher view the process of research.

The philosophical viewpoint, or the guiding set of beliefs, fundamental to qualitative inquiry is that knowledge and reality are constructed, multiple realities exist, the researcher creates knowledge through subjective analysis of participants in a naturalistic setting, and in the case of generic qualitative inquiry, embraces a methodology without limitations (Caelli et al., 2003; Creswell, 2009, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Percy et al., 2015). These fundamental beliefs frame the interpretive lens, placing the researcher at a point in the continuum of knowing, and are identified by Creswell (2013) as: (a) postpositivism, (b) social constructivism, (c) postmodernism, (d) pragmatism, (e) feminist theories, (f) critical theory, (g) critical race theory, (h) queer theory, and (i) disability theory. Creswell (2013) posited that certain methodologies are better suited for certain lenses or frameworks, for example, postmodernism may be best served with the methodology of ethnography or grounded theory. Until the researcher understands his/her own philosophical viewpoint and interpretive lens, only then should a methodology be chosen. Ergo, generic qualitative inquiry should not be used simply because the student researcher is not versed in a methodology or because the student has been told it is a less demanding qualitative research option.

Choosing a methodology that aligns with one's assumptions and interpretive lens is essential to quality research (Caelli et al., 2003; Richards & Morse, 2013). Generic qualitative inquiry may be viewed as appealing as it fits well with many interpretive frameworks but is not bound by the rules of a methodology (and its subsequent methods) or the precise definition of constructionism. Caelli et al. (2003) posited that "basic or generic approaches to qualitative research have become quite common, even though few and disparate guidelines for their implementation or evaluation have been proposed" (p. 2). Herein lies the problem for the novice researcher, without a set of instructions for how to build and implement a research design, a generic qualitative inquiry can quickly become a muddled effort.

Caelli et al. (2003) asserted that, at minimum, a generic qualitative inquiry should be inclusive of four characteristics: "(a) the theoretical positioning of the researcher, (b) a congruence between methodology and methods, (c) strategies to establish rigor, and (d) the analytical lens of the researcher" (p. 5). The researchers' theoretical positioning refers to the belief system comprised of ontology, epistemology and axiology; the researchers' views of reality and knowledge creation, as well as their value framework. Congruence between

methodology and methods refers to aligning the methodology (the tradition) with the methods used for inquiry and analysis. For example, a phenomenological study, which seeks to discover the lived experience of participants within a phenomenon, would not use artifacts (such as in a case study) in its research process nor would it analyze the data through cross-case analysis. Generic qualitative researchers, who may espouse no particular methodology, are then challenged to align methods with theoretical positioning and their analytical lens. Strategies to establish rigor in a generic qualitative inquiry may include addressing personal biases or assumptions, creating a system to test saturation, ensuring a detailed reporting of the research procedures, or participant validation of the researchers' interpretation of the data (Caelli et al., 2003; Cooper & Endacott, 2007). The strategies for rigor are also influenced by the theoretical positioning and analytical lens of the researcher. Whereas theoretical positioning is related to the researcher's beliefs and motivation for the study, the analytical lens, or interpretive lens, is related to how the researcher interacts with the data. The researcher's biases, assumptions, and presuppositions all influence how the data will be analyzed and interpreted (Caelli et al., 2003; Creswell, 2013).

Percy et al. (2015) posited that generic qualitative research is appropriate for mixed methods research, or when the theoretical positioning of the student encompasses a belief that knowledge and reality can exist outside of the lived experience of the participants as well as being constructed through social interaction. In their prescriptive article Percy et al., also posited that generic qualitative research may be used when the information desired cannot be gathered through another methodology or cannot be easily integrated into a quantitative study. In addition, Percy et al., suggested a generic qualitative approach when the researcher has a priori knowledge or a categorical set of pre-understandings. The researcher believes that some aspect of the research problem can be known prior to the study. This puts a generic qualitative inquiry at the center of the knowing continuum; some objective reality and knowledge may exist outside of the research and some knowledge and reality may only be subjectively constructed within the social interaction of the researcher and participant. Simplistically, the researcher knows his or her theoretical positioning, brings his or her truth/reality to the study, and is open to newly constructed knowledge as he/she interacts with the study participants and the data generated. The goal of the research is to describe the phenomenon or process, and therefore a generic descriptive study is appropriate as it is not bound by specific methods to generate knowledge.

If a researcher accepts that generic qualitative inquiry is in the center of the knowing continuum it could be stated it is well suited for the researcher with the lens of pragmatism or postpositivism. Creswell (2013) offered that postpositivism is results oriented with rigorous data collection and analysis while pragmatism is outcome focused and data collection and analysis may be from multiple sources and through multiple methods which best address the research problem. Circling back to the work of Percy et al. (2015) these two interpretive lenses both focus on a priori knowledge integrating with newly constructed knowledge and therefore the use of semi-structured open-ended questions is a valid means of data collection in a generic qualitative study. A student researcher, with limited time and financial resources, and a desire to explore a priori knowledge, may choose the more flexible pragmatic approach. It is important to note that an accepted view of pragmatism is that it involves the researcher's desire to affect change and relate knowledge to action (Goldkuhl, 2012). Data collection in a pragmatic approach allows the researcher to utilize multiple methods of inquiry including interviewing, reviewing archival documents, and/or observing the participants in a naturalistic setting. Following collection of the data, where does the student begin in the analysis process without a prescriptive set of guidelines to deconstruct and analyze the data?

Analysis Methods in Generic Qualitative Inquiry

Each of the five research traditions have their own set of methods or tools to analyze data. Phenomenology is closely related to generic qualitative inquiry due to its descriptive nature and the examination of a process or phenomenon (Worthington, n.d.). However, while phenomenology seeks to discover the shared essence of meaning of a process or phenomenon, generic qualitative inquiry seeks to uncover the individual meaning of a process or phenomenon from the perspective of the participants. While Jick (1979) espoused the concept of utilizing whatever methods best answer the research question, novice researchers may get lost in the vast array of methodological tools and lose congruence with their analytical lens or theoretical positioning.

Kennedy (2015) asserted that the VSAIEEDC model of analysis is appropriate when conducting generic qualitative research. As a researcher, the student is not borrowing from a methodology, which according to McLeod (2001) he/she has not had the time to comprehend or assimilate. The VSAIEEDC process is a cognition-based model which follows seven steps to analysis allowing for reflexivity and rigor. Cooper and Endacott (2007) emphasized reflexivity and rigor as two key elements necessary in generic qualitative research. Again rather than borrowing a method, or constructing via piecemeal from multiple methodologies a plan for reflexivity and rigor, the VSAIEEDC model offers a prescriptive approach to generic data analysis.

The VSAIEEDC Model

Seminal author, Roland Persson (2006) described the VSAIEEDC model as generic analysis. A generic analysis to correspond to a generic qualitative inquiry. Persson originally developed the VSAIEEDC model for use in researching the gifted and talented but its premise is applicable generically. The model entails the following seven steps: “(a) variation (b) specification (c) abstraction (d) internal verification, (e) external verification, (f) demonstration, and (g) conclusion” (p. 38). The central theme for the VSAIEEDC model is that all analysis is cognition based in a comparison of recurring patterns (Persson, 2006). Persson explained his concept thusly: “all analytical behavior is based on *pattern recognition*. It is by comparison we automatically—for we are thus hardwired—evaluate new information with already stored information in order to ‘make sense’ of what we see, hear or experience” (2006, p. 32). Persson was emphatic that the seven steps of the VSAIEEDC model were iterative and that the process followed in VSAIEEDC allowed for greater rigor and validity through the “full exhaustion of information” (p. 33).

Persson (2006) asserted the validity of this generic model as other qualitative analysis methods integrated cognition-based principles. Kennedy (2015) likened the model to other seven steps methods such as the Moustakas modified van Kaam method. Again, if all methodologies fall somewhere within the continuum of knowing (Creswell, 2009) then the use of an analysis method based on cognition (how we know) can align with several interpretive lenses, such as pragmatism and postpositivism. Persson (2010) indicated that his generic VSAIEEDC model begins with variation within the data; what is the same and what is different. Specification is defined as a process wherein characteristics within groups of data are identified (constant comparison analysis), abstraction wherein commonalities are externalized (drawn out from the data) and depicted by coding within specific data groups (Persson, 2010, p. 544). The verification processes within this method included internal verification, a comparison process to determine if the codes are logical and feasible based on the knowledge of the researcher’s interaction with the data, a fit between the larger emerging data (Persson, 2010) and any a priori knowledge (Kennedy, 2015). External verification was

related to theoretical corroboration typically conducted through tying back data to existing theory. The acronym VSAIEEDC related to a step within the verification steps which Persson described as *exploration*, defined as “a visual overview of the reduced data in search of frequency related regularities or irregularities” (p. 34). The demonstration step involved conceptualizing frequencies and irregularities (such as a co-occurrence analysis) in a graphical or charted form. Finally, conclusion, within the VSAIEEDC model entailed reaching the point of data saturation, coming to an endpoint of abstraction (nothing more is drawn from the continual iterative levels of analysis) and the formation of the perceived results of the study (Persson, 2006).

The VSAIEEDC Model in a Generic Qualitative Inquiry Research Design and Analysis Plan

While Percy et al. (2015) asserted that generic inquiry may be appropriate when no other form of inquiry fits the research content, study focus or data to be gathered, researchers must understand why their study falls into this quandary. If the data desired and generated does not fit within the five traditions, researchers must ask why? It is in conceptualizing and verbalizing the impetus for the study that researchers can discover where they land on the continuum of knowing. For example, Percy et al., indicated that a researcher with a priori knowledge, pre-determined themes or categories of pre-understanding, would chose generic qualitative inquiry, due to the belief that knowledge can exist and be generated both objectively and subjectively; that while multiple realities may exist, reality can be known outside of the participants’ personal experience. Percy et al. added, “Actually, researchers considering any study of people’s subjective ‘take’ on actual external happenings and events should consider generic qualitative inquiry as their approach” (pp. 78-79). This assertion supports the concept that there can exist an individual reality within an observed external reality (happening, event, or phenomena) which leads to the conclusion that generic qualitative researchers fall in the center of the continuum of knowing.

Understanding where one’s world view fits into the realm of research approaches is the first step in a quality analysis. Conceptualization and verbalization of the motivation for the study is critical to determining the interpretive lens. Caelli et al. (2003) explained the necessity of understanding and proclaiming one’s reasoning for choosing any approach, generic or otherwise, “Disciplinary allegiances must be made explicit then for two reasons: (1) as a signal to the researcher’s theoretical positioning, and (2) as an indication of the possible disciplinary-related methodological interpretations and associated methods of the author(s)” (p. 6). A postpositivist, postmodern, or pragmatic approach most closely align with a generic qualitative inquiry which espouses a view of objective and subjective realities and a deeper understanding, not merely a description, of the interaction of those realities within an event, happening or phenomenon.

As Caelli et al. (2003) posited, certain methods may be utilized in a generic approach which do not invoke a methodology such as member checking, memoing or journaling. The VSAIEEDC model leaves to the researcher which methods of external and internal verification they may choose to use but remains true to its generic roots of cognitive processing of repeated patterns. The theoretical allegiance to the concept that all analysis is cognition-based establishes a level of rigor within a generic qualitative inquiry. The methodology and methods are in congruence when a generic analysis method is applied to a generic qualitative inquiry. This concept of congruence was asserted by Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, and Spiers (2002) to be the first and primary goal of rigor.

These concepts of congruence, rigor, saturation and abstraction lay the foundation for a solid generic qualitative inquiry research plan. The VSAIEEDC method offers a

prescriptive guideline for a generic qualitative research analysis plan. Variation is an overview of what is immediately known from the data- what is the same, what is different. Specification initiates grouping based upon a set of recurring patterns. Abstraction entails a labeling or coding of like data through frequency analysis. The verification steps may be inclusive of self-journaling throughout the process to ensure that researcher bias does not infer preconceived meanings to emerging patterns, member checking, theoretical and thematic analysis (how does the data verify existing published research or moving back and forth between each data set in constant comparison), demonstration may be inclusive of word frequency analysis and co-occurrence analysis between themes. Conclusion is the process wherein further levels of abstraction return no additional patterns and evaluation and synthesis of the data lead to a foundation to present results (Persson, 2006). Kennedy (2015) in her use of the VSAIEEDC model of analysis, in a generic inquiry with pre-existing themes, leaned heavily upon thematic and theoretical analysis utilizing the tools of frequency analysis, constant comparison, and cross-occurrence; however, the VSAIEEDC is not exclusive of other analysis forms such as inductive analysis wherein themes are generated from the patterns of discourse. VSAIEEDC may be utilized for framework analysis, cluster analysis or vignette analysis. The end goal of the research, action oriented, theoretical development, empowering voices, substantiation of a funding request, defines the generic analysis tools utilized within the model; however, the model's seven steps still guide and inform the analysis plan.

This article has firmly defined the generic qualitative approach and has grounded the approach in the center of the continuum of knowing. The extant literature suggests that those students whose beliefs fall within the center of the knowledge continuum typically approach research from postmodern, postpositivist, or pragmatic analytical/interpretive lens. The theoretical positioning also guides this methodology and its analysis. Specifically, student-researchers' axiology, how they value the facets of the process of knowledge and truth creation, will influence the use of the VSAIEEDC model. A step-by-step template for conducting analysis within the researcher's analytical lens and theoretical positioning is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: *VSAIEEDC Analysis Template for Postpositivist, Postmodernist, and Pragmatic Perspectives*

Analysis Steps	Postpositivist	Postmodernist	Pragmatic
Variation	Scan the interviews/data for immediate perceptions of what is the same and what is different within the data	Scan the interviews/data for immediate perceptions of what is the same and what is different within the data	Scan the interviews/data for immediate perceptions of what is the same and what is different within the data
Specification	Looking closer at the similarities and differences separates them into natural categories that are theoretically supported or theoretically-laden	Deconstruct the data; identify categories that emerge from within the variation and similarities	The pragmatist begins with an end in mind, typically solving a problem or creating an action plan. Align data into pre-determined categories (what fits-what doesn't) or create categories which align with practical application of the research
Abstraction	Identify words, descriptions, and phrases that represent each category and reduce them to a conceptual representation- example: "I dread work every day" becomes "work avoidance"	Evaluate words, descriptions, and phrases and intervene with an examination of the social processes in play; from the examination create a comprehensive characterization of the data	Identify words, descriptions, and phrases and evaluate them for resolvability and to assist in furthering the study's purpose; transform the words and phrases to align with the study's intent

		which integrates the multiple perspectives of the study participants	
Internal verification	Negotiate with self in determining if the representations are logical and feasible; categories are causal and/or predictive in nature-examine reasoning for personal bias	Negotiate with self in determining if the representations are logical and feasible- the categories represent fragments of individual reality and are integrated into a constructed meaning -examine reasoning for personal bias	Negotiate with self in determining if the representations are logical and feasible-the end categories would result in supporting the proposition (the researcher's impetus for the study and beliefs regarding action for resolvability)- examine reasoning for personal bias
External verification	Corroborate findings with existing theory; is inclusive of multiple data derived from multiple sources	Findings relate to existing theory or published reports; is inclusive of multiple data derived from multiple sources or methods; member checking is a valid strategy for verification (Morse et al., 2002)	Findings are relevant to practitioner issues and have support in practice; relevance and rigor co-exist (Cho, Mounoud, & Rose, 2012) with precise defined published or created data and useful application
Demonstration	Theory-driven approach lends itself to content analysis; demonstrations may include charted or graphed demographic data, word frequency analysis, co-occurrence analysis, cross-comparison analysis, and cluster analysis (Namey et al., 2007)	The emergent nature of postmodernism lends itself to thematic versus theoretical analysis; include charted or graphed code co-occurrence analysis, hierarchical cluster analysis, theme cross-comparison, or grouping themes within themes	Demonstration of the analysis of findings in a pragmatic approach reflect actionable circumstances in an attempt to resolve the research and practical problem; demonstrations may include charted or graphed demographic data, word frequency analysis, co-occurrence analysis, cross-comparison analysis and explanatory analysis or modeling
Conclusion	Evaluate the performed analysis and its result-determine if additional analysis will yield more information	Evaluate the performed analysis and its result-determine if second or third level (a deeper analysis of emergent information) analysis will yield more information	Evaluate the performed analysis and its result-determine if analysis and findings are relevant and resolvable or if additional analysis or quantitative analysis is needed to support action steps

Note: The demonstration recommendations are not inclusive of all available analysis techniques nor do they presume to be the only techniques appropriate for a particular study.

Implications and Recommendations

The problem for novice student-researchers, particularly dissertation authors, is a lack of concentrated study and experience within a specific qualitative methodology. This absence of experience leads mentors and students alike to propose a generic qualitative approach. However, the generic approach has its own theoretical position at the center of the continuum of knowing. Generic qualitative research is not a light version of phenomenology or case study and treating it as such leads to research with many areas of incongruence and possibly a lack of validity and credibility (Caelli et al., 2003; Percy et al., 2015). The findings from the

research conducted for this paper resulted in several recommendations which include closely examining one's theoretical positioning, reflecting on the impetus of the study, determining one's analytical/interpretive lens, and only then determining if a generic qualitative inquiry is appropriate. Once it is determined that a generic qualitative inquiry is appropriate for the research study and the researcher, it is recommended rather than borrowing from methodologies the student-researcher presumably does not understand, through lack of study or experience, the student-researcher instead uses a generic cognition-based analysis method. It is recommended that the VSAIEEDC model, and its methods, lead to alignment with the theoretical positioning of a generic qualitative researcher, are incongruence with the methodology of generic qualitative research, have implicit strategies for rigor, and serve several analytical lenses within the continuum of knowing. This researcher recommends using the model, along with the template in Table 1, to effectively produce a generic qualitative research paper or dissertation.

Conclusion

This article provided a synthesis of the limited extant literature specific to generic qualitative inquiry and demonstrated how the VSAIEEDC generic analysis model aligned with generic qualitative inquiry. The overarching goal was to provide novice student researchers with a deeper understanding of generic qualitative inquiry and to provide a framework for determining if generic qualitative inquiry is the best suited approach to their study. Caelli et al. (2003) asserted that generic qualitative inquiry will most likely become more common and, "Without a body of literature and critical discussion, novice qualitative researchers, their supervisors, clinical researchers, and manuscript and grant reviewers will not have the methodological foundations to move forward in their work" (p. 9). This article sought to move forward the critical discussion of the underpinnings of a generic qualitative approach and offered a method in congruence with the generic qualitative methodology.

A secondary goal of this article was to assist the novice researcher, who may have been given a recommendation to pursue the generic qualitative approach, in lending a starting point in finding their theoretical positioning, in clearly articulating their interpretive lens and world view, and in understanding why a generic qualitative approach should be taken. A third goal was to offer a boilerplate for analysis of data generated from a generic inquiry which would keep the novice researcher's method and methodology in congruence, enhancing both quality and rigor in the research process.

References

- Caelli, K., Ray, L., & Mill, J. (2003). 'Clear as mud': Toward greater clarity in generic qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(2), 1-27.
- Cho, L. C., Mounoud, E., & Rose, J. (2012). Dealing with the opposition of rigor and relevance from Dewey's pragmatist perspective. *M@n@gement*, 4, 368-390. doi: 10.3917/mana.154.0368
- Cooper S., & Endacott, R. (2007). Generic qualitative research: A design for qualitative research in emergency care? *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 24, 816-819. doi:10.1136/emj.2007.050641
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Goldkuhl, G. (2012). Pragmatism vs. interpretivism in qualitative information systems

- research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 21, 135-146. doi:10.1057/ejis.2011.54
- Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 602-611. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2392366>
- Kennedy, D. M. (2015). *Nonprofit real estate association CEOs peer networks: A qualitative inquiry of social support within the job demands-resources model* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3732421)
- McLeod, J. (2001). *Qualitative research in counselling and psychotherapy*. London, UK: Sage.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(2), 1-19. Retrieved from <http://www.iqim.ualberta.ca/en/InternationalJournalofQualitati.aspx>
- Percy, W. H., Kostere, K., & Kostere, S. (2015). Generic qualitative research in psychology. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(2), 76-85. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss2/7>
- Persson, R. S. (2006). VSAIEEDC - a cognition-based generic model for qualitative data analysis in giftedness and talent research. *Gifted and Talented International*, 21(2), 29-37. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:33782/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Persson, R. S. (2010). Experiences of intellectually gifted students in an egalitarian and inclusive educational system: A survey study. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 33, 536-569. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ893883.pdf>
- Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2013). *Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Worthington, M. (n.d.). Differences between phenomenological research and a basic qualitative research design [pdf document]. Capella University dissertation research materials. Retrieved from <http://a1149861.sites.myregisteredsite.com/DifferencesBetweenPhenomenologicalResearchAndBasicQualitativeResearchDesign.pdf>

Author Note

Dawn M. Kennedy holds a Ph.D. in Organization and Management with a leadership specialization from Capella University. Dr. Kennedy currently teaches graduate courses for REALTOR University, an authorized degree granting private university. Dr. Kennedy has been conducting qualitative research within the scope of her career as a Chief Executive Officer of trade associations and trade councils. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: dkennedy14@capellauniversity.edu

The author wishes to acknowledge the tremendous contribution to the body of academic knowledge brought forth by Dr. Roland S. Persson MFA, PhD, FCollT, Professor of Educational Psychology, School of Education & Communication, Jönköping University, and for his continued assistance in the development of the VSAIEEDC method of analysis.

Article Citation

Kennedy, D. M. (2016). Is it any clearer? Generic qualitative inquiry and the VSAIEEDC model of data analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 21(8), 1369-1379. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss8/1>
