

# LONGITUDINAL QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW DATA COMPARISONS WITHIN AND BETWEEN COUPLES OVER TIME

---

Anna Dechant

State Institute for Family Research at the University of Bamberg

15.09.2016

RC 33

# INTRODUCTION

---

- more and more qualitative longitudinal research
- also more common multiple perspectives within one unit of analysis, e.g. one couple, over time
  - benefits: more perspectives and insights  
discussion processes
  - challenges: consideration of different points in time  
combining different perspectives
- previous analysing strategies often focussed on either the longitudinal dimension (e.g. Holland et al., 2006; Thomson & Holland, 2003; Hermanowicz, 2013; Saldaña, 2003) or the multiple perspectives within one unit of analysis (e.g. individual interviews: Peukert, 2016; Ruling, 2007; couple interviews: Peukert, 2016; Maierhofer & Strasser, 2016; Ruling, 2007)

# PROPOSED DESIGN

---

- based on separate interviews with both partners of couples at two points in time
- analysis of interviews of first point in time
  - each individual interview
  - comparison of both partners in each couple
  - comparison of the different couples
  - comparison of the women's and men's interviews
- analysis of interviews of the second point in time
  - see above
- using the longitudinal design
  - comparison of both points in time, focussed on changes, persistency and inconsistencies

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

---

- DFG-funded project: „The Household Division of Domestic Labour as a Process. How does the Division of Housework Change over the Course of Relationships? “
  - 14 couples: living together, expecting their first child and both gainfully employed at time of first interview, similar (and high) educational attainments
  - interviews at two points in time
  - interviews with both partners separately
  - topics in the interview guidelines: division of housework, paid work and childcare – past, present and plans

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

---

- research questions: How did the couples plan to involve professionals into the care for their child and how did they realize it? What were the reasons for their? Did both partners in all couples have similar ideas and explanations? Were there gender-specific patterns?
- computer assisted analysis (MAXQDA)
- codes: partly derived from the interview guidelines, partly inductively from the interviews
- iterative processes

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- first interview: individual level

*Table 1: interviewee's plans and ideas for the use of professional childcare within the first year of the child's life*

	crèche	child-minder or crèche	no professionals	maybe
informants	C♂, C♀, K♀, K♂	F♂, J♂	A♀, D♀, D♂, E♀, E♂, F♀, G♀, G♂, H♀, H♂, L♀, L♂, M♀, M♂, N♀	B♀, I♀, I♂, J♀

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂; no information on plans in the interviews of A♂, B♂, N♂

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- first interview: individual level

*Table 2: reasons for the interviewee's plans and ideas for using or not using professional childcare in the first year of the child's life*

	finances, occupation	preference	gender	child's best	availability	no explanation
informants	A♀, F♂, G♀, G♂, J♂, K♀, K♂, L♀	B♀, I♀, I♂, J♀, K♀, M♀, M♂, N♀	L♂	C♀, D♀, E♀, F♀, H♀, H♂, J♀, L♂	D♀, D♂	C♂, E♂

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂; no info on plans or ideas in the interviews of A♂, B♂, N♂

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- first interview: couple level & across couples

*Table 1: interviewee's plans and ideas for the use of professional childcare within the first year of the child's life*

	crèche	child-minder or crèche	no professionals	maybe
informants	C♂, C♀, K♀, K♂	F♂, J♂	A♀, D♀, D♂, E♀, E♂, F♀, G♀, G♂, H♀, H♂, L♀, L♂, M♀, M♂, N♀	B♀, I♀, I♂, J♀

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂; no information on plans in the interviews of A♂, B♂, N♂



# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- first interview: couple level & across couples

*Table 2: reasons for the interviewee's plans and ideas for using or not using professional childcare in the first year of the child's life*

	finances, occupation	preference	gender	child's best	availability	no explanation
informants	A♀, F♂, G♀ G♂, J♂, K♀, K♂, L♀	B♀, I♀, I♂, J♀, K♀, M♀, M♂, N♀	L♂	C♀, D♀, E♀ F♀, H♀, H♂, J♀, L♂	D♀, D♂	C♂, E♂

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂; no info on plans or ideas in the interviews of A♂, B♂, N♂

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- first interview: informants' sex

*Table 1: interviewee's plans and ideas for the use of professional childcare within the first year of the child's life*

	crèche		child-minder or crèche		no professionals		maybe	
informants	C♂, K♂	C♀, K♀	F♂, J♂		D♂, E♂, G♂, H♂, L♂, M♂	A♀, D♀, E♀, F♀, G♀, H♀, L♀, M♀, N♀	I♂	B♀, I♀, J♀

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂; no information on plans in the interviews of A♂, B♂, N♂

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- first interview: informants' sex

*Table 2: reasons for the interviewee's plans and ideas for using or not using professional childcare in the first year of the child's life*

	finances, occupation		preference		gender		child's best		availability		no explanation	
informants	F♂, G♂, J♂, K♂	A♀, G♀, K♀, L♀	I♂, M♂	B♀, I♀, J♀, K♀, M♀, N♀	L♂		H♂, L♂	C♀, D♀, E♀, F♀, H♀, J♀	D♂	D♀	C♂, E♂	

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂; no info on plans or ideas in the interviews of A♂, B♂, N♂

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- second interview: individual level

*Table 3: interviewee's information on the use of professional childcare at the time of the second interview*

	crèche	child-minder	no professionals
informants	K♀, K♂	B♀, B♂, C♀, C♂	A♀, A♂, D♀, D♂, E♀*, E♂*; F♀, F♂, G♀, G♂, H♀, H♂, I♀, I♂, J♀, J♂, L♀, L♂, M♀, M♂, N♀, N♂

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂

\* informant considers to involve professionals in childcare in the near future

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- second interview: individual level

*Table 4: reasons for using or not using professional childcare at the time of the second interview*

	finances, occupation	preference	competence	feelings	child's best	availability, conditions	family care	no explanation
informants	B♀, K♀, K♂	A♂, B♀, F♀, F♂, H♀, H♂, I♀, M♀, M♂	A♀, G♀, H♀	A♀, F♂, N♂	A♀, C♀, C♂, F♀, J♀, K♂, L♂, M♂	D♀	E♀*, E♂*, F♀, F♂, I♀, I♂, M♀	B♂, D♂, G♂, L♀, N♀

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂

\* informant considers to involve professionals in childcare in the near future

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- second interview: couple level & across couples

*Table 3: interviewee's information on the use of professional childcare at the time of the second interview*

	crèche	child-minder	no professionals
informants	K♀, K♂	B♀, B♂, C♀, C♂	A♀, A♂, D♀, D♂, E♀* E♂*, F♀, F♂, G♀, G♂, H♀, H♂, I♀, I♂, J♀, J♂, L♀, L♂, M♀, M♂, N♀, N♂

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂

\* informant considers to involve professionals in childcare in the near future

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- second interview: couple level & across couples

*Table 4: reasons for the use of professional childcare at the time of the second interview*

	finances, occupation	preference	competence	feelings	child's best	availability, conditions	family care	no explanation
informants	B♀, K♀, K♂	A♂, B♀ F♀, F♂ H♀, H♂ I♀, M♀ M♂	A♀, G♀ H♀	A♀, F♂ N♂	A♀, C♀, C♂, F♀, J♀, K♂, L♂, M♂	D♀	E♀*, E♂* F♀, F♂, I♀, I♂, M♀	B♂, D♂ G♂, L♀, N♀

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂

\* informant considers to involve professionals in childcare in the near future

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- second interview: informants' sex

*Table 3: interviewee's information on the use of professional childcare at the time of the second interview*

	crèche		child-minder		no professionals	
informants	K♂	K♀	B♂, C♂	B♀, C♀	A♂, D♂, E♂*, F♂, G♂, H♂, I♂, J♂, L♂, M♂, N♂	A♀, D♀, E♀*, F♀, G♀, H♀, I♀, J♀, L♀, M♀, N♀

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂

\* informant considers to involve professionals in childcare in the near future



# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- second interview: informants' sex

*Table 4:* reasons for the use of professional childcare at the time of the second interview

	finances, occupation		preference		compe- tence		feelings		child's best		availability, conditions		family care		no expla- nation	
informants	K♂	B♀, K♀	A♂, F♂, H♂, M♂	B♀, F♀, H♀, I♀, M♀		A♀, G♀, H♀	F♂, N♂	A♀	C♂, K♂, L♂, M♂	A♀, C♀, F♀, J♀		D♀	E♂*, F♂, I♂,	E♀*, F♀, I♀, M♀	B♂, D♂, G♂	L♀, N♀

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂

\* informant considers to involve professionals in childcare in the near future

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

- longitudinal comparison

*Table 5:* comparison of the interviewees' plans and ideas for the use of professional childcare during the pregnancy with the realizations one year afterwards

		plans and ideas				
		crèche	child-minder or crèche	no professionals	maybe	no plan
realisation	crèche	K♀, K♂				
	child-minder	C♀, C♂			B♀	B♂
	no professionals		F♂, J♂	A♀, D♀, D♂, E♀*, E♂*; F♀, G♀, G♂, H♀, H♂, L♀, L♂, M♀, M♂, N♀	I♀, I♂, J♀	A♂, N♂

Note: alphabetic characters denote the interviewed couples; female partners are denoted with ♀ and male with ♂; \* informant considers to involve professionals in childcare in the near future

# EXAMPLE OF USING THE PROPOSED DESIGN

---

- longitudinal comparison
  - partly different explanations: competence, feelings, family care
  - different explanations of the involvement or not-involvement of professionals compared to the explanations for the plans, e.g. financial reasons to feelings
  - fewer differences between men's and women's explanations

# CONCLUSION

---

- qualitative longitudinal interview data with couples need adequate analysing methods
- proposed method compares
  - individuals
  - individuals within couples
  - between couples
  - between women and men
  - over time

# CONCLUSION

---

- benefits:
  - findings show
    - that some partners have different plans
    - that even if two partners have the same plan, they do not necessarily explain it similarly
    - some explanations are more often used by women, others by men
    - in some cases, realizations differ from plans
    - explanations change with time
  - allows to focus on differences and similarities on different levels

# REFERENCES

---

- Hermanowicz, Joseph C. (2013): The Longitudinal Qualitative Interview. In: *Qual Sociol* 36 (2), S. 189–208. DOI: 10.1007/s11133-013-9247-7.
- Holland, Janet; Thomson, Rachel; Henderson, Sheila (2006): Qualitative longitudinal research. A discussion paper. London: London South Bank University (Working paper, no. 21).
- Maierhofer, Sara; Strasser, Irene (2016): »Das war bei uns ganz einfach, weil ich war der Verdiener« – Elterliche Arbeitsteilung im Fokus von Traditionalisierungsprozessen. In: *Journal für Psychologie* 24 (1), S. 225–252.
- Peukert, Almut (2015): Aushandlungen von Paaren zur Elternzeit. Arbeitsteilung unter neuen Vorzeichen? Wiesbaden: Springer VS (Geschlecht und Gesellschaft, Band 61).
- Reimann, Swantje; Alfermann, Dorothee (2014): Zum Einfluss der Elternschaft auf die Karriereorientierung von Ärztinnen. Eine Fallrekonstruktion. In: *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* 26 (2), S. 169–198.
- Rüling, Anneli (2007): Jenseits der Traditionalisierungsfallen. Wie Eltern sich Familien- und Erwerbsarbeit teilen. Frankfurt am Main: Campus (Politik der Geschlechterverhältnisse, Bd. 37).
- Saldaña, Johnny (2003): Longitudinal qualitative research. Analyzing change through time. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.
- Thomson, Rachel; Holland, Janet (2003): Hindsight, foresight and insight. The challenges of longitudinal qualitative research. In: *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 6 (3), S. 233–244. DOI: 10.1080/1364557032000091833.