

Suggestion Analysis: An analytical lens for making qualitative research more actionable in practical fields

Prokopis A. Christou 
Cyprus University of Technology

Suggestions are a vital yet often overlooked form of qualitative data, offering insight into how research participants envision change, improvement, or alternative possibilities within qualitative inquiry. Despite their practical relevance, limited methodological attention has been given to their identification and interpretation in qualitative datasets. This paper introduces suggestion analysis as a qualitative analytical method designed to identify, interpret, and categorize suggestions within qualitative data. Grounded in a constructivist ontology and interpretivist epistemology, the method treats suggestions as socially situated communicative acts. A five-step process is outlined, guiding researchers from familiarization to interpretation. Especially suited to applied contexts, such as tourism, suggestion analysis enables the generation of actionable insights through a structured yet flexible approach that contributes primarily at a practical level. The method may be used independently or alongside other qualitative analytic approaches.

Keywords: *Qualitative research, Qualitative analysis, Suggestion analysis*

1 INTRODUCTION

A wide range of analytical approaches, such as thematic analysis, sentiment analysis, content analysis, and discourse analysis, depending on the analytical procedure followed by researchers, have long been used to analyze qualitative data. These methods are effective for uncovering patterns in participant feedback, user comments, focus group discussions, and interviews derived from participants (Braun and Clarke, 2024; Drisko and Maschi, 2016). However, it may be argued that a common limitation is the tendency of such analytical approaches to focus on what is being described or felt by informants/participants (Morgan and Nica, 2020; Wiles et al., 2011), rather than what is being proposed for improvement or change. Obviously not all research is directed towards addressing problematic situations that individuals or organizational members may experience, yet this is often the case of applied or evaluative research. A crucial category of communication in the form of suggestions (as explained in the sections that follow) may be grouped together, as in the form of clusters or themes along

Prokopis A. Christou is an Associate Professor at the Cyprus University of Technology, Cyprus. He specializes in qualitative inquiry, qualitative research and analysis, and the implications of GenAI for qualitative research. He has published monographs, edited volumes, and empirical, methodological, and conceptual articles in reputable journals.
Email: prokopis.christou@cut.ac.cy

with general opinions, perceptions, or experiences, and thus risks being overlooked. Yet, collapsing directive or similar statements into broad categories may obscure the operational intent embedded in participant discourse, therefore reducing the transformative potential of qualitative findings (Saldaña, 2021). Suggestions may appear indirectly or subtly, embedded within broader commentary or expressed through indirect language, making them hard to pinpoint, and consecutively make use of them. This creates a significant blind spot, particularly in contexts linked to human experiences, such as the social sciences and sub-sectors within which change, innovation, and continuous improvement is expected, such as the field of tourism (Zhang, 2025; Xiang et al., 2021).

Therefore, this underscores the need for a form of analysis specifically attuned to recognizing, extracting, categorizing, and interpreting these valuable communicative acts that may come in the form of suggestions by informants. As such, this theoretical study with its analytic methodological positioning, builds on the premise that new methodological and analytical approaches can contribute significantly at both practical and theoretical levels (Morgan and Nica, 2020; Jewitt et al., 2017), while the construction of a new analytic method represents a legitimate process through which researchers respond to evolving research process, emerging or even neglected data complexities (Denzin and Lincoln 2008). While suggestion analysis may function as a stand-alone approach in studies where participants articulate proposals for change, it may also complement existing analytic methods, as explained in the sections that follow, by adding a focused and in-depth layer attentive to participants' forward-looking or actionable expressions. In this paper, suggestion analysis is defined as a qualitative analytical method designed to identify, interpret, and categorize suggestions within qualitative data. Such suggestions may be articulated by different types of participants, including guests, employees, managers, students, or residents, depending on the context of the study.

2 POSITIONING SUGGESTION ANALYSIS WITHIN A RESEARCH PARADIGM CONTEXT

Despite their frequent appearance in qualitative datasets, particularly when researchers ask informants to express these directly for a situation, problem, or condition, suggestions may be treated by research analysts as peripheral, instrumental, or reducible to other analytical categories. In many qualitative studies, they often appear in sections labelled "recommendations" (Sanip, 2020), without a consistent or rigorous method for identifying or interpreting them. In response to this, a new form of analysis specifically targeting suggestions, may offer a more context-sensitive and meaning-oriented approach. It begins from the premise that suggestions are not just isolated statements, but expressions shaped by the informant's values, intentions, personal or workplace experiences, and the discursive environment in which they are embedded. Indeed, the significance of suggestions has been well recognized at a personal, organizational, and societal level (Bekhterev, 2017; Michael et al., 2012). When data exhibit functionally distinct characteristics (such as, for example being directive or solution-oriented), analytic positioning demands the development of such procedures that are capable of engaging with these properties systematically (Patton, 2015). By providing a structured yet interpretive way to examine such contributions, this distinct form of analysis can assist researchers uncover the transformative potential of suggestions, particularly in fields where specific and practical actions are needed, and may come from the

“participant voices.” Nonetheless, a distinct form of analysis that places suggestions in its core, requires that we first examine what suggestions truly entail. As suggestion analysis has not yet been formally defined in the literature, it is important to clarify what is meant here by a “suggestion.” In this context, a suggestion is defined as a forward-looking communicative act through which participants articulate perceived possibilities for change, improvement, or alternative ways of dealing with a situation.

Even so, to fully comprehend the nature of suggestion analysis, ontological and epistemological clarification is important. This is a crucial aspect in any proposed method of analysis (as in Braun and Clarke, 2006). Suggestion analysis adopts a constructivist ontology (Lee, 2012; Onuf, 2012), which understands social reality as socially constructed through interaction and meaning-making, and treats suggestions as socially produced communicative acts through which aspects of that social reality are expressed and negotiated. In this sense, suggestions are viewed as context-dependent social expressions that emerge within particular discursive and experiential settings. This does not mean that all suggestions are necessarily applicable, “good,” or equally useful; rather, their relevance and potential value depend on the context in which they are expressed and interpreted.

Epistemology, in turn, concerns how knowledge of that reality is produced (Kuhn and Weinstock, 2012). In the case of suggestion analysis, an interpretivist epistemology is most appropriate, given that it focuses on the meanings participants assign to their experiences and how those meanings are communicated through various means, such as in-depth interviews or conversations between researcher and participant within ethnographic contexts. Interpretivism emphasizes that understanding is mediated by language, context, cultural assumptions, and the meanings that people assign to things and experiences (Ocean et al., 2022). The meaning of a suggestion is not fixed or universal, since it depends on how, why, and in what situation it is expressed. From this interpretivist perspective, suggestion analysis is concerned with how participants articulate perceived possibilities for change or improvement, and how these expressions reflect their values and experiences. Suggestions are therefore more than simple feedback or propositions given by informants. Within the research context, they may become useful resources that reveal what individuals value, desire, or envision as change. Grounded in this epistemological stance, suggestion analysis seeks to interpret these expressions and uncover their depth rather than reducing them to surface-level content. To make this clearer and for contrast purposes, Table 1 presents a clear comparison of suggestion analysis with other key forms of qualitative analysis, including its ontological and epistemological positioning.

3 STEPS TO FOLLOW IN SUGGESTION ANALYSIS

A step-by-step process for suggestion analysis as expected in a paper of this scope, is proposed as follows and takes the form of a guide, similar to other studies of analogous direction and scope (as in: Braun and Clarke, 2021; Mayring, 2021; Jensen et al., 2022). This process treats the dataset as a potential field of suggestions, not limiting analysis only to responses to specific questions that researchers may ask respondents (e.g., “Do you have any suggestions?”, “So, what do you propose for...”), but identifying suggestions wherever they are reasonably discernible within the dataset. As such, it recognizes that participants may at times express suggestions indirectly, for example through reflections, frustrations, comparisons, or imagined alternatives, provided that these are supported by clear contextual or linguistic cues. It should be

Table 1 Suggestion Analysis: A comparison with other key qualitative analysis methods (source: author)

Aspect	Suggestion analysis	Thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006; 2021; 2024)	Content analysis (Drisko and Maschi, 2016; Stemler, 2000)	Sentiment analysis (Wankhade, 2022; Feldman, 2013; Liu, 2010)	Discourse analysis (Johnstone and Andrus, 2024; Gill, 2000)
Primary focus	Forward-looking, actionable ideas expressed by participants	Patterns of shared meaning relevant to the research question	Systematic categorization of manifest or latent content	Emotional valence and attitude in text	How language constructs social realities, identities, and relationships
Key unit of analysis	Suggestions as socially situated communicative acts (e.g., proposing change)	Themes representing underlying concepts across the dataset	Words, phrases, concepts, or categories in the data	Sentiment polarity (positive, negative, neutral) or intensity	Discursive acts, positions, and interactional context
Ontology & Epistemology	Constructivist ontology- social reality as socially constructed; interpretivist epistemology- focus on how participants articulate and interpret possibilities for change	Flexible	Can be positivist (quantifying content) or interpretivist (analyzing meaning)	Primarily positivist; computational linguistics foundations	Constructivist/ poststructuralist— meaning as socially constructed in discourse
Identification approach	Actively searches for suggestions (e.g., by using linguistic cues and contextual interpretation)	Iterative coding and theme development from the entire dataset	Systematic coding rules; may involve counting frequencies or mapping concepts	Automated or manual classification based on (e.g.) sentiment lexicons	Examines power, ideology, and identity

Data treatment	Categorizes and interprets proposals for change; reflects on relationships between categories	Groups data into themes to interpret meanings and patterns	Summarizes and categorizes textual or visual data for pattern detection	Labels emotional tone rather than interpreting deeper meaning	Analyzes structure, function, and implications of language use
Strengths	Directly generates actionable insights; captures participant-driven innovation; adaptable to applied/practical contexts	Highly flexible; rich depth of meaning; widely applicable	Handles large volumes; adaptable to mixed methods	Fast for large datasets; good for trend monitoring	Reveals hidden power relations, cultural assumptions
Limitations	Narrow-specific focus; risk of over-interpretation; may underrepresent voices without explicit suggestions	Risk of producing vague themes; less inherently action-oriented	May strip away nuance; less suited to deeply contextual meaning	May miss context-specific meanings	Highly interpretive; less suited to producing direct practical recommendations

noted that computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software can support the following process of suggestion analysis by enabling systematic identification, categorization and visualization of suggestions across large datasets (Silver and Lewins, 2014). Through the inclusion of specific AI-assist features in such programs today (such as NVivo and MAXQDA) can facilitate this process, given the dynamics presented by GenAI within the context of qualitative analysis (Christou, 2023) and the prompts given by researchers with specific sentences and keywords towards this direction, as explained more clearly in the following steps.

3.1 Step 1: Familiarization with the data

The first step in suggestion analysis is familiarization with the data, which mirrors the initial phase of other forms of analysis, such as content or thematic analysis, where researchers aim to develop a feel for the data before engaging in more focused coding (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Familiarization with qualitative data (also with the support of specialized qualitative software) acts as an initial phase in which researchers begin to develop an interpretive understanding of the data and become attuned to subtle linguistic patterns and discursive shifts before analytical categorization takes place (Friese, 2019). This rather immersion-in the dataset- phase enables the researchers to move toward analytic attentiveness to communicative intentions (Bazeley, 2020). Even so, in the context of suggestion analysis, familiarization serves a more specific purpose: that is, to attune the researcher to the diverse and often subtle ways that suggestions may be expressed across the dataset. A central challenge of this stage lies in the fact that suggestions are not always or necessarily stated directly or overtly. Participants may express recommendations indirectly, rather than by explicitly stating what “should” be done. For example, a statement like, *“The lectures were hard to follow, especially in the first weeks. It might have helped if we had a short summary video each week,”* includes a reflective observation followed by a softly phrased suggestion in this case by a participant who is a university student.

3.2 Step 2: Identification and extraction of suggestions

Whereas the first step emphasizes gaining a holistic understanding of the dataset’s broader contexts and narrative flows, the second phase shifts toward analytical precision. This involves the careful detection and documentation of each instance (case) in which a participant offers a suggestion, whether overtly or subtly embedded within their discourse. The explicit identification of analytically relevant segments requires methodological vigilance as in other forms of analysis (Graneheim and Lundman, 2004), yet in this case researchers must differentiate descriptive narrative and communicative acts that specifically project intentionality or desired change. As explained earlier, suggestions may appear explicitly, through clear directive or propositional language by informants (“They should do this...”). Yet, in some cases, suggestions may be couched in hypothetical, conditional, or modal phrasing (i.e.: “It might help if...”). A major challenge for the researcher in this phase is discerning the boundary between descriptive commentary and forward-looking proposition that may come in the form of suggestion. Importantly, not every description of a problem or negative experience should be treated as a suggestion; such interpretations should be made only where there is sufficient contextual or linguistic indication of forward-looking intent. To

address these challenges, researchers can adopt certain strategies, such as, developing a flexible yet rigorous set of linguistic cues (modals, such as: “might,” “could”), conditionals (“if...then”), or suggestive verbs (“recommend,” “propose”). These may act as heuristics to guide the extraction process. This step transitions the researcher from broad immersion into targeted analytic action focused on suggestion, marking the beginning of transforming raw data into interpretable insight. For example, the following extract describes a hotel check-in experience by a participant, as derived from an in-depth interview:

“We arrived just after a small group of guests wanted to check-in... It was rather chaotic. The hotel lobby was full... The receptionist was calm but clearly trying to serve many people at once... There was only one person to handle all these check-ins... While we waited for around 20 minutes, I noticed a few people trying to fill in forms while standing or balancing them on their luggage. I ended up using my phone as a surface to complete my form. When it was my turn, things were better...it was fine...”

The extract illustrates how participants may describe conditions that are relevant to improvement-oriented analysis. However, in cases such as this, researchers should proceed cautiously, since descriptions of inconvenience or dissatisfaction do not automatically constitute suggestions. At most, such extracts may indicate areas where further inquiry or interpretive attention is warranted, particularly if supported elsewhere in the dataset by more explicit forward-looking language. In an alternative form of analysis, such as thematic analysis, the form-filling discomfort may have been blended into a broader theme such as a “busy setting” and described as part of the overall experience. Suggestion analysis, by contrast, encourages closer attention to whether participants also articulate discernible proposals, preferences, or implied alternatives that can be interpreted responsibly and contextually.

3.3 Step 3: Categorization of suggestions

This phase helps make sense of the full set of suggestions by organizing them into categories that reflect common concerns or ideas. Take, for example, a qualitative study that aims to evaluate the experiences and perceptions of first year students in a university, to address issues of stress linked to the students’ first exposure to university-level studies. One participant (student) said while describing the first semester of university: *“It would’ve made a big difference if we’d had a clearer orientation to the system in the first week. I spent hours just figuring out how to submit assignments.”* Another noted, *“Someone needs to walk us through the platform—not just send a PDF and expect us to figure it out.”* Even though these are worded differently, they are both asking for “better support at the start (of their university studies),” hence could be grouped together. Even so, this step can be challenging because suggestions often overlap or fit into more than one group. A single comment might include a new idea, fix a problem, and try to prevent future issues all at once. In such cases, we may need to make a judgment (and this is where critical judgment and reflection by the qualitative researcher is important) about what the main point of the suggestion is- or choose to include it in more than one group. It is also helpful to go back to the informants’ responses and ask as analysts: *What exactly is this person hoping will change?* and *How is this similar to what others have communicated?* This process is flexible and reflexive, as stated above. As we group suggestions, we might notice new patterns, or

realize that some of our early groupings perhaps do not make sense anymore- or at least do not contribute to a specific group. We can change, combine, or split groups as our understanding of suggestions deepens.

3.4 Step 4: Reflecting on the categorizations

This phase of reflection helps ensure that the analysis remains true to the data in its full complexity and not merely to the parts where participants responded directly to questions that asked for suggestions, if such questions were included in our list of questions to the participants. Reflexive review of emerging categories supports epistemic transparency since it enables researchers to interrogate their own assumptions (such as what constitutes a suggestion), coding choices, and interpretive positioning (Finlay, 2002). This step involves revisiting the dataset as a whole to make sure that the categorizations are still doing justice to the range and richness of participants' suggestions, by also including those that were expressed indirectly but remain sufficiently supported by participants' language and context. This is also an opportunity to consider how different types of suggestions relate to one another, not just within each categorization, but across them. Some suggestions might challenge or contradict others, or reveal tensions in what different participants want. By engaging in such reflexive practice, methodological integrity is enhanced since it ensures that categorizations remain grounded in participant meaning (Berger, 2015).

3.5 Step 5: Interpretation and presentation

Interpreting qualitative data is a pivotal aspect of qualitative inquiry (Willig, 2017). This phase implies going beyond listing or describing suggestion categories, and beginning to ask: What do these suggestions reveal about the participants' experiences, thoughts and priorities? How do they respond, whether directly or indirectly (subtly), to the central questions of the research? And what might they contribute to practical change or theoretical insight? Essentially this step combines presentation and interpretation. It begins by clearly explaining each suggestion category (in terms of what kinds of suggestions it includes, and why it matters). This includes using direct quotes from participants for documentation and justification purposes, while the aim is to analyze what these categories mean in the context of the study. Effective presentation of qualitative findings requires purposeful narrative construction that communicates analytical insight while preserving trustworthiness to participant voice (Riessman, 2008). One effective way to present the findings is to walk through the categories one by one, outlining the range of suggestions within each and explaining how they relate to broader patterns in the data. Where helpful, the analysis can also be supported by a visual format such as a matrix or conceptual diagram. Such tools may help illustrate relationships between categories, the types of change being proposed, or the different levels at which suggestions are directed (e.g., individual, institutional, structural). This phase should also bring the analysis back to the main aim of the research. For instance, if the study was designed to explore how visitors experience and make sense of venues or places that are linked with relaxation, the question now becomes: How do these suggestions reveal what visitors felt or experienced at the specific venue or site? What do their suggestions tell us about what they felt was missing, poorly

managed, or worth improving (if infrastructure and processes were involved beyond the physical surroundings and environmental qualities)? By doing so, suggestions become more than just practical feedback since they offer insights into how people interact with a venue/place, what they value, and how they believe their experience could have been different.

This is also the stage where the analysis may begin to contribute to practical implications and/or theoretical development, depending on the goals of the research. It may be argued that due to the nature of suggestions (as derived from participants- whether individuals, patients, employees, managers, or professionals), these are best suited for evaluative or practical research contributing significantly towards practical rather than theoretical implications. In an era in which scientific knowledge is bombarded by questions such as “what are the theoretical implications of this study?,” or “who does this study contribute towards new theory development?,” this may be one of the greatest advantages of suggestion analysis- that it can truly contribute towards actionable measures and practical implications.

4 AN EVALUATION OF APPLICABILITY, STRENGTHS, AND LIMITATIONS OF SUGGESTIONS ANALYSIS

One of the core strengths of suggestion analysis rests in its unique focus on forward-looking, action-oriented expressions embedded within qualitative data that may be overlooked by traditional analytic approaches. It aligns closely with participatory and co-design methodologies by structurally embedding participant contributions within analytic and decision-making processes (Cornwall and Jewkes, 1995). Its structured yet interpretive process is particularly well-suited for qualitative studies that aim to generate actionable insights, especially in applied, evaluative, or participatory contexts. More specifically, it is valuable in evaluative research that gathers feedback on services provided, programs, or interventions. This analytical method also aligns well with participatory and co-design approaches, where participants contribute actively to shaping outcomes. By foregrounding participant-generated proposals for change, suggestion analysis supports the translational potential of qualitative data for practice-oriented outcomes, while strengthening participant-centered epistemology through the privilege of participant voices as agents of proposed transformation (Creswell and Poth, 2016). Additionally, suggestion analysis can be applied in studies focused on lived experience, where participants articulate perceived possibilities for change or improvement. In policy-relevant or reform-oriented research, it may provide a structured way to extract participant-driven suggestions that can inform decision-making. It may become useful in different contexts and fields, including sociology, psychology, and education, as well as sub-fields within them, such as marketing and management.

In more practical terms, given the emphasis on action-oriented expressions, suggestion analysis aligns particularly well with research questions that seek participants’ perceptions, beliefs, and ideas about change and improvement, or alternative possibilities. Such research questions can be understood not only as prompts for participant interviews or focus group discussions, but as overarching research questions that guide entire qualitative studies, with additional sub-questions. Framed at this conceptual level, they align well with research situated in interpretivist, constructivist, experiential, and practice-oriented paradigms. In more practical terms and given the emphasis on action-oriented expressions, suggestion analysis aligns particularly well

with tourism and hospitality research overarching questions that seek participants' perceptions, beliefs, and ideas about change, improvement, or alternative possibilities, such as:

- *“What changes do visitors perceive as necessary to enhance their overall destination experience?”*
- *“How do hotel guests describe service encounters that shaped their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their stay?”*
- *“How do tourists recount interactions with staff or local residents that contributed to feeling welcomed?”*
- *“How do frontline employees describe aspects of service delivery processes that facilitate or hinder their daily work?”*
- *“How do residents envision improvements to tourism development and visitor management in their locality?”*
- *“How do visitors perceive the physical features that contribute to feeling comfortable at a hospitality setting or a destination?”*
- *“How do hospitality and tourism students perceive the relevance of their curriculum to current industry practices and expectations?”*

Although suggestion analysis may stand as a distinct analytic method in certain empirical studies (e.g., evaluative studies) and in which participants provide sufficiently clear suggestions, it can also be used in combination with broader analytical approaches such as thematic analysis and content analysis, depending on the overall aim of the study. When used as an independent method, it is particularly appropriate in studies where the primary aim is to generate actionable insights, evaluate programs, or identify participant-driven proposals for change. When a qualitative study also seeks to explore broader meanings, patterns, or contextual influences shaping participants' experiences, suggestion analysis may be combined with methods such as thematic or content analysis. In such cases, overarching experiential or interpretive findings can be complemented by a focused layer of suggestion-oriented analysis, ensuring that actionable implications are not obscured within thematic structures. In some studies, suggestion analysis may be applied sequentially, following an initial thematic or content analysis, contributing an additional layer of interpretive depth focused on actionable elements within participants' accounts.

Nevertheless, the method comes with certain limitations. The process of interpreting what qualifies as a “suggestion,” particularly when dealing with indirect language, requires significant judgment, contextual sensitivity and careful restraint. There is a particular risk of over-interpretation when descriptions of problems or dissatisfaction are treated as implied proposals for change without sufficiently clear evidence in participants' language. This makes the approach vulnerable to inconsistency or bias if not conducted reflexively and without transparent documentation, particularly when dealing with data linked to human intervention, such as in the case of counseling psychology (Morrow, 2005). This issue may become even more problematic if AI tools are used to “find” suggestions within a given dataset, without human intervention. There is also the risk of flattening complex narratives into simplified categories of action, particularly when producing outputs designed for practical use. Moreover, not all research questions are well-served by this method. For instance, in studies where meaning, identity, or symbolic expression are the focus, suggestion analysis may be too narrow to stand alone, as clarified previously. Finally, the emphasis on forward-looking ideas could inadvertently marginalize participants who do not offer

suggestions, either because they feel disempowered or because their critique lies not in proposing solutions but in naming systemic problems. To mitigate these limitations, researchers could engage in ongoing reflexive practice, revisiting the original data to ensure that interpretations remain grounded in participants' language and context, and to document decision-making transparently especially when identifying and categorizing suggestions.

5 CONCLUSION

The aim of this paper was to introduce suggestion analysis as a distinct form of qualitative analysis, by bringing attention to participants' own ideas and prompts for change. These suggestions, whether expressed directly or subtly, represent a powerful yet often overlooked form of data in the analysis process of qualitative data. By outlining its conceptual foundations, methodological steps, and practical applications, this paper has positioned suggestion analysis as a rather simple but nonetheless rigorous and adaptable approach. Rooted in a constructivist ontology and interpretivist epistemology, as critically examined in this paper, it treats suggestions not as isolated statements, but as socially situated communicative acts of meaning-making that are analytically valuable within qualitative inquiry. The five-step process, from familiarization through interpretation and presentation, provides a well-documented, easy and systematic way to engage with suggestions in all their forms, whether explicit, or embedded in broader narrative accounts.

Suggestion analysis may be employed on its own or integrated with broader qualitative approaches, such as thematic and content analysis, thereby enhancing studies that seek to combine experiential depth with practical and action-oriented outcomes. Indeed, as explained earlier, one of the greatest strengths of suggestion analysis lies in its immediate relevance to practice. In a current scientific research scene filled with requests for theoretical contributions which may prioritize theoretical or philosophical discussions, practical implications may not be given the appropriate attention by researchers. This is where suggestion analysis becomes useful. In fact, this is perhaps one of the greatest advantages of suggestion analysis: because the analysis of the data reveals participants' own ideas for change, while naturally lending itself to actionable outcomes. Unlike other forms of qualitative analysis that may marginalize data that may be put into practice, suggestion analysis produces findings that are actually oriented toward informing practices, policies, designs/redesigns, or programs. Ultimately, suggestion analysis expands the researcher's analytic lens, not only to what is but to what participants believe *could be*, hence contributing to direct, rich, and actionable recommendations for change or improvement. As the author of this paper, with extensive experience in qualitative research and analysis, I propose this analytical approach, whether used independently or alongside other methods, and invite future researchers to adopt it, critique it, expand its capabilities, examine its potential limitations, and further refine or evolve it.

REFERENCES

- Bazeley, P. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: Practical strategies*. Sage Publications.
 Bekhterev, V. M. (2017). *Suggestion and its role in social life*. Routledge.

- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 15(2), 219–234.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE publications.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2024). Thematic analysis. In F. Maggino (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 7187–7193). Springer.
- Christou, P. A. (2023). How to use artificial intelligence (AI) as a resource, methodological and analysis tool in qualitative research?. *Qualitative Report*, 28(7), 1968–1980.
- Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). What is participatory research?. *Social science & medicine*, 41(12), 1667–1676.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (3rd ed., pp. 1–43). Sage Publications.
- Drisko, J. W., & Maschi, T. (2016). *Content analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Feldman, R. (2013). Techniques and applications for sentiment analysis. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(4), 82–89.
- Finlay, L. (2002). Negotiating the swamp: the opportunity and challenge of reflexivity in research practice. *Qualitative Research*, 2(2), 209–230.
- Friese, S. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS.ti*. Sage Publications.
- Gill, R. (2000). Discourse analysis. *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*, 1, 172–190.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105–112.
- Jensen, C., Hoben, M., Chamberlain, S. A., K. Marshall, S., Young, R. A., & Gruneir, A. (2022). Data analyses using the action project method coding technique: a guide. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, 16094069221108035.
- Jewitt, C., Xambo, A., & Price, S. (2017). Exploring methodological innovation in the social sciences: the body in digital environments and the arts. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(1), 105–120.
- Johnstone, B., & Andrus, J. (2024). *Discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kuhn, D., & Weinstock, M. (2012). What is epistemological thinking and why does it matter?. In B.K. Hofer & P.R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Personal epistemology* (pp. 121–144). Routledge.
- Lee, C. J. G. (2012). Reconsidering constructivism in qualitative research. *Educational Philosophy and theory*, 44(4), 403–412.
- Liu, B. (2010). Sentiment analysis and subjectivity. In N. Indurkha & F.J. Damerau (Eds.), *Handbook of natural language processing* (pp. 627–666). Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Mayring, P. (2021). *Qualitative content analysis: A step-by-step guide*. SAGE publications.
- Michael, R. B., Garry, M., & Kirsch, I. (2012). Suggestion, cognition, and behavior. *Current directions in Psychological science*, 21(3), 151–156.
- Morgan, D. L., & Nica, A. (2020). Iterative thematic inquiry: A new method for analyzing qualitative data. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*, 19, 1609406920955118.
- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 250.
- Ocean, M., Montgomery, R., Jamison, Z., Hicks, K., & Thorne, S. (2022). Exploring the expansive properties of interpretive description: An invitation to anti-oppressive researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, 16094069221103665.
- Onuf, N. G. (2012). Constructivism. In N. Onuf (Ed.), *World of our making* (pp. 35–65). Routledge.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Sage Publications.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage Publications.

- Sanip, S. (2020). Research methodological challenges and recommendations for conducting a comparative qualitative longitudinal study across two countries on different continents. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 1609406920917493.
- Silver, C., & Lewins, A. (2014). *Using software in qualitative research: A step-by-step guide*. SAGE Publications
- Stemler, S. (2000). An overview of content analysis. *Practical assessment, research, and evaluation*, 7(1).
- Wankhade, M., Rao, A. C. S., & Kulkarni, C. (2022). A survey on sentiment analysis methods, applications, and challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(7), 5731–5780.
- Wiles, R., Crow, G., & Pain, H. (2011). Innovation in qualitative research methods: A narrative review. *Qualitative Research*, 11(5), 587–604.
- Willig, C. (2017). Interpretation in qualitative research. In C. Willig & W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2, 274–288. Sage Publications.
- Xiang, Z., Stienmetz, J., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2021). Smart Tourism Design: Launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on designing tourism places. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 86, 103154.
- Zhang, J. (2025). Patterns of innovation-driven tourism competitiveness: Insights from 270 Chinese cities. *Tourism Management*, 107, 105063.