The Embodied Subjectivities of Videography

Alkemeyer, Thomas

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

The Embodied Subjectivities of Videography

Thomas Alkemeyer *

Abstract: *»Die verkörperten Subjektivitäten der Videografie«.* In recent ethnographic research, videography represents the "gold standard," promising to bring more into observable view of an investigated reality than the mere human eye possibly could. While some approaches to videographic research do reflect on the social-constructional contribution of video-technological methods of visualization, they do not reflect on this aspect with regard to researchers as researching subjects in the practices of videographic research. This commentary addresses this "black box." From a praxeological and subjectification-theoretical perspective, it is interested in the construction of "videographically researching subjects" in the various social sites of videography, focuses on the materiality and (inter-)corporeality of these subjectivation processes, and addresses the epistemological risks inherent in the videographic privileging of the visual sense as well as the videotechnological possibilities of analyzing the collected data material, such as the risk of "scholastic fallacies" (Bourdieu 2000). In conclusion, some consequences are drawn from this framework for videographic research on violence and for reflecting on the meaning of the body in videography.

Keywords: Videography, practice theory/praxeology, subjectivation, materiality, (inter-)corporeality.

1. Introduction

Videographic research is, in the metaphorical sense, the embodiment of the programme of ethnography focused upon the publicly accessible dimensions of the social. Consequently, in this approach, "the cultural" is not regarded as being made up of immaterial (cognitive) artefacts, but is also accessed via its "public appearances," i.e., via its materialization, e.g., in spatial arrangements, things, bodily performances, and written documents. However, being "public" and "accessible" is not meant to imply that these social dimensions are simply open to view. Instead, there is work involved in making them observable such that observations are plausible and open to intersubjective

* Thomas Alkemeyer, CvO University Oldenburg, School of humanities and social sciences, Sociology and the sociology of sport, 26111 Oldenburg, Germany; thomas.alkemeyer@uni-oldenburg.de.

Historical Social Research 47 (2022) 1, 247-267 | published by GESIS
DOI: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.11

dialogue. Inherent to this work of plausibilization are research tools such as theories, concepts, and recording media – pen and paper, recorders, cameras, etc. – without which none of it can be achieved.

Especially in recent ethnographic works, much stock has been placed in technology such as video cameras and digital conservation, analysis, and evaluation systems. Videography and "camera ethnography" (Mohn 2018) have become the "gold standard" of recent ethnographic and praxeographic approaches. Their use promises to visibilize the situated bodily enactments of social practices (e.g., Knoblauch and Tuma 2017; Mohn 2018). Depending on the theoretical-methodological approach, electronic media such as cameras, computers, and software are understood either as instruments for recording, documenting, and preserving an empirically extant reality or as imaging devices "artificially" producing the object of research before it can be studied (Breidenstein et al. 2020). These technological media suggest the advantage of expanding or even replacing the researcher's capacity for recording, comprehending, and recalling, and of bringing that into the picture from different angles – long shots, medium shots, point-of-view shots, etc. – which previously evaded the gaze for various reasons (Mohn 2018, 4) or was not even accessible to the researcher's senses in situ: micro interactions, movements and gestures, facial expressions, local ecologies of action, etc. (e.g., Heath, Hindmarsh, and Luff 2010; Tuma 2017). Thus, when videographic imaging is used, the dimensions of the social that are as ephemeral as they are "silent" feature heavily (Hirschauer 2006). Examples of this can be found in the study of the corporeality of interaction and subjectivation in classrooms, gyms, or factories (e.g., Mohn and Amann 2006; Pille 2013; Brümmer and Alkemeyer 2016; Meyer, Streeck and Jordan 2017; Streeck 2017; Engel 2020; Meyer 2021) or the situated (re-)production of power and dominance relations in practices of staged and "real" violence (e.g., Collins 2008).

To the extent, firstly, that emphasis is given to the *documentary* potential of videography, allowing access to empirical reality that is especially amenable to objectivation providing a platform for detailed analysis, there is, however, the risk of – perhaps somewhat ironically – losing sight of the social constructional work of the methods themselves. This risk can be avoided, secondly, by a camera-ethnographic approach that takes an offensive approach and understanding the *work* of visibilization as an analytical strategy (e.g., Mohn 2018). In this view, the object of research emerges in an interplay of active imaging, or rather image-making, in which epistemological approaches, knowledge, vague intuition, technical capabilities and the skills of the researchers interact. Nevertheless, the common denominator of both of these approaches is that they at best rudimentarily also reflect upon construction stemming from researching subjectivity – i.e., a mixture of bodily activities, experiencing, perceiving, and thinking – tied to videographic research

practices.[1] Such reflection is critical for at least two reasons: on the one hand, because findings simply cannot be attained without finders, i.e., researchers; on the other hand, because subjectivity is not an a priori or permanent factor, but rather emerges first and foremost in the course of practices – i.e., in this case, in the course of (video-)ethnographic research.

This chapter addresses this "black box" of videographic methodology. It asks how researchers are constituted as researching subjects in the various social sites,[2] phases, and situations of videography (data production, data analysis, publication of findings, etc.) and how they constitute themselves. Without making any claim to being exhaustive, we will consider in the following the practices of a) observing and collecting data in the field and b) analyzing the collected material in data sessions: What happens to the researchers under the socio-material and socio-technical conditions of these sites? How are they involved in the practices carried out there? How do they engage in these practices themselves? And how do the subjectivities of the researchers and the sites of research co-constitute each other in these practices? Of course, these are questions that actually affect all research. Therefore, it will be vital to keep sight of their videographic specificity by, e.g., considering the question of the extent to which the medium of video, due to the "mechanical objectivity" (Daston and Galison 2007) attributed to it, is particularly "enticing" in imagining video-technically observable reality as objective reality external to the researcher and, correspondingly, viewing researchers as "readymade" extant subjects who observingly gaze upon this reality.

The thus expressed interest in the constitution of "videographically researching subjects" is in accordance with a post-structuralist sociology that *decentralizes* the category of the subject but does *not eliminate* it completely. In this sense, this chapter makes the case for a sociology of videographic research practice recognizing that an understanding of provinces of meaning studied by means of videography that aims to transcend folk theories and spontaneous sociologies of everyday life cannot be achieved without appropriately enabled[3] "researching subjects": Researchers are no mere apparatuses for the accurate recording of a given reality at hand, but instead *they* make distinctions, choose focal points in their observations, adjust their gaze, discover one thing but overlook another, give shape to what is being

[1] By "practices" in plural we (e.g., Alkemeyer, Buschmann and Michaeler 2017) mean specifically, in the sense of Schatzki (2002), recognizable practice formats such as playing football, filling out a bank transfer, or doing an ethnography. "Practice" in the singular, in turn, refers to the contingent embodied performance of practices.

[2] Schatzki (2002) uses the concept of "site" to refer to a specific type of social order in which material arrangements and practices coexist.

[3] See Alkemeyer and Buschmann (2017) for a broader praxeological explanation of how the term "enablement" refers to the practical process of equipping bodies and their people with requisite skills to be "in tune" with a given practice.

discovered, point to, communicate, evaluate, and take responsibility.[4] However, it is explicitly not our intention to assert a constitutional-theoretical primacy of the individual. Rather, our basic assumption is that both the enablement to research as well as the actual research activity only take their concrete form within the interplay of research practice; and this interplay does not only involve the interaction of human beings, the type of interactant we perhaps most anticipate, but also of participating things and artefacts (spaces, technologies, knowledge, language, etc.).

Consequently, the focus of this interest in the *subjectification* of researchers is the constitutive conditionality of their subjectivity through the materiality, corporeality, and technicality of these practices. For ethnographic research practice, this emphasis on the bodily-material binding of all action is also particularly relevant because it is precisely in this methodological approach to social reality that the bodies and senses of researchers operate as prominent media. In this regard, the issue of what the *video*-ethnographic variant of ethnographic research means for the researching bodies and senses becomes highly pertinent – especially in cases when processes are being observed, such as practices of violence, that not only specifically concern and involve the corporeality of the researched but also those of the researchers.

Before being able to address the specifics of videographic research on violence (V) at the end of this chapter, reflections on the specific corporeality (II) and materiality of videographic research in its various sites of collecting (III) and evaluating (IV) "research data" are required.[5]

2. Bodies as Media and Subjects of Ethnographic Research

Subjectification takes place when humans are confronted with the material constellations and "co-participants" of their life-worlds. This confrontation oscillates between passivity and activity: On the one hand, humans are exposed to these worlds, they are addressed and contacted by them, required to respond, or are even injured. And, on the other hand, they have an active effect on these worlds. Both dimensions are bound to their corporeal existence: There is no contact without the contactable, no activity without a body directed towards a world surrounding it. This applies to any activity, also

[4] In this sense, selectivity is not a deficiency but rather a methodological necessity vis-à-vis the (videographic) *illusio* of being able to gain a complete overview of what is going on in the field.

[5] For the issue at hand, it is helpful to adhere to this basic distinction of the different sites of video-ethnographic research. Although some video-ethnographic approaches postulate a continuous switch between data collection "in the field" and data interpretation "at home" (Mohn 2018, 6), this also seems prudent insofar as this distinction is in line with the reality of this method as it is typically performed.

including seemingly purely intellectual preoccupations such as reading or doing arithmetic; they happen in a specific place, involve specific things (such as books, paper, or tablets), and are performed via typical movements, gestures, and postures.

Accordingly, we use the term subjectification to describe precisely the processes in which specific dispositions and styles of acting, feeling, and thinking are formed *in* and *between* different practices together with historically and socially determined body techniques (Alkemeyer 2013).

This circumstance is of particular relevance for ethnographic research because ethnographers usually engage with their respective research field over longer periods of time with all their senses in order to gain insights that could not be obtained if they were to adopt a merely contemplative stance. Of course, it is valid that the form and degree of this engagement can differ considerably – this can range from a casually accompanying observation to an "enactive ethnography" (Wacquant 2015) requiring the decisive involvement down to one's "flesh and blood." Nevertheless, the common denominator of all ethnographic engagement is that ethnographers do not merely register "surface signals" (Amann and Hirschauer 1997, 25), like technical recording devices, but also comprehend what is going on around them. Their bodies function as basic sensory media of cognition and comprehension: they sense emerging moods, resonating undertones, changing intensities, and implicit tensions (Scheffer 2002, 362); depending on the position, perspective, and intensity of the researching engagement, certain aspects of the reality in the field impose themselves on the sensorium of the body as remarkable (salient), characteristic (significant), and meaningful (relevant), while others are barely registered as diffuse background noise.

Inevitably, specific skills go into this sensing recognition that have been imprinted on the researching bodies during their inner- and outer-academic socialization as schemata for perception, reactions, and evaluation that are continually being further developed and reshaped. Their "feel" for the field is *immediate* in the sense that it is based on bodily reactions that can never be completely controlled, but it does occur in a *not unmediated* way in that these reactions are bound to experiences without which the ethnographer would not be the subject as who they are researching. Thus, inner-academically, e.g., one's membership in a school of thought as communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991) act as an agency of mediation for this responsivity. In their research communities, (prospective) researchers absorb the respective canonical research discourses and form, within the framework of a *collective* pedagogy *implicit* in the respective research practices, characteristic

skills, routines, and styles of doing ethnography. This socialization in academia, in turn, overlaps with experiences made elsewhere.[6]

Moreover, how the senses for ethnography are actually set up is not only determined by socialization but is also *situational*.[7] This is because receptivities and perception styles incorporated during socialization are nothing more than *dispositions* that are available in and around research practice as a repertoire of *possible* resources. Which of these possibilities are actually mobilized in the practices of research and the shape they will ultimately take depends on research situations and their material-semiotic interplay: on their spatial arrangements, lighting conditions, soundscapes, smells, and climatic conditions; on the "object(ive) meanings" (Holzkamp 1973) and affordances (Gibson 1977) of the objects and technologies involved; and on framing discourses and media representations.

The multisensorial gestalt and atmosphere of and in the field always play a vital role in determining whether and how the researchers' socialized senses are addressed, stimulated, and focused. Researchers are therefore never completely in control of what appears relevant to them, what attracts or repels them, and of the emotions, feelings, and thoughts with which they respond. Instead, their response behaviour results from the "aleatory encounter" (Althusser 2006) of their incorporated dispositional repertoire with the conditions of the field and the research situation. This does not only hold for highly participatory (auto-)ethnographies, but also for accompanying observations "from the sidelines": *All* observation takes place in an *intercorporeal* space in which a specific interkinesthetic interplay emerges between observer and observed. The objects, movements, and gestures that are observable in the field potentially have infinite properties and meanings. Their polysemy and ambiguity is limited only by the interplay of the objective situational conditions with the subjectively incorporated dispositions of the researcher.

We conceive such situated embodied subjectivity as "corporeality-in-accomplishment" (Alkemeyer, Buschmann, and Michaeler 2017), combining Bourdieu's assumption of a permanent incorporation of dispositions (habitus) with the performative-theoretical insight into the situated shaping of a particular body in the course of the accomplishment of a practice or practices. Thus, the concept is critically positioned both against the substantialist notion of fixed bodies that are always self-identical where- and whenever they may be and against the radically post-substantialist idea of a completely fluid ontology according to which bodies are different depending on their

[6] Meier zu Verl and Tuma (2021, 139) view these already incorporated experiences as "enabling resources." But, as prominently demonstrated by Fleck (1980), they can also entail a blinkered way of thinking hampered by tunnel vision to what is already known.

[7] In the sense used by Goffman (1963, 22) vis-à-vis that which is merely-situated, i.e., happens to occur in situations.

involvement in whatever they are doing or having done to them (Boll 2019, 15). "Bodies-in-accomplishment" draws attention in a positive sense to how permanently incorporated bundles of dispositions are *selectively* mobilized in the here and now of practical performance. The concept turns focus towards the conditions and processes in which *specific* dispositional "elements" of a habitus that transcend situations via incorporation are updated in a respective practice at hand and are adjusted to its (normative) expectations, while *other* dispositions remain silent and invisible in the background.

Contrary to a cognitivistic, overly cerebral understanding of competence, knowledge, consciousness, and reflexivity, in this perspective, all abilities are grounded in concrete activities and correspondingly organized bodies-in-accomplishment. This concept of a subject that is only constituted in practice – critically opposed to classical notions of autonomous subjects – also clearly brings its susceptibility to disturbances and interference into view, thus opening up the possibility of reflecting on such disturbances and making them productive for research. In any moment of practice during the aleatoric encounter with other human and non-human participants, once socialized incorporated dispositions – affects, memories, behavioural routines – can involuntarily come to the fore, although their appearance was not foreseen in the current practice: A body socialized in ballet finds it difficult to learn the completely different movement system of taiji because, time and again, it falls back into the dance movement patterns of its bodily "primary language" (Mitchell 2022fc); while witnessing violent scenes in family settings, the participatory objectifying view of an ethnographer can suddenly be infiltrated by the painful memory of one's own family history threatening to lead to a loss of control in and over the research situation, etc. These examples alone illustrate that the unity of a body-in-accomplishment is always threatened by irritation or even disintegration. The consequences are empirically open-ended: Uncertainty, hesitation, stopping completely, and exiting are just as possible as, e.g., using the emergent disturbance constructively, taking it as an opportunity for self-reflection and the cultivation of other modes of behaviour.

3. On the Conditionality of Research Subjects through the Materiality and Technologicity of Data Collection Practices

The social theoretical insight into the situatedness and susceptibility of socializationally predisposed bodies-in-accomplishment is relevant to the understanding of *all* practices. (Video-)ethnographic research practices are a particular type of practice in that, on a theoretical and methodological basis, they aim to explore practices observed "in the field" that appear to

researchers as being "somehow" remarkable. Like other practices, they have their own traditions, routines, rules, etc., and their performance is subject to the concrete conditions and "potential of the situation" (Jullien 2004 [1996]). These circumstances, which are both trans-situationally constant and situationally transient, do not completely predetermine concrete research practice, but they do prefigure it and, thus, also condition a certain forming of researching subjectivity in its corporeal and cognitive dimensions.

In the case of videographic research practices, the gravity of this issue of co-constitutive interdependence of research practice and its subject is increased due to the specific role of technology. Therefore, in the following, the main focus will be on this aspect's contribution: From a constructivist perspective, I expressly do not view the technologies involved in research in a culturally critical manner as artefacts that betray the romanticized ideal of a genuine, original "sensual ethnography" (Schulz 2015) steeped in corporeal immediacy and that distort research findings, but rather as *productive* media that allow for and enable certain *observational* and *visual practices* in the first place[8] – but nevertheless, this does not mean refraining from weighing their utility and the problems they may cause.

Regardless of where and how these technologies are put to use in research – positioned "where the action is" in a fixed position as a still or a hand-held camera, at the editing table, or in data sessions – they are a basic constitutive part of a *visual* culture of doing ethnography: They privilege *seeing* as a medium for gaining insight, they orient the researchers' senses towards what is visible, call for a specific kind of *perceptiveness* and institute the researched bodies as *observed* bodies, i.e., as "speaking," "revealing," "communicative" displays that carry clues to their past and transmit information in the present and can subsequently be transformed into the subject of semiotic or performative interpretation processes. Therefore, videographic technologies weigh a *sensory regime* that at least implicitly implies the inferiority of not only auditive perceptiveness but also the seismographic perceptive qualities of smell, taste, and touch (Schulz 2015, 46): they support a cultural "hegemony of the eye" (Comolli 1985, 46) that attributes greater importance to the visible for the constitution of (social) reality than other sensory layers of meaning. This culturally specific type of visualism is also already prevalent in all the ethnographic approaches in which the meaning of "observing" tends to be reduced to "looking" instead of also including other sensory channels. Moreover, videographic approaches tend to exacerbate the hegemony of the eye to the extent that they embody trust in the technological optimization of seeing and, thus, fuel the *illusio* of being able to achieve ever greater transparency, even more "in*sight*" and deeper knowledge by means of improvements in visualization technologies.

[8] I wish to thank Carolin Holzkamp for this reference.

Understanding these technologies only as visual aids, mnemonic devices, or even as a substitute for physical participation in the field, clearly falls short. For their use not only supplements, enhances, or replaces researchers' sensory organs but also influences and organizes their sensory perception apparatus and consequently prefigures specific self-relations as well as relations vis-à-vis what is occurring in the field. In other words, they are constitutively involved in the formation of specific bodies-in-accomplishment of videography, in which seeing dominates the other senses in its sensory regime. This privileging of vision and the visible corresponds to a tendency to forget those sensory layers of reality that are hidden from the (camera's) eye because they can only be experienced, accessed, and comprehended through other senses such as sounds, tastes, smells, and haptics. It is only the interplay of all these sensory layers that furnishes social goings-on and processes with their characteristic multisensory structure, their affective signature and dynamic nature, i.e., an atmosphere emerges that draws in or repels, electrifies, or leaves cold, feels threatening, or calming – and not in the same way for all participants, but dependent on the dispositions they bring to the table.

If we now consider more closely how seeing is organized in videographic practice in the field, then camera positions obtain salience. Cameras can provide an overview via long shots, medium shots, or from vantage points in the air, now made increasingly feasible by drone technology; they can – also as fixed cameras or mobile hand-helds – imitate or follow the point of view of individual actors; researchers can select different fields of view (framing), they can zoom in or out and shift focus. Each of these camera positioning options unveils certain things and belongs to its own "scopic regime" (Meyer and von Wedelstädt 2013), i.e., to a particular way of aligning visual perception.

At the same time, this implies that every camera position and usage corresponds to its own bodily-mental *involvement* (Goffman 1966, 33). Cameras are not only positioned instrumentally, but they also position their users (Janetzko 2021, 45). Thus, the "synoptic perspective" of the overview camera easily promotes an attitude of omniscience and superiority. This attitude then leads to "scholastic fallacies" (Bourdieu 2000, 49) when the difference between the synoptic view and the perspectives of the "little people," i.e., between being involved at an objectifying distance versus directly, is forgotten. The same holds true for illusions of proximity or even the identity of the researchers' and participants' perspective when the camera gets in the mix of what is going on.

Permanently installed cameras at least have the advantage of enabling researchers to have their hands free: While the camera can literally be left to its own devices to "stare" at whatever it is pointed at, an ethnographer can move freely in the field, let their senses roam, and switch between different modes of perception as the field and their dispositions allow (Scheffer 2002, 363). In

contrast, a handheld camera requires continuous operation and must be focused, adjusted, and monitored. It absorbs a good portion of the researcher's attention and, in research practice itself, enters into an *intercorporeal* relationship with the researching body. Practice of and experience with getting used to the camera gradually combine to form a "techno-corporal actor" (Rammert and Schubert 2017, 351). This hybrid research entity then participates in the field in its own way. The categorical boundaries between body and technology blur both in introspective perception and from the symbolically significant external perspective: In self-experience, the camera is gradually integrated into the "space of muscular sensation" (Wittgenstein 1998 [1964], 102) of the researching body-in-accomplishment; the camera and its imaging (visual) facilities become an integral, oftentimes techno-emotionally laden part of the movements, perceptions, and sensations of this body, i.e., via the camera the hybrid body-in-accomplishment incorporates its environment into its perception and recognizes above all the aspects that appear to it to be "filmworthy." At the same time, for the other field participants, the camera also symbolically identifies its user as a competent researcher. In this sense, it is not only a research instrument but also a medium of dramaturgical self-presentation and -positioning of the researcher (Laube 2021). Thus, camera-mediated interaction with other actors in the field dissolves the "reciprocity of eye" in the sense of Simmel (1907) (Boll 2019, 94) and institutionalizes the researcher for all participants as an actively observing subject, while the actors are addressed and instantiated as viewable and seen.[9] Such (self-)displays inevitably also steer the researcher's bodily-mental relationship towards themselves and the field: it builds distance between the viewers and the viewed, subject and object, ultimately, e.g., hindering participatory research. In the context of videographic research, this distance could only be closed by also equipping the research subjects – insofar as the field allows – with cameras in order to capture the research field as co-researchers from *their* perspective.

4. Privileging Accurate Vision and the Risks of Scholastic Errors

The socio-material or socio-technical arrangements of the *sites* of analysis form their own constellations of "human-medial interaction" (Brümmer 2019, 283), specifically steering and shaping researchers' subjectivity. In this sense, video processing of the material collected in the field via software at

[9] In the context of (potentially) violent interactions, the conspicuity of researchers due to the use of a camera can also pose a risk, as recently demonstrated by journalist teams covering COVID-19 protests.

the editing table and/or in front of screens already enables and demands special working practices, routines, micro gestures, and attentional attitudes.

At this juncture, we will now focus on collective data sessions, as they belong to the standard practice of videographic research. In the format of data sessions, the synthetic face-to-screen relationship (Knorr Cetina 2009; Motowidlo and Trischler 2018) of the participating researchers to the visually represented field is embedded in the physical co-presence of the interpretive community. Here, video recordings are no mere neutral data material, but "materialised memory" (Brümmer 2019, 283) exhibiting a specific kind of affordance: they invite co-analysis and develop by virtue of their visual and audio dimensions the symbolic power to recall – from a distance and after the fact – thoughts, feelings, and states of mind that were associated with them in the situations of their collection (Bourdieu 1990, 69; Schnettler and Knoblauch 2009, 283).

These recordings then, fed medially into data sessions, are therefore not faithful copies of past observations and experiences, but representations from which a reality sui generis is created in the here and now of collective data-interpretive practice: The recordings recall traces of the past field-research reality, from which an image of this reality is created in its own right by means of mimetic procedures of showing, speaking, writing, editing, etc. These imaging practices involve and steer the interpreters' sensorium and thinking in a special way: The data session installs a dispositive of observation in which previously unrecognized characteristics and properties are elicited via media-technological means from the traces of the pictorially appresented field reality. At the same time, in this dispositive, the observers expose themselves with their observations to a community of practice that observes them and, in turn, their observations.

Only collective "elicitation work" (Knorr Cetina 1988, 89) creates a videographically accessible reality as an epistemic object in its own right. This work involves skills that are instructed in education settings as well as in research practice itself. These include – in addition to a fundamental willingness to engage empathetically and reflexively in interaction – skills of the practical use of video technology as well as techniques of professional videographic filming, viewing, and transcribing (e.g., Goodwin 1994; Schindler 2017), such as complex documents containing time-stamps, text, and images (Janetzko 2021, 68) that allow videographically represented practices to be decoded "frame by frame" (e.g., Streeck and Mehus 2004; Heath, Hindmarsh, and Luff 2010). These techniques would be inconceivable without video technology. The functions that the technology enables allow sections of recordings to be repeated (play back), slowed down (slow motion), and frozen in time (stills); researchers can zoom in and out, cut and reassemble, omit or supplement, (re-)arrange, and compare sequences side by side. For appropriately disposed and trained researchers, these technologies promise their own

"utility value": they invite the exploitation of what is technically possible, not infrequently developing an attraction in their own right. The researcher's social *libido* (Bourdieu 1998, 78-9) is then distributed between the object of research and the attraction of the technically possibilities.

However, the increase in epistemological value added by such technologically supported analytical practices corresponds with certain risks. Here, I expressly do not mean that they are accompanied by a loss of the insight-generating qualities of immediately lived research experience. On the contrary, I aim to elucidate precisely the risks that result from the specific stance of this lived experience due to the use of imaging technologies.[10] Playback, slow motion, zoom, etc. can indeed contribute productively to the ethnographic estrangement of the mundane and familiar and increase researchers' awareness of the temporality and richness of detail of what occurred in the field. But they also support a tendency to (mis-)read the extended temporality of slowed-down videos as the temporality of real events and, thus, invisibilize the time pressure weighing on actors in "real" practice, making it impossible for them to pay attention to details in and alongside their actions. In practice, actors orient themselves with all their senses less to details – especially decontextualized details – but to movement gestalts (Meyer 2021, 167), i.e., to abstract compositions that permeate every detail. By establishing distance between people's experience and the researcher's experience of time and reality – slow motion not only slows down the depicted movements, but also stretches the potential time span for interpretive seeing – the technical possibilities of digital analysis may even hinder the understanding of an observable practice rather than assisting it (Schmidl 2021).

All in all, the video-technological possibilities to make things observable run the risk of allowing researchers to believe that they see and, thus, know *more* than those they are researching. In this case, they promote an attitude of superiority and a tendency towards a scholastic misjudgement of reality, which over time may even congeal into a specific kind of research habitus. This applies in particular to those extreme cases of video data analysis in which video material produced by others and elsewhere – e.g., by law enforcement officers – is used. Some researchers even see an advantage here: the researching subject is not exposed to the confusion and disorder of the real situation, but can calmly view and analyze the material, free from stress, emotional excitement, and their own corporeal involvement (e.g., Nassauer and Legewie 2020, 137-8). However, in such a contemplative attitude, a tendency to "see" *order in(to)* the events easily develops, whereas a corporeally involved observing subject would be more likely to perceive chaos. An aspect

[10] By shifting emphasis in such a manner, I am taking a position against the assumption of a specific visual persuasiveness (Burri 2008, 238) of images as images. Rather, from a praxeological perspective, it is instead the practices of their usage that, e.g., renders evidence or suggests objectivity (Schade and Wenk 2011).

of scholastic misjudgement that is particularly significant for the study of violent practices is that the socio-technical constitution of the reality recalled and recreated in data sessions as an object of *observation* promotes a tendency to overemphasize the communicative dimensions of events because they can be seen so clearly: being and making visible makes the events appear one-dimensionally as a symbolic interaction (characterized by body language). What falls by the wayside is the experience of affects, feeling vulnerable and threatened that only arises in the situation itself, as well as the necessity for the participants to react to the behaviour of others in the situation in mediated immediacy, i.e., quasi-intuitively.

In recent approaches, there are attempts to combat these risks of scholastic misjudgement via performative methods such as re- and pre-enactment (e.g., Tuma 2017, 113). In these research methods, the researching bodies act as media of emphasis, depiction, demonstration, emotionality, understanding, problematizing, and reflecting by selectively re-enacting or pre-enacting videographed movements, gestures, and forms of interaction. The method thus utilizes that class-, milieu-, gender-, or situation-specific practical knowledge materializes in movements, postures, and gestures. It promises to shed light on the cultural layers of meaning and social (power) relations that are thus (re-)enacted or to uncover erroneous conclusions that can result from a purely contemplative-observational and discursive-reasoning approach to the data (Meier zu Verl and Tuma 2021, 135).

Indeed, re-enactment could, e.g., gain access to the mechanisms of symbolic violence of shame and humiliation that unfold subtly in seemingly insignificant utterances, looks, and micro gestures. However, the exact opposite could also occur in *those* cases when re-enactment authenticates the illusion of a deeper understanding of the videographically appresented reality, or when it is used to plausibilize one's own interpretations. Re-enacting then serves first and foremost to "authenticate and bear witness" (Weingart 2004, 106) by making a particular interpretation of the images seem more obvious. Thus, making performatively visible suggests that the discrepancy between the sites of field research and data sessions could be bridged by the power of imagination, but it disguises that in both sites, different bodies-in-accomplishment are constituted and that the material collected in the field is no longer the same when it is used as a medium in a data session. Insofar as this is not sufficiently reflected, it can contribute to the subjectification of the group of interpreters as a "collective subject" (Alkemeyer, Bröckling, and Peter 2018), whose "individual parts" no longer question or challenge each other, but instead assure the correctness of their collective interpretation and thus their unity leading in the extreme case to epistemologically unfruitful "groupthink."

5. Some Consequences for Videographic Research on Violence

Every social site of videographic research produces its own reality: In the field, via practices of recording, what is deemed relevant is translated into written and visual data; in data sessions, these data are then the material for technologically mediated interpretations; these, in turn, under the aegis of representational conventions and established narratives, enter into practices of notation in which interpretations are condensed into narratives. Each of these sites engages and constitutes researchers' subjectivity in their own particular way.

For research on violence, this is relevant in several respects. First of all, it concerns access to the field as well as the possibilities of research participation in it. For instance, researchers are not made equal in their capabilities for participating in violent practices such as boxing (Wacquant 2006), mixed martial arts (Staack 2019), or street fighting. In particular, actual participation requires a body that is able to form a type of recognizable enablement vis-à-vis the normative standards of the practices at hand: it must be enabled and thus capable of adequate styles of action and competences, e.g., of "meting out" and "taking one's licks," inflicting and enduring pain, of seeing, perceiving, and feeling, as well as an appearance that fulfils field-immanent norms (of masculinity, combativeness, discipline, etc.). Since bodies are "built" and socially disposed differently, it is obvious that not everybody is formable as an enabled body-in-accomplishment. The possibility of access and one's ability to play along are, thus, fundamentally conditioned by embodied dispositions and experiences of violence, and this conditionality, in turn, prefigures what and how something imposes itself on the participants as relevant, is recorded as data and interpreted and expounded upon in further phases of the research process.[11]

Overall, videographic research on violence seems to tend to reduce phenomena of violence to the moment of occurrence, situationistically to privilege *physical violence* taking place in the moment and bound to individual actors, and to steer researchers' sensorium towards this violence. Thus, such a "default setting" for research allows trans-situational contexts and structural relations of violence that do not automatically entail direct physical violence to slip through its fingers, or rather senses. Even with regard to physical

[11] Video technology intensifies the issue of access. Structural as well as physical and symbolic violence often occurs hidden and unannounced in everyday life. Even publicly accessible violence can only be captured on camera to a limited extent. Also, for this reason videographic violence research gladly accepts videos that for example are produced by "passers-by" such as police or mass media (Nassauer and Leggewie 2020). These videos often reproduce socially established and relatable imaginings of violence and in turn ignore other imaginings.

practices of violence, the visual medium of video technology promotes a one-sided focus of attention on the visibly apparent, communicative-symbolic dimensions of bodily interaction at the expense of both structural contexts and those intercorporeal and interkinesthetic dimensions of violence that cannot be directly inferred from images. However, it is precisely these dimensions that become particularly salient in situations of (the threat of) physical violence. For here, the participants perceive themselves not only as social actors in the sense of displays and "addresses" for messages and behavioural expectations, but also as "raw" bodies from whose position, distance, accumulation, and movement relevant information must be gleaned instantaneously for their own navigation and "survival."[12] Unlike in many other social situations, the participants here are addressed "holistically" – with all their characteristics, senses, and affects – they are taken in and carried away by what is happening. Akin to "speed sports" – football, tennis, or ice hockey (Luhmann 2008, 251, fn. 60) – they are required to *react* directly to rapidly changing body constellations. This happens in the medium of a (more or less trained) intuition-guided perception that does not take a time-consuming detour via reflective consciousness and presupposes a corresponding stance of a body-in-accomplishment with all its motor and sensory dispositions.

The enormous, even existential discrepancy between the body-in-accomplishment required in a situation characterized by violence and the body-in-accomplishment, e.g., in data sessions can hardly be bridged by re-enacting video recordings. Rather, the total appropriation of the bodies involved, the extreme case of which, e.g., in the case of torture (or severe illness), consists of being thrown back on one's elementary corporeal self and deprived of the cultural meaning and communicability of being (Scarry 1985), can only be experienced in situ under the condition that the videographer also physically exposes themselves to what is going on (Lindemann 2017, 64; Collins 2008).[13] Only then can they gain analytical access to those moments and dimensions of what is being researched, whose logic, mechanisms and effects cannot be recognized from "the outside" and, consequently, can hardly be gleaned from video recordings: the sensory intensity of what is happening, the affective energy of people shouting and screaming, the trampling and kicking of feet, the sound of fists or other "percussive tools" as they hit objects and bodies, the symbolic violence contained in a look, a gesture or intonation, altogether then all the dimensions of intercorporeal relations that could be described with the cultural studies term of *presence* (Gumbrecht 2012).

These dimensions are not accessible and comprehensible via distanced observation and interpretation searching for meaning, but only through

[12] Wacquant (2006) offers a particularly perspicuous demonstration in this regard in his autoethnography of boxing.

[13] Of course, this is only possible in an extremely limited sense as the case of torture demonstrates.

exposure, participation, and co-experience. Researching them therefore necessarily requires the researcher's participation in the embodied practices being researched, preferably on a regular basis and over a longer period of time (Meyer 2021, 168). For only in this case do the researchers also form a requisite body-in-accomplishment, which under certain circumstances allows them to identify, re-enact, and finally translate into a suitable language, even in a videographic data corpus, those moments and effects of violent intercorporality that have a pre-reflexive effect and can hardly be verbalized. Otherwise, if interpretation only draws on material filmed by others and elsewhere, or if the videographer in the field was exclusively occupied with the practices of videographic recording and did not also physically engage with the recorded events themselves, the threat of the scholastic distortions alluded to are nearby.

6. Conclusion

Videographic practices privilege the visual dimensions of the social and, thus, the researchers' vision. Consequently, they develop a tendency to dethematize everything that eludes this sense. This tendency cannot be completely remedied by performative methods of analysis and interpretation that aim to bring the insight-generating qualities of other senses into play. Particularly when research interest is aimed at social and affective dynamics or the (de-)subjectivizing effects of violent practices, it is probably indispensable for the researcher to enter the practical fray or – where this is not possible – to refer to insider perspectives and the (textual and pictorial) representations from actors and "victims."

Understanding, as elucidated above, is always also a body matter, and bodies matter in that they understand differently because they are socialized differently. In addition, the bodies of the researchers are also adapted differently to the various sites and phases of research, and, thus, the researchers form disparate bodies-in-accomplishment in these contexts, whose coherence solely results from their dispositions.

This insight into the decenteredness of researching bodies and, thus, of researching subjects does not, however, speak per se against video-ethnographic research that simply cannot do without the seismographic qualities and research skills of embodied subjects. But it does warrant the consideration of the socializational, situational, and technological conditionality of researchers' skills and capacities, as well as reflection on the fact that they are only *enabled* to carry out specific research actions in the situated interplay of practice consisting of people, bodies, things, artefacts, and technologies. For only such a continuous reflection on the constitutional conditions of one's own research and the insights gained therein keeps the otherwise non-topical

influence of these conditions on the research process in check, counteracts the illusion of immediate understanding, and, taking both limits and possibilities into account, allows a reflected use of one's subjectively incorporated capacity for insights. The sociological trick of the trade would then not only consist of using procedures of estrangement to make visible those predominantly unrecognized, taken-for-granted premises hidden in the self-evident that underlie the actions and utterances of those being studied (Hoebel 2021) but also to apply these procedures to the research and its researching subjects (Querfurt 2016, 112).

From a praxeological perspective, such a reflection on the constitutive conditionality of researching bodies-in-accomplishment and, thus, of the production of knowledge in practice would also have to be organized methodically. For instance, conceivable would be reflected *formation* of researcher subjectivity through systematic participation in disparate sites of research in conjunction with specific practices of reflection – e.g., following Bertolt Brecht's theory of Gestus. In his programme of theatre pedagogy, which is explicitly designated as a sociological research laboratory, Brecht understands (routinized) movements, postures, and gestures – with striking parallels to Bourdieu – as forms of storage and accomplishment of ways of thinking that have become self-evident, whose alienation, realization, and critique can, therefore, be achieved through a playful-experimental approach to them (Steinweg 2005). In the context of this approach, the performative play with specific body techniques of, e.g., research would not serve the re-enactment of videographed images, but would be a corporeal-practical strategy for the socio-analysis of the researching subjects, possibly supplemented by a methodical dialogue with actors and experts from the field in joint data sessions in which their image production, para-ethnographic knowledge, perspectives, and linguistic forms are also articulated, "tapped into," and made reflexively fruitful. "Small performative forms of visualization" (Tuma 2017, 113) such as re-enactment would then be only *one* methodological aspect in complex constellations of triangulation, in which different approaches – group discussion, (text-image) transcriptions, collages, and many more – reciprocally inform, question, and fruitfully challenge each other.

For researchers, such strategies and tricks would bring an increase in autonomy insofar as they would gain a critical distance not only from the taken-for-grantedness in the researched field, but also from their own research practices and the stances of their subjectivity generated in these practices. In this way, not only alternative perspectives on the field open up but also on their own research practices (Hoebel 2021). The methodologically reflected movement *between* the different sites, practices, and phases of research, the performative play with typical body constellations and routines as well as the systematic dialogue of different standpoints and perspectives would, thus, generate conditions for becoming aware of the conditionality and

particularity of one's own perceptions and for reflectively helping to shape one's own researching subjectivity in the complex interplay of (self-)determination.

References

Alkemeyer, Thomas. 2013. Subjektivierung in sozialen Praktiken. Umrisse einer praxeologischen Analytik. In *Selbst-Bildungen. Soziale und kulturelle Praktiken der Subjektivierung*, ed. Thomas Alkemeyer, Gunilla Budde, and Dagmar Freist, 33-68. Bielefeld: transcript.

Alkemeyer, Thomas, Ulrich Bröckling, and Tobias Peter. 2018. *Jenseits der Person. Zur Subjektivierung von Kollektiven*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Alkemeyer, Thomas, and Nikolaus Buschmann. 2017. Learning in and across Practices. Enablement as Subjectivation. In *The Nexus of Practices: Connections, constellations, practitioners*, ed. Allison Hui, Theodore Schatzki, and Elizabeth Shove, 8-23. London: Routledge.

Alkemeyer, Thomas, Nikolaus Buschmann, and Matthias Michaeler. 2017. Critique in Praxis: Arguments for a Subjectivation Theoretical Expansion on Practice Theory. In *Praxeological Political Analysis*, ed. Michael Jonas and Beate Littig, 67-83. London: Routledge.

Althusser, Louis. 2006. The underground current of the materialism of the encounter. In *Philosophy of the encounter: Later writings, 1978-1987*, ed. Oliver Corpet and François Matheron, 163-207. London, UK: Verso.

Amann, Klaus, and Stefan Hirschauer. 1997. Die Befremdung der eigenen Kultur. Ein Programm. In *Die Befremdung der eigenen Kultur. Zur ethnographischen Herausforderung soziologischer Empirie*, 7-52. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Boll, Tobias. 2019. *Autopornografie. Eine Autoethnografie mediatisierter Körper*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bourdieu, Piere. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. *Practical Reason. On the Theory of Action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Breidenstein, Georg, Stefan Hirschauer, Herbert Kalthoff, and Boris Nieswand. 2020. *Ethnografie. Die Praxis der Feldforschung*. Konstanz: UVK/UTB, 3rd ed.

Brümmer, Kristina. 2019. Spielsysteme, Matchpläne, Spielanalysen. Über Praktiken und Medien des Kontingenzmanagements im gegenwärtigen Fußball. *Sport und Gesellschaft* 16 (3): 266-300.

Brümmer, Kristina, and Thomas Alkemeyer. 2016. Practice as a Shared Accomplishment. Intercorporeal Attunement in Acrobatics. In *Enactive Intercorporeality. The Coordination, Concertation and Collectivization of Moving Bodies in Sports*, ed. Christian Meyer and Ulrich von Wedelstaedt, 27-56. London: Oxford University Press.

Burri, Regula V. 2008. Bilder als soziale Praxis: Grundlegungen einer Soziologie des Visuellen. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 37 (4): 342-358.

Collins, Randall. 2008. *Violence. A Micro-Sociological Theory*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Comolli, Jean-Luc. 1985. Technique and Ideology: Camera, Perspective, Depth of Field. In *Movies and Methods. An Anthology*, ed. Bill Nichols, 40-57. Berkeley, University of California Press.
Daston, Lorraine, and Peter Galison. 2007. *Objectivity*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
Engel, Juliane. 2020. Zum sichtbar Unsichtbaren. Relationale Praktiken der Subjektivation in der Videografieforschung. In *Das Erziehungswissenschaftliche qualitativer Forschung*, ed. Robert Kreitz, Christine Demmer, Thorsten Fuchs, and Christine Wiezorek, 61-84. Opladen: Barbara Budrich.
Fleck, Ludwik. 1980. *Entstehung und Entwicklung einer wissenschaftlichen Tatsache*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
Gibson, James J. 1977. The theory of affordances. In *Perceiving, acting, and knowing*, ed. Robert Shaw and John D. Bransford, 67-82. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Behavior in Public Spaces*. New York: The Free Press.
Goodwin, Charles. 1994. Professional vision. *American Anthropologist* 96 (3): 606-633.
Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. 2012. *Präsenz*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
Heath, Christian, John Hindmarsh, and Paul Luff. 2010. *Video in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
Hirschauer, Stefan. 2006. Puttings things into words. Ethnographic description and the silence of the social. *Human Studies* 29 (4): 413-441.
Hoebel, Thomas. 2021. Auf wessen Seite steht Howard Becker? Ein Nachwort. In *Soziologische Tricks. Wie wir über Forschung nachdenken können*, ed. Howard S. Becker, 321-338. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.
Holzkamp, Klaus. 1973. *Sinnliche Erkenntnis. Historischer Ursprung und gesellschaftliche Funktion der Wahrnehmung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Athenäum.
Janetzko, Alexandra. 2021. *Talent (be)werten: Eine praxeographische Untersuchung von Talentsichtungen im Leistungssport*. Bielefeld: transcript.
Jullien, François. 2004 [1994]. *A Treatise on Efficacy. Between Western and Chinese Thinking*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
Knoblauch, Hubert, and René Tuma. 2017. Videoanalyse. In *Handbuch Körpersoziologie*, ed. Robert Gugutzer, Gabriele Klein, Michael Meuser, 409-422. Bielefeld: transcript.
Knorr Cetina, Karin. 1988. Das naturwissenschaftliche Labor als Ort der Verdichtung von Gesellschaft. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 17 (2): 85-101.
Knorr Cetina, Karin. 2009. The Synthetic Situation: Interactionism for a Global World. *Symbolic Interaction* 32 (1): 61-87.
Laube, Stefan. 2021. Material Practices of Ethnographic Presence. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 50 (1): 57-76.
Lave, Jean,Wenger, Etienne. 1991. *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Lindemann, Gesa. 2017. Verfahrensordnungen der Gewalt. *Zeitschrift für Rechtssoziologie* 37 (1): 57-87.
Luhmann, Niklas. 2008. Inklusion und Exklusion. In: idem.: *Soziologische Aufklärung 6: Die Soziologie und der Mensch*, 226-251. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
Meier zu Verl, Christian, and René Tuma. 2021. Video Analysis and Ethnographic Knowledge. An Empirical Study of Video Analysis Practices. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 50 (1): 120-144.

Meyer, Christian. 2021. Interkorporalität. In *Ansätze einer Kultursoziologie des Sports* ed. Kristina Brümmer, Alexandra Janetzko, and Thomas Alkemeyer, 153-174. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
Meyer, Christian, and Ulrich von Wedelstaedt. 2013. Skopische Sozialität - Sichtbarkeitsregime und visuelle Praktiken im Boxen. Soziale Welt, Themenheft *Visuelle Soziologie* 64 (1-2): 69-96.
Meyer, Christian, Jürgen Streeck, and Jordan, J. Scott. 2017. *Intercorporeality: Emerging Socialities in Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Mitchell, Robert. 2022fc. *Ballet and Taiji in Practice. A Comparative Autoethnography of Movement Systems*. Bielefeld, transcript.
Mohn, Bina E. 2018. Kamera-Ethnografie. Schauen, Sehen und Wissen filmisch gestalten. In *Handbuch Filmsoziologie,* ed. Geimer Alexander, Heinze Carsten, and Winter Rainer, 1-21. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
Mohn, Elisabeth, and Klaus Amann. 2006. *Lernkörper. Kamera-ethnografische zum Schülerjob. DVD-Video und Begleittext*. Göttingen: IWF.
Motowidlo, Jagoda, and Ronja Trischler. 2018. Face to Screen. Eine techniksoziologische Betrachtung videographischer Forschungspraxis in bildschirmbasierten Situationen. In *Handbuch qualitative Videoanalyse,* ed. Moritz Christine and Michael Corsten, 279-302. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
Nassauer, Anne, and Nicolas M. Legewie. 2020. Methodologische Entwicklungen in der Gewaltforschung. Videodatenanalyse, Mixed Methods und Big Data. *Österreich Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 45 (1): 135-156.
Pille, Thomas. 2013 *Das Referendariat. Eine ethnographische Studie zu den Praktiken der Lehrerbildung*. Bielefeld: transcript.
Querfurt, Andrea. 2016. *Mittlersubjekte der Migration. Eine Praxeographie der Selbstbildung von Integrationslotsen*. Bielefeld: transcript.
Rammert, Werner, and Cornelius Schubert. 2017. *Technische und menschliche Verkörperungen des Sozialen*. TUTS – Working Papers, 4-2017. Berlin: Technische Universität Berlin.
Scarry, Elaine. 1985. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Schade, Sigrid, and Silke Wenk. 2011 *Studien zur visuellen Kultur. Einführung in ein transdisziplinäres Forschungsfeld*. Bielefeld: transcript.
Schatzki, Theodore R. 2002. *The Site of the Social. A philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University Press.
Scheffer, Thomas. 2002. Das Beobachten als sozialwissenschaftliche Methode - von den Grenzen der Beobachtbarkeit und ihrer methodischen Bearbeitung. In *Qualitative Gesundheits- und Pflegeforschung*, ed. Doris Schaeffer and Gabriele Müller-Mundt, 351-374. Bern: Huber.
Schindler Larissa. 2017. Beobachten. In *Handbuch Körpersoziologie,* ed. Robert Gugutzer, Klein Gabriele, and Michael Meuser, 395-407. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
Schmidl, Alexander. 2021. Actions in Slow Motion: Theoretical and Methodological Reflections on Temporality in Actions and Intersubjective Understanding. *Human Studies* 44 (3): 433-451.
Schnettler Bernd, and Hubert Knoblauch. 2009. Videoanalyse. In *Handbuch Methoden der Organisationsforschung*, ed. Stefan Kühl, Petra Strodtholz, and Andreas Taffertshofer. Wiesbaden, 272-297: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Schulz, Marc. 2015. “Sinnliche Ethnografie” als Fiktion und “Augen-Ethnografie” als Praxis: Anmerkungen zum ethnografischen Wahrnehmen und Erkennen als epistemologisches Problem. *Zeitschrift für Qualitative Forschung* 16 (1): 43-55.
Simmel, Georg, ed. 1907. Soziologie der Sinne. In *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen 1901-1908*, 276-292. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
Staack, Michael. 2019. *Fighting As Real As It Gets. A Micro-Sociological Encounter*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.
Steinweg, Reiner. 2005. *Lehrstück und episches Theater. Brechts Theorie und die theaterpädagogische Praxis*. Frankfurt a.M.: Brandes & Apsel.
Streeck, Jürgen. 2017. *Self-Making Man. A Day of Action, Life, and Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Streeck, Jürgen, and Siri Mehus. 2004. Microethnography: The Study of Practices. In *Handbook of Language and Social Inter-action*, ed. Kristine L. Fitch and Robert E. Sanders, 381-405. Mahwah, Nj: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Tuma, René. 2017. *Videoprofis im Alltag. Die kommunikative Vielfalt der Videoanalyse*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
Wacquant, Loïc. 2006. *Body & Soul. Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wacquant, Loïc. 2015. *For a Sociology of Flesh and Blood*. Qualitative Sociology 38 (1): 1-11.
Weingart, Brigitte. 2004. Viren visualisieren: Bildgebung und Popularisierung. In *VIRUS! Mutationen einer Metapher*, ed. Ruth Mayer and Brigitte Weingart, 97-130. Bielefeld: transcript.
Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1998 [1964]. *Philosophical Remarks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

HSR
Historical Social Research

All articles published in HSR Special Issue 47 (2022) 1:
Visibilities of Violence: Microscopic Studies of Violent Events and Beyond

Introduction

Thomas Hoebel, Jo Reichertz & René Tuma
Visibilities of Violence. On Visual Violence Research and Current Methodological Challenges.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.01

I. Facing Violence: Microscopic Studies with and without Audiovisual Data

Anne Nassauer
Video Data Analysis as a Tool for Studying Escalation Processes: The Case of Police Use of Force.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.02

Christian Meyer & Ulrich v. Wedelstaedt
Opening the Black Box: An Ethnomethodological Approach for the Video-Based Analysis of Violence.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.03

Laura D. Keesman & Don Weenink
Feel it Coming: Situational Turning Points in Police-Civilian Encounters.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.04

Susanne Nef & Friederike Lorenz-Sinai
Multilateral Generation of Violence: On the Theorization of Microscopic Analyses and Empirically Grounded Theories of Violence.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.05

Frithjof Nungesser
Studying the Invisible. Experiences of Extreme Violence as a Methodological Challenge.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.06

II. Shifting Limitations: The Temporal Embedding and Unfolding of Violent Events

Wolff-Michael Roth
The Emergence and Unfolding of Violent Events: A Transactional Approach.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.07

Jo Reichertz
Escalation of Violence in Unclear Situations – A Methodological Proposal for Video Analysis.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.08

Ekkehard Coenen & René Tuma
Contextural and Contextual – Introducing a Heuristic of Third Parties in Sequences of Violence.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.09

Thomas Hoebel
Emplotments of Violence. On Narrative Explanations and their Audiovisual Data.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.10

HSR

Historical Social Research

All articles published in HSR Special Issue 47 (2022) 1:
Visibilities of Violence: Microscopic Studies of Violent Events and Beyond

III. Challenging Research: Methodological, Theoretical and Ethical Problems of Analyzing Violence

Thomas Alkemeyer
The Embodied Subjectivities of Videography.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.11

Gesa Lindemann, Jonas Barth & Johanna Fröhlich
The Methodological Relevance of a Theory-of-Society Perspective for the Empirical Analysis of Violence.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.12

César Antonio Cisneros Puebla
Microsociology of Killing in Mexican Video Executions.
doi: 10.12759/hsr.47.2022.13