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Some Notes on a Student Research Workshop on "Biography Analysis, Interaction Analysis, and Analysis of Social Worlds"

This paper will be pretty much down-to-earth: we will offer some remarks about our experiences with a student workshop (1) on qualitative social research in which some empirical studies (diploma theses and doctoral theses) within the fields of biography analysis, analysis of social worlds and interaction analysis have been produced. We won't explicitly deal with the abductive logic underlying qualitative research characterized by a complex and continuous interplay of general and case specific considerations; and we neither want to sound normative nor strictly didactic ("That's how qualitative research should be done or taught").

The aim is modest: We want to give you some impressions of the organizational context and the arc of work (to use a term of Anselm Strauss) of qualitative research projects of students who have been supervised by us. We believe that a description of these features that have emerged over the last six years could contribute to a discussion of general and specific interactional and sequential characteristics of qualitative research work. And we regard a comparative investigation of the actual work as a prerequisite for spelling out and validating an empirically grounded epistemology.

First we want to stress that we don't distinguish between students and researchers in any principal terms. We look at them as beginning researchers who study interesting phenomena, collect valuable data and have some interesting investigations to offer to the community of social scientists. Of course, when starting to work with them one has to make explicit many considerations which are taken for granted within the research work of mature scientists. But at the same time it is exactly the constant necessity to explicate and discuss features of qualitative inquiries when guiding the students' research work and when confronted with the students' specific styles of thought, action, and reaction in pursuing and analyzing qualitative data, which is a strategic opportunity for sharpening one's sense regarding the theoretical and methodological grounds of one's own approach.

Most of the students we are working with are not sociology students proper, but students of social work and former professionals (mostly social workers, but also teachers, ministers and others) who returned to the university for a postgraduate study of "supervision" (a type of counselling that has developed in dealing with isolate and recurring problems of professional practice) (Schütze 1984a). This has not been a serious obstacle, because most of these students have been dealing with the methodological problems of sociology on their own. They participated in systematic seminars on various topics of qualitative social research conducted by us and, of course, the students have not previously acquired any analytical skills, methodical skills, nor have they been trained in qualitative research.

Every academic year, in addition exactly these students carry with them a rich knowledge of social situations - and having dealt with many "social cases" in their practical studies or professional work situations - they are familiar with the attitude of carefully scrutinizing the dynamics of (collective, affective or individual) single cases and writing empirical documents. Among the things they have not previously acquired are analytical distance, technical skills for qualitative sociological analysis, the patience for step-by-step work in conducting a research project, and the sensitivity for the due timing (e.g., looking at mistakes at work, looking at mistakes at work, looking at mistakes at work) into cases (because their former practical analyses always had to be short-hand and pinpointing, fading out of awareness the dubious features of many procedures and assumptions). It is astonishing how much of exactly these virtues and capabilities (and mistakes) again and again have to be rediscovered in the research workshops.

In the research workshop, although occasionally it is painful for them to undergo substantial identity changes due to the fact of becoming aware of the intricacies of naturalistic inquiries into the dynamics of single cases. Of course this has consequences for their later work as professionals. Admittedly, in later work situations as professionals they again must conduct shorthand analyses of single cases as routine procedures. But then they will be aware of the many proclivities to make mistakes; they will know when it will be necessary to step back and start an explicating analysis; and they will be capable of conducting full-scale case analyses using basic theoretical categories and research procedures of qualitative sociology.

We also consider it as an advantage that often our students develop their initial research interests in reflecting about their own very real professional experiences (or experiences during their professional socialization) and that they have a direct access to the fields they want to study. Some recent cases are as follows: A priest decided to talk to other priests to tell their life stories and a sociologist (cf. Heidemann 1986). Of course, the biographical relationship of the students to their former fields of professional practice also provides for some difficulties of conducting research within exactly these areas. Many mundane assumptions about phenomena to be studied have to be given up, and sometimes the phantasmagoria of the students to the interaction with the actors within the research field under study (which generally must be seen as conducive to generating empirical questions and theoretical conclusions) gets inordinately intensive (i.e., leads to extreme anger, disappointment, practical criticism or even to touches of a depressive mood). But coping with and overcoming those crises results in powerful personal developments of the students into the inner state of analytically-minded and empirical-minded sociological researchers. The newly acquired sensibilities and analytical skills are soon used for autonomous research work, and later on they enable our former students to be back to professional work to see more and more precisely than many other practitioners. Our positive experience of teaching research to students who worked as professional practitioners or undergo socialization into a profession is, of course, not new. For many years Anselm Strauss trained nurses to become qualitative social researchers alongside with students of sociology. The way we have organized our workshop has been deeply influenced by our experiences with a research team and a research seminar of Anselm Strauss.

While there are many similarities in teaching qualitative research, e.g., procedures of biography analysis, to students in general (regardless
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(1) The workshop of qualitative social research was started six years ago. It was set up by Fritz Schütze and has been mainly organized by Gerhard Riemann. In the last two and a half years, in running the workshop we are being assisted by Thomas Reim, Dieter Nittel, and Peter Strauss who hold degrees in sociology, educational science and social work, respectively.
of their disciplinary affiliation), our remarks in the last two paragraphs already reveal something of what we think is distinctive for students of social work and supervision, especially their "natural leaning towards case analysis; the development of their themes out of practical, professional involvements; a direct access to the fields which they want to do research on; and the consequentiality of their extended research experience for later professional practice with clients. When we compare them with sociology students it seems to us that we have and still have experiences with teaching and supervising sociology students, too. Sociology students might find it easier to locate their particular qualitative study with regard to sociological paradigms, the history of their discipline, and the body of topically relevant literature; and they might be quite self-conscious when approaching their data (e.g., "Is this a legitimate interactionist claim to be adhering to?"). But it is exactly this lack of naivety and this aspiration towards seeming sophistication which could turn their analysis.

But, of course, it is difficult to generalize in a few words since there are multiple ways for sociology students to become involved in different topics and to relate to their research, and we don't claim it is more worthwhile to work with students who already had some practical professional experience. We just find it important to take the students' respective professional and educational biographies into account so that one can adjust one's teaching and supervising to their special strengths and weaknesses. It is different with sociology and with social work students. And it makes good sense to spend more time thinking about teaching sociological research skills to former, present, and future professional practitioners. When mentioning this we also think of the close relationship between Social Work and Chicago Sociology during the twenties and early thirties: i.e., during the phase in which important qualitative case analyses were published (cf. Carey 1975; Bulmer 1984). The history of this relationship and its final dissolution (which probably had problematic implications for both sides) is still to be more carefully researched.

The basic idea of the student research workshop is that the central procedures (not only of data collection but also of data analysis) are communicative ones. Biography analysis like other types of qualitative research depends on various communicative activities. The informant is asked to tell her or his life history, and during the course of narration she/he is also induced to describe life situations and to argue about systematic problems of her or his life and the respective relationship to her- or himself. The researcher has to work on these communicative materials meticulously. At first she/he has to follow the line of communicative representation, and this is basically organized in the sequential order set by the informant. This step of research is done within the communicative scheme of description: the researcher focusses on the representational practices of the informant and also have special strengths and "hang ups" (we have had and still have experiences with teaching and supervising sociology students, too.) Sociology students might find it easier to locate their particular qualitative study with regard to sociological paradigms, the history of their discipline, and the body of topically relevant literature; and they might be quite self-conscious when approaching their data (e.g., "Is this a legitimate interactionist claim to be adhering to?"). But it is exactly this lack of naivety and this aspiration towards seeming sophistication which could turn their analysis.

But, of course, it is difficult to generalize in a few words since there are multiple ways for sociology students to become involved in different topics and to relate to their research, and we don't claim it is more worthwhile to work with students who already had some practical professional experience. We just find it important to take the students' respective professional and educational biographies into account so that one can adjust one's teaching and supervising to their special strengths and weaknesses. It is different with sociology and with social work students. And it makes good sense to spend more time thinking about teaching sociological research skills to former, present, and future professional practitioners. When mentioning this we also think of the close relationship between Social Work and Chicago Sociology during the twenties and early thirties: i.e., during the phase in which important qualitative case analyses were published (cf. Carey 1975; Bulmer 1984). The history of this relationship and its final dissolution (which probably had problematic implications for both sides) is still to be more carefully researched. The basic idea of the student research workshop is that the central procedures (not only of data collection but also of data analysis) are communicative ones. Biography analysis like other types of qualitative research depends on various communicative activities. The informant is asked to tell her or his life history, and during the course of narration she/he is also induced to describe life situations and to argue about systematic problems of her or his life and the respective relationship to her- or himself. The researcher has to work on these communicative materials meticulously. At first she/he has to follow the line of communicative representation, and this is basically organized in the sequential order set by the informant. This step of research is done within the communicative scheme of description: the researcher focusses on the representational practices of the informant and also have special strengths and "hang ups" (we have had and still have experiences with teaching and supervising sociology students, too.) Sociology students might find it easier to locate their particular qualitative study with regard to sociological paradigms, the history of their discipline, and the body of topically relevant literature; and they might be quite self-conscious when approaching their data (e.g., "Is this a legitimate interactionist claim to be adhering to?"). But it is exactly this lack of naivety and this aspiration towards seeming sophistication which could turn their analysis.
within the dynamics of research interaction. This means that the students should work together in small research groups, in which everybody is encouraged and supported to start interaction. In addition, the students should realize the power of contrastive comparisons and of generating general categories which can be used in different research projects of various empirical logics without forcing them upon the empirical materials. This can be provided for by putting students together who follow up different substantive research questions (the principle of topic heterogeneity) and by arranging a joint meeting of research groups in regular intervals in order to focus on general basic theoretical and methodological questions and to share the experiences of working them through (the principle of arena debate).

Our workshop consists of three interactive small research groups. Each of them consists of four to six students who meet once a week for three or five hours (also usually during the semester-break). Each group meets with one of our three co-workers who have extensive experiences with qualitative research procedures themselves. They are in charge of the work in their groups, i.e., they guide the participants' mutual cultural descriptions of data, the discussion of theoretical memos and other research steps. They set up the schedule of meetings in such a way that at the same time the norm of reciprocity of the students' sharing of the research work of each other is fulfilled on the one hand and the potentials of communicative interaction for the various research steps can be exhausted on the other.

The co-workers tutor the individual students by continuously and specifically commenting on the progress and retardations of their work, they address the "mistakes at work" of the students and help to overcome the emotional difficulties connected with them. E.g., they explicate weak points like the failure to gain conceptual distance from data, the tendency to subsume data under suggestive, grand theoretical categories that cannot really be grounded in data, the neglect of formal features of a text or the failure to multiply perspectives in the description of his or her data and in the commenting on his or her memos. The crucial point in the work of the groups is the realization of the norm of reciprocity of the students' sharing of the research work of each other is fulfilled on the one hand and the potentials of communicative interaction for the various research steps can be exhausted on the other.

The person who is in charge of the whole research workshop takes turns in participating in the discussion of the three working groups and chairs a plenary meeting of all members of the workshop which takes place every third week.

The function of this plenary meeting is to give overviews over research procedures and to focus on basic research steps that can be found in any qualitative research project (so that the student researcher will be able to use her or his own research capacities on various research questions: this is extremely important for a mature researcher as well as for a mature professional who should be capable to conduct thoughtful and correct single case analyses); to discuss methodological problems and difficulties that are not simply serious concerns for the work of all "novice" researchers, and to give enough room for the report on and discussion of psychological and "life organizational" questions related to the first big research work in one's life. Two very important functions of these "arena sessions" are the following: the students should learn that most of their tasks and problems are of a "common" nature and that they can be shared with the others in the group; the research supervisors should learn what sorts of social, psychological and logistic problems have appeared which they had not expected themselves.

The main instructor watches the interaction processes within each of the research groups on a regular base; sometimes he realizes barriers of interaction and related research work, which the group instructor and the group participants didn't realize because they are "externally" engrossed in their intensive collaborative research work. Insecure students may start to influence the course of interaction with any open criticism, and later on he will work through the obstacles to interaction and research steps with the group instructor within a private session or together with the other group instructors. These sessions can be called "small bits of the work of supervisor and supervisa" -- this we did learn from our supervision students! -- are extremely important for the constant assessment of the quality of research work of interactively working together and of the teaching-learning process. In addition, they are starting points for revisions and amendments of teaching procedures - and sometimes even of the research procedures.

The main instructor keeps himself informed about the development of the individual students' research, gets to know some bits of the data which they bring in and looks over and comments on samples of structural descriptions and other case specific and comparative analyses. This is always done on the base of reports of the group instructors, who normally will guide the research projects quite autonomously. In looking together on the ongoing research projects, the instructors will sensitize each other for the intricacies of the related social processes of archs of research work as well as of the identity metamorphoses which the individual students have to undergo during these novel experiences. Sometimes, besides the regular course of group exploits, the instructors will meet to reflect in meetings when things have become quite complicated in terms of difficult text materials or obstacles to generating theoretical models as well as in terms of sociopsychological difficulties in group interaction and the individual students into account only once they can make their active contribution in organizing the work and group process can prove to be helpful. During the normal phases of a student's research project he will exert his main influence via the regular meetings with his co-workers to discuss the progress, the problems, and the timing of the research projects in the three groups. Supervising qualitative research requires a lot of sensibility, and the face-to-face communication about one's own experiences with supervising such projects helps to focus on problems and "mistakes at work" which had been "felt" somehow but not really grasped and formulated.

The crucial point in the work of the groups is the realization of reciprocity: Each student is expected to take part in the verbal discussion of his or her fellow students' ideas, data and memos, while he or she can trust that the others invest time, energy, and creativity in participating in the description of his or her data and in the commenting on his or her memos. We have experienced that it has many advantages when the research topics in one group widely differ (this has partly to do with the fact that students often feel more free in the beginning when working on others' data than on their own data or that students bring in and look over and comments on samples of structural descriptions and other case specific and comparative analyses. When working in the three groups. Supervising qualitative research requires a lot of sensibility, and the face-to-face communication about one's own experiences with supervising such projects helps to focus on problems and "mistakes at work" which had been "felt" somehow but not really grasped and formulated.
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Usually when students start to develop an interest in doing their own empirical project within our research workshop, they have already become familiar with the style of qualitative research by having participated in one of our seminars on special research procedures. So they have already become familiar with the nature of qualitative data (e.g., transcriptions of narratives and of special types of face-to-face interaction, field notes etc.), and they have already developed a sense of the arc of work of qualitative research and what its findings and insights could look like.

It is important that they have basically made up their mind whether or not qualitative research would be suitable for them before attending the research workshop so that no one will be seriously disappointed and wastes time.

When a student contacts us because of the workshop and there is still a place in one of the groups available the following activities occur (1):

1. The student not only states what he or she is interested in but is also asked to tell about the history of his or her interest in the particular problem. Thereby one can discover if the way he or she formulates the problem really reflects his or her original interests or distorts them (e.g., by adopting a restrictive and seemingly scientific vocabulary). It is also essential to find out if the student is specifically interested in social phenomena which can be dealt with in process analysis. These are questions of basic social and biographical processes typical for the social realm under study, e.g., a social movement, biographical processes related to a career line etc. The basic process mechanisms which the research process will result in theoretically are arrived at via theoretical sampling and constant contrastive comparison; they prove to be ubiquitous and are selected for research under specified conditions. Of course it could turn out that she or he is really more interested in questions of quantitative distribution of social features within a well defined social universe; such a research question can only be addressed via the standard questionnaire techniques of the social sciences; and then we will send the student to a more suitable supervisor. (Admittedly, there are many opportunities to base a quantitative distribution analysis on a qualitative first-hand research project, and, in the reverse, it sometimes proves useful to study certain phenomena first delineated quantitatively as theoretically astonishing, odd or extremely vague, because they presuppose social processes which are basically unknown. In a thoroughgoing qualitative approach these combinations of qualitative and quantitative methods are normally too time-consuming and complicated for our students, and they are not very common even with mature social researchers. But there are some beautiful examples like Strauss et al. 1964/1981, and hopefully some of our more permanent co-workers will work on these triangulations of qualitative and quantitative methods in the future. Right now we still argue that one must have the basic process mechanism of professional work and related biographical processes. The biographical processes of suffering, working-through and attacking social problems, as well as the collective processes of social movements and social worlds, but by no means qualitative social research should only be seen as an auxiliary research step into the direction of "mature" quantitative research. There is no epistemological legitimation for such an assessment, for the research steps can be repeated by others and are open to questions of reliability of the use of research procedures and to the questions of theoretical and empirical validity of categories.)

After being informed about what is going on in the research workshop and what is expected from the individual members, the student is asked about his or her temporal considerations (when does he or she expect to finish the study?) and how much time he or she has available. Such queries are necessary to prevent illusionary planning, disappointments, and "time panic" later on.

If the student stays interested it is obvious that his or her still very vague research problems can fruitfully be dealt with in the research workshop, he or she is being advised to collect relevant data on one case (e.g., a narrative interview) for the purpose of dimensionalizing the research topic in first analytical terms.

2. The preliminary formulation of the topic will be the first result accomplished within the group-meeting after the student-researcher has told about his or her interests in the problem area, the other participants comment on the data, and in continuously interacting with the data of this one case and keeping the student's interests in mind one jointly arrives at first notions of elementary dimensions of the topic. It is important that the student-researcher is actively participating, can specify his or her interests, is able to ratify the reformulation of his or her topic, and doesn't feel driven into a "wrong" direction which he or she is not really interested in. On the basis of this first formulation the student is being advised as to her or his procedures of collecting data (e.g., how to conduct a narrative interview which is specifically suited to the topic, how to avoid specific traps) and to theoretical sampling: what cases to select in a first phase in the light of first notions about theoretical variation.

3. After the student has done a couple of interviews, he or she tells the other participants about them: about the substance of the interviews and about formal features of the narratives. This is followed by a joint comparison of the single cases in order to reach a decision about what interview should be selected first for a transcription, structural description, and analytical abstraction. The main criterion for the selection of a case is whether or not the case represents the biographical and social processes one is mainly looking for, whether or not it appears to be in the center of one's interests. And, of course, one also has to take into consideration what kinds of difficulties one would encounter during the analysis when choosing one text instead of another one - difficulties arising out of complicated formal features: sequences of conspicuous variations, excesses of documentation etc. To study such data could become necessary during later phases of research and it could lead to important insights, but it could prove to be quite frustrating and misleading to focus on them right from the start.

4. After the student has finished an exact transcription of the first interview the text is distributed among the participants of his or her working group who carefully read it before gathering again. During this meeting the group members first take turns to comment on the interview in general and to cautiously formulate first abstractions. This is sometimes followed by short discussions in which first propositions are back up or put in doubt by other participants, but usually this does not

(1) Since our short article stresses the practical aspects of working with students, we won't go into details about the sequence of research steps and the characteristics of the kind of biography analysis which we do and teach (cf. Schütze 1983, 1984, pp. 108-115; Riemann 1987, chapter 2). A few remarks should suffice.
take a lot of time since there is much more emphasis laid on the actual and detailed work with the material. This first exchange of ideas is useful nevertheless, so that first abstractions can be voiced and kept in mind (as sensitizing notions that can turn out to be false of irrelevant) which help members not to drown in the microscopic details of a text later on.

The analysis of the first case (as well as the analysis of the second interview, cf. (6)) is usually quite time consuming and lasts a couple of weeks depending on the skills of the student and the time and patience he or she has to write down and rewrite the description. Spending so much time on case analyses is quite worthwhile since the generalities that one is looking for (like structural processes in biographies - trajectories of suffering, biographical action schemes, creative metamorphoses, phases of a life cycle; other kinds of social processes like sequences of professional socialization; the impact of historical developments on biographical experiences) can already be discovered and spelled out in the close scrutiny of single case materials.

The participants' work with the first interview proceeds in the following manner:

- The members shortly discuss the interview situation and try to critically comment on the researcher's interviewing and its consequences for the quality of the data. And they differentiate between text sorts (narrative, argumentative, and descriptive sequences) that can be found in various parts of the main narrative and later phases of the interview and share first impressions about their representational and communicative functions.

- They carefully proceed in discovering and marking the narrative segments, suprasegmental parts, and subunits within segments, i.e., they compare their assessments and reach an agreement about the boundaries of the presentational units of the text - units that correspond to experiential units in the unfolding life history. Detecting these units consists of looking for formal indicators (especially the orderly pattern in which segments are introduced, detailed and summarized) and taking the substantive content of the narrative into account.

- In collaborating on a detailed structural description of the narrative the participants start off from the narrator's own categories and predicates and make use of a whole array of formal features of the text (like background constructions, argumentational vs. narrative sequences, discrepancies, intonation contours etc.). Structurally describing the interview consists of an attempt to reconstruct the biographical development of the narrator as it had been experienced by him or her, i.e., to explicate the structural processes of the life course, other social processes (including collective trajectories and macro-historical changes that have to be taken into account if one wants to understand the particular life history), the impact of milieu and social worlds, and the development of significant relationships; and, of course, it has to be spelled out during a description what kinds of theories the narrator developed and which functions (orientation, explanation, legitimation, concealment etc.) they serve.

- While the whole narrative is being orally described in a series of group meetings it is the individual student-researcher's task to decide what he or she can make out of the other participants' contributions: what to pursue or set down to discard or elaborate. The researcher is solely responsible for his or her own product. Acquiring descriptive writing skills and developing one's own style of description usually takes quite some time. Students have to learn that a structural description is neither simple paraphrasing nor subsuming the text under previously derived categories, but a first abstraction that stays firmly and visibly grounded in data. The text of a description should demonstrate how analytical categories and predicates emerge and how inferences are being made.

After the student has written up the structural description of the first interview which is the main part of the first portrait chapter, he or she develops a memo which contains an analysis of the first case; sometimes the group discusses the memo so that the researcher gets some feedback for revising it. The analytical abstraction consists of a summary explication of (a) the structural processes of this particular biography and of the interlinkage of biographical processes and other social phenomena, (b) the narrator's different kinds of autobiographical theories and how they relate to life historical experiences, and (c) the features that are case specific and those that appear to be general.

5. When the researcher has finished the first case analysis, he or she gives an oral and comparative overview over the interviews that have been collected in the meanwhile which finally leads to the selection of a second case that has to be analyzed. This decision is based on the criterion of maximizing differences (with regard to the first case) in order to span as much theoretical variation as possible. Usually students have to collect about twelve narrative interviews during their project in order to reach a large amount of sufficient comparative data, which can be classified in some subunits of the interviews. Principally speaking, as many interviews should be conducted as categories of the theoretical models and insights into their relationships could still be added and fruitfully differentiated (the research rule of theoretical saturation cf. Glaser and Strauss 1973, pp.111-113). And taking the quite specific research questions a student has formulated during the first phase of their project, the number of twelve interviews will normally suffice. But sometimes the dynamics of contrastive comparison and generating a theoretical model will point to the necessity to conduct additional interviews. This won't always be possible depending on the difficulties of reaching additional informants with highly specific social features (defined in theoretical terms), of getting entry to them, of developing a trust relationship and of reserving enough time and privacy for doing an interview with them. If students encounter serious obstacles to reaching additional informants, it can happen that we have to skip these additional research steps, taking the time pressure of our students into account who have to deliver their theses within certain time limits (three to five months; with some extension time, mostly additional six months). But this decision not to go on with data collection results in holes of the theoretical model, which have to be stated specifically.

6. The second case analysis consists of the same phases like the first one: differentiation of text sorts, structural description, and analytical abstraction. The student has to spend much more time and patience again, but usually it does not take as long as during the first case analysis since he or she has acquired more capacities in looking for what is important, explicating it and writing it down. He or she has accumulated more security and has developed a more realistic sense of timing. Every student is developing his or her own distinctive style, too, and has implicit notions of what constitutes a good and esthetically satisfying text of analysis. In supervising their writing one has to be careful not to impose one's own esthetical criteria on them.
7. After the completion of the second case analysis the student researcher attempts to draw the outline of a contrasting comparison of the two cases. This is the starting point for an extensive discussion in the group in which contrasts are accentuated or elaborated, new ones suggested, hierarchies of contrasts developed etc.. Usually it becomes necessary to orally present new cases, to collaborate on a short analytical abstraction of them and compare them since the theoretical variation within the data cannot be totally exhausted by the two or three cases that had been selected as "corner stones". The aim is to develop elementary analytical categories and to discover basic alternatives of social processes that are basic for:

8. generating a theoretical model. The contours of a theoretical model that fits the data emerge in the course of the joint contrasting comparison. It is important that this first sketch of a theoretical model is basically developed by the student researcher because he or she has the best knowledge of all the data, and he/she has to identify with the research project as his/her own work product after it has been finished. This desideratum can be realized by asking the student to deliver a first sketchy theoretical memo on the base of which the group can proceed. The phase of generating theoretical models implies the potential that the instructors commit serious professional mistakes, because at the end of the research everybody tends to be not patient enough to let the student do his or her own steps of generating theoretical insights and categories which will be slow at the beginning. The instructors normally have acquired the capability to start very fast selective coding and formulating theoretical categories, because they have a vast overview over such categories generated in previous projects and are thus the proclivity not to look closely enough into the materials, and then the theoretical model enforced on the student will be shallow and not sufficiently "to the point". In addition, proceeding in such a way expropriates the student from the core of his/her research study.

While most of the work of building and substantiating a theoretical model is the student's "solitary" job at home, all the essential processes of theory construction are already visible during the meeting of the working group. The interactional dynamics of such a meeting is especially helpful for actuating the communication scheme of argumentation which is basic for confronting the category. There is an ongoing process of generating and fact categories (which are already the outcome of lengthy case and comparative analyses) with new pieces of data, i.e., the categories are being empirically controlled, differentiated, backed up or put in doubt; new categories emerge, and the whole model is constantly being respecified, is becoming denser and moving towards "theoretical saturation" (to use the term of Glaser and Strauss again).

9. The final research step consists of confronting the categories and relations of the theoretical model with fresh data. Finally the categories of the model and their relations to each other have to be ostensively presented and empirically warranted by relating them to selections of fresh empirical data (of additional interviews) which had not been used for writing up the portrait chapters. By relating the categories to fresh data they undergo a second phase of specification, differentiation, and sometimes even revision. This research step is important in order to insure the capacity of the theoretical categories, relations, and theoretical models built out of them to be transferable to, and workable on, new occurrences and sorts of single cases and empirical materials. I.e., it clarifies their generality and analytical power.

When one compares the studies which have been completed within our research workshop one can see that quite often certain kinds of theoretical models have been used (partly in combination with other ones).

The theoretical models are organized around some basic theoretical building blocks that are to a certain extent related to the Chicago tradition of sociology (and Symbolic Interactionism), which dealt with social and biographical processes thoroughly. But we have to stress, that by looking into the text materials these theoretical building blocks can be found again and again, because they formulate basic structural processes of social reality. The theoretical building blocks are:

- Career models

The central idea is that there are homogeneous or conflicting, clearly defined or very vague institutional expectation patterns for the biography incumbent to react to. Sometimes it becomes necessary to look closely enough into the materials these theoretical building blocks can be found again and again, because they formulate basic structural processes of social reality. The theoretical building blocks are:

- Models on structural processes of the life course

Here the focus is on the dynamics of biographical processes themselves which can be central important within the life course of the informant and structure her/his activities towards fellow interactants and towards her-/herself. One example is the emotionally intensive life phase of the young mother focussed on her new born child and the child's biological and psycho-social development, which also implies steps of maturation of the young mother herself (cf. Riemann 1987 on psychiatric patients, Maunenbrecher 1955 on Turkish "guest workers", Jurgens 1985 on women in life situations of extreme poverty and despair). The first process can be dealt with by the category of metamorphosis, e.g. gaining new capacities and having to integrate them into one's own identity development, the second one by the category of trajectory (cf. Strauss/Glaser 1970: being totally controlled by the overwhelmingly powerful conditions of the occurrence of decisive "outer" and/or "inner" events which force the biography incumbent just to react.)

- Relational models on the attitudes of the biography incumbent towards her or his life course

The central idea is that in specified life situations that are constrained by powerful social structures the biography incumbent develops a systematic relationship towards her or his biography which organizes the retrospective sedimentation of her or his life experiences and controls the outlook at her/his own biographical future. These systematic biographical attitudes gain a partial autonomy over concrete events occurring in the course of daily affairs of the subjects; this sometimes leads to the ignoring or "fading out of awareness" of biographical experiences which could serve as counter-evidence against the biographical attitude.
Models on the development and changes of social worlds, social milieus, and social movements

Those theoretical building blocks fit when "sensitizing topics", shared social problems, and mutually known "kernel activities" are focussed and enacted by specified categories of actors who live in social networks open to accelerated sociocultural change (e.g. art), who suffer under social conditions finally understood as changeable by collective endeavors and/or who are thrown into an outsider position towards society and have to develop their own texture of social relationships. Under all these living conditions social forms of mutual orientation will develop, which are organized around central topics, issues and activities. The focus of inquiry can be on the development and change of the central organizations and institutions of social milieus, social worlds, and/or collective movements; on the relationships and changes of the living arrangements of actors and their networks of communication, or on the impact of the unfolding and change of the social and orientational frames of social worlds, social milieus and/or social movements on the life course and biographical identities of their protagonists and/or followers. Studies have been done, e.g., on the West German youth center movement (Wagner, 1982), on the change of the social milieu of the inner city/old town of Kassel during the last one hundred years (Straus, 1984), on the life of women with children who choose not to live in small families but in "Wohngemeinschaften" (various people sharing an apartment or a house, who - at least partly - are not married and who - at least partly - are not related to each other) (Dreifurst, 1986) or on the changes of the social world of German drug addicts in Amsterdam and on the impact of these changes on the everyday life and biographies of the participants in this world (Heimboldt, 1987).

The various theoretical, building blocks allowed to have to be differentiated from the formal architectural principles by which the theoretical models are constructed. One very common and very old architectural principle is that of the natural history (cf. Turner in Park, 1969: XXII f.). Within the frame work of the natural history perspective the researcher attempts to outline the "logical" or "natural" concatenation of types of events of the social process under study. E.g., she/he differentiates between various sequentially ordered stages as well as between various alternative lines of the unfolding of the social process. Each previous phase of the unfolding of the social process must be seen as conditionally relevant (1) to its following phase. The explanatory power of the natural history principle depends on the reactions of the parties of letter writers in Poland and Chicago.
to each other. But soon during the research process it became clear that the structure of interaction between the letter writers in Poland and Chicago amounts to distortions or confirmations of social relationships of the letter senders and receivers, and this immediately led to the analysis of the biographical processes involved: trajectories of suffering of dis-oriented and culturally deprived immigrants or metamorphoses of identity, i.e., gaining new opportunities to develop personally and socially. During the course of research with different sorts of empirical data and various research procedures it became clear to the students that every theoretical model of some complexity will employ several of the basic theoretical building blocks mentioned above (or others), several of the procedural strategies of analysis and several of the underlying architectural principles of theory construction. (In addition, the procedural strategies and architectural principles are translatable to other sorts of empirical data and areas of substantive social phenomena not tackled before, and they are translatable into each other.)

We hope that we could give an impression of some of the didactic, interactive and epistemological features of our research workshop and their systematic relationships with each other, which are pivotal for our educational and scientific collaboration with our students. We just think it is a good idea to give some room and spend some time to communicate about the actual research practices and practices of organizing the training in one's own "home territory".

Besides the obligatory publication of dissertations we are planning to publish some of the diploma studies which we think are worth to be noticed by a larger audience of social scientists and practitioners (1). We will start with Heidemann's (1986) study on becoming a Catholic priest. In order to keep it "low profile" and financially affordable, we will organize the publication ourselves with the assistance of the library of Kassel University (GhK-Gesamthochschulbibliothek).

---

(1) Until now about thirty diploma theses and three dissertations have been produced. Most of them are within the field of biography analysis, some in the fields of interaction analysis and analysis of social worlds.

---
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