Part 1

Introduction
In recent years qualitative research has developed into a broad and sometimes almost confusing field of study. It has become part of the training in empirical research methods in a variety of subjects and disciplines. This broad palette of subjects extends from sociology, via psychology, to cultural studies, education and economics, to name but a few. Alongside the traditional compartmentalized subjects it is receiving growing attention in the rather more applied disciplines, such as social work, nursing or public health. Qualitative research has always had a strongly applied orientation in the questions it addresses and in its methods of procedure, and it now occupies an important place in these areas. In the realm of social sciences there is, in the broadest sense, hardly any area of research in which it is not at least partially used – particularly if one considers the international dimension. Even though there is no shortage of criticism, preconceptions and prejudice about qualitative research, one may still claim that it is now established and consolidated, and that, in the way suggested by Thomas Kuhn (1970), it has now achieved the status of a paradigmatic ‘normal science’.

Qualitative research claims to describe life-worlds ‘from the inside out’, from the point of view of the people who participate. By so doing it seeks to contribute to a better understanding of social realities and to draw attention to processes, meaning patterns and structural features. Those remain closed to non-participants, but are also, as a rule, not consciously known by actors caught up in their unquestioned daily routine. Qualitative research, with its precise and ‘thick’ descriptions, does not simply depict reality, nor does it practise exoticism for its own sake. It rather makes use of the unusual or the deviant and unexpected as a source of insight and a mirror whose reflection makes the unknown perceptible in the known, and the known perceptible in the unknown, thereby opening up further possibilities for (self-) recognition. The theory and practice of obtaining these perspectives will be briefly illustrated here by looking at four questions that are addressed in classic qualitative studies.
1 How do young migrants affect a local culture? How do they view their life and their prospects? How do they react to their environment and what form of social organization does their group life engender?

2 What are the consequences of living as a patient in a psychiatric clinic, and how can patients preserve their identity under the conditions that prevail there?

3 What are the bases for the possibility of communication and joint action in quite different social situations?

4 What are the concrete results of unemployment, and how are they processed individually and in a local community?

These are a few topic areas from the infinite variety of possible questions that, with the aid of qualitative methods, may be handled particularly well and in a theoretically productive and practically relevant form.

1 William F. Whyte’s (1955) classic ethno-graphic study of a street gang in a major city in the eastern United States in the 1940s offers, on the basis of individual observations, personal notes and other sources, a comprehensive picture of a dynamic local culture. Through the mediation of a key figure Whyte had gained access to a group of young second-generation Italian migrants. As a result of a two-year period of participant observation he was able to obtain information about the motives, values and life-awareness and also about the social organization, friendship relations and loyalties of this local culture. These were condensed in theoretically important statements such as:

Whyte’s gangs can be seen simply as an example of a temporary non-adjustment of young people. They withdraw from the norms of the parental home … and at the same time see themselves as excluded from the predominant norms of American society. Deviant behaviour is to be noted both towards the norms of the parental home and towards the prevailing norms of the country of immigration. Deviant behaviour, even as far as criminality, may be seen as a transient faulty adaptation that bears within itself both the option of adaptation and of permanent non-adaptation. (Atteslander 1996: XIII)

2 From an exact description of the strategies used by inmates to secure their identities, Erving Goffman (1961b), in his studies of psychiatric clinics and prisons, was able to capture general structural features of what he called the ‘total institution’: when confronted with such depersonalizing modes of behaviour as institutional clothing, the lack of privacy, constant surveillance, a regimented daily timetable and so on, inmates reacted with irony, play-acting, exaggerated adaptation, secret pacts with the staff, rebellion and the like. Through this construction of a ‘sub-life’ in the institution, they safeguard their survival as subjects. This study may be regarded as one of the great studies of organizational sociology using qualitative research methods. Moreover, it set in train a public debate about the situation of psychiatric patients and prisoners, and provided a stimulus for reform in the appropriate quarters. Even today it still provides the motivation for a plethora of similar studies in other areas, such as old people’s homes (e.g. Koch-Straube 1997).

3 From a basic theoretical perspective, Harold Garfinkel (1967a), using so-called crisis experiments, was able to demonstrate the implicit pre-conditions and rules that govern the production of everyday processes of understanding. This made it possible to describe social integration as a consistent fabric of constructs which participants adapt to situations: if, in an everyday encounter, a person replies to the cliché enquiry ‘How are you?’ with the counter-enquiry ‘Do you mean physically, mentally or spiritually?’, this leads to a breakdown in the expected sequence of events. From this it becomes clear that utterances can only be understood in relation to some context and that there is no ‘pure’ meaning. Shared everyday human activities are more strongly marked by a competent situational application of interactional and communicative rules (‘ethno-methods’) than by abstract norms, and in these rules knowledge and cultural experience is constantly being produced and activated.

4 In a study that is still regularly quoted in unemployment research, Jahoda, Lazarsfeld and Zeisel (1933/1971) investigated the consequences of unemployment in a small Austrian industrial village at the time of the world economic crisis in the 1930s. Using an imaginative combination of quantitative (for example, measurement of walking speed, income statistics) and qualitative methods (for example, interviews, housekeeping books, diary entries, young people’s essays about their view of the future, document analysis and so on) and also some historical materials they developed, with the basic concept (Leitformel, see Jahoda 1992) of a ‘tired society’, a concise...
characterization of the life-feelings and the everyday course of events in a community affected by unemployment. At the same time they were able to identify a variety of individual 'behavioural types' in reaction to unemployment, such as 'unbroken', 'resigned', 'desperate' and 'apathetic' – a result that has proved to be of heuristic value in contemporary research (see 2.8).

Whyte represents a successful example of an ethnographic study (see 3.8, 5.5 below), and it is in this tradition that community and subculture research, investigations of deviant behaviour and 'cultural studies' (see 3.9) have developed. Goffman (see 2.2) provided the stimulus for many institutional analyses, investigations of interactions between professionals and their clients or patients, and also drew attention to strategies for situational presentation of an individual identity in the face of others. Garfinkel's study represents a development in qualitative research that seeks to identify formal rules and structures for the construction of everyday action (see 2.3). And the complex sociography of Jahoda et al. shows the practical value and socio-politically relevance qualitative research may have (see 2.8).

2 WHY QUALITATIVE RESEARCH?

What is it, in general terms, that constitutes the particular attractiveness and relevance of qualitative research? In its approach to the phenomena under investigation it is frequently more open and thereby 'more involved' than other research strategies that work with large quantities and strictly standardized, and therefore more objective, methods and normative concepts (Wilson 1970). In replies to questions in a guided interview (see 5.2), in biographical narratives (see 5.11), in ethnographic descriptions (see 5.5, 5.22) of everyday life or of processes in institutions, a fundamentally more concrete and plastic image often emerges of what it is like, from the point of view of the person concerned, to live, for example, with a chronic illness, than could be achieved using a standardized questionnaire. In an age when fixed social life-worlds and lifestyles are disintegrating and social life is being restructured out of an ever-increasing number of new modes and forms of living, research strategies are required that can deliver, in the first instance, precise and substantial descriptions. They must also take account of the views of those involved, and the subjective and social constructs (see 3.4) of their world. Even if postmodernity age is perhaps already over, the processes of pluralization and dissolution, the new confusions that are referred to by this concept, continue to exist. Standardized methods need for the design of their data-collection instruments (for example, a questionnaire), some fixed idea about the subject of the investigation, whereas qualitative research can be open to what is new in the material being studied, to the unknown in the apparently familiar. In this way perceptions of strangeness in the modern everyday world, where 'adventure is just around the corner' (Bruckner and Finkielkraut 1981), can be described and their meaning located. This very openness to the world of experience, its internal design and the principles of its construction are, for qualitative research, not only an end in themselves giving a panorama of 'cultural snapshots' of small life-worlds, but also the main starting point for the construction of a grounded theoretical basis (see 2.1, 6.6).

3 RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

The label 'qualitative research' is a generic term for a range of different research approaches. These differ in their theoretical assumptions, their understanding of their object of investigation and their methodological focus. But they may be summarized under three broad headings: theoretical reference points may be sought, first, in the traditions of symbolic interactionism (see 3.3) and phenomenology (see 3.1), which tend to pursue subjective meanings and individual sense attributions; second, in ethnography (see 3.2) and constructivism (see 3.4), which are interested in everyday routine and the construction of social reality. A third point of reference is found in structuralist or psychoanalytical (see 2.5, 5.20) positions, which proceed from an assumption of latent social configurations and of unconscious psychic structures and mechanisms.

These approaches also differ in their research goals and in the methods they apply. We may contrast those approaches in which the 'view of the subject' (Bergold and Flick 1987) is in the foreground with a second group whose goal is rather to describe the processes involved in the construction of existing (everyday, institutional or simply 'social') situations, milieux (e.g. Hildenbrand 1983) and social order (such as
ethnomethodological linguistic analysis; see 5.17). The (largely) hermeneutic reconstruction of ‘action and meaning-generating deep structures’, according to psychoanalytic (see 5.20) or objective-hermeneutic (see 5.16) ideas (Lüders and Reichertz 1986), is characteristic of the third type of research perspective.

The methods of data collection and processing that are dealt with fully in Part 5 of this book may be allocated to these research perspectives as follows. In the first group, guided and narrative interviews (see 5.2) and related processes of coding (see 5.13) or content analysis (see 5.12) are in the foreground. In the second research perspective, data tend to be collected in focus groups (see 5.4), by ethnographic methods or (participant) observation and through media recording of interactions so that they may then be evaluated by means of discourse or conversation analysis (see 5.19, 5.17). Here we may also include approaches to genre and document analysis (see 5.18, 5.15). Representatives of the third perspective collect data mainly through the recording of interactions and the use of photos (see 5.6) and films (see 5.7), which are then always allocated to one of the various forms of hermeneutic analysis (cf. Hitzler and Honer 1997).

Table 1.1 summarizes these subdivisions and gives examples of research fields that are characteristic of the three perspectives.

### Table 1.1 Research perspectives in qualitative research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research perspective</th>
<th>Modes of access to subjective viewpoints</th>
<th>Description of processes of creation of social situations</th>
<th>Hermeneutic analysis of underlying structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical positions</td>
<td>Symbolic interactionism</td>
<td>Ethnomethodology</td>
<td>Psychoanalysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of data collection</td>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Genetic structuralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of interpretation</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews</td>
<td>Focus groups ethnography</td>
<td>Recording of interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative interviews</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recording of interactions</td>
<td>Films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of interpretation</td>
<td>Theoretical coding</td>
<td>Conversation analysis</td>
<td>Objective hermeneutics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative content analysis</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>Deep structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative analyses</td>
<td>Genre analysis</td>
<td>hermeneutics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermeneutic procedures</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>Hermeneutic sociology of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of application</td>
<td>Biographical research</td>
<td>Analysis of life-worlds and organizations</td>
<td>Family research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of everyday knowledge</td>
<td>Evaluation research</td>
<td>Biographical research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural studies</td>
<td>Generation research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 BASIC ASSUMPTIONS AND FEATURES OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

In all the heterogeneity of the approaches that may be characterized as ‘qualitative research’, there are certain basic assumptions and features that are common to them all (cf. also, in this context, Flick 2002, chs 1 and 2; von Kardorff 2000; Steinke 1999, ch. 2).

**Basic assumptions of qualitative research**

First, social reality may be understood as the result of meanings and contexts that are jointly created in social interaction. Both are interpreted by the participants in concrete situations within the framework of their subjective relevance horizons (Schütz 1962, see 3.1) and therefore constitute the basis of shared meanings that they attribute to objects, events, situations and people (Blumer 1969). These meanings they constantly modify and ‘frame’ (Goffman 1974, see 2.2) according to context in reaction to the meanings of others. In this sense social realities appear as a result of constantly developing processes of social construction (Berger and Luckmann 1966, see 3.4). For the methodology of qualitative research, the first implication of this is a concentration on the forms and
contents of such everyday processes of construction more than on reconstructing the subjective views and meaning patterns of the social actors.

Secondly, from the assumption about the constant everyday creation of a shared world there emerge the character of the process, and the reflexivity and recursivity of social reality. For qualitative research methodology a second implication of this is the analysis of communication and interaction sequences with the help of observation procedures (see 5.5) and the subsequent sequential text analyses (see 5.16, 5.17).

Thirdly, human beings live in a variety of life situations that may be ‘objectively’ characterized by indicators such as income, education, profession, age, residence and so on. They show their physical circumstances meaningfully in a total, synthesized and contextualized manner and it is only this that endows such indicators with an interpretable meaning and thereby renders them effective. Statements obtained from subjects and statements classified according to methodological rules may, for example, be described using the concept ‘life-world’ (see 3.8). Here subjective or collective meaning patterns (such as ‘lay theories’, ‘world-views’, shared norms and values), social relationships and associated incidental life circumstances may be related to individual biographical designs, past life history and perceived possibilities for future action. This process renders subjectively significant personal and local life-attitudes and lifestyles both recognizable and intelligible. From a methodological point of view this leads to a third implication: to a hermeneutic interpretation of subjectively intended meaning that becomes intelligible within the framework of a pre-existing, intuitive everyday prior understanding that exists in every society of meanings which may be objectivized and described in terms of ideal types. This in turn makes it possible to explain individual and collective attitudes and actions.

Fourthly, background assumptions of a range of qualitative research approaches are that reality is created interactively and becomes meaningful subjectively, and that it is transmitted and becomes effective by collective and individual instances of interpretation. Accordingly, in qualitative research communication takes on a predominant role. In methodological terms this means that strategies of data collection themselves have a communicative dialogic character. For this reason the formation of theories, concepts and types in qualitative research itself is explicitly seen as the result of a perspective-influenced reconstruction of the social construction of reality (see 3.4). In the methodology of qualitative research two fundamentally different reconstruction perspectives may be distinguished:

- the attempt to describe fundamental general mechanisms that actors use in their daily life to ‘create’ social reality, as is assumed, for instance, in ethnomethodology (see 3.2);
- ‘thick description’ (Geertz 1973b, see 2.6) of the various subjective constructions of reality (theories of everyday life, biographies, events and so on) and their anchoring in self-evident cultural phenomena and practices in places and organization-specific environments.

Investigations of the first type provide information about the methods used by everyday actors to conduct conversations, overcome situations, structure biographies and so on.

Investigations of the second type provide object-related knowledge about subjectively significant connections between experience and action, about views on such themes as health, education, politics, social relationships; responsibility, destiny, guilt; or about life-plans, inner experiences and feelings.

---

BOX 1.1 BASIC THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

1. Social reality is understood as a shared product and attribution of meanings.
2. Processual nature and reflexivity of social reality are assumed.
3. ‘Objective’ life circumstances are made relevant to a life-world through subjective meanings.
4. The communicative nature of social reality permits the reconstruction of constructions of social reality to become the starting point for research.
Characteristics of qualitative research practice

The practice of qualitative research is generally characterized by the fact that there is no single method, but a spectrum of methods belonging to different approaches that may be selected according to the research questions and the research tradition.

A central feature of qualitative research that is related to this is (2) the appropriateness of methods: for almost every procedure it is possible to ascertain for which particular research-object it was developed. The starting point was normally that the previously available methods were not suited to this specific purpose. For example, the narrative interview (see 5.2, 5.11) was originally developed for the analysis of communal power processes, and objective hermeneutics (see 5.16) for studies of socializing interaction. It is typical of qualitative research that the object of investigation and the questions that are brought to bear represent the point of reference for the selection and evaluation of methods, and not – as often still generally happens in psychology with its emphasis on experiments – that everything that cannot be investigated by particular methods is excluded from the research.

Qualitative research (3) has a strong orientation to everyday events and/or the everyday knowledge of those under investigation. Action processes – for instance, the development of advisory conversations – are situated in their everyday context.

Accordingly, qualitative data collection, analytical and interpretative procedures are bound, to a considerable extent, to the notion of contextuality (4): data are collected in their natural context, and statements are analysed in the context of an extended answer or a narrative, or the total course of an interview, or even in the biography of the interview partner.

In the process (5), attention is paid to the diversity of perspectives of the participants. A further feature of qualitative research is that the reflective capability of the researcher about his or her actions and observations in the field of investigation is taken to be an essential part of the discovery and not a source of disturbance that needs to be monitored or eliminated (6).

Moreover, the epistemological principle of qualitative research is the understanding (7) of complex relationships rather than explanation by isolation of a single relationship, such as ‘cause-and-effect’. Understanding is oriented, in the sense of ‘methodically controlled understanding of otherness’, towards comprehension of the perspective of the other party.

To allow this perspective as much freedom of movement as possible and to get as close to it as possible, data collection in qualitative research is characterized, above all, by the principle of openness (8) (Hoffmann-Riem 1980): questions have an open formulation, and in ethnography observations are not carried out according to some rigid observational grid but also in an open fashion.

Qualitative studies frequently begin (9) with the analysis or reconstruction of (individual) cases (Gerhardt 1995), and then only proceed, as a second step, to summarizing or contrasting these cases from a comparative or generalizing viewpoint.

Furthermore, qualitative research assumes the construction of reality (10) – the subjective constructions of those under investigation and the research process as a constructive act (see 3.4).

Finally, despite the growing importance of visual data sources such as photos or films, qualitative research is predominantly a text-based discipline (11). It produces data in the form of texts – for example, transcribed interviews or ethnographic fieldwork notes – and concentrates, in the majority of its (hermeneutic) interpretative procedures, on the textual medium as a basis for its work.

In its objectives qualitative research is still a discipline of discovery, which is why concepts from epistemology – such as abduction (see 4.3) – enjoy growing attention. The discovery of new phenomena in its data is frequently linked, in qualitative research, to an overall aim of developing theories on the basis of empirical study.

5 RELATIONSHIP WITH QUANTITATIVE-STANDARDIZED RESEARCH

Qualitative and quantitative-standardized research have developed in parallel as two independent spheres of empirical social research. Where research questions correspond they may also be used in combination (see 4.5). But here it should not be forgotten that they also differ from each other on essential points. For example, differences between the two research approaches are seen in the forms of experience that are
considered to be subject to methodical verification and, consequently, admissible as acceptable experience. This impinges in essential ways on the role of the investigator and on the degree of procedural standardization (see 4.1).

1 In quantitative research a central value is attached to the observer's independence of the object of research. Qualitative research, on the other hand, relies on the investigator's (methodically controlled) subjective perception as one component of the evidence.

2 Quantitative research relies, for its comparative-statistical evaluation, on a high degree of standardization in its data collection. This leads, for example, to a situation where in a questionnaire the ordering of questions and the possible responses are strictly prescribed in advance, and where – ideally – the conditions under which the questions are answered should be held constant for all participants in the research. Qualitative interviews are more flexible in this respect, and may be adapted more clearly to the course of events in individual cases.

Apart from debates in which both research directions deny each other any scientific legitimacy, we may ask more soberly under what circumstances – that is, for what questions and what objects of research – qualitative or quantitative research respectively may be indicated.

Qualitative research may always be recommended in cases where there is an interest in resolving an aspect of reality (‘field exploration’) that has long been under-researched with the help of some ‘sensitizing concepts’ (Blumer 1969). By using such ‘naturalistic’ methods as participant observation, open interviews or diaries, the first batch of information may be obtained to permit the formulation of hypotheses for subsequent standardized and representative data collection (for example, on the role of family members in rehabilitation; on the life-world of mentally ill people). Here qualitative studies are, if not a precondition, then a sensible follow-up to quantitative studies.

Qualitative research can complement so-called ‘hard data’ on patients (for example, socio-demographic data, the distribution of diagnoses over a population) with their more subjective views – such as perceptions of their professional future in the face of illness, or their degree of satisfaction with the results of particular types of treatment.

Qualitative (case-)studies can complement representative quantitative studies through differentiation and intensification, and can offer explanations to help in the interpretation of statistical relationships.

6 THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Qualitative research can look back on a long tradition that, in most of the social sciences, goes back to their origins. Since the 1960s in the United States and since the 1970s in the German-speaking world it has experienced a
rennaissance, and since then has become still more widely disseminated (cf. Flick 2002: 10, for the phases in this development). To date, there is no monograph that describes the history of qualitative research.

Its development has always been characterized by the fact that it has been conducted in very different subdisciplines that were each characterized by a specific theoretical background, an independent understanding of reality and an individual programme of methods. One example of this is ethnomethodology, which has distinguished itself by a specific research style (see 2.3) and theoretical background (see 3.2), with conversation analysis as its research programme (see 5.17) that has itself been differentiated into several newer approaches (see 5.18, 5.19), and which is altogether characterized by a broad empirical research activity. Corresponding to such developments, we find today that a whole range of qualitative research fields and approaches have been established which are developing independently and which have relatively little connection with discussions and research in the other fields. In addition to ethnomethodology, these fields of qualitative research may be exemplified by objective hermeneutics (see 5.17), biographical research (see 3.6, 3.7, 5.11), ethnography (see 3.8, 5.5), cultural studies (see 3.3, 3.9) or (ethno-)psychoanalytic research and deep structure hermeneutics (see 2.5, 5.20).

This differentiation within qualitative research is reinforced by the fact that the German- and English-language academic debates are, to some extent, concerned with very different themes and methods and there is only a very modest degree of interchange between the two areas.

In conclusion, we should refer again to the fact that discussions on method in the German literature, after a period in the 1970s where the main focus was on debates about matters of fundamental methodological theory, have now entered a phase of increasing methodical consolidation and the broad application of methods in empirical projects. In the Anglo-American debate, on the other hand, the 1980s and 1990s were marked by a new kind of reflection and by the questioning of certain methodical certainties. (The key issue here is the crisis of representation and legitimization brought about by the debates on writing in ethnography: cf. contributions in Denzin and Lincoln 2000; see also 2.7, 3.3, 5.5, 5.22.) Here too, however, there has been in recent years an increased desire to present the canonization of the procedure in textbooks, with at least partial reference to the self-critical debates (e.g. Gubrium and Holstein 1997; see part 7).

7 AIMS AND STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

The Companion will provide a survey, with appropriate ‘map-references’, of the different versions of qualitative research and a state-of-the-art overview of new trends in the spheres of theoretical and methodological development. In addition, it will endeavour to establish connections and to show common ground and differences in the (sometimes) extremely heterogeneous developments in the basic assumptions in epistemology, the types of classification specific to particular theories, the underlying methodological positions and the way methods have developed in qualitative research. These aims will be met in the following stages. Part 2, Qualitative Research in Action, will give the reader some insight into the research practice of a number of leading figures in qualitative research. By means of one or more studies we will show how such research personalities as Anselm Strauss, Erving Goffman, Norman Denzin or Marie Jahoda arrive at their research questions, and what characterizes their typical research designs, their selection of methods, their approach to their field and their procedures for data collection, evaluation and final interpretation. The selected representatives will then be classified according to whether they occupy an important place in either the history or the current practice of qualitative research.

Part 3, The Theory of Qualitative Research, first introduces the essential theoretical bases of qualitative research. In the first sections (3.1–3.5) the various background theories (such as phenomenology, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism) are examined to ascertain their influence on the design of qualitative investigations, their implications for matters of method in general, and for the selection of specific methods and interpretations. In the later sections (3.6–3.12) outlines are given of various object-related qualitative research programmes (such as biographical, organizational or evaluation research).
Part 4, *Methodology and Qualitative Research*, deals with questions of epistemology – from abduction and the role of hypotheses, to quality control in qualitative research. In addition, this part is concerned with more general questions of set-up in qualitative research – from the framing of the research design, to possibilities and limitations in linking qualitative and quantitative research, or in the sampling procedure.

Part 5, *Doing Qualitative Research*, introduces the essential methods of qualitative research with reference to the sequencing of the qualitative research process. The chapters are organized in four subsections. ‘Entering the Field’ outlines ways into the field and obstacles researchers might meet on their way. In ‘Collecting Verbal Data’ the most important methods of collecting verbal material – interviews and focus groups – are characterized. ‘Observing Processes and Activities’ introduces approaches to audiovisual data (observation and the use of film and photographic materials). ‘Analysis, Interpretation and Presentation’ includes chapters on methods for the elaboration (transcription of verbal data) and analysis of interview data, on computer-assisted analyses, content analyses and the most important methods of data interpretation. The final chapters in this subsection deal with questions of the presentation of results and research procedures in qualitative investigations.

In Part 6 we consider *Qualitative Research in Context* from several points of view, again in two subsections. In ‘The Use of Qualitative Research’, issues of research ethics and data protection, and of how qualitative research is to be incorporated in teaching, and questions of the utilization of findings are considered. The second half of Part 6 focuses on ‘The Future and Challenges of Qualitative Research’, with reference to its development: what has happened in the past, what is perhaps problematic, what is desirable and what may be expected in the future. Finally, Part 7 presents a selection of *Resources* for the qualitative researcher, which provides information about such matters as relevant journals, the classic literature and manuals, databases, computer programs and Internet sources.

**FURTHER READING**


