

The ESA RN Qualitative Methods Mid-term Conference

“Teaching Qualitative Methods”, University of Łódź, September 15-17, 2008

The conference “Teaching Qualitative Methods” (Midterm Conference of Qualitative Methods Research Network of European Sociological Association) took place between 15.IX 2008 and 17.IX 2008 at Faculty of Economics and Sociology, University of Łódź, Poland. The main organizer was The Sociology of Management and Organization Department, but the conference was prepared in cooperation with ESA Research Network 20 Qualitative Methods and the Polish Sociological Association (Section of Qualitative Sociology and Symbolic Interactionism), and with financial support of Director of Institute of Sociology, UŁ, Dean of Faculty of Economics and Sociology, UŁ and Rector of University of Łódź. The main host of the conference was prof. Krzysztof Konecki (University of Łódź, Poland), who also took care of good scientific content of the conference. The conference was organized under a patronage of President of Łódź, dr Jerzy Kropiwnicki. Polish Scientific Publishers PWN has presented their offer, including translations of two books by David Silverman, a conference participant.

The three-day conference had eight thematic sessions, three plenary sessions and three meetings with authors of the latest publications of the field. On the first day of the conference prof. Anne Ryen, president of ESA RN20 Qualitative Methods and prof. Krzysztof Konecki, vice-president of ESA RN20 Qualitative Methods opened the conference officially, then prof. Ansii Perakyla (University of Helsinki, Finland) and dr Johanna Ruusuvoori (University of Tampere, Finland) gave the first plenary lecture.

First plenary session, entitled „Teaching QM procedures and techniques” was chaired by prof. Krzysztof Konecki. During the session there has been spoken of various aspects of discourse analysis, its possible applications.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

Session 1, Teaching QM procedures and techniques.

During the session, *Ruth Wodak* presented her paper on “Dilemmas in (Critical) Discourse Studies: The Many (Inflationary) Meanings of ‘Discourse’”. In her paper, Ruth Wodak, (Lancaster University, UK) discussed her experiences when teaching Discourse Analysis to post-graduate students or even Post-Docs from other, neighbouring fields. As Wodak says, it seems to be the case that discourse analysis has become a fashion, is trendy, and thus almost every new project necessarily has to include some notions of discourse and some promises of ‘doing discourse analysis’: this is true *inter alia* for Political Sciences, Media Studies, Sociology, History, Anthropology, and Management Studies. However, few interdisciplinary studies make the effort to integrate the important literature in the field of Discourse Studies, to reflect on the concepts of ‘discourse’, ‘text’, and ‘communication’, or to operationalize their research questions with linguistic-discursive categories. Frequently, the quoting of text sequences or a narrative interpretation seem to suffice. Ruth Wodak also noted, that after having realized the need for teaching discourse studies to an interdisciplinary audience which will not have the chance to learn linguistics, pragmatics, multi-modal analysis, or text linguistics from scratch, this has been a challenge for her to design overview courses which allow for precise definitions, on the one hand, and which also discuss the epistemological traditions of the various schools of Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis, on the other. As many scholars are certainly aware of, many significantly different notions of ‘discourse’ exist which also imply very different methodologies and methods of text analysis. Indeed, it is

relevant to distinguish 'text', 'discourse', 'genre', and 'context' from each other, in a very first step. Thirdly, these courses should also illustrate the actual 'doing' of discourse-analytic investigations. In the paper, Ruth Wodak has first illustrated some of the challenges, and then presented some of the examples and solutions which she has used when designing her post-graduate interdisciplinary discourse-analysis courses.

Unfortunately Karin E. Peterson with her paper "How Does One Teach a Practice? Qualitative Methods in an Undergraduate University Classroom", had to withdraw due to travel logistics.

The second session was „Researchers' learning and experience", chaired by prof. Thomas Eberle (University of St Gallen, Switzerland). During the session researchers have shared their experiences and practical knowledge from the field which they have gathered during researching various fields.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

The author of the session report is prof. Thomas S. Eberle

Session 2, Researcher's learning and experience.

In this session, four researchers reported on learning processes and experiences. *Monika Grochalska* (University of Warmia and Mazury, Poland), in her presentation on *Narrative Interviews and Adult Learning*, argued that both researchers and interviewees can learn by doing narrative interviews. Student researchers can learn active listening, respecting other's memories, coping with emotions and using other's experience in one's own life, as well as developing techniques. Obstacles to the learning process can be: improperly prepared research, wrong time and place, lack of time and lack of sensitivity and willingness as well as common fears. Also the interviewees can learn, notably an awareness of events' meanings for the lifespan, the ability to retrospect, the ability to tell the life story, coping with emotions and using past experiences in further life. The conclusion then emphasized the positive aspects of "narratives as a therapy" for both researcher and interviewee. This came somewhat as a surprise, as a therapy usually presupposes a diagnosis of an ailment or an affliction which was definitely missing here. Should we, when teaching qualitative methods, not rather strive for skills?

This is the direction which was taken by *Marta Ceglomska and Katarzyna Iwinska* (Collegium Civitas, Poland) in their presentation *Learning by Doing*. First they pointed out that there is still a division between qualitative and quantitative methods in teaching programs and that the students usually underestimate the sophistication of qualitative research techniques (in contrast to statistics and quantitative methods). This is a major challenge to meet, together with the fact that there is hardly enough time to teach all the necessary tools and techniques. How to do it? The presenters gave the following recommendations: Firstly, classes should be interactive and skills-oriented, with minimum lecture and maximum workshop. Readings should convey the scope of qualitative research to inspire students, and assignments should be used as a warm-up before a more complicated research project. Secondly, students should participate in each stage of a research project, in the design, data gathering, analysis, report as well as the presentation of the findings. Thirdly, students should learn how to use professional software (Atlas.ti). However, computer classes have another format and require strictness and discipline, and students have to become aware that the software does not do the job for them. Marta and Katarzyna concluded with the appeal to engage students in various stages of the research process, give as many assignments as possible and encourage students to practice.

A special road was taken by *Izabela Wagner* (Warsaw University, Poland) with her lively presentation *Coupling career fairy tales – 'Specific Sociology Class.'* She started out with the warning that she would not talk

about teaching sociology based on the methods of sociology teachers nor on one of the famous accounts on the 'tricks of the trade.' Instead, she would share a personal teaching experience which got a very positive response by the participants, and which took a different road than textbooks on the history of sociological ideas or handbooks about qualitative methods. Following Geertz who recommended studying what the practitioners of a science do, she set out to look at the biographies of sociologists, their family backgrounds, their education, their practices and experiences, their collaborations and their successors – in other words: to study the people behind the theories. By means of the concept of career coupling processes she showed that science is a group activity: the scientist is usually presented like one single man, but he is always part of a collaboration. The 'big men' of science are made by their disciples who cite and quote them and develop their ideas further. And both sides benefit: by collaborating they help each other building their careers. Izabela illustrated her case by many plausible examples. She taught her sociology class not as a history of ideas but as a history of collaborations of human beings. This approach stirred a lot of interest among the students who had suffered so far from the obscure, boring and difficult, complex theories and concepts of sociology and suddenly detected the human side of sociology, namely its making in collaborations. Students and teacher made a trip together which was illuminating to all of them and which was a qualitative approach to researching the making of sociology. The lively presentation which got much attention among the audience, conveyed convincingly the great enthusiasm and inspiration the teacher had felt.

Piotr Chomczyński (University of Lodz, Poland) then gave his presentation *Qualitative Research on people who served a sentence. How to study stigmatized groups?* This was not a report on how to teach qualitative methods but rather on a researcher's experience during a research process. Firstly, some conceptions on stigmatizing practices as a social phenomenon were presented (Lemert, Goffman, Becker). Then the sources of data were spelled out: articles in newspapers and internet, documentary films, interviews with former prisoners and prison psychologists, interviews with prisoner's families and with representatives of the public opinion, experiments which were directed at the social perception of prison inmates, and photo analyses. This was work in progress, much of the research was only projected and not yet implemented, and therefore the reported learning experiences were rather scarce. Some difficulties which were encountered so far were referred, such as the difficulty to access former prisoners and their families and their reluctance to give information, the biases in the utterances of people under study and the complexity of the analyzed problems.

The last session of the day was a **Meet the Author** with prof. *David Silverman* (King's College, London University, UK), author of the book "Doing qualitative research", published in Polish by PWN as "Prowadzenie badań jakościowych". The discussion was lead by scientific editor of the book, prof. Krzysztof Konecki.

The first conference day was completed with an official dinner, which took place in Museum of the Factory in Manufaktura complex, where conference guests could also participate in presentation of an old, factory working system and watch a film on Łódź factory workers' life.

16 September, the second day of the conference, plenary lecture was given by prof. *Brian Roberts*. After the plenary session there took place a third thematic session concerning teaching qualitative methods of social sciences in multicultural context. The session was chaired by prof. Ross Koppel (University of Pennsylvania, USA), and papers presented by researchers from Israel and Norway have attracted attention of the conference participants to the difficulty and rising importance of such type of research, and as well, ways of teaching how to conduct such research.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

Session 3, Teaching QM in multicultural context.

Anne Ryen (University of Agder, Norway) presented her paper about teaching QM online: Guide to a successful cross-cultural master-course, in which she shared her experience from The Master's Programme in Development Management. (She has shared her experiences on working on Faculty started The Master's Programme in Development Management.) Particular emphasis is on on-line learning (e-learning pedagogy) where most of the teaching, instruction, tuition and supervision take place on the Internet through the Fronter Learning Management System and with a pedagogic having a social constructivist approach. The programme was implemented by a network of universities from the South and the North (Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Uganda, Ghana, and Norway) recruiting students from across the world. Anne's focus is on the qualitative methodology part. Each course is sectioned into modules based on a variety of students' activities, - student-student and student-tutor/teacher interaction - plus a number of hand-ins. After presenting the structure, interaction and results, she has discussed two particular interlinked matters: first, how can we make teaching QM online work and second, how does the study programme in practice relate to the Southern voices on assumed universality of Western research as captured in terms like "the captive mind" and "inquiring frames"? The discussion of these issues will be based on the experiences and results from the study programme. This includes the debate: how do we at course-level handle the Western bias of the social sciences?

The second presenter was *Shalva Weil* (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel) on training multi-cultural researchers in qualitative methods. The speech has also analyzed the snags and the spin-offs of training a multi-cultural team in collaborative research. Taking the example of a large-scale qualitative study carried out in Israel among Jews and Arabs on the subject of violence in schools, Shalva Weil discussed the choice of research assistants, the criteria for selection, the interaction between the researchers, and the major collaborative issues that troubled them. In addition, it considered the issue of hierarchy: both among team researchers and in relation to the principal researcher (this lecturer), who trained them. In this respect, also the political and social influences on the researchers, who hold different political and social ideologies, have been considered. The presentation has also weighed up the advantages of team research vis-a-vis "lone wolf research", and demonstrated how important multi-cultural issues are today in conducting large-scale research in multi-cultural societies.

During the second session this day, chaired by prof. Giampietro Gobo (University of Milano, Italy), Polish, Mexican and Swiss researchers have presented their experience from teaching qualitative methods outside sociological environment, e.g. among doctors, businessmen and economists.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

The author of this session report is prof. Giampietro Gobo

Session 4, Reaching outside sociological environment.

Thomas S. Eberle (University of St. Gallen, Switzerland) and *Christoph Maeder* (University of Teacher Education TG, Switzerland), two Swiss sociologists, faced the topic of teaching qualitative methods in business administration courses and reported their experience of teaching them in business school. Initially students of such courses are not really interested about methods because they usually associate 'methods', firstly, with dry, uninteresting talk about abstract ways of developing a research project, and secondly, with complex quantitative procedures which bear no meaning to their lived experience at all. As a result, they hardly choose courses on methods as an elective. In addition students are not interested in the scientific purity of theoretical concepts, methodology, applied methods and claims of statements. They prefer quick-and-dirty methods, which will do it for all practical purposes. Eberle and Maeder showed their strategy to capture students' attention about qualitative methods using films, advertisement material

and so on. The (initial) skeptical students become, lesson by lesson, involved and change their attitude toward methodology, appreciating qualitative methods and their efficacy in studying even topics related to business.

Svetlana Gudkova working at the Leon Kozminski Academy of Entrepreneurship and Management of Warsaw, talked about “Field Research as a Method of Entrepreneurial Education”. She showed the possibilities of the use of qualitative research in teaching entrepreneurship. Their teaching strategy is based upon encouraging students to enter the field and do their own qualitative research projects. Gudkova and Glinka use field research as an integral part of the learning process: students participating in entrepreneurship courses conduct open, semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurs. Doing this they have possibility not only to gain unique experience-based knowledge and learn about the ways of doing business, but also have a chance to change an attitude towards running own business (and recognize it as a natural path of their career) which is very important in Poland.

Lukas T. Marciniak (University of Lodz, Poland), a Polish sociologist, accounted his experience of teaching qualitative methods to practitioners (engineers and physicians) not familiar with sociology but interested in studying social processes. Practitioners understand that application of the social research methodology is necessary in contemporary times; however they believe that the way of application should be appropriate to the rudiments of their science as well as their cumulated research experience and taken for granted markers for a “good” method. In such cases, qualitative methods workshop is an occasion to express own methodological assumptions and becomes an arena of negotiations. And the focus of the workshop instantly moves from training to producing the “right” method, compatible with all previous suppositions. Marciniak described his repertoire of interactional strategies used for negotiating research method and some aspects of the social organization of interdisciplinary research team work observed by him during workshops for engineers and physicians.

Margarita Santoyo and *Rodriguez José Arellano Sabio*, sociologists from the Centro de Estudios Sociológicos (Centre of Sociological Studies) of FCPyS-UNAM (National University de Mexico), described their interesting experience of tutoring the fieldwork of students of the BA in Sociology at the National University of Mexico. These candidates learn qualitative methods by doing own research projects and understand theory through practice.

Session fifth, the last one this day, chaired by prof. Shalva Weil (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel) concerned mutual relations between quantitative and qualitative research methods. Researchers presenting their papers have spoken about opposition and compatibility of those research methods and also to the use of both techniques in different research types.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

Session 5, Qualitative and Quantitative.

The first contributor was prof. *Ross Koppel* from Sociology Department, University of Pennsylvania, and Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania with his paper on “Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Data: Symphony or Cacophony?” He argued that the benefit of combining and triangulating multiple research methods is an accepted principle of sociology and most social sciences. And that more than one method is better than a single methodological approach-providing the researcher with a more rounded and nuanced view of the subject. In addition, Koppel pointed that potential biases associated with any one method may be better observed and perhaps

even partially counteracted via a multiplicity of approaches. In the event of conflicting findings from multiple methods, the contrasting findings are valued as reflections of a complex reality and of the utility of alternative techniques. Koppel has highlighted the dichotomy between the integrative and separatist perspectives among social researchers. In the paper Koppel has also discussed his efforts to combine and present six research methods: 1-observing and shadowing nurses using a specific technology (bar-coded medication administration with scanning machines? BCMA) at two hospitals; 2- interviewing staff and hospital leaders at five hospitals; 3-analysis of data reflecting 336,000 uses of BCMA that also involved approximately 40,000 BCMA overrides (circumventions) by nurses and doctors; 4- researcher participation in staff meetings about the technology and its implementation; 5-participation in one hospital's "failure-mode-and-effects analyses"? a discussion of errors and possible errors; 6- a convenience sample of one-on-one interviews with leaders from 32 hospitals who attended professional meetings.

The second presenters were *Piotr Weryński* and *Adam Lech* (The Silesian University of Technology, Poland), who presented their paper on triangulation as a method of quantitative research. Piotr and Adam claimed that number of authors writing about using any quantitative sources in sociological research point to a necessity of using different methods, independent data sources, and triangulation of theoretical perspectives in research process as well as comparing results obtained by several researchers.

They have also suggested introducing two supplementary types of triangulation, beside those mentioned by Denzin. The first one is triangulation of cognitive perspectives of individual examined actors of social life, both personal and institutional. Another type of triangulation is triangulation of analysis levels, i.e. taking into consideration in analytical work of a researcher data, phenomena and processes from micro, mezo and macro levels, and mutual interactions of these emergent levels of reality. A vital role in that approach is played by exogenic factors interactions. Importance of instrumental links of a community with external systems (centres of power, extraregional non- governmental organisations, European Union structures) should be considered. Piotr and Adam have also spoken about the problem of using triangulation procedure as a way of rendering research results obtained by qualitative methods more objective and of verifying the accuracy of the data obtained in that way. Our analysis will be illustrated by an example of applying triangulation in research conducted among the homeless by means of Fritz Schütze's autobiographical narrative interview. The objective of additional information sources used in the research was above all to verify biographical facts given by examined people during narrative interviews, particularly in those cases where because of various reasons (e.g. incoherence of narration) the facts raised some doubts.

Unfortunately Marek Gorzko with his paper *To What Extent Are Qualitative Methods a "Natural Sociology"?* and Irena Szlachcicowa with *Qualitative versus Quantitative Research – the Toxic Opposition* had to withdraw their papers due to travel logistics.

At the end of the second day of the conference there took place a **Meet the author** session with prof. *Giampietro Gobo*, whose discussant was prof. Anne Ryen. The meeting concerned his book (entitled) „*Doing Ethnography*” published in 2008 by Sage.

After the second day of the conference our quests took part in Łódź sightseeing, where all most important Łódź monuments were presented, and where they could find out more, about the history of the city.

Third and the last day of the conference has begun with a plenary lecture by prof. *Andrzej Piotrowski* (University of Łódź, Poland). Then the sixth thematic session took place, chaired by Christoph Meader (Kreuzlingen/St. Gallen, Switzerland), entitled „Visual data analysis in QM teaching”. During the session researchers from Italy, Germany and Poland presented their experience concerning the use of visual data (like films and photographs) and laboratories in teaching qualitative research methods.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

The author of this session report is prof. Christoph Maeder

Session 6, Visual data analysis in QM teaching.

Scholars teaching qualitative methods should, like every teacher, take the recipient designs of their audiences into account. In this sense *Giampietro Gobo* (University of Milano, Italy) argued strongly for an extended use of films for teaching methods and methodology, because our society is becoming more and more “a visual society”. This means that our everyday life is riddled with more and more cameras (surveillance, reconnaissance, cell phone with cameras etc.) and image producing devices (screens, printers etc.). In other words our students live in a highly visually organized environment and they are used to the visual technologies. Maybe even more than they are used to the use of text! Taken together this implies that teaching qualitative becomes a visually based enterprise too. The examples given by Gobo fostered a lively and interesting discussion. And it was mentioned by a discussant that – just as an example for this strategy - it is very difficult to have productive discussions, when using movies in teaching. *Krzysztof Konecki* (University of Lodz, Poland) proposed to use photographs of people to analyze the displays of identities of people in grounded theory based research designs. The material he showed came from an impressive study on homelessness in Lodz. One of the important but up to today neglected features of living the homeless life is the more or less complete lack of private space. This could be very well seen on the pictures of homeless people in their ordinary settings. Konecki also demonstrated a way to transcend the idea of a singular identity of a person by the analysis of photographs of the same person in different, but typical situations of homeless people. *Bernt Schnettler* (TU Berlin, Germany)) gave insights into a working environment for visual research at the Technical University of Berlin. Even though there are no experiments done there, the place is called the “Laboratory for Qualitative Video-Analysis.” In the curriculum of the students of sociology at the TU Berlin there is obviously ample time and space for the introduction of visual sociology, mainly based on video-data of different settings and practices. Schnettler referred to four impressive examples of students` video-work and insisted on text as concomitant outcome. *Waldemar Dymarzyk* (University of Lodz, Poland) introduced the auditorium into some of his own experience in learning qualitative methods in Lodz and then gave insight into a project where the production of gender roles through the division of work was documented by the use of photography. Along e.g. the dichotomies of serious / not serious, inside / outside, hard work / easy work it could be shown how male and female spheres are socially constructed. The final overall discussion did not yield a single conclusion, but the four inspiring presentations surely deepened the understanding of the audience how visual data could be used in teaching qualitative methods.

Seventh thematic session concerned institutional context of teaching qualitative methods. The session was chaired by prof. Bernt Schnettler (TU Berlin, Germany). Scientists, who took part in the session have presented various aspects of institutionalized teaching of qualitative methods, both on universities and in business organizations.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

The author of this session report is prof Bernt Schnettler

Session 7, "QM in institutional context", chaired by Bernt Schnettler (TU Berlin, Germany), counted with two presentations, the first being delivered by *Jan K. Coetzee* (Department of Sociology, Rhodes University, South Africa). Coetzee presented research on "The role of the University in shaping students' perception of risk", focusing on how young students experience their world as an interpretive reality with the use of shared common-sense meanings and knowledge. He starts from the assumption that risk is not a static, objective phenomenon, but is constantly constructed and negotiated. Coetzee explored ways of integrating risk awareness into teaching methodology and its possibilities to become embedded into mainstream teaching. Showing results on AIDS prevention, he describes how University can take a pro-active stance by means of integrating awareness of risks in teaching qualitative methodology in combination with the practice of research projects. Through teaching and ongoing feedback on research projects students are required to engage with different aspects in the field of risk. Teaching qualitative methodology in this way becomes part of the University's engagement in the mundane task of students' transition towards adulthood. The second presentation by *Marżena Baryluk* (Uniwersytet Wroclawski, Poland), dealt with "Increasing employee awareness through their participation in the company's condition" by suggesting what she denominated as "the practice of applying the research author model 'together research'". This model relies on a broad set of basic moral assumptions, whose application supposedly might foster cooperation, enhance work performance and support the creation of an appropriate working environment in firms. The model's crucial characteristics are described as subjectivity, partnership, dialogue, transparency and ethics. Modelled as a kind of participatory research practice, "together-research" apparently helps increasing awareness, understanding and responsibility for the company. It consists of the following phases: prior-understanding, dialogue, interpretation, understanding and application. Baryluk finally discussed limitations and expected possibilities of this research model in practice. Both presentations illustrated, although in quiet different manner, the profit of applying knowledge and skills inspired by qualitative methods to rather pragmatic fields outside the realm of strict scientific research.

Eighth, and the last thematic session entitled "Teaching by research" was chaired by prof. Anne Ryen. During the session scientists have shared their experience in conducting research with students and communities. The main attention of the audience was attracted by very personal relations between researchers and the researched, which enabled a very deep entering into the research field.

A precise description of the session may be found here:

The author of this session report is prof. Anne Ryen

Session 8, Teaching by research.

The first contributors were *Bodea Crisan* and *Tammy Thomas* (University of Pittsburgh, USA) who presented a paper about "An Apprenticeship Approach to Community Participatory Qualitative Research". Crisan and Thomas described their experiences of an Advanced Ethnographic methods class developed for Master and Doctoral students in Public Health, US. The students had previously studied ethnographic methods with the instructor, and expressed interest in a more in-depth, advanced level course. A newly designed course was therefore created. The course was inspired by three related desiderates:

- 1) to facilitate an apprenticeship, practice-based approach to teaching and learning the tools and processes of qualitative research;
- 2) to develop rich relationships with the community; and
- 3) to stimulate a collaborative, creative team work among instructor, students, and community participants.

Their professor's* long standing relationships with two family service community-based agencies made this apprenticeship training model in qualitative research possible to happen. Based on the community-based participatory research, student researchers met with the community organizations to discuss and design the research project. With one agency, students and the professor designed the research together with a parent leadership group. Students participated in the design, data collection, analysis, writing the final report, and presentation of data. Additionally, a series of reflexive meetings among student participants were organized to discuss the salient aspects of the field and research experience as crystallized throughout the collaborative project. In their presentation, they focused on the most relevant aspects of this research experience from the perspective of the students, including: forging a collective framework for conceptual and practical research activities; interpersonal values and dynamics in establishing a research team composed of community participants and students; community participants as active decision makers during all the phases of the research process; hands-on qualitative research as a venue for appreciating the complexities, challenges, and rewards of qualitative work; the opportunity to reflect on and actualize the creative potential of qualitative team work.

* Crisan and Thoman also honoured their late professor who had taken them through this process and experience.

The second contributor was *Kaja Kaźmierska, (University of Łódź) with Teaching Biographical Approach-Using Biographical Approach*. In her presentation, Kaźmierska took us along her experiences based on courses from biographical analysis run for students who had chosen interpretative sociology as a main perspective. Her main focus was on showing some sociological and epistemological aspect of the biography analysis rather than methodological ones. Also, she showed ways of using biography in an educational process as such e.g. when transmitting collective memory or in social work activities.

Unfortunately, Ana Maria Brandão with her paper "I've found more difficulties than I expected to", had to withdraw due to travel logistics.

At the end of the day, also the end of the conference, there took place a **Meet the author** session with prof. *Ruth Wodak* and dr *Michał Krzyżanowski* (Lancaster University, UK). The discussion with editors of „Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences” was conducted by dr. Anna Horolets (Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Poland).

Then, during an official conference closing prof. Anne Ryen, president of ESA RN20 Qualitative Methods, thanked all organizers with a special emphasis on prof. Krzysztof Konecki, our main host for the conference, and Dominika Byczkowska, leader of the local organising committee, for making the RN20 midterm conference (citation:) ”a most successful event, socially as well as academically”.

and summed the conference up, as a very important and rewarding project, which made it able for the world's most important qualitative sociologists to meet and share their experiences. The conference has also showed how important and wide part of the research knowledge is teaching qualitative methods, and how many possibilities it gives, both inside and outside sociological and organizational environment.

Some of the conference full papers will be published in a special issue of *Qualitative Sociology Review* (www.qualitativesociologyreview.org)

Dominika Byczkowska

Leader of the local organizing committee