



# Zeitschrift für Diskursforschung

## Journal for Discourse Studies

Herausgegeben von Reiner Keller | Werner Schneider | Willy Viehöver

■ **Florian Elliker, Rixta Wundrak, Christoph Maeder**

Introduction to the thematic issue and programmatic thoughts on the Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography

■ **Florian Elliker**

A Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography

■ **Rixta Wundrak**

»Welcome to paradise«. Methodological accentuations to the Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography based on field notes from a refugees' shelter

■ **Christoph Maeder**

Wissenssoziologische Diskursethnographie (WDE)? Die Kombination von Diskursanalyse und Ethnographie als Suchbewegung zwischen Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit

■ **Yalız Akbaba**

Discourse Ethnography on Migrant Other Teachers: Turn the Stigma into Capital!

# Inhaltsverzeichnis

*Willy Viehöver / Reiner Keller / Werner Schneider*  
Editorial ..... 230

## Themenbeiträge

*Florian Elliker, Rixta Wundrak, Christoph Maeder*  
Introduction to the thematic issue and programmatic thoughts on the  
Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography ..... 232

*Florian Elliker*  
A Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography ..... 249

*Rixta Wundrak*  
»Welcome to paradise«. Methodological accentuations to the  
Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography  
based on field notes from a refugees' shelter ..... 276

*Christoph Maeder*  
Wissenssoziologische Diskursethnographie (WDE)?  
Die Kombination von Diskursanalyse und Ethnographie als  
Suchbewegung zwischen Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit ..... 299

*Yalız Akbaba*  
Discourse Ethnography on Migrant Other Teachers:  
Turn the Stigma into Capital! ..... 309

Florian Elliker/Rixta Wundrak/Christoph Maeder

## Introduction to the thematic issue and programmatic thoughts on the Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography

This thematic issue provides an introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography (SKADE).<sup>1</sup> SKADE emphasizes the relevance and analytical value of an ethnographic approach to discourse analysis. It is situated within the Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Analysis (SKAD), an approach primarily based on the work of Reiner Keller (1997, 2011a, 2011b, 2013). The SKAD paradigm has pursued two major objectives: (1) to link discourse theory to qualitative methodologies; and (2) to re-introduce a perspective that is concerned with wider societal structures into an interpretive research tradition that tends to empirically focus on the study of micro-settings (ibid., S.62). As a relatively recent methodological programme, SKADE aims at integrating the conceptual framework of SKAD with elements of ethnographic research strategies. This encompasses, among other issues, methodological implications for conceiving the study of discourses in ethnographic ways, practical ethnographic methods of data collection and analysis, and an ethnographic approach to delineating the research fields in which discourses are to be identified and analysed.

While the combination of ethnography and discourse analysis has been discussed in various forms, the suggestions put forward in this issue build on the previous and ongoing work of the contributors and editors that is – broadly speaking – situated within a qualitative and interpretive social science tradition of discourse analysis. Research talks in St Gallen (2016),<sup>2</sup> Cracow (2016),<sup>3</sup> and Augsburg (2017)<sup>4</sup> initiated the development of a programmatic framework – SKADE – suited to conceptualizing and articulating the shared aim of studying discourses in contexts of lived experience and interaction. The articles in this issue, each based on different projects and methodological variations, can be regarded as an initial contribution towards outlining a SKADE programme.

- 1 The German acronym for SKADE is WDE and stands for *Wissenssoziologische Diskursethnographie*.
- 2 Conference on discourse ethnography organized at the Research Institute of Sociology in St Gallen, Switzerland, 4–5 April 2016.
- 3 ESA RN20 Qualitative Methods Midterm Conference, European Sociological Association, Cracow, Poland, 1–3 September 2016.
- 4 Conference: Die diskursive Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit III. Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven einer wissenssoziologischen Diskursforschung. Stream 1: Wissenssoziologische Diskursethnographie. Augsburg, Germany, 23–24 March 2017.

As with most ethnographic work, SKADE pursues an object-oriented strategy when it comes to determining a specific research strategy for a given project. Thus, the SKADE programme is open to different methodological procedures and may entail a plurality of different data. Continuing the tradition of SKAD, it furthermore engages with analytical and theoretical questions articulated in the work of Michel Foucault and translates these into an interpretive theoretical framework. Both of these concerns warrant explicit reflection on how different methods and types of data (triangulation), as well as theoretical schools within the interpretative paradigm, are combined. Such a combination, however, goes beyond ›adding‹ a method to the study of discourses; rather, it entails the necessity of discussing the underlying theoretical premises of the ethnographic approaches and discourse-analytical perspectives – a discussion that is informed at once by theoretical reflections and empirical research practice. The articles in this issue aim at fostering such a discussion, putting forward different theoretical assumptions for a programme of SKADE as well as suggesting new emphases for discourse-ethnographic studies.

If analysing discourses is understood very broadly as studying »patterns in the structure and functioning of language, and in the constitution and communication of meaning as it unfolds and becomes manifest in specific contexts« (Rau/Elliker/Coetzee forthcoming), then various research strategies can be identified that pursue an ethnographic approach to studying discourses. Established discourse-analytical approaches suggest using ethnographic methods as exploratory fieldwork in addition to the more conventional type of data (Wodak/Meyer 2001). Other approaches include linguistic ethnographies (Creese 2008; Blommaert 2006; Rampton et al. 2004; Tusting/Maybin 2007; van Praet 2010), socio-linguistic ethnographies of communication (Gumperz/Dell 1972), and studies that use classic ethnographic methods to analyse the use of language (see Jewitt 2009) – for instance in classrooms (Kress et al. 2004), or studies that address situated writing practices (Smart 2006; Swales 1998).

For many of these approaches, ethnography could rather be described as a useful tool with which to analyse »language in use« or »text in context«, but not as an integral part of the analytical and theoretical framework. Studies that aim to explicitly bring together both ethnographic research traditions and discourse perspectives (Smart 2008; Macgilchrist/van Hout 2011) have focussed on the political and legal domain, e.g. courtrooms (Michaeler et al. 2010); on biographical research, e.g. experiences and ascriptions of racism (Ransiek 2016); and on pedagogical practices (Langer 2008; Lin 2008; Ott 2011; Reh/Breuer/Schütz 2011), the latter broadly situated in a poststructuralist tradition (Fegter et al. 2015). Yet another methodological elaboration in which discourse and ethnography are combined is called *dispositif analysis* (see e.g. Lippert 2014).<sup>5</sup> Due to the various epistemological, theoretical, and disciplinary traditions, these approaches vary considerably in how they conceive the relationship between discourse (and the notion of discourse itself) on the one hand, and ethnographic research strategies on the other (for discussions on the relationship between discourse (analysis) and ethnography, see e.g. Hammersley 2005; Keller 2007; Lima 2010; Ott/Langer/Rabenstein 2012).

5 See e.g. Jäckle (2011). For a critical discussion, cf. Keller (2007, 2016).

While partially building on these approaches, the contributors of this issue situate the research problems, concepts, and phenomena in question within a sociology of knowledge approach in a phenomenological tradition (see for a recent discussion on the relationship between phenomenology and sociology Eberle 2016). The following subsections in this introduction follow this contextualization. Section 1 introduces SKAD, establishing the basic notion of discourse and its theoretical underpinnings. Section 2 serves to bring ethnography and SKAD together by outlining some of the central epistemological premises and concepts. Both sections aim at programmatically outlining SKADE, demonstrating where such an approach differs from the aforementioned discourse-ethnographic strategies. In section 3, some of the main sensitizing concepts are introduced that the contributions in this issue regard as pivotal to SKADE. Finally, section 4 provides a brief overview over these contributions.

## 1 The Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse (SKAD)

The Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse (SKAD) (Keller 1997, 2011a, 2011b, 2013) departs from and incorporates the work of Michel Foucault (1974a, 1988, 1974b, 1978, 1991b, 1991a) and integrates his work into the sociology of knowledge in the tradition shaped by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann's »Social Construction of Reality« (1966).

SKAD conceives discourses as both social power structures and structuring practices (Keller 2013). Situated within the interpretive paradigm and the qualitative research tradition, the approach has been developed to broaden the focus of qualitative research to include wider societal structures of knowledge – situated in a research environment in which, particularly within the German interpretive sociologies, empirical qualitative studies have predominantly practised micro-analytical methods, studying small life-worlds (e.g., Honer 1993) and scenes (e.g., Hitzler/Pfadenhauer 1998; for an overview, see Hitzler/Honer 1997). Empirical research in the SKAD tradition has particularly focused on studying and analysing discourses as they appear in and structure social domains that are considered of wider societal significance, such as the political field, the legal system, state bureaucracies, the mass media, the education system, large organizations of any kind, etc. Within this context of a concern with the macro-level, studying and analysing discourses ethnographically reintroduces the micro- and meso-level of analysis and thus constitutes to some extent a »return to the local«.

## 2 The Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse Ethnography (SKADE)

As Keller has suggested, there are several ways of relating SKAD with ethnographic research strategies (Keller 2003, 2011b, S.260ff), conceiving this relationship and research approach as »ethnography of dispositifs«, i.e. a »focused discourse ethnography« that is

primarily aimed at analysing dispositifs (Keller 2007; Keller 2016). Dispositifs are understood in the Foucauldian tradition as infrastructure aimed at solving specific action problems (ibid.). Keller suggests distinguishing between dispositifs of discourse production and dispositifs of discourse-related interventions in the world. The contributions in this issue depart from this focus on the infrastructural underpinnings of discourses and its implication, namely that discourse-related construction of reality cannot be explained by discourses alone.

While not specifically employing the notion of dispositif, SKADE as put forward – in differing ways – in this issue rests on central tenets of a phenomenological sociology of knowledge in the tradition of Alfred Schütz (1967), Schütz and Luckmann (1974, 1989), and Berger and Luckmann (1966). This scholarly tradition is particularly well suited as an epistemological and theoretical framework for discourse analysis as well as ethnography, as its conceptual apparatus is differentiated enough to consider and integrate phenomena of concern to both strands of research: (1) situated action and experience, actors, and cultural knowledge; and (2) larger sign- and language-based meaning contexts and (more or less obdurate) structures. In the following, we will highlight a few of these conceptualizations that are central to what we understand SKADE to be.

The »social« dimension of reality (or »sociality«) is established in two ways. On the one hand, it is established through the situated production of intersubjectivity – a process that is fleeting and evanescent and depends on the effort that the actors put into sustaining it. On the other hand, the knowledge that the actors use is socially derived, i.a. the action plans they routinely and implicitly or consciously and explicitly form and employ are largely based on socially derived stocks of knowledge (implying a different notion of agency for human actors and objects; for a differentiated discussion, see Poferl/Schroer 2015). Acting (*handeln*) derives its meaning from these action plans, or what Schütz calls »actions« (*Handlungen*) (Schütz 1967). The way an individual's stock of knowledge is structured depends on the various contexts, situations, and institutions in which this knowledge was constructed and is repeatedly applied. Knowledge, experience, and action are shaped by a large range of social structures that may form relatively independent contexts on their own. This resonates with Foucault's later work, as Keller (2011b, S.138) points out, highlighting the importance of distinguishing between »discourses from discourse-external practices or fields of practice and the study of the relations between the two«. Actors experience reality in individuated and partially individualized ways and develop a sense of agency and way of acting that may go beyond merely reproducing structures. Thus, the development and formation as well as the effects and reality construction of discourses are »mediated« by and happen in interplay with local contexts and actors that are at least partially autonomous and endowed with a sense of agency. Consequently, the social and discourse-related construction of reality is construed to be at once objectified and obdurate – through processes of institutionalization and legitimation – as well as processual and evanescent in its everyday production through actors (see Berger/Luckmann 1966).

Experience, knowledge, and action are fundamentally corporeal experiences and cannot be reduced to sign systems and language in particular, although the latter plays a cen-

tral role in structuring everyday reality. In the phenomenological sociology of knowledge tradition, meaning constitution is based on bodily experiences and perception, the typification of which is considered to be at least in part pre-linguistic (see for a discussion e.g. Eberle 1984, S.60ff.). Acting (*handeln*) and behaviour/behaving (*verhalten*) are both corporeal and embodied processes as well as processes based on sign systems and language; while de facto intertwined, they must not be reduced to one of these dimensions. Consequently, SKAD analytically distinguishes between acting that is predominantly discursive (i.e. sign- and language-based) and non-discursive acting that is primarily centred around bodily movements and experiences (Keller 2013, S.71). Both forms of acting – discursive and non-discursive – may be structured by and related to discourses (understood as large-scale meaning context and structures) or may be structured by relatively resilient other (local) contexts and structures. However, it would be wrong to imagine two entirely separate worlds – the one of discourses and the other of non-discourse-related realities. The distinction is an analytical one and poses methodological challenges (see Wundrak 2018). The contributions of this issue differ slightly with regard to how they treat this distinction. Yet, all of them consider the relationship between local context and discourse as an analytically valuable one, posing the question as to what extent actors, for example, can be conceived as acting in partially autonomous or resilient ways when engaging with, relating to, and being subjugated by discourses. Situated within an interpretative approach, SKADE aims to answer empirically not only how orders of knowledge shape situations and its practices, but also how orders of knowledge emerge and are constructed in everyday interaction. These and further methodological problems warrant further theoretical discussion and empirical work.

To summarize: SKADE reflects on the relationship between the local and discourses. Discourses do not exist in a discursive universe on their own; rather, their formation, reproduction, and transformation; their effects and ways of intervening in the world; and the ways they are constructed through local action and experience, must (also) be understood and analysed in relation to the relevant contexts of the everyday life-worlds of the actors that at once use and are subjected to discourses. This in turn implies a study of these life-worlds, the actors engaged in discourse use, and discourse in daily interaction. Discourses are not reduced to text-based (i.e. discursive) forms of realities, but manifest themselves and even emerge in bodily action and corporeal experience.

Ethnographic research strategies – with their focus on studying social reality based on »first-hand experience and exploration« (Atkinson et al. 2001, S.4) and their concern with »culture«, i.e. with reconstructing the explicit and implicit knowledge that underpins and shapes perceiving, experiencing, interpreting, and acting (see e.g. Spradley 1979; Frake 1980; Quinn/Holland 1987; Geertz 1973) – are particularly well suited to studying both the local structuring forces and contexts and the discourses with which local actions in these contexts are intertwined, focusing on actually lived, embodied experience and action. In other words, SKADE studies – through participant observation and interviewing – how discourses are implicated in constructing and transforming reality, and how these differently shaped bodies of knowledge come to shape action and experience either in conflicting or complementary ways.

Certainly, this juxtaposition of ethnography and discourse analysis should not imply that they each have not considered some of the other's main concerns: many strands of discourse analysis consider materiality, the spatial situatedness, the embodied nature of reality construction, and various ethnographic traditions consider (hegemonic) discourses to be part of the forces that structure their research field. However, within a qualitative social research tradition, there are hardly any approaches that consider both ethnographic and discourse-analytical sensibilities in equal ways. The following section discusses some of the main sensitizing concepts of SKADE.

### 3 Sensitizing concepts in discourse ethnography

The articles in this thematic issue on discourse ethnography cover a range of common topics, each of which they consider in different ways. In the following section, we introduce some of the major sensitizing concepts that guide discourse-ethnographic research according to the programme of SKADE.

*a. Social actions/practices:* Practices, as outlined above, constitute a central interest of discourse ethnography that aims at going beyond the analysis of documents (understood as ›naturally occurring‹ artefacts) by analysing discourses based on data that has been collected through participant observation and interviewing. In a sociology of knowledge perspective, practices are understood as temporally and spatially situated social actions that are embedded in processes of meaning construction and constitution. In this tradition – going back to Weber (1978) and Schütz (1967) – acting has always been conceived to be embodied and material, and to entail ›inner‹ experiences as well as social action directed towards the environment and other actors (see for critical discussion of practices and how they relate to meaning, Reichertz 2016). Although in many cases the distinction is an analytical one, discourses may be reproduced both in so-called discursive and non-discursive ways (i.e. through communicative action and embodied action) and may inform the actors' perception by constituting introjected constraints.

*b. Micro-macro-linkage and local settings:* Such practices are often not only structured by discourses, but by other systems of relevance whose structuring effect is shaped by other social structures and forces (Elliker 2016; Elliker/Coetzee/Kotze 2013). While such structures may be located on the macro- or micro-level of analysis, discourse ethnographies often focus on the meso-level of analysis, i.e. on *local contexts* understood as bounded and spatially situated interaction scenes that may be embedded in specific group cultures or cultures of organizations or institutions. In this regard, Rixta Wundrak suggests engaging with the Foucauldian notion of »heterotopia« to analyse how local social settings and life-worlds are bounded (with a particular focus on the processes of social closure), how they are self-organized, and how they reproduce and contest at the same time relations and structures of the ›outside world‹, i.e. the larger social settings in which they are embedded.



Thus, as Florian Elliker highlights, discourse ethnographies need to entail careful consideration of how small local settings are chosen to analyse discourses that are understood as large-scale structures. He distinguishes between two principle purposes of a discourse ethnography: (1) analysing how a specific setting is structured by (a broad range of) discourses; and (2) analysing a specific discourse through a study of several small settings. In a radical situational perspective, even meso-level action appears as something »external« to the situation. Hence, discourse ethnographies need to develop a conceptual grasp of the local setting they are studying (among many other options, the articles in this issue use the notion of heterotopias, institutions, and group cultures). The distinction between a local context and discourses is a particular strength of a discourse-ethnographic approach, as it allows us to analyse how discourses are negotiated in the everyday life-worlds, to study the agency of actors (i.e. how actors are affected by discourses or remain resilient to them), and to investigate how discourses are interwoven with local practices.

*c. Discourse effects:* SKADE aims to show how discourses produce *specific* effects and social outcomes, as Yalız Akbaba and Rixta Wundrak demonstrate in their contributions to this issue – effects that could hardly be shown by using only »naturally« occurring documents as data, such as official administrative documentation. While Akbaba shows, based on a previous discourse-analytical study, how two different migration-related discourses lead to contradictory and ambivalent situations in the daily life of migrant teachers (and how these teachers actively deal with them), Wundrak analyses how her ethnographic experience sensitized her to how the imagery evoked by the refugees – embedded in the immediate context of a refugee shelter – related to (and contradicted) the dominant migration-related discourse, and how other social dynamics (not directly related to migration discourses) shaped interaction in the shelter. As Elliker highlights in his more conceptual article, studying such local settings in detail allows us to analyse what type of social forces lead to what type of specific social outcomes.

*d. Reflecting and selecting ethnographic experiences:* There is a broad range of contemporary ethnographic approaches, among many others the Chicago School, dramaturgical sociology, and cognitive anthropology, but also subjectivist and hyperrealist auto-ethnographies. They vary considerably, a possible common denominator being that ethnographic research consists of the construction of a field in which data are produced through participant observation (including audio and video recording). What type of knowledge an ethnographic research approach is able to produce and how this knowledge relates to the reality under study is a matter of contested discussion (see for an overview Adler/Adler 2008). Many of the contemporary ethnographies are not only aware that the researcher plays a central part in how they relate to the actors in the field, but use subjectivity as an epistemological source. As Wundrak and Akbaba discuss in their articles, reflexivity regarding the research process and the position of the researcher could play an important part in discourse ethnography. Both focus on the subjectivity of the researcher, and demonstrate how the reciprocal relationship of insights won by conventional discourse-analytical studies and the researcher's own ethnographic account reveals

further insights into how discourses operate in local settings and how they structure relations between the actors. They also demonstrate how other local systems of relevance shape the relations of actors in the field. Wundrak thus suggests that discourse ethnographies draw on the traditions of auto-ethnography to engage in such a reflexivity, using it as an integral part of data collection. In order to do that, discourse ethnographers can ask themselves how specific utterances came up in communicative interaction and how they are manifested in the researcher's protocol. In terms of sampling, Elliker suggests – drawing on Randall Collins' notion of the film still – that a discourse ethnography needs to reflect specifically on how local settings are sampled. This depends on the basic analytical purpose of discourse ethnography: to understand a local setting in its entire complexity and how this setting is structured by discourses, or to mainly reconstruct how a specific discourse is manifest in different settings. Depending on the analytical purpose, a different set of ›film stills‹ need to be chosen, demonstrating how they represent a particular ›film‹. In any case, a discourse ethnography will have to rely additionally on data other than ethnographic data. A particular strength of discourse ethnography is that it allows us to trace both how different local settings are linked by discourses (thus constituting a higher degree of complexity in terms of social organization) and what type of discourse-related sources are employed in everyday action.

*e. Data pluralism and »methodological constructivism«:* Overall, the authors of this issue maintain a stance towards the use of plural data material, and underline the importance of triangulation. In the authors' view, triangulation is not a progressive and self-triggering validation of a predetermined object, under the assumption that more perspectives on one object or one case give a more realistic picture of the whole. It is not a deepening or consolidation of hypotheses about an object. What a researcher does in the field when participating, observing, and writing field notes is actually the process of continuously constructing (research) objects. Wundrak calls this approach »methodological constructivism« (Wundrak 2012). According to the theoretical background of the sociology of knowledge, this should be understood as a social construction of research objects (Berger/Luckmann 1966). She suggests seeing the discourse-ethnographic process of collecting and analysing data as a »montage«, acknowledging the processual nature of both the way discourses take on specific forms in any given social setting and the practice of ethnographic research. In a SKADE context, to conceive discourse ethnography as a montage means to do discourse analysis in a case-reconstructive manner and to produce a »tale of the field« (van Maanen 1988). A montage results in a sociological story that is based on the actions and experiences of all involved individuals, including the researcher, and uses a plurality of data and cultural expressions. Furthermore, as one of the purposes of an ethnographic report is to translate experiences in the field to the imagination of the reader, Wundrak demonstrates how visual data may help to achieve this while at the same time expanding the researcher's reflective space, allowing them to better understand social relations and the associated meanings in the field.

*f. Truth/reality, power/structure:* As Christoph Maeder argues in his contribution, one of the core concerns of discourse analysis is how (mediated through organization and discipline in a given society) truths are established, and how these truths are implied in constituting options for action with regard to the individuals who are affected by these discourses. The notion of ›truth‹ is an initial focus that complements both a sociology of knowledge approach in the tradition of Berger and Luckmann (1966) and the various traditions of ethnography that have been more concerned with the broader notion of reality construction (part of which is often the production of truth[s]).

As the authors in this issue submit, the ethnographers themselves are usually in a privileged position (situated within academia) to be ›writing‹ the truth; any discourse ethnographer must thus engage in two reflections. First, what type of truth they are able to produce, which in turns depends on the epistemological framework underpinning the research endeavour. For example, while Elliker submits that ethnography may register objectifying processes and relatively obdurate realities in reflective and non-naive realist ways (the possibility of which depends on the specific empirical research field), Akbaba and Wundrak focus on the situatedness of reality production and how the researcher is engaged in it. The strength of a sociology of knowledge approach consists of the fact that this is not conceived as contradictory: it conceives the social reality as being simultaneously objectified and obdurate, as well as being processual and evanescent. Second, the expectation that ethnographer is supposed to ›write the truth‹ positions them in specific ways in relation to the research participants. While this warrants empirical adjudications with regard to which strategies ethnographers employ to establish a rapport with the research participant, this speaks to the notion of power (and structure) – the second conceptual and empirical focus discourse analysis brings to a sociology of knowledge approach.

As Maeder argues, a SKADE research endeavour focuses on how truths are produced in spatially and temporally situated, manifest social actions – and how this production is underpinned by power. This power, however, also rests in the macro-structural dimension of discourses, i.e. in the higher degree of organizational complexity with which discourses connect a broad range of local settings. Power and structure thus form a connection that is to be examined in its local productive force and in the ways it connects various social settings. As Wundrak and Akbaba demonstrate based on their empirical research, discourse ethnographers are well positioned to observe, trace, reconstruct, and analyse how power and structure are implicated in the production of truths and realities. Both authors not only analyse how discourses structure relationships between actors and researchers in powerful ways. The objective of the analysis is also to understand how power dynamics and discourses – thus, meanings of truth – are constructed interactively. To what extent can actors ›resist‹ discourses, and to what extent are they subjugated by them? Where is power lodged? What other powerful processes of truth production are embedded in local contexts? How do they negotiate ›demands‹ of different, conflicting discourses or ›truths‹ *in situ*?

## 4 The articles in this issue

Elliker's contribution aims at demonstrating how a sociology of knowledge approach can be employed as an epistemological and theoretical framework to join discourse analysis and ethnographic research strategies, contributing to SKADE. The conceptual reflections centre around the relationship between the micro- and macro-level of analysis, based on the notion that the theoretical infrastructures of micro- and macro-sociological approaches, as well as the empirical manifestations of processes and structures on all levels, mutually depend on each other. The SKADE approach, Elliker suggests, provides a framework to conceptualize and analyse these linkages. He first engages with the notion that there is no external context to situated, local action – a notion that has been put forward in recent developments in Grounded Theory, similar to how context is conceived of in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. These notions of contexts, however, are premised on a focus on those senses that register impressions from outside any given actor's body, particularly (but not only) the visual, auditory, and tactile senses, thus restricting social situations sensorily to what the actors perceive is happening outside themselves. By considering ›inner experience‹ and ›meaning contexts‹ (*Sinnzusammenhänge*), Elliker demonstrates that elements do not necessarily need to be externalized to be relevant to interaction, and that the externality of constraints that operate in any given situation is to be located on the ›meaning level‹: it is in the form of meaning connections that actors may both establish trans-situational links and contextualize their activities to be part of something external. External contexts of interaction situations operate through constraining the comprehension of actors as ›introjected constraints‹ (Fine 1991).

In a similar vein, as external contexts are relevant to an analysis that focuses on local action (as ethnographic research often does), local micro-settings are relevant when macro-level phenomena are analysed (as discourse research often does). Engaging with a recent reconceptualization of a macro-analytical perspective, Elliker argues that micro-settings do not simply reproduce macro-level structures. Instead, they are centrally implicated in shaping *how* macro-level processes produce specific social outcomes. Local settings, importantly, may constitute contexts that are relatively resilient in the face of macro-level forces. This warrants a study of macro-level processes through the lens of local action, enabling any analysis to attribute specific social outcomes to one or several macro- *and* meso- or micro-level processes. SKADE, as Elliker suggests, is ideally suited to integrating both analytical concerns. Discourses, conceived as macro-level forces, are analysed in how they structure situated action conjointly with other social forces on the macro-, meso-, and micro-level. Local settings may constitute a relatively autonomous layer of practice: individuals' actions are shaped by knowledge that is structured by introjected constraints that it turn are linked to both local contexts and discourses.

From a situational perspective, i.e. seen and analysed from any given interaction setting, discourse-specific introjected constraints operate as external contexts, the externality of their constraining force situated on the meaning level. This does not reduce discourses to the meaning; rather, they are manifest in and reproduced through a more or

less large material(ized) infrastructure. A sociology of knowledge perspective, however, enables us to conceive the discourse-immanent ›structural connection‹ (that links the dispersed manifestations and articulations of discourses) as a meaning connection or meaning context, providing a consistent theoretical framework for the study of macro-level forces in local contexts. Elliker spells out the implications of this conceptualization for distinguishing discourses from local contexts (the methodological requirements for the ethnographic study of discourses), and distinguishes two principle analytical purposes of discourse ethnography.

Wundrak develops a methodological programme for SKADE. These methodological considerations are grounded in past ethnographic fieldwork as well as discourse analyses (in Romania and Israel), and are illustrated with her latest empirical work in a refugee shelter in Berlin. Assuming two roles in the field – as ethnographic researcher and as volunteer – Wundrak describes how the associated experiences entangled her in a range of associations that went beyond the dominant discursive frame at the time in Germany, enabled by investigating discourses as practices in local settings. While the latter of the discursive frames – the so-called »welcome culture« – did indeed appear as relevant, the multi-faceted statement »welcome to paradise« expressed by one of the local actors refers not only to the relative safety of a shelter, but in an ironic way also to the hopelessness and suffering of the refugees living in the shelter. Wundrak's methodological programme suggests ways in which researchers can analytically and reflectively deal with the associations evoked by such encounters within local settings, and how these observations can be conceptualized.

Drawing on existing literature on methodology, Wundrak introduces three emphases underpinned by the idea of data pluralism and triangulation: (1) the use of visual data as part of what she calls »montage«; (2) Foucault's notion of heterotopias; and (3) the use of auto-ethnography in discourse research. Extending Kalthoff's (2010) notion of »collage«, she uses the term »montage« to refer to the processuality of the ethnographic experience as well as the forming and shaping of discourses. The actions and performances of all individuals involved as well as the researcher's observations and associations, are part of the sociological story as montage.

Wundrak demonstrates how the researcher's visual imagination may be fruitfully included in such a montage, both by providing a reflective space to analyse cultural meanings and by offering the reader a visual imagining of the ethnographic experience. The concept of heterotopia refers to the space in which discourses become empirically manifest and are ethnographically investigated – notably the boundaries of these small lifeworlds, the specific self-organization of such spaces, and the specific ways in which heterotopias are meaningful to the »outside« world. As real places (in contrast to utopias), heterotopias are »other places« that »simultaneously represent, contest, and invert« the larger social space in which they are embedded. Critically engaging with her own field notes, Wundrak suggests that drawing on the notion of »auto-ethnography« allows us to analytically leverage the differences between the researcher's view and the world under study, and calls for an examination of the researcher's irritations in their relationship to

the world. She conceives discourse ethnography as a discourse analysis in which reflection should be central. Reflection and subjectivity are primary epistemological sources of new findings and valuable insights.

In his conceptual article, Maeder thematizes the relationship between power, truth, and reality, and discusses how a sociology of knowledge conception of discourse analysis provides an epistemological framework that is well suited to the study of discourses ethnographically. Referring to the work of Michel Foucault, Maeder sees discourses as arrangements of knowledge and practice that produce and distribute truth(s) in powerful ways. Individuals are formed, produced, and distributed as *subjects* and are, through manifold techniques and practices, continuously disciplined. While subjects may partially use this productive power for their purposes, the effect of maintaining certain truth(s) rests in the structure of how things are arranged. Referring to the work of Keller, he argues that this notion of discourse provides a conceptual extension of the »post-Mannheim« sociology of knowledge in the tradition of Berger and Luckmann (1966) in terms of power and macro-structures. SKAD thus provides a conceptual focus on how power and discipline are generated and maintained in everyday life and science, and – complementing the notion of symbolic universes and institutions – thematizes the macro-structural dimensions of reality construction. In this perspective, however, the notion of *truth* is part of the more broadly understood construction of *reality*.

This corresponds to how truth (and power) have been thematized and relativized in ethnographic research. Truth is seen in relation to the cultural, social, and spatial location, and rather conceived as (*emic*) *perspective*, *cultural theme*, *webs of meaning*, or *cultural model*. Similarly, power is usually only one among many sociological categories that ethnographies employ to study the production of truth(s) and realities. Many of the ethnographic traditions (such as the Chicago School, dramaturgical sociology, and cognitive anthropology, but also subjectivist and hyperrealist auto-ethnographies) are more concerned with studying the production of reality in interaction and organization and less with power and truth (as is research in the tradition of symbolic interactionism). Discourse research, with its focus on power and truth, can thus fruitfully be combined with an ethnographic observation of practices, as the latter will time and again be confronted with the production and distribution of truth or »partial truths«. Maeder thus suggests speaking of SKADE in those cases where ethnographic methods are used to study how, within normative contexts, truth(s) and rules are enforced as situationally manifest principles of order and structure, i.e. to study the discursive practices of truth production. In a SKADE perspective, however, such discursively established truths are partially limited in their power through partially resistant actors and local contexts.

In her contribution, Yalız Akbaba demonstrates how mutually relating a discourse-analytical approach and an ethnographic research strategy produces additional analytical insights by providing a theoretical and empirical framework that leaves more space for the reflexivity of the researcher. The argument is based on her empirical study of migrant teachers in Germany (Akbaba 2014, 2015, 2017). In that study, Akbaba empirically re-

constructs two migration-related discourses: an integration discourse and a utility discourse. The former presents migrants with two types of opposing messages: while demanding assimilation, it constructs them as remaining incommensurably different, and while highlighting the economic and demographic necessity of immigration, it construes it also as a threat. Within the latter (the utility discourse), migrant teachers appear as instrumental and useful to the integration process of minority pupils. Based on ethnographic fieldwork in classrooms, Akbaba is able to demonstrate *how* these two discourses are related to each other in the everyday practices of the teachers. Instead of assuming specific discourse effects based on textual analyses, the ethnographic work shows how teachers deal with the different discourse frameworks and their everyday implications in situated (communicative) action. Based on this combined approach, Akbaba develops the notion of »double-binding ethnicity« to describe the contradictory effects of migration-related discourses in the lives of migrant teachers.

Conceiving discourses from a SKAD perspective, Akbaba argues that the notion of »practice« constitutes the »common ground« for ethnographic research and discourse analysis. Drawing on a similar distinction put forward by Keller (2011b) between discourses and a relatively independent practice context, a practice approach calls for a detailed analysis of how practices and discourses relate to each other – an endeavour, Akbaba argues, for which ethnography is well suited. She does, however, critically engage with what she calls a »positivist« or »realist« legacy of ethnographic research, which she sees as prone to »naturalist« or overly objectifying assumptions, arguing that the strength of ethnographic research lies less in demonstrating some »objective« reality than in the degree of complexity with which local settings can be studied and analysed. At the same time, she demonstrates how her own ethnographic accounts were first structured by the conventional insights of migration discourse analyses, implying a neglect of other categories of analysis, e.g. how power and gender structure classroom interactions. Using data from her own study, she demonstrates how the reciprocal relating of ethnographic data and insights from a discourse-analytical approach (Akbaba/Bräu/Zimmer 2013) enlarged the room for the researcher's methodological and theoretical reflexivity and fostered the development of the concept of »double-binding ethnicity«.

## References

- Adler, P.A./Adler, P. (2008): Of rhetoric and representation. The four faces of ethnography. In: *The Sociological Quarterly* 49, S. 1–30.
- Akbaba, Y. (2014): Interkulturelle Kompetenz im Lehrerzimmer. In: Eisenbraun, V./Uhl, S. (Hrsg.): *Geschlecht und Vielfalt in Schule und Lehrerbildung*. Münster: Waxmann, S. 75–92.
- Akbaba, Y. (2015): Paradoxe Handlungsanforderungen an Lehrer\*innen »mit Migrationshintergrund«. In: Bräu, K./Schlickum, C. (Hrsg.): *Soziale Konstruktionen in Schule und Unterricht. Zu den Kategorien Leistung, Migration, Geschlecht, Behinderung, Soziale Herkunft und deren Interdependenzen*. Opladen, Berlin, Toronto: Barbara Budrich, S. 139–152.
- Akbaba, Y. (2017): *Lehrer\*innen und der Migrationshintergrund. Widerstand im Dispositiv*. Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.

- Akbaba, Y./Bräu, K./Zimmer, M. (2013): Erwartungen und Zuschreibungen. Eine Analyse und kritische Reflexion der bildungspolitischen Debatte zu Lehrer/innen mit Migrationshintergrund. In: Bräu, K./Georgi, V.B./Karakasoğlu, Y./Rotter, C. (Hrsg.): Lehrerinnen und Lehrer mit Migrationshintergrund. Zur Relevanz eines Merkmals in Theorie, Empirie und Praxis. Münster: Waxmann, S. 37–57.
- Atkinson, P./Coffey, A./Delamont, S./Lofland, J./Lofland, L. (2001): Editorial introduction. In: Atkinson, P./Coffey, A./Delamont, S./Lofland, J./Lofland, L. (Hrsg.): Handbook of Ethnography. London: Sage, S. 1–7.
- Berger, P.L./Luckmann, T. (1966): The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City und New York: Doubleday.
- Blommaert, J. (2006): Ethnography as counter-hegemony. Remarks on epistemology and method. In: Working papers in urban language and literacies 34. London: Institute of Education.
- Creese, A. (2008): Linguistic ethnography. In: King, K.A./Hornberger, N.H. (Hrsg.): Encyclopedia of language and education, 2nd Edition, Volume 10: Research methods in language and education. New York: Springer, S. 229–241.
- Eberle, T.S. (1984): Sinnkonstitution in Alltag und Wissenschaft. Der Beitrag der Phänomenologie an die Methodologie der Sozialwissenschaften. Bern und Wien: Paul Haupt.
- Eberle, T.S. (2016): Phenomenological Life-World Analysis and Interpretive Sociology: Finding a Pathway through the Divergent Strands. In: Halas, E. (Hrsg.): Life-World, Intersubjectivity, and Culture. Contemporary Dilemmas. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York: Peter Lang, S. 27–41.
- Elliker, F. (2016): Externe Kontexte als sinnhafte Strukturierung sozialer Situationen. Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Diskurs und Interaktion. In: Raab, J./Keller, R. (Hrsg.): Wissensforschung – Forschungswissen. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa, S. 47–59.
- Elliker, F./Coetzee, J./Kotze, P.C. (2013): On the Interpretive Work of Reconstructing Discourses and Their Local Contexts. In: Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research 14(3) (online), Artikelnr.: 4 (ohne Seitenzahlen), nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs130342 (Abruf 17. Oktober 2017).
- Fegter, S./Kessl, F./Langer, A./Ott, M./Rothe, D./Wrana, D. (Hrsg.) (2015): Erziehungswissenschaftliche Diskursforschung. Empirische Analysen zu Bildungs- und Erziehungsverhältnissen. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Fine, G.A. (1991): On the Macrofoundations of Microsociology. Constraint and Exterior Reality of Structure. In: The Sociological Quarterly 32(2), S. 161–177.
- Foucault, M. (1974a): Die Ordnung der Dinge. Eine Archäologie der Humanwissenschaften. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Foucault, M. (1974b): Die Ordnung des Diskurses. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Foucault, M. (1978): Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit. Berlin: Merve.
- Foucault, M. (1988): Archäologie des Wissens. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Foucault, M. (1991a): Governmentality. In: Burchell, G./Gordon, C./Miller, P. (Hrsg.): The Foucault Effect. Studies in governmentality, with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault. Chicago: Chicago University Press, S. 87–104.
- Foucault, M. (1991b): Politics and the Study of Discourse. In: Burchell, G./Gordon, C./Miller, P. (Hrsg.): The Foucault Effect. Studies in governmentality, with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault. Chicago: Chicago University Press, S. 53–72.
- Frake, C.O. (1980): Language and cultural description. Essays by Charles O. Frake. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973): The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.
- Gumperz, J.J./Dell, H. (Hrsg.) (1972): The ethnography of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hammersley, M. (2005): Ethnography and Discourse Analysis: Incompatible or Complementary?, martynhammersley.files.wordpress.com/2013/06/ethnography-and-discourse-analysis.pdf (Abruf 17. Oktober 2017).



- Hitzler, R./Honer, A. (Hrsg.) (1997): *Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik. Eine Einführung*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich/UTB.
- Hitzler, R./Pfadenhauer, M. (1998): Eine posttraditionale Gemeinschaft. Integration und Distinktion in der Techno-Szene. In: Hillebrandt, F./Kraemer, K. (Hrsg.): *Verlust der Sicherheit?* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, S. 83–102.
- Honer, A. (1993): *Lebensweltliche Ethnographie*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag.
- Jäckle, M. (2011): Subjektivationsprozesse im Geschlechterregime Schule. Skizze einer (poststrukturalistischen) Dispositivanalyse. In: Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien: *Gender und Schule. Konstruktionsprozesse im schulischen Alltag*, Bulletin Texte 37, S. 32–55.
- Jewitt, C. (Hrsg.) (2009): *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Kalthoff, H. (2010): Beobachtung und Komplexität. Überlegungen zum Problem der Triangulation. In: *Sozialer Sinn* 11(2), S. 353–365.
- Keller, R. (1997): Diskursanalyse. In: Hitzler, R./Honer, A. (Hrsg.): *Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik. Eine Einführung*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, S. 309–333.
- Keller, R. (2003): Zum möglichen Verhältnis zwischen Diskursanalyse und Ethnographie. Workshop “Ethnographie der Arbeit – Arbeit der Ethnographie”, 2003, Berlin.
- Keller, R. (2011a): The Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse (SKAD). In: *Human Studies* 34, S. 43–65.
- Keller, R. (2011b): *Wissenssoziologische Diskursanalyse. Grundlegung eines Forschungsprogramms*. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Keller, R. (2013): *Doing Discourse Research. An Introduction for Social Scientists*. London und Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Keller, R. (2016): Die Untersuchung von Dispositiven. Überlegungen zur fokussierten Diskursethnographie der wissenssoziologischen Diskursanalyse. Forschungsgespräch “Diskursethnographie”, 2016, St.Gallen.
- Keller, R. (2007): Diskurse und Dispositive analysieren. Die Wissenssoziologische Diskursanalyse als Beitrag zu einer wissensanalytischen Profilierung der Diskursforschung. In: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 8(2) (online), Artikelnr.: 19 (ohne Seitenzahlen), <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0702198> (Abruf 17. Oktober 2017).
- Kress, G./Jewitt, C./Bourne, J./Franks, A./Hardcastle, J./Jones, K./Reid, E. (2004): *Englisch in urban classrooms. A multimodal perspective on teaching and learning*. London: Routledge.
- Langer, A. (2008): *Disziplinieren und entspannen: Körper in der Schule – eine diskursanalytische Ethnographie*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Lima, C. (2010): Are ethnography and discourse analysis compatible?, [chrislima90.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/are-ethnography-and-discourse-analysis-compatible.pdf](http://chrislima90.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/are-ethnography-and-discourse-analysis-compatible.pdf) (Abruf 17. Oktober 2017).
- Lin, A. (2008): Using ethnography in the analysis of pedagogical practice. Perspectives from activity theory. In: Bhatia, V./Flowerdew, J./Jones, R.H. (Hrsg.): *Advances in discourse studies*. London: Abingdon, S. 67–80.
- Lippert, I. (2014): Studying Reconfigurations of Discourse. Tracing the Stability and Materiality of Sustainability/Carbon. In: *Zeitschrift für Diskursforschung/Journal for Discourse Studies* 2(1), S. 32–54.
- Macgilchrist, F./van Hout, T. (2011): Ethnographic Discourse Analysis and Social Science. In: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 12(1) (online), Artikelnr.: 18 (ohne Seitenzahlen), <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101183> (Abruf 17. Oktober 2017).
- Michaeler, M./Albrecht, S./Schank, J./Scheffer, T./Wundrak, R. (2010): Die Realität medialer Berichterstattung – Veröffentlichungsprozesse von Untersuchungsausschüssen in Deutschland, England und der EU. In: *Soziale Welt* 61(2), S. 137–156.
- Ott, M. (2011): *Aktivierung von (In-)Kompetenz: Praktiken im Profiling – eine machtanalytische Ethnographie*. Konstanz: UVK.

- Ott, M./Langer, A./Rabenstein, K. (2012): Integrative Forschungsstrategien – Ethnographie und Diskursanalyse verbinden. In: Friebertshäuser, B./Kelle, H./Boller, H./Bollig, S./Huf, C./Langer, A./Ott, M./Richter, S. (Hrsg.): *Feld und Theorie. Herausforderungen erziehungswissenschaftlicher Ethnographie*. Opladen: Budrich, S. 169–184.
- Poferl, A./Schroer, N. (Hrsg.) (2015): *Wer oder was handelt? Zum Subjektverständnis der hermeneutischen Wissenssoziologie, Wissen, Kommunikation und Gesellschaft*. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Quinn, N./Holland, D. (1987): Culture and Cognition. In: Holland, D./Quinn, N. (Hrsg.): *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge und New York: Cambridge University Press, S. 3–41.
- Rampton, B./Tusting, K./Maybin, J./Barwell, R./Creese, A./Lytra, V. (2004): *UK Linguistic Ethnography. A Discussion Paper*, [http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fss/organisations/lingethn/documents/discussion\\_paper\\_jan\\_05.pdf](http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fss/organisations/lingethn/documents/discussion_paper_jan_05.pdf) (Abruf 17. Oktober 2017).
- Ransiek, A.-C. (2016): Zum Verhältnis von Interaktion, Narration und Diskurs – Implikationen für eine Verbindung von Diskursanalyse und biographischen Fallrekonstruktionen. In: Bosančić, S./Keller, R. (Hrsg.): *Perspektiven wissenssoziologischer Diskursforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS, S. 279–297.
- Rau, A./Elliker, F./Coetzee, J. (forthcoming): Collecting Data for Analyzing Discourses. In: Flick, U. (Hrsg.): *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Reh, S./Breuer, A./Schütz, A. (2011): Erhebung vielfältiger Daten in einem ethnographischen Design: Diskurse, symbolische Konstruktionen und pädagogische Praktiken als Lernkultur. In: Ecarius, J./Miethe, I. (Hrsg.): *Methodentriangulation in der qualitativen Bildungsforschung*. Opladen: Budrich, S. 135–154.
- Reichertz, J. (2016): Braucht die qualitative Sozialforschung die Praxistheorie oder: Was gewinnt man, wenn auf das Mentale verzichtet? In: Raab, J./Keller, R. (Hrsg.): *Wissensforschung – Forschungswissen*. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa, S. 830–848.
- Schütz, A. (1967): *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.
- Schütz, A./Luckmann, T. (1974): *The Structures of the Life-World*. Vol. 1. London: Heinemann.
- Schütz, A./Luckmann, T. (1989): *The Structures of the Life-World*. Vol. 2. Evanston: Northwestern University.
- Smart, G. (2006): *Writing the economy. Activity, genre and technology in the world of banking*. London: Equinox.
- Smart, G. (2008): Ethnographic-based discourse analysis. Uses, issues and prospects. In: Bhatia, V./Flowerdew, J./Jones, R.H. (Hrsg.): *Advances in discourse studies*. London: Abingdon, S. 56–66.
- Spradley, J.P. (1979): *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York und Chicago: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Swales, J.M. (1998): *Other floors, other voices. A textography of a small university building*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tusting, K./Maybin, J. (2007): Linguistic ethnography and interdisciplinarity: Opening the discussion. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(5), S. 575–583.
- van Maanen, J. (1988): *Tales of the Field. On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- van Praet, E. (2010): The dual voice of domination. Ritual and power in a British embassy. In: *Text & Talk* 30(2), S. 213–233.
- Weber, M. (1978): *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley und Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Wodak, R./Meyer, M. (Hrsg.) (2001): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wundrak, R. (2012): Erzählungen aus Jaffa. Narrationstheorie und Triangulation in kulturvergleichenden Analysen. In: *ZQF – Zeitschrift für Qualitative Forschung* 13(1–2), S. 151–171.
- Wundrak, R. (2018): Biografie als Praxis-Diskurs-Formation. Eine praxeologische Perspektive auf lebensgeschichtliche Interviews. In: Alber, I./Griese, B./Schiebel, M. (Hrsg.): *Biografieforschung als Praxis der Triangulation*, S. 83–104.

*Anschrift:*

Dr. Florian Elliker  
University of St. Gallen  
Research Institute of Sociology  
Müller-Friedbergstrasse 8  
9000 St. Gallen  
Switzerland  
florian.elliker@unisg.ch

Dr. Rixta Maria Wundrak  
University of Bremen  
SOCIUM Research Center on Inequality and Social Policy  
Mary-Somerville Str. 9  
28359 Bremen  
Germany  
wundrak@uni-bremen.de

Prof. Dr. Christoph Maeder  
Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich  
Lagerstrasse 2  
CH 8090 Zürich  
christoph.maeder@phzh.ch