

ESF Exploratory Workshop on

# Improving The Quality of Qualitative Research

## Scientific Report

Kristiansand, Norway, 25 - 28 June 2007

**Convened by:**  
**David Silverman<sup>①</sup>, Anne Ryen<sup>②</sup> and Shalva Weil<sup>③</sup>**

<sup>①</sup> Dept of Sociology, Goldsmiths' College, University of London

<sup>②</sup> Department of Sociology, Social Work and Welfare, Agder University College

<sup>③</sup> Hebrew University of Jerusalem

---

Co-sponsored by:



*Forum for research on professions  
and  
Department of Sociology, Social Work and Welfare*

## **1. Executive Summary**

### Background to the Workshop

Qualitative research is increasingly being employed as a suitable methodology in education, economics, law, sociology, anthropology, accounting-studies, and a wide variety of other disciplines. This methodology is also gaining popularity in market-based evaluation studies and traditional quantitative territory, such as business studies and economic geography, and in development studies in different continents.

Qualitative research studies constitute the background to decisions on change both in Europe and in developing countries. Its increasing use can be attributed to the sensitivity of its research tools and the variety of techniques that one can employ.

However, if the credibility of such research is doubted, then the policy implications of qualitative work may also fail.

A workshop on Improving the Quality of Qualitative Research opened at Agder College in Kristiansand, Norway, was sponsored by the ESF and Main Objectives of the Workshop and co-sponsored by the Forum for research on professions and Department of Sociology, Social Work and Welfare, Agder College. It was designed to bring together internationally recognized scholars to address the credibility gap in qualitative research. The aim was to produce a European – scale collaboration based on diversity.

### The Credibility Gap and the Quality of Research

There are a wide array of suggestive theories and contrasting methodologies currently present in qualitative research. This may tempt us to believe that credibility does not matter and that the maxim 'anything goes' applies to our work. With few numbers, even qualitative researchers who are serious about their credibility in the outside world appear to rely on mere examples or instances to support their analysis. Hence, research reports routinely display data extracts which serve as telling instances of some claimed phenomenon. However, the use of such an evidential base rightly provokes the charge of (possible) anecdotalism, i.e. choosing just those extracts which support one's argument.

### The Importance of the Exploratory Qualitative Research Workshop

The workshop brought together internationally recognized scholars, ranging from junior scholars to acclaimed full professors, from a wide range of European countries,

who have addressed this credibility gap. The workshop provided an opportunity to develop substantial arguments to satisfy our external critics and to inspire a new generation of qualitative researchers.

### Scientific Content of the Meeting

There were 14 scientific presentations, all of them excellent, taking to task the credibility gap in qualitative methods and suggesting techniques and tools to overcome the gap. These ranged from collaborative projects, to the use of documents, life-histories, single major informants, applied theatre and conversation analysis. In addition, it was suggested that qualitative methods should be regarded as a craft, and that in the study of qualitative methods, one should examine how artefacts are created, and try and minimize artefactuality. The majority of scholars came from the discipline of sociology, but interesting perspectives were provided from anthropology and psychology, as well as from management. The sessions were accompanied by lively discussion, as well as small group discussions on the practice of qualitative methods and the future of the workshop group and the discipline.

### Outcomes of the Meeting

The workshop achieved its academic aims by convening a group of top scholars in the field, each with a different perspective, who could contribute ideas and experience to the field of qualitative methods. There were discussions on how to continue these discussions, an idea of a summer school was floated and the proceedings will be published in an on-line journal for qualitative methods.

## **2. Scientific content of the event**

The workshop opened on June 25, 2007 with a presentation by **Asbjorn Rodseth**, a Professor of Economics from the University of Oslo, who is a representative of the Standing Committee for the Social Sciences of the ESF. Rodseth explained the workings and the funding opportunities of the ESF, including the Exploratory Workshops, of which this workshop on "Improving the Quality of Qualitative Research" is one, which was approved in 2007.

The three co-conveners – David Silverman from the University of London, Shalva Weil from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Anne Ryen, who was also the local organizer at Adger College, Kristiansand – introduced the workshop.

The workshop was organized to allay the doubts of funding bodies and to take up the challenge of quantitative colleagues so that qualitative studies can be recognized as legitimate and of quality. The workshop was organized around two themes: Improving Quality and Better Methodologies.

The first speaker in the Improving Quality stream was **Christoph Maeder** from Switzerland, who spoke about "The Quest for Quality in Qualitative Research", asking "Is there still hope?" He pointed to the fact that qualitative research, as a scientific endeavour, is itself socially embedded and there is a need to be able to assess and evaluate qualitative research by comprehensible criteria. Given the inconsistency and theoretical nature, he saw a need to develop such criteria. Drawing on experience in a working group who developed a proposal of "Guidelines to sound qualitative research" for the Swiss Academy of Social Sciences and Humanities, he explained what happened to the researchers and shared with workshop participants the guidelines. Maeder set out general guidelines for qualitative research, maintaining that sound qualitative research is based on theoretical social science questions and topics concerning research, which enable intersubjective agreement. The guidelines were designed to provide evaluation criteria that hitherto were more or less implicit and to aid researchers in submitting their proposals to funding agencies. A lively discussion ensued debating the guidelines and discussing their institutionalization. The political context was also considered.

The second speaker in the stream was **Marie Buscetto** from France, who presented on the subject of reflexivity as quality. Relying heavily on the French tradition in qualitative methods, she discussed the epistemological ambivalence of ethnography, in which research methodology is primarily subjective, and certainly not positivist, and in which the four R's (reliability, representativeness, reactive and reproducible) do not apply. She maintained that once subjects are interacting with researchers, a new definition of scientific principles is needed, leading to the establishment of what is progressively labelled as a "reflexivity model". Based on the idea that the observer is

embedded in the world she means to study, reflexivity implies that social relations developed through the research are part of the study. They may be used either to open up research possibilities, or to analyze data constructed through the survey while maintaining as great a degree of control as possible on the conditions of their sociological interpretation. Buscatto laid out key principles in action for carrying out research by reflexive means, in which truth is conceived as "more or less"; the research data is socially produced with the researcher influencing the objects of research, and the critical use of methods, of which there are multiple types. In order to avoid the "trap of over interpretation", and improve the quality of qualitative research, a set of "precautionary" principles, procedures, and techniques may be used at different research stages. These bear on observation contextualization as well as on such practices as systematic note-taking, cross-checking, saturation, triangulation and testing one's material by submitting it to the observed subjects and to colleagues.

Under "Better Methodologies", **Steinar Kvale** gave a psychological perspective to the qualitative methodology of interviewing. Kvale suggested that one should look at research in general and specifically at interviewing as a social craft, which takes time to learn. He stated that the interviewing process is not 'scientific' but a highly skilled craft requiring a repertoire of specialized tasks and the exertion of personal judgment. Good interviewing requires a formulated theoretical approach at the outset and a good handle on techniques. Discussion focused on the analysis of data elicited in interviewing, as opposed to collecting the information, while interpreting the data at the time of interviewing.

**Daniel Bertaux** addressed the question of how could life-histories be used to address the credibility gap in qualitative methods? Life-histories are effective until one gets to 'saturation point' after a number of interviews. Life-histories reveal the passing on of resources from one generation to another in family studies. Bertaux suggested that there are six properties of life-histories:

1. Historicity (using people as informants as the social milieu, not necessarily about themselves, like ethnographers. As opposed to narrativists, where the focus is on the way people interpret their lives, and the truth is not necessarily the truth, or reality. Bertaux says the reality is very important, and not lies or beliefs).

2. Contextuality
3. Singularity (normally we search for generalizations, but in the life-history every person is singular)
4. Subjectivity (including how the individual acts as well as feel)
5. 'Activity'-what people have done during their lives, how they modify their action
6. Expressivity-gives the quality of the interview

They give credibility to 5 different categories:

- Academia-ethnographers; meaning and construction; critical
- Policy-makers or funding agencies
- Practitioners
- People themselves (to feedback to them)
- The educated public

That evening the questions raised on improving the quality of qualitative research were debated over dinner.

On the second day of the workshop, **Krzysztof Koniecki** lectured on "Triangulation and the quality of qualitative research: the problem of reality" in which he described methodological and epistemological problems connected with fieldwork. He analysed the "investigated reality", "the realness of the researched reality", assuming that researchers have specific perspectives of the social and psychic reality. He went on to discuss the analytical process, and the commonsense procedures (so called triangulation procedures), which are used in the field by researcher and during analysis or writing a research report to adequately "re – present" researched reality. He pointed out that the stages of reality representation are interconnected and create one complex intellectual process, which is called "field research" but the additional meta -analysis of the process amounts to what we call "reflexive field research". The problem of the quality of qualitative field research is strictly connected with grounding the description of reality and the reality itself (by triangulation) and not with the problem of validity, i.e. whether the research procedures truly help to answer the research questions or whether the research measures what it was intended to measure. The quality of qualitative field research is also not connected with a problem

of reliability (whether the results are consistent over time) because even revisits to the field cannot solve the problem of temporal and historical changes of reality in the investigated field.

Konieczki exemplified the use of triangulation in his own fieldwork in a factory in Poland, where he documented flirting on the production line, and in another fieldwork setting in Japan, where people said one thing and acted differently. The repetitiveness of research can afford the opportunity of intersubjectivity. Discussion focused on the existence of reality or the impossibility of proving "non-reality", and revisits as one method of triangulating.

**Gillian Hundt**, in a multi-media presentation, discussed the use of applied theatre as a methodological tool in qualitative research, which has relevance to collaborative studies, in which one increases the use of research subjects in one's research endeavours as a means of data collection, data validation, and knowledge transfer. Applied theatre, performed in non theatre spaces, can be a powerful tool for eliciting views and touching audience's emotions as well as cognition. Her two examples came from South African villages and a UK setting. Hundt related to theatre as a form of data collection, data validation and the dissemination of knowledge. She based herself on Boal's ideals of the "theatre of the oppressed", whereby the audience become "spect-actors" (not spectators) and are given a voice. The South African study looked into hypertension leading to a stroke at a relatively early age and used applied theatre to study the norms in society surrounding the illness and the solutions. She claimed that one can address the credibility gap by using multidisciplinary research and have it verified across disciplines.

In the UK, applied theatre was used as a vehicle to raise issues in relation to risk, identity and ethics in relation to prenatal genetic screening. Issues from an ESRC study on this topic were dramatized through a multimedia one woman show with a panel discussion.

The theatre acted as a trigger for deeper thought and discussion on risk, and other problems. Hundt's presentation terminated with a number of problems with the use of theatre as a powerful method "which produces a visceral gap reaction", and as a means of addressing a credibility gap to an audience and to a public. These include the difficulty of evaluation, and the constant negotiation of the research frame.

**David Silverman** discussed art and artefactuality in qualitative research, giving examples from medical research. His paper discussed whether research findings may be an artefact of research design, as in the 'hard' sciences. For instance, in medicine, randomised control trials have become regarded as the Gold Standard precisely because they are seen to prevent spurious, artefactual findings. Similarly, past criticisms of IQ tests draw heavily upon the self-confirming nature of their results. Using examples from studies of 'national identity', Silverman showed how the issue of artefactuality may play a useful role in assessing the design of qualitative research. . An alternative to surveys is in-depth interviews. Silverman discussed the limits of interviews, which often still have leading questions, tidied up transcripts, anecdotal use of extracts not in a sequence and the tendency to use interviewees' responses to answer one's research question. He claimed that the appeal to in-depthness mirrors the romanticism of the "Interview Society" and that direct questions on 'identity' in 'in-depth' interviews clearly generate responses that may be artefactual. Manufactured data necessarily produces responses that are an artefact of the research setting. He showed how identities are inevitably articulated in local contexts which must be described. are articulated. Silverman concluded his talk by asking: Is artefactuality unavoidable? He maintained that it depends on how documents or transcripts are analysed. He concluded that one must study how artefacts are created, or try and minimize artefactuality by avoiding manufactured data and examining natural behaviour, avoiding the pitfalls of focus groups and in-depth interviews.

After lunch in Agder College's cafeteria, we proceeded with the afternoon's lectures. **Lindsay Prior** from Belfast University talked about repositioning documents. He maintained that in sociology the focus on documents has been almost entirely in terms of content and interpretation i.e. monocular. Documents are usually considered mute, inert, like an informant. However, qualitative researchers can regard documents as topics; and even consider documents as 'actors'. Prior took examples from the field of genetics in the UK NHS (National Health Service). He showed that documents are not only written but used and serve as a resource for action, about the past, present and plans for the future. He stated that in networks, in which documents are entangled, documents are actually 'actors', albeit non-human actors. In the example he analysed, a genetic chart constructed by medical staff was considered as an active 'actor'. Documents constitute part of an interactional network. Prior suggested treating



documents as a source of information, opinion, and belief. Indeed, the standard approach to the use and analysis of documents in social research focuses primarily on what is contained within them. In this frame, documents are viewed as conduits of communication between, say, a writer and a reader – conduits that both contain, and can be scrutinized for, meaningful messages. He said that while documents invariably contain information, every document enters into human activity in a dual relation. First, documents enter the social field as a receptacle (of instructions, obligations, contracts, wishes, reports etc). Second, they enter the field as agents in their own rights with effects on patterns of interaction. In improving the quality of qualitative research, Prior suggest how we can move beyond the hermeneutics of text and to draw upon some observable features of documentation as data resource in action.

Prior was followed by **Giampietro Gobo**, who tried to explore whether it is possible to change the trend of good organizational reasons for bad research. Like Silverman, he demonstrated how even in hard sciences, many important experiments never took place, or the material was tampered or manipulated. They were conceived but in practice were only 'thought experiments' and never occurred. The history of hard sciences is a continuous, incessant and recursive display of schizophrenic behaviour: stating strongly overt methodological rules and then secretly disrupting them because, for a number of organisational reasons, it is impossible to apply the set of methodological rules showed off in the handbooks. In methodology, rules are often prescribed that are often tacitly removed or worked out. Gobo stated that he does not necessarily subscribe to post-modernist ideas that find methodology as an obstacle. However, he examined good organizational reasons for bad research e.g. public or perish pressure, and many other reasons. Sometimes, data collection and analysis are sacrificed. In addition, there are good sociological reasons for bad research e.g. if methodology is constituted by rules, which are rarely applied, methodology can rarely be applied as is it written in the qualitative methodology handbooks. One way is to revisit traditional methodological concepts e.g. validity, reliability etc. and craft a new methodology that is more practical and sociologically and organizationally-based. Gobo gave an example from his own work on sampling in which he showed that most of the well-known qualitative researchers were actually survey-workers and most of their work was derived from small and opportunistic samples. He called for decolonizing

methodology and a methodology grounded in practice. He argued that we need more tips and advice on how to carry out our task. A trend is research teams. Why is team research growing? It is an organisational answer to academic pressure. In a research team, the methodological rules are loose because it is difficult to control all research behaviours. How much can one trust their ethnographic notes? So we have to find a sustainable methodology in order to take into account these organizational changes in qualitative research. He pointed out, however, that such 'situated methodology' doesn't totally give up traditional ways of carrying out research.

In the afternoon, the workshop sessions split into three groups to discuss 'improving quality'. Participants debated the credibility gap and asked what are the challenges of this gap? They wanted to narrow the question suggesting that there is not a general credibility gap. They pointed out that in certain European countries, ethnography, ethnology and qualitative methods are quite advanced. There were discussions of who commission research and who are the policy-makers. Discussions were continued at the delicious conference dinner (including whale!).

On the third and last day of the workshop, **Paul Drew** opened with a lecture on conversation analysis (CA). CA is an inter-disciplinary method connecting Sociology, Linguistics, Psychology and other disciplines. It is a rigorous and systematic method for analysing talk-in-interaction in a wide range of ethnographic and interactional settings – and thereby as a method for understanding the 'constitution' and co-construction of the work of various organizations and institutions. Drew reviewed the method, its applicability and its limitations, and considered the intersection with other research methods. Basing himself on a conversation between George Bush and Tony Blair, recorded at the G8 meeting in St Petersburg in July 2006, which was recorded by mistake when Bush's microphone was accidentally left on, Drew showed how a single conversation can in fact influence international diplomacy. In a study of affiliation in interaction, Drew demonstrated that conversation forms move from imperatives ("I need you to...") to ("I wonder if...") i.e. from low contingency and high entitlement, to high contingency and low entitlement. Bringing examples from ENT (Ear, Nose and Throat) oncology, the doctor always makes positive remarks; he worked with 60-80 cases and argued that qualitative methodologists should attempt to analyse larger data sets (hundreds of cases). Giving examples from his research in

medical health with Primary and Secondary Care consultations between doctors and patients, Drew concluded that CA, combined with other methodological tools, could strengthen the quality of qualitative methodology.

**Anne Ryen** addressed the credibility issue in ethnographic research when working with a main informant, an Asian businessman in East Africa. Publications on working with informants have focused on informants as insiders, the challenge in recruiting an informant in a new field, and the quandaries informants may produce. Later researchers got concerned with the potentially exploitative nature of qualitative methods, and about the moral ambiguities of fieldwork. Ryen claimed that field relations should be seen as resembling ordinary relations between lay people. Portraying informants solely as information-providers veil the interactional aspects of doing fieldwork. Rather we should describe the shifts in the collaborative relations in the field. This leads us to accept the multiplicity of why informants volunteer to participate in our projects. As in daily life, members move between alternative contexts and paired identities. In this way, researchers can avoid being trapped in the "neo-colonialism" of cross-cultural research. Correct relations with the major informant are crucial to the credibility of our research. Analysing informant-researcher relations as less structural and more collaborative will provide us with more wide-ranging data and is crucial to the credibility of our research. She maintained that field relations should be seen as resembling ordinary relations between lay people, and argued against portraying informants solely as information-providers. She exemplified with extracts from conversations between the researcher and her key informant. She claimed that researcher-researched interaction is never static. In real life, Ryen's key informant was depressed and non-depressed, and at times the conversations were personal; Ryen recommend that researchers should be more flexible about drawing professional/private boundaries in field relations and should not exclude all personal matters from the relationship. These conversations should be regarded as part of the fieldwork itself, which is part of the ordinary everyday life of ethnographers.

**Christian Heath**, in his lecture "The Strike of a Hammer", argued for the use of audio-technological innovations in qualitative research. He stated that sociologists

have not taken advantage of videos and audio-visual material. Basing himself on Bernard Hibbits, a legal anthropologist, who claims that different forms of non-verbal actions, such as large noises, handshakes, and so on, are essential for securing legal contracts e.g. wedding contracts, and are increasingly absent in modern society. Heath's paper focused on the public auction and the strike of a gavel on a piece of wood, which marks the valuation and sale of goods, from small amounts to millions. The gesture is of a profound, momentary, legal significance. In auctions of fine art, antiques and objets d'art, the striking of the hammer signifies the acceptance of the highest bid, whereby the closing session concludes the contract between buyer and seller. Even the design of a simple gesture, the striking of the gavel, is representative of the complexities of social relations. Video can be an unprecedented opportunity to address the fine details of social action and interaction in naturally occurring settings. Heath brought the attention of his audience to the finest details of the sequential actions, through which he developed analytic insights that are grounded within the sequential organisation of activities and prioritise the importance of participants' 'standpoint' and 'practice'. Through the auction, Heath demonstrated how video analysis can take into consideration talk, visible and material conduct whilst taking the participants standpoint and their participation seriously.

In order to overcome the so-called 'legitimation crisis' in qualitative studies, which 'makes problematic the traditional criteria for evaluating and interpreting qualitative research', one tactic, as suggested by several former speakers, is to engage in collaborative research. In the wake of globalisation, collaborative research has accelerated, to the extent that it has become the 'darling' of most funding bodies. **Shalva Weil** examined collaborative research, which has not come under the scrutiny of qualitative methodologists. Within anthropology, collaborative ethnography stems from a well-entrenched tradition engaging others in a public act, sometimes far beyond the boundaries of the discipline's discourse. However, too little attention has been given to the pitfalls of collaborative qualitative research in general. This may involve surrendering academic principles to further political ends, claiming 'authority' over weaker partners and suppressing dialogical cooperation. In the paper, Weil gave examples of feelings of "colonialism" from recent collaborative research she conducted on violence in schools in Israel with a Palestinian co-researcher and Palestinian partners.

### **3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcomes**

The workshop brought together international experts in qualitative methodology to discuss the state of the art and the quality of their discipline. The workshop was oriented to application with participants suggesting how to overcome the credibility gap in qualitative methods. The workshop was of a high academic standard and afforded a wonderful opportunity to exchange ideas in a face-to-face situation without the tensions and waste of time of a large conference.

The workshop was designed to examine the credibility gap in qualitative studies and it did - by convening different scholars in different fields of qualitative methodology from such areas as conversation analysis, applied theatre, interviewing, etc. The challenges of credibility include how we present ourselves to different audiences: academics, practitioners, funding agencies and other lay people. The workshop was organized to allay the doubts of funding bodies and to take up the challenge of quantitative colleagues and it certainly provided a serious academic forum in which such questions could be discussed. To this end, the workshop was organized around two themes: Improving Quality and Better Methodologies.

Another purpose of the workshop was both to stimulate younger scholars in the field and to act as catalyst for clear thinking in the field. Four younger researchers attended the workshop and participated in lively manner, particularly in the informal session. In other words, the workshop was a true learning environment for all.

The timing of the workshop was essential in order to "nip in the bud" the doubts of potential funding bodies and the existing critiques of qualitative research from quantitative colleagues so that qualitative studies will be recognised as legitimate. The workshop will have direct effects on the direction of a larger group of qualitative researchers who will be meeting in Glasgow, Scotland for the ESA (European Sociological Association) Research Network in Qualitative Methods conference. Several participants of the ESF workshop will also lecture there (including David Silverman who will present a semi-plenary) and they will bring the knowledge they acquired in Kristiansand to that meeting. Some also participate in the EUROQUAL project and will no doubt share their wisdom there, too. It was pointed out that EUROQUAL is already funded by the ESF such that a continuation through

EUROQUAL would be inappropriate. The convenors will examine whether there is any possibility of turning to any other Research Networking Programme since many of the workshop participants are already part of various qualitative methods networks. The workshop participants thought that another follow-up workshop should be held, with a possible approach to other funding agencies for support, such as ESRC or even the Marie Curie networks.

The workshop papers will be published in summer 2008 in a Special Issue of the online journal *Qualitative Sociological Review* to be edited by Anne Ryen.

Other ideas that arose included a summer camp to train graduate students or mid-career personnel in different branches of qualitative methods.

## **4. Final Programme**

Sunday 24 June 2007

19.00 Evening *Dinner*

Monday 25 June 2007

12.00 *Lunch*

13.00 *Registration*

13.30 Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF)

Asbjorn Rødseth (Standing Committee for the Social Sciences)

13.45 Introduction by the conference convenors (Anne Ryen, David Silverman, Shalva Weil)

Stream 1: Improving Quality

14.00 Paper 1: Christoph Maeder: The quest for quality in qualitative research: Is there still hope?

15.00 Paper 2: Marie Buscatto: Reflexivity as Quality: Principles in Action

16.00 *Coffee break*

Stream 2: Better Methodologies

16.30 Paper 3: Steinar Kvale: Interviewing between method and craft

17.30-18.30 Paper 4: Daniel Bertaux: Methodological sophistication or social relevance? The way forward for qualitative methods in sociology

Evening *Dinner*

Tuesday 26 June 2007

Stream 1: Improving Quality

09.30 Paper 5: Krzysztof T. Konecki: Triangulation and the quality of qualitative field research: The problem of reality.

10.30 *Coffee break*

11.00 Paper 6: Gillian Hundt: Utilising Applied Theatre within Qualitative Research

12.00 Paper 7: David Silverman: Art and Artefact in Qualitative Research

13.00 *Lunch*

Stream 2: Better Methodologies

14.00 Paper 8: Lindsay Prior: Repositioning documents

15.00 Paper 9: Giampietro Gobo: Good organisational reasons for bad research: is it really possible to change the trend?

16.00 *Coffee break*

16.30-18.00 Workshops sessions [split into 3 groups to discuss ‘improving quality’]

19.30 *Conference dinner*

ESF SCSS Exploratory Workshop:

Improving The Quality Of Qualitative Research

*Kristiansand, Norway, 25 - 28 June 2007*

Wednesday 27 June 2007

09.30 Stream 2: Better Methodologies

Paper 10: Paul Drew: Improving the Quality of Conversation Analytic

Research: Some Methodological Directions

10.30 *Coffee break*

11.00 Paper 11: Anne Ryen: Re-working Credibility: Working with a Main

Informant in Ethnography

12.00 *Lunch*

13.00 Stream 1: Improving Quality

.14.00 Paper 13: Christian Heath: Video and the analysis of multi-modal interaction in ‘complex’ environments

15.00 Coffee break

1530 Plenary: future directions

17.00 *Conference ends*

Evening *Dinner*

## **5. Statistical Information on Participants**

- The conference convenors came from 3 different ESF countries: Norway, UK and Israel
- Of the 18 participants (excluding the ESF representative), 10 ((55.5%) were male, 8 (44.5%) were female.
- 7 participants were professors; 4 were local Norwegian Ph.d students.
- The 14 main participants represented 9 European countries: UK (4), Israel (1), Norway (1), Denmark (1), France (2), Italy (1), Ireland (1), Poland (1), Switzerland (1), Sweden (1)
- All the participants were sociologists, except 2 anthropologists and 1 psychologist, but they work in different university departments, including management, education, health and social medicine.



## 6. Final List of Participants

Convenor:

1. David SILVERMAN  
Department of Sociology  
Goldsmiths College / Kings' College  
University of London  
34 Broadhurst Avenue  
Edgware, London HA88TS  
United Kingdom  
Email: soa02ds@gold.ac.uk

Co-Convenors:

2. Shalva WEIL  
Research Institute for Innovation in  
Education  
Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Mt. Scopus  
91905 Jerusalem  
Israel  
Tel: +972 2 6722466  
Fax: +972 2 5882100  
Email: msshalva@mssc.huji.ac.il

Local Organiser:

3. Anne RYEN  
Department of Sociology, Social Work  
and  
Welfare  
School of Management  
Agder University College  
Service Box 422  
4604 Kristiansand S  
Norway  
Tel: +47 38 14 15 33  
Fax: +47 38 14 10 28  
Email: Anne.Ryen@hia.no

ESF Representative:

4. Asbjørn RØDSETH  
Department of Economics  
University of Oslo  
P.O. Box 1095, Blindern  
0317 Oslo  
Norway  
Tel: +47 2285 5133  
Email: asbjorn.rodseth@econ.uio.no

Participants:

5. Tormod Wallem ANUNDTSEN  
Agder University College  
University of Oslo  
Servicebox 422  
4604 Kristiansands  
Norway  
Tel: +47 3814 3643  
Fax: +47 3814 1231  
Email: Tormod.W.Anundsen@hia.no

6. Daniel BERTAUX  
Centre d'Etudes des Mouvements Sociaux  
(CEMS)  
Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences  
Sociales  
(EHES)  
54, Bld Raspail  
75006 Paris  
France  
Email: bertaux@ehess.fr

7. Marie BUSCATTO  
CNRS  
Laboratoire G.Friedmann  
University of Paris I Pantheon-Sorbonne  
43c rue Thomas Lemaitre  
9900 Nanterre  
France  
Email: marie.buscatto@wanadoo.fr

8. Paul DREW  
Department of Sociology  
Heslington  
York Y10 5DD  
United Kingdom  
Email: wpd1@york.ac.uk

9. Liv FEGRAN  
Agder University College  
University of Oslo  
Servicebox 422  
4604 Kristiansands  
Norway  
Email: Liv.Fegran@hia.no

10. Giampietro GOBO  
Dipartimento di Studi Sociali e Politici  
Facoltà di Scienze Politiche  
Università degli Studi di Milano  
via Conservatorio 7  
20122 Milano  
Italy  
Email: Giampietro.Gobo@unimi.it

11. Anne HALVORSEN  
University of Bergen  
Servicebox 422  
4604 Kristiansands  
Norway  
Tel: +47 3814 1669  
Fax: +47 3814 1061  
Email: Anne.Halvorsen@hia.no

12. Christian HEATH  
The Department of Management  
King's College  
University of London  
150, Stamford Street  
London SE1 8WA  
United Kingdom  
Email: christian.heath@kcl.ac.uk

13. Gillian HUNDT  
School of Health and Social Studies  
Warwick University  
Social Studies Building  
Coventry CV4 7AL  
United Kingdom  
Email: Gillian.Hundt@warwick.ac.uk

14. Krzysztof KONECKI  
Instytut Socjologii Instytut Socjologii  
ul. Rewolucji 1905r., 41/43  
90-214 Lodz  
Poland  
Email: konecki@uni.lodz.pl

15. Steinar KVALE  
Psykologiske Institut  
Jens Chr. Skous Vej 4  
8000 Aarhus C  
Denmark  
Email: steinark@psy.au.dk

16. Christoph MAEDER  
Department of Sociology  
University of St Gallen  
Tigerbergstrasse 2  
9000 St Gallen  
Switzerland  
Email: christoph.maeder@unisg.ch

17. Lindsay PRIOR  
Department of Sociology  
School of Sociology  
Queen's University  
Belfast BT7 1NN  
Ireland  
Email: l.prior@qub.ac.uk

18. Hege WALLEVIK  
Agder Research  
University of Life Sciences, Oslo  
Servicebox 415  
4604 Kristiansand  
Norway  
Tel: +47 92648409  
Email: hege.wallevik@hia.no

19. K.A.K.K WIJEWARDENE  
Section of International Maternal And  
Child  
Jayawardenepura University  
Akademiske Sjukhuset 611  
75185 Uppsala  
Sweden  
Tel: +46 18 611 5989  
Email: rashmid@sltnet.lk