

**Sunday, 4<sup>th</sup> July**

**Arrival of participants, joint dinner**

**Monday, 5<sup>th</sup> July Part I Semi-structured interviews**

1.1 Introduction (09.00-11.00)

*I: Discussion of experiences with qualitative interviewing, topics of the workshop*

*II: Situating semi-structured interviews as a data collection tool*

Questions for discussion:

What are the advantages and disadvantages of qualitative interviews?

For what purposes can qualitative interviews with informants (expert interviews) be used?

What is the difference between interviewing informants and interviewing respondents?

How do expert interviews differ from other forms of qualitative interviews in terms of informational yield and control of the interview situation?

*III Conceptual basis of expert interviews*

To what extent do we need a conceptual background when interviewing informants?

How can a conceptual background be formulated?

*Literature:* Hammersley and Gomm 2008, Miles and Huberman 1994, 16-25, Laudel and Gläser 2010 on empirical research questions

Coffee break 11.00-11.30
--------------------------

1.2 Translation of research questions into interview guides (11.30-13.00)

Questions for discussion: What are the major differences between everyday communication and interview situations?

Content, forms and functions of interview questions.

*Literature:* Patton 339-380

13.00-14.00 Lunch
-------------------

1.3 Training: Finding the right questions (14.00-16.00, two groups)

Analysis of interviews according to types of questions and wrong questions,

Construction of interview questions for specific situations and for specific empirical research questions

Coffee break 16.00-16.30
--------------------------

## 1.4 Conduct of interviews 16.30-18.00

Questions for discussion:

What are the most important criteria for selecting interviewees?

What are the major advantages and disadvantages of email-, internet-, phone and face-to-face interviews?

What are the major advantages and disadvantages of conducting interviews alone and conducting them with two interviewees?

How do we contact interviewees?

Why should interviews be recorded and transcribed?

What are the two most important ethical rules for qualitative interviewing?

What can we do when informing interviewees about the research question is likely to change their answers?

Further topics: special situations in interviews, special interviewee behavior, common interviewer errors.

Literature:, Patton 2002: 380-384, 404-415, Gordon 1975: 138-174, 197-210, Seidman 1991: 31-41, Thomas 1993; Trinczek 2009; Examples of Letters and Consent sheets

**Joint dinner**

## **Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> July Part II Interviewing researchers (half-day)**

### 2.1 The role of research content in semi-structured interviews with researchers (09.00-11.00)

What are examples of research questions that require addressing the content of academics' research?

What are examples of research questions that do not require addressing the content of academics' research?

How can we include the content of research at all if it is the subject matter of a different discipline?

What sociologically relevant information can be collected when research content is made an interview topic?

How can answers about research content be analysed?

*Literature:* Zuckerman 1972, Gläser and Laudel 2007

Coffee break 11.00-11.30

### 2.2 Accessing the research content: Sources and procedures (11.30-13.00)

Topics: Analysis of web pages, Web of Science, Google Scholar, Demonstration of an approach to analysing research biographies

*Literature:* Gläser and Laudel 2009a (research trails)

13.00-14.00 Lunch

### 2.3 Preparing and conducting interviews about research content (14.00-16.00)

Introduction to Web of Science, demonstration of an analysis of research biographies

Coffee break 16.00-16.30

### 2.4 Using your knowledge in interviews and thereafter (16.30-18:00)

How do we tell interviewees how much of their science we do understand?

How do we use graphical representations of research biographies?

Does it matter whether our interviewees are good or bad researchers?

How do we include epistemic properties in the analysis of our empirical data?

Li: Gläser and Laudel 2007 (Interviewing Scientists), Gläser and Laudel 2009b ('good' and 'bad' experts)

**Joint dinner**