



Qualitative Sociology Review

Volume II, Issue 2 – August 2006

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.2.2.01>

Lukas T. Marciniak
Lodz University, Poland

Editorial: Article as a Process of the Quality Constructing

It is a great pleasure to prepare an article for publication and a great honor to have an opportunity to participate in a process of improving it. For us, members of the Editorial Staff, it is always the process of the quality constructing, when author, reviewers and editors try to make an original submission a better article.

If we apply qualitative, sociological perspective to analyze this process, we will recognize it as a continual negotiation between the author – someone who aims to present findings, theories or considerations; the reviewer – someone who tries to advice how it should be presented, and the editor – someone who intends to publish the best, important and valuable article. Of course, such triple interaction is often difficult and that is because the author plans to keep unchanged as much of the original text as possible, especially when she/he feels that each change is an impoverishment of her/his subjective means of expression; at the same time, the reviewer wants to modify as much as possible because she/he feels that every suggested revision will improve the paper and that recommended revision, generally speaking, is the only valuable way to supply constructive criticisms for the author. The editor has own point of view, own imagination of forthcoming issue and is sure that the most important is to adjust the article to the requirements of the issue, of the journal, of the style guides, of the publisher etc. They all have the same purpose, the quality of the work, they only see it as attainable in a quite different ways.

Those who do not decide to go beyond own stock of meanings, break off negotiating and interacting. The process ends in success only when they all manage to construct their, intersubjective definition of the quality. And they hope that all readers will share their opinion.

In the current issue, we present eight considered, carefully prepared articles and we hope that you will appreciate their quality.

The first article, written by Yeslam Al-Saggaf and Kirsty Williamson, is based on the ethnographic exploration of the virtual communities in Saudi Arabia but is much deeper than a simple description and presentation of the findings. Authors aim to focus not only on the substantive field of their study or on the applied method but also on the epistemological roots of doing ethnography. The research problem (virtual communities in Saudi Arabia) and the main subject of the article (use of unobtrusive observation and participation) are considered from the constructivist perspective.

Another article which offers simultaneously, interesting subject of the study and important reflection upon the researcher's experience of the research, is a Bruce Arnold's work which highlights the problem of death and dying in a Thai

Buddhist hospice. It is a penetrating, grounded on the autoethnographic – autobiographical data, study of the phenomenon and its cultural context, the researcher's involvement in the research process and the role of researcher's emotions or taken-for-granted classification schemas.

In the third article, Val Gillies and Rosalind Edwards examine the concept of social capital and refer it to the work of major social capital theorists – James S. Coleman and Pierre Bourdieu. While authors intend to compare social capital theories, present and describe these different interpretations of the concept, their article is far from theoretical debates. It is empirically based analysis, founded on a qualitative study of parenting resources, developed and supported by gathered data and illustrated using case studies examples.

The fourth article, written by Noriko Milman and Jerome Rabow, is an examination of the impact of a politically-charged symbol on the everyday interactions. The problem is studied from the symbolic interactionist perspective, referred to the work of E. Goffman, especially his work on stigma, identity management and the self and grounded on auto-ethnographic data gathered during “The Pink Triangle” experiment revived by the authors.

Another, empirically explored issue is the concept of collective identity, studied on the substantive field of the Canadian fathers' rights movement and described by Robert A Kenedy in his article. Author applies a “Three-Pronged” methodology – a combination of the participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and content analysis and takes a case study approach to investigate the phenomenon of collective identity but also to evaluate and discuss the usefulness of employed method with reference to the specific, research problem.

The sixth article is an ethnomethodological approach to the legal studies in general and analysis of the structural organization of a ruling in particular. Baudouin Dupret briefly presents the Egyptian legal and judicial system as a basis for further considerations and applies the praxiological study of texts to investigate Egyptian trial, known as the “Queen Boat case.”

The seventh article may be recognized as an essay describing author's experience. Indeed, and the experience of the sur-real is deeply explored by Alexander Kozin who uses phenomenology as a method. This article is a reflection upon the experience of the human body and the experience of the embodied abnormality, referred to the studies of embodiment conducted by Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty and presented in the context of the art.

Finally, the last article written by Frank Nutch describes how photographic identification became a research technique. Because of the specific substantive area of the study - photographic identification of cetacea, this article will be valuable for those readers interested in sociological non-human animal studies, visual sociology as well as qualitative research within the context of sociology of science and scientific knowledge.

Have a nice reading!