TECHNIQUES FOR OBTAINING QUALITATIVE DATA IN WRITTEN ONLINE INQUIRIES

Daniela Schiek,[1] Carsten G. Ullrich[2]

Abstract: In this paper we discuss the possible benefits of written asynchronous online inquiries for qualitative social research and digital inquiry techniques. Although qualitative interviews and group discussions have been conducted online since the mid-1990s, we know very little about their methodological benefits, their concrete execution techniques of digital questioning, active listening and relationship building. We show the methodological potential of written research exchanges which enable the articulation (and thus the empirical reconstruction) of statements which are not yet socially ratified. Furthermore, we discuss the importance of face-to-face contact before the actual inquiry, which can increase the mutual commitment between researchers and respondents. Finally, we argue that signals of permanent 'listening' and recognition of the respondents' expressions are constitutive in obtaining qualitative data, which means a personal and trustful communication style and a high frequency of contact with probably a non-directive questioning technique.

Keywords: Online methods, qualitative methods, data quality, online interviewing, online group discussion.

Résumé: Dans cet article, nous discutons des avantages possibles des enquêtes écrites asynchrones en ligne pour la recherche sociale qualitative et les techniques d'enquête numérique. Bien que des entretiens qualitatifs et des discussions de groupe aient eu lieu en ligne depuis le milieu des années 90, nous ne connaissons que très peu leurs avantages méthodologiques, leurs techniques d'exécution concrètes de questionnement numérique, d'écoute active et de construction de relations. Nous montrons le potentiel méthodologique des échanges de recherches écrites qui permettent l'articulation (et donc la reconstruction empirique) d'énoncés qui ne sont pas encore socialement ratifiés. En outre, nous discutons de l'importance du contact direct avant l'enquête, ce qui peut accroître l'engagement mutuel entre les chercheurs et les répondants. Enfin, nous soutenons que les signaux d'écoute permanente et de reconnaissance des expressions des répondants sont constitutifs dans l'obtention de données qualitatives, ce qui signifie un style de communication personnel et confiant et une fréquence élevée de contact avec probablement une technique de questionnement non directive.

Mots clés: Méthodes en ligne, méthodes qualitatives, qualité des données, interviews en ligne, discussion en groupe en ligne.

Resumen: En este artículo discutimos los posibles beneficios de las investigaciones escritas asíncronas en línea para la investigación social cualitativa y las técnicas de investigación digital. Aunque las entrevistas cualitativas y las discusiones de grupo se han realizado en línea desde mediados de los 90, sabemos muy poco acerca de sus beneficios metodológicos, sus técnicas concretas de ejecución de preguntas digitales, escucha activa y construcción de relaciones. Demostramos el potencial metodológico de los intercambios de investigación escrita que permiten la articulación (y por lo tanto la reconstrucción empírica) de enunciados que aún no están socialmente ratificados. Además, discutimos la importancia del contacto cara a cara antes de la investigación real, lo que puede aumentar el compromiso mutuo entre los investigadores y los encuestados. Por último, argumentamos que las señales de "escucha" permanente y reconocimiento de las expresiones de los encuestados son constitutivas en la obtención de datos cualitativos, lo que significa un estilo de comunicación personal y confiable y una alta frecuencia de contacto con probablemente una técnica de interrogatorio no directivo.

[1] A. Daniela Schiek, Dr., Universität Duisburg-Essen, D-45117 Essen, Germany. E-mail: daniela.schiek@uni-due.de

[2] A. Carsten G. Ullrich, Prof. Dr., Universität Duisburg-Essen, D-45117 Essen, Germany. E-mail: carsten.ullrich@uni-due.de

- – 79

———————————— Ж ————————————

T he internet is increasingly seen as an empirical data resource by qualitative researchers. This is especially true of (multi-sited) ethnography (e. g. Dicks, Mason, Coffey & Atkinson, 2006; Williams, 2007; Beneito-Montagut, 2011). However, online communications have also been increasingly used for reactive forms of qualitative data collection since the mid-1990s, such as in the form of group discussions or dialogues via e-mail, web forums, chats and micro blogs. Nevertheless, the use of online media for qualitative interviews or group discussions has been barely studied yet. This is particularly true of written asynchronous communication with a time lag and the absence of the communication partners, mostly realized via e-mail, web forums or micro postings on homepages or social media profiles.

Typed asynchronous online communications constitute the maximal contrast with the face-to-face inquiries of qualitative research, which is the usual mode of qualitative data production. For this reason, they hold the highest potential for innovation in the field of online methods – they may become a particular method – but also the most challenges. There are in particular two basic aspects of these communications which have not yet been developed. The first is the methodological potential of written inquiries in qualitative research. What are the benefits for qualitative researchers from using written online communications as research instruments? The second is the specific techniques needed to obtain qualitative data in asynchronous online communications. What instructions are needed for textual interviewing and digital relationship work? Questions regarding data quality, the participants' motivation and trust despite the physical absence of the communication partners and the time lag are currently unsolved but also probably fruitful aspects. Therefore, in this article we focus on both the methodological advantages of written asynchronous online inquiries and on the techniques of relationship building, communication styles, and inquiry practices. For illustrative reasons, we partly refer to the first findings from our own experimental study about reactive qualitative online inquiries. Because we are still analysing the data and evaluating our experiment, we can only give advance notice of some of our results. For this reason, this paper is not centred around our research.

THE METHODOLOGICAL POTENTIAL OF WRITTEN ASYNCHRONOUS ONLINE INQUIRIES IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

In most articles arguing for internet-based qualitative interviews or group discussions, pragmatic aspects play an important role. There is a focus on time- and cost-saving and the reachability of respondents who are (geographically or mentally) 'far away' from the research.

Simplicity in the recruitment of participants, the possibility of large samples and extensive reductions in interviewer effects are also mentioned (e.g. Persichitte, Young & Tharp, 1997; Bampton & Cowton, 2002; Meho, 2006). Most of the aspects of the debate, such as large samples or the reachability of respondents, regard features which are important not only for qualitative research in particular but for empirical social research in general. Furthermore, features like time- and cost-saving are not necessarily true, because digital inquiries can also be timely and costly in their conceptualisation, execution, archiving, and analysing.

However, the extensive reduction of interviewer effects – which is usually more an argument for quantitative researchers – is an interesting and paradoxical feature of interest for qualitative researchers. On the one hand, personality and communication style and therefore physical presence are basic elements, or rather instruments, of qualitative inquiry: individuals develop sense and action through social interaction and face-to-face elements play an important role in coordination of action (Mead, 1968: 108f., 1987: 234; Goffman, 1977: 233, 1986). If we practise 'natural' interactions in research inquiries, we are able to stimulate processes of organizing sense and action. This is why face-to-face communication is the usual form of qualitative inquiries; qualitative interviewers understand themselves and their own verbal and non-verbal activities as immediate elements of the social interaction processes running in interviews and as basic research instruments.

Due to the immediate synchronization of actions, on the other hand, in face-to-face interactions we can only reach actions and statements which individuals can make spontaneously without the risk of (even unconscious) sanctions or interruption by the counterpart. In asynchronous written communication, this strong synchronization of actions is lacking and this is the reason why it is probably suitable for studying topics which are not (yet) socially ratified and which individuals cannot couch in words off the cuff. The methodological aspects of written online inquiries have not been discussed in current research, but there are linguistic and sociological indications of the exceptional social utility of asynchronous written exchanges.

Even though synchronous online communication in the form of chats or (video) phoning is also a specific means of communication due to its mediation (e.g. Heath & Luff, 1993), these written or oral chats are conceptually oral talks (Koch & Österreicher, 1994; Storrer, 2001; Dürscheid, 2003). One can assume that video, the telephone and synchronous text chats are selected in everyday life in order to compensate for the immediate physical absence of others and to bridge the resulting distance. In contrast, e-mails, blogs, forums, etc. are selected just because of the distance from the communication partner. The absence of an immediate other and the time lag in interaction seem to enable specific actions by individuals. Therefore, written actions can overcome the immediate situation and provide permanence (Ehlich, 1980). Simmel (1992) argued that in written correspondence deeply personal and immediate experiences (such as emotions) can be connected to the objective and permanent form of written language. Asynchronous written communication allows a manifest interconnection between the affective and the intellectual, because the physical absence of the communication partners, the time lag and the multimodality of asynchronous written online communication enable individuals to 'research' and sort their experiences and intentions. The experience may not be available spontaneously and narratively, and not even verbally. As Hull and Nelson (2004: 253) point out,

81

through hypertext the processing of meanings and their constitution by the mutual interplay of feelings, perceptions and interpretations can be partly organized and expressed processually. Therefore, the original conception of 'hypertext' (in microfilm and computer technology) targeted exactly this function of personal 'mind mapping': the storing of ideas and knowledge in all possible formats with links between them were for Vygotzky (1934), Bush (1945) and Nelson (1991) a desirable system of structuring experience or knowledge before or without placing it in pure texts or communications off the cuff. Especially on the internet 'HTML' (hypertext markup language) enables this to a far greater extent and far more comfortably than analogue systems and synchronous face-to-face communication methods.

Hence, for qualitative research, the 'mail survey' is particularly interesting when it is directed to processes of the constitution of meaning and experience. Written asynchronous interaction opens up opportunities to study these processes at an earlier stage than is possible with synchronous and oral procedures – already when experiences are (still) not coagulated and ratified socially, while they are still sorted, refined, discarded, reformulated, pointed, discussed with third parties or tried in interaction – and so when they are first constituted. Thus, qualitative research can come close to the limits of sociality and examine processes that lie between objectivity and immediate subjectivity, 'internal dialogue' and objective importance (Mead, 1986). This is why written asynchronous inquiries are predestined to be of use in sociological studies of 'unusual' experiences and actions at the limits of (prototypical) sociality, e. g. interactions with (becoming or dying) humans or amoral and risky statements (Schiek, 2014).

Despite qualitative researchers having used written asynchronous online inquiries since the mid-1990s (e. g. Foster, 1994; Murray, 1997; Mann and Stewart, 2000; Salmons, 2015; LaMarre & Rice, 2016), they are largely unfamiliar with their concrete conduct. Even experiences with the time duration of data collection range from a few weeks to several months or years. This depends not only on the research question but also on the motivation of the respondents, which is very probably influenced by the inquiry techniques, the relationship work and active 'textual listening' by the interviewers (Schiek & Ullrich 2016). Both the active listening and relationship work is still a methodological challenge due to the researcher's reduced control of the field he/she 'enters' in written asynchronous online communication. In the following section, we discuss possible solutions for procedures of relationship building, inquiry practices and communication styles which can lead to obtaining qualitative data in asynchronous written online exchanges.

TECHNIQUES OF QUALITATIVE ONLINE INQUIRIES

As mentioned above, the lack of face-to-face elements in online interactions seems to be both an advantage and a disadvantage at the same time. While the interviewer cannot (unconsciously) interrupt and sanction the respondent and this may motivate participants' articulation of risky experiences, he/she is also not able to regulate a trustful relationship or stimulate conversation as usual. To make online inquiries fruitful in qualitative social research, researchers have to solve this paradoxical situation and to find ways of combining reservation

with trustful, binding and stimulating interaction. Indeed, 'digital inquiring' has to treat respondents with 'interactive reserve,' which means caring about their autonomy even more than in face-to-face inquiries while considering their needs for interactive feedback more and differently than we are used to doing. It can be said that qualitative online inquiries are an exponentiation of the qualitative face-to-face inquiry: while in qualitative inquiries we override the reciprocal calibration of interests, or rather topics to be discussed, in qualitative online inquiries this is even more the case. In qualitative online inquiries we have to make respondents' interests and needs central in conversation even more than we used to do face-to-face. Is this easy to implement? One may be sceptical. Indeed, qualitative researchers are familiar with relationship work in the research field; one can even say that they are experts at stimulating and regulating the flow of data. This is so because qualitative research postulates the maxim of communication. As mentioned above, interpretative social researchers try to follow a 'natural' interaction in organizing their inquiries and face-to-face-elements play a basic role in the social coordination of action by individuals. Muscular movements are regarded as the smallest unit of action with which individuals position themselves in relation to others and with which to "get knowledge of the reactions of others" (Mead, 1987: 234; Goffman, 1986: 7). Simmel (1992) described how sensory gestures basically organize social relations. Using the everyday methods of face-to-face interaction as research instruments to study individual constructions of sense and action is a constitutive characteristic of qualitative research. Thus, most of the techniques for interview regulation are more in the background and at a sub-linguistic level, for example signs of paying attention such as 'mmh,' eye contact (Schütze, 1977; Herrmanns, 2000; Helfferich, 2011: 90f.) or the creation of a trustful atmosphere and relationship (Ullrich, 1999: 442, Seidman 2006: 95, Magnusson & Marecek, 2015: 59), even by means of clothing (Gorden, 1975: 222). Not only for methodological pragmatic reasons but also in relation to ethical responsibility towards respondents, it is very important for them to receive expressions of interest from interviewers and to be able to rate them, particularly in qualitative inquiries, where the trend of the interaction and themes is open and narratives are very personal. However, in written inquiries there is a lack of inviting gestures and facial expressions and it is currently not clear whether or how we should or can compensate for them in keyboard-based research conversations. The digital inquiry is completely virgin soil for qualitative researchers and they are unfamiliar with it. However, the following section deals with possible working solutions to these challenges of digital inquiries.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FACE-TO-FACE CONTACT IN QUALITATIVE ONLINE INQUIRIES

Consequently, the most self-evident assumption is that qualitative online interviews or group discussions should be framed by face-to-face contacts with the interviewer. However, this issue is very unclear and the views expressed in published works are inconsistent. While meeting each other face-to-face seems to be helpful for a trustful contact between the interviewer and the respondent on the one hand (e.g. Illingworth, 2001; Kivits, 2005; Housten, 2008), on the other hand in some studies participants say that they say much more personal things because of the anonymity of the interviewer and that they would not do so if they knew the researcher personally (e.g. Früh, 2000: 65). Accordingly, the anonymity of interviewers is the advantage most frequently mentioned in all

the publications about online inquiries. In our own experimental study of 'forum discussions as qualitative research instruments' – which is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and is being carried out over the period 2015-2017 – we have conducted online group discussions preceded by different ways of getting to know each other. Groups which have had a face-to-face meeting before starting the discussion have a significantly more 'lively' and more continuous online forum discussion than groups with only an online round of introductions and especially more than groups without any round of introductions (groups where we started the discussion immediately). This result shows that a high level of getting to know each other before the actual inquiry can be necessary to obtain 'deep' data and constant participation. We assume that face-to-face meetings increase mutual 'commitment' and should be seen as a confidence-building strategy. However, acquiring qualitative data in asynchronous written online inquiries depends not only on face-to-face contact but also on specific styles of talking, and inquiry techniques which are able to show 'active listening' and recognition of the respondents' statements.

TEXTUAL STIMULATION TECHNIQUES

To show active 'listening' and recognition of the participants' statements in written asynchronous online inquiries, we argue that open non-directive inquiry practices are much more important than in face-to-face interviews. Due to the medium's 'information poverty' in interpreting each other, in written contact uncertainty about the relevance to the research and the desirability of their statements is much stronger for the respondents than in face-to-face contacts. In our study of reactive forum discussions, we find that the respondents show much higher levels of motivation and participation in non-directive -moderated rounds than in semi-structured discussions. These findings are confirmed by statements by Murray (1997) and Erdogan (2001) that in online focus groups the autonomy of the participants is higher and the interaction with the moderator is less than in face-to-face situations. However, we cannot remove the interviewer and moderators from these communications and leave the respondents on their own because signs of presence, 'listening,' and respecting the participants' expressions are very important. Nevertheless, while qualitative researchers are experts at open and non-directive questioning (it might be easy to heed the advice of non-directivity), the textual stimulation of qualitative data and, therefore, 'digital interviewing' techniques are absolutely virgin soil. There are some elements of the active 'listening' in face-to-face-interactions which can be transferred to written forms of interaction, e.g. verbal expressions of interest and understanding of stories and statements. Gallagher (2015) presents textual forms of this. Interaction strategies from older mass media such as television or radio are also probably useful because they too have to maintain motivation and relationships in an uncontrollable interrupted interaction (respondents can go to sleep during the programme or switch off at any time). Hence, instruments are needed to bridge the distance and create intimacy, such as personal forms of address, but also additional communication through other channels, e.g. fan clubs, live meetings with actors or extending stories into the real life of the audience (Horton & Wohl, 1956). For qualitative online inquiries, this means that we have to reduce the distance by using personal forms of address and employing more parallel channels in addition to the main conversation on the screen – maybe face-to-face meetings and a permanent 'textual presence' plus written backstage conversations beyond the actual interview and its stage. These latter

extra channels are important for reasons of minimizing the strong intervention character that written 'listening' would have in the actual interview: While listening and recognition signals pass via a back channel in face-to-face-interactions and are not the centre of the attention of the interaction partners (Goffman 1977: 233ff.), in mediated online conversations without physical presence they may take on too literal a meaning and may disturb focused interactions. We hold that interviewers need to simulate the quiet and soft gestural and facial regulation of data flow through lateral channels. They should not import all these strategies into the main conversation due to the disturbance that they create when they are written during the actual interviews: physical nodding is less interrupting than a written form of it is and we have to find alternatives for it or, rather, develop techniques of 'textual presence.' In our study, we are able to show that a high degree of textual presence and a personal informal communication style have a positive effect on obtaining constant and 'deep' data during the inquiry. We choose a distant communication style and only occasional contact for the control groups while we address the experimental groups informally and often send signals of presence, bonding and reception.

CONCLUSION

The use of internet-based asynchronous communication in qualitative research can currently be improved, especially as there is much evidence that such communication allows specific actions and can be empirically accessible. Due to its written form, multimodality and the absence of the communication partners, qualitative researchers have the chance to study experience constitution earlier than with oral communication – namely when experiences are (still) at the limits of sociality and are not (yet) socially validated or legitimized. Even through hypertext, no experience can be examined beyond the boundaries of sociality – the interpretation of what the interviewee really 'thinks' is (re)constructive work in face-to-face interviews as well as in typed asynchronous online inquiries.

Nevertheless, qualitative research needs a specific definition of the virtual and asynchronous research field and environment. Further conversation analysis and empirical experiments are needed to identify and categorize the kind of interaction in written asynchronous online communication, in both natural and reactive research situations. This also applies to the planning of data collection and the arrangement of the relationship between respondents and researchers, or rather interviewers. At the moment, we cannot estimate whether the rituals of social and trustful relationships together with the signs of engagement in a conversation which are described by interaction analysts (Goffmann, 1977, 1986) can or even should be transformed into digital asynchronous interaction. Further systematic studies are needed to explore this question. However, there are many indications pointing towards the thesis that we should orientate our online communication around methods we have learned in everyday-life face-to-face interactions. In research communication we very probably need to search for derivations or reinventions of this and study the phenomenon of 'interaction without a counterpart' (Ayaß, 2005; Knorr-Cetina, 2012) in general. This should be seen as an opportunity: studying mediated interaction and the re-arrangement of research relationships and interview techniques is very fruitful in terms of methodological reflection and innovation.

REFERENCES

Ayaß, R. (2005). Interaktion ohne Gegenüber? In Jäckel, M. & Mai, M. (eds.), *Online-Vergesellschaftung? Mediensoziologische Perspektiven auf neue Kommunikationstechnologien.* Wiesbaden: VS., 34–49.

Bampton, R. & Cowton, Ch. (2002). The E-Interview. *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 3 (2). http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/848/1843.

Beneito-Montagut, R. (2011). Ethnography goes online: towards a user-centred methodology to research interpersonal communication on the internet. *Qualitative Research 11(6),*716-735.

Bush, V. (1945). *As we may think.* Available at: http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1945/07/as-we-may-think/303881/.

Dicks, B., Mason, B., Coffey, A., & Atkinson P. (2006). *Qualitative Research and Hypermedia. Ethnography for the Digital Age*. Sage.

Dürscheid, Ch. (2003). Medienkommunikation im Kontinuum von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit. Theoretische und empirische Probleme. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Linguistik* 38, 37–56.

Ehlich, K. (1980). Schriftentwicklung als gesellschaftliches Problemlösen. *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 2, 335–359.

Endres, B.O. (2004). Ist Hypertext Text? In: Kleinberger, G. U. & Wagner, F. (eds), *Neue Medien – Neue Kompetenzen?* Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 33–48.

Erdogan, G. (2001). Die Gruppendiskussion als qualitative Datenerhebung im Internet. Ein Online-Offline-Vergleich. *kommunikation@gesellschaft* 2 (5). http://www.soz.uni-frankfurt.de/K.G/B5_2001_Erdogan.pdf.

Foster, G. (1994). Fishing with the net for research data. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 25 (2), 91–97.

Früh, D. (2000). Online-Forschung im Zeichen des Qualitativen Paradigmas. Methodologische Reflexion und empirische Erfahrungen. *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 1 (3). http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/download/1052/2280.

Gallagher, J. (2015). Five Strategies Internet Writers Use to "Continue the Conversation". *Written Communication* 32 (4), 396-425.

Goffman, E. (1977). *Rahmen-Analyse. Ein Versuch über die Organisation von Alltagserfahrungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Goffman, E. (1986). *Interaktionsrituale. Über Verhalten in direkter Kommunikation.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Gorden, R. (1975). *Interviewing. Strategies, techniques, and tactics*. Homewood, Illinoi: Dorsey.

Heath, C. & Luff, P. (1993). Disembodied conduct. Interactional symmetries in video-mediated communication. In: Button, G. (ed.), *Technology in working order. Studies of work, interaction, and technology.* London: Routledge, 35–54.

Helfferich, C. (2011). *Die Qualität qualitativer Daten*. 4. Edition. Wiesbaden: VS.

Hermanns, H. (2000). Interviewen als Tätigkeit. In: Flick, U. , Kardorff, E. v. & Steinke, I. (eds.), *Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch.* Hamburg: Rowohlt, 360–368.

Horton, D. & Wohl, R. (1956). Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observation on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry, 19/3,* 215-229.

Houston, M. (2008). Tracking Transition: Issues in Asynchronous E-Mail Interviewing. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research 9 (2).* http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/419.

Hull, G.A. & Nelson, M.E. (2005). Locating the Semiotic Power of Multimodality. In: *Written Communication* 22 (22), 224-261.

Ilingworth, N. (2001). The Internet matters: Exploring the use of the Internet as a research tool. *Sociological Research Online 6 (2).* https://lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/30828/1/U601323.pdf.

Knorr Cetina, K. (2012). Die synthetische Situation. In: Ayaß, R. & Meyer, Christian (eds.), *Sozialität in Slow Motion. Theoretische und empirische Perspektiven.* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 81–109.

Kivits, J. (2005). Online interviewing and the research relationship. In C. Hine (Ed.), *Virtual Methods: Issues in Social research on the Internet.* Oxford: Berg, 35–49.

Koch, P. & Oesterreicher, W. (1994). Schriftlichkeit und Sprache. In J. Baurmann, J., H. Günther & O. Ludwig (eds.), *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch internationaler Forschung.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 587–603.

Magnusson, E. & Marecek, J. (2015). *Doing interview-based qualitative research.* Cambridge: University Press.

Mann, C. & Stewart, F. (2000). *Internet communication and qualitative research.* A handbook for researching online. Sage.

LaMarre, A. & Rice, C. (2016). Embodying Critical and Corporal Methodology: Digital Storytelling With Young Women in Eating Disorder Recovery. *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 17 (2). http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/2474/3951.

Meho, L. (2006): E-Mail-Interviewing in qualitative research: A methodological discussion. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 47 (10), 1284–1295.

Mead, G. H. (1968). *Geist, Identität und Gesellschaft. Aus der Sicht des Sozialbehaviorismus.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Mead, G. H. (1987). *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (1). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Murray, P.J. (1997). Using Virtual Focus Groups in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research* 7 (4), 542–549.

Nelson, T.H. (1991). As we will think. In: J. M. Nyce & P. Kahn (eds.), *From Memex to Hypertext: Vannevar Bush and the Mind's Machine.* Boston: Academic Press, 245–260.

Persichitte, K., Young, S. & Tharp, D. (1997). Conducting Research on the Internet: Strategies for Electronic Interviewing. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED409860.pdf.

Salmons, J. (2015). *Qualitative Online Interviews.* 2nd Ed. London: Sage.

Schiek, D. (2014). Das schriftliche Interview in der qualitativen Sozialforschung. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 43 (5) 2014, 379 – 395.

Schiek, D. & Ullrich, C. (2016). The problems of motivation and data quality in typed asynchronous online inquiries. In: F. de Souza, A. P. Costa, L. P. Reis, A. Moreira, D. Lamas (eds.), *Proceedings International Symposium on Qualitative Research Vol 5 (2016).* http://proceedings.ciaiq.org/index.php/ciaiq2016/issue/view/16

Schütze, F. (1977). Die Technik des narrativen Interviews in Interaktionsfeldstudien – dargestellt an einem Projekt zur Erforschung von kommunalen Machtstrukturen. *Manuskript Universität Bielefeld: Arbeitspapiere und*

Forschungsberichte Nr. 1.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. 3rd Ed. New York: Teachers College Press.

Simmel, G. (1992). *Soziologie. Band III: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. 6. ed. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Storrer, A. (2001). Getippte Gespräche oder dialogische Texte? In: A. Lehr & H.E. Wiegand (eds.), *Sprache im Alltag*. Beiträge zu neunen Perspektiven in der Linguistik. Berlin u. a.: de Gruyter, 439–465.

Ullrich, C. G. (1999). Deutungsmusteranalyse und diskursives Interview. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 28 (6), 429-447.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1934).

Williams, M. (2007). Avatar watching: participant observation in graphical online environments. *Qualitative Research* 7 (1), 5-24.