

The Life Story of my Research Project

**Digging deeper into Section I - Berbegal, A. (2013). Methods in Practice, in Richards, L. (coord).
Handling Qualitative Data (3rd edition). London: Sage**

Three years on...

Research developments from published project:

Berbegal, A. (2009). Methods in Practice - Inside companionship for minors: troubles and weaknesses of an ethnographic approach to Deviance and Education, in Richards, L. (coord.). *Handling Qualitative Data: A Practical Guide (2nd edition)*. London: Sage.

Retrieved from <http://www.uk.sagepub.com/richards/references4.htm>

Doing justice to the development of my research project over the last three years is no negligible matter.

Its beginnings represented my “baptism” as a researcher.

Its end has resulted in my professional immersion at the Academy.

And I now realise that its continuation means that I need to analyse its place in an institutional context of scientific and intellectual production.

However, I will not limit myself to simply listing times, facts and circumstances. Or if I do, it will be taking care to ensure that behind the *life story* of this project, the change that my scientific-social worldview has undergone is comprehensible (Peneff, 1990; Bertaux, 1997; Pineau, 1998; Legrand, Gaulejac & Lejeune, 2000; Bamberg, 2007; González, 2008). A prisoner of gestation conditions and the way to guide the project within my personal and academic/professional project, its life story is condemned to co-exist with my own life story.

I will begin with a conviction contained in my analysis: cards are not important; it's how you play your hand.

My construction of the life story of this project will not be limited to just outlining a sociology of knowledge in defence of a social constructivism that can be stretched to absolute relativism (Barnes & Bloor, 1982). That approach would be too simplistic. It is obvious that research is developed under production conditions, but it is not so obvious that we can extract the *equal validity* of knowledge from these conditions (Boghossian, 2006). In this sense, I find it more useful to study these conditions from the point of view of the *reflexivity* of the author (Bourdieu, 2001). Therefore, the aim of this autobiographical method is to demonstrate that the sterile oppositions in the social sciences (explanation/understanding, objectivity/subjectivity, holism/individualism, realism/idealism etc.) can only be resolved in practice (Hollis, 1994). The scientific-social “way of seeing” and “way of listening” will not be reduced to technical or methodological alternatives. They are rather the “medium” that enables this development.

I will therefore analyse my project from a “being with” the social realm stance, an *accompaniment* of the social realm that can embody, re-embody and sometimes disembody a conflictive and unstable production of knowledge (Ardoino, 2000). From this perspective, the justification for the development of the project will be freed from a fetishism of symbolic merchandise that reduces it to the research object, line or subject matter. I will avoid the risk of

oscillating between a fetishism of empty concepts and of purely formal types and an empirical and methodological fetishism.

The life story of this project will make me question myself about the traditional challenges that the social sciences face, reflecting the changes and variations experienced by this project compared to its starting point (Delory-Momberger, 2000). In form and content I will humbly try to make a pilgrimage to them.

To avoid unnecessary repetitions, allow me to briefly summarise the origins of the project.

I recognise that it started with a deep *involvement* with the Academy (here) and not with the researched situation (there). As an ethnographic quasi-exercise, ethno-methodological to be precise, I entered a totally unknown world in an attempt to understand it. My natural relationship with the world to be researched did not define me as a “participating observer” but an “observing participant”. And if things were not already complicated enough, I opted for an “entryist” approach for the fieldwork where I always kept my research intentions secret (Lapassade, 2011).

I gradually went through a process of “conversion”. I assumed the role of “member” within the context of professional studied intervention and, contradictory and dynamic, this displacement of “being with” the social realm turned out to be my main source of knowledge. An exciting position in its complexity and in its unique perspectives of understanding the situation. The production of knowledge was interwoven in the heart of a multiple, non-contradictory being (Elster, 1985; Boumard, Lapassade & Lobrot, 2006): a worker from the institution (experienced as a member, and as a professional in practice), a researcher (experienced from outside of the researched situation) and internal analyst (experienced as a traitor regarding the researched context).

This attitude to the fieldwork (Geertz, 1988) could lead to a person being stigmatised today as the equivalent of a tourist postcard, and why not? The “being here”, in the Academy, as a university member among university members, was what motivated the adventure, what determined the way of ending it and what led me, among other things, to publish the study to which this text refers (Berbegal, 2009). Within this multiple existential perspective, finally it was the researcher who took the largest part.

The reader can imagine the resulting vacuum.

My attitude during the fieldwork brought with it major obstacles for fluid continuation. The distance between the two worlds, the Academy and the researched situation, became wider and wider. The possible communicating resources, devices and vessels between the two worlds had not been constructed during a research process.

Also, despite starting and ending everything in the Academy, it was very difficult to adapt the research to the Academy.

Its objective did not fulfil any explicit demand from a scientific community, from a research group or from a sector of society that, through a better financed project or structure, would request that knowledge be produced for its use.

There was no inspiration to be found in any prospective study that appreciated the social value of knowledge either, which would have guaranteed its long quality of life through development, impact and dissemination. In no way the study was located in current educational research, in its “hot spots”.

My project resisted being so easily integrated into the lines of research of my thesis directors. It is also well known in the Academy that very often the quality of thesis work is not as important as the person who directs it and in which scientific organisation you carry out the work.

Inspired by microsociology (Lapassade, 1994), with a certain ethno-methodological tendency (Garfinkel, 1967; Ardoino & Lecerf, 1986), unorthodox minority-focused, under suspicion in academic squabbles that are still irrelevant between positivists and non-positivists, stigmatised as anti-sociological, with a complicated disciplinary status, the possible interest and depth of my research posed problems of *accountability* – scientific value – and *indexical* understanding – concepts and constructs that are not widely shared.

None of these factors helped the fluid integration of my project into the typical management and organisational models of the knowledge. Not without a certain irony, a research project about social-educational *deviance* ended up becoming an academic *deviance*.

Once the research ended, the “being here” in the Academy intensified.

1. My new professional context

A complex path drew nearer. The development of my project had to find a way of defining itself within a difficult intra and inter-systemic balance.

In 2009, faced with a postdoctoral and employment vacuum, I collaborated as an intern on a project run by the [EtnoEdu Research Group](#), thanks to the recommendations of my thesis director, the lecturer Fernando Sabirón and the lecturer Ana Arraiz (see [Socioconstructivism web page](#)).

At the same time as my temporary situation as an intern, for six months I decided to write the continuation of my research project, translated into English and French, in order to send it in a rather unorthodox way to a score of researchers and seek a post-doctoral position. The project was a clear continuation of my research: “*Be-Coming Between*” from the *Inside of the Accompaniment Relationship: Derived from the “Being With” in Social/Anthropological/Technical Sciences*. Although in the end it was not successful, the replies were gratifying, pleasant and motivating.

I still remember this personal initiative with a smile.

At the end of that year, when my research was published in the project of the lecturer Lyn Richards (Berbegal, 2009), I began working for the University of Zaragoza as an assistant lecturer, first in the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences in Teruel and later in the Faculty of Education in Zaragoza. An *institutional analysis* of my new professional context was put in motion.

In my new role as a university lecturer I had to understand my new institution as belonging to a transitional point such as convergence towards the European Higher Education Area. I began to enter a new professional, educational and research culture and, ridding myself of my naivety (and freedom) that I had enjoyed during my doctoral thesis I gradually entered into a “field” where knowledge was subject to a certain type of management and a sibylline planning that was narcissistic and economically driven.

During this time my project remained on standby.

At the same time, I was given the chance to take on some work that would help me to understand the terrain I was exploring. Together with my good friend David Doncel Abad, a fellow student in 2005 at the Educational Research and Documentation Centre of the Spanish Ministry for Education and Science and current Sociology lecturer at the University of Salamanca, we began an analysis of the current assessment of lecturing staff in Spanish universities at the request of a group of researchers from several Brazilian universities. The project also included the participation of other researchers from Latin America and Europe (Berbegal & Doncel, 2010).

This study enabled me to deepen my understanding of a natural analysis of my current institution and of the assessment models for lecturing staff.

I observed that around me, due to the effect of a socialisation into a culture of quality, collateral academic situations were appearing. It seemed that educational and research practices were changing. The higher interest of being recognised through a certain assessment (which is what they wanted) was being transformed into what would become *academic excellence*. This was a transformation that provoked general unease in a certain part of the lecturing staff, not because of a natural resistance to change or to being assessed, but because of the implications associated with a certain type of change and assessment. During this time I noticed that members of the lecturing staff (perhaps under even more pressure nowadays) were obliged to redouble their efforts to reassess their work using the bargaining chip of quality and that they were increasingly exposed to ethical and professional dilemmas by having to choose between “doing” and “demonstrating”. Overcoming these dilemmas began to overshadow their professional time and space due to assessment and guarantee processes if they wished to safeguard the presentation and survival of their academic “self”. In part I began to be a witness to the way in which the culture of quality was not only deliberately facilitating a transformation of the educational and research model, but also of professional culture.

As I occupied one of the most vulnerable levels of university lecturer I found myself obliged to consider how to survive this game.

This institutional logic, which can be transferred to other professional systems or social institutions, took on a complex, contradictory meaning in the university institution. In terms similar to the duty of the church to manage the faith of its believers, universities have the duty to organise and manage an idealised abstraction; knowledge. In this sense, the *homo economicus* paradigm or instrumental rationality as the main governing body of the university aroused understandable suspicions, associated with the ontological and political dimension and with the training of the “seeing” of future generations. The controversy had arrived: either an obsolete university (withdrawn from new social needs, corporate based and endogamous, closed in on itself and in need of regeneration) or a broken up university (which reduces all epistemological value to its social use, to its social-economic effects and to social order, calling into question the possibility that criticism and a new way of thinking could emerge from the dusty doors of university offices).

Faced with this situation, I intuited that adopting a different worldview would bring with it a quasi-existential paradox that, despite its complexity, could be subjected to a savage reductionism: either you are inconsistent by playing a game whose rules you do not accept from the beginning or you are irresponsible regarding your duties and obligations as a member of the institution.

Assuming my responsibility in the production of knowledge in a consistent way became a critical challenge for me. In other words, giving continuity and visibility to my research and integrating my academic-professional project “here”, while maintaining my educational worldview, seemed to me a Herculean task.

It was at this time that my assumptions about social reality and its functioning went into crisis.

2. Presenting my project within the university structure

My constructivist concept of social reality, committed to adopting interactions between social actors, individuals and groups as its starting point, to then understand their structural nature, demanded a rethink from me. I was aware of the power of a trans-individual entity as never before. In hindsight, I myself, my education and my thesis could have been interpreted as a product of this entity. This feeling reminded me that this supra-structural determinism that was so heavily questioned from my worldview on education was not so absurd. The current situation made me question myself again about the symbolic dimension of the social order, and I entered a classic dilemma of the social sciences that I thought, with a certain degree of smugness, that I had overcome in my doctoral thesis. The consciousness of social actors and their ability to produce social reality was threatened by the effect of the biographic illusion (Bourdieu, 1994, 81-89) and by an intellectually obsessed focus that could reduce the theory of action to the point of view of an observer (Rubinstein, 1981). Once again I was stuck in the objective-subjective dialect.

However, I also noticed that the constrictions of the structure were recreated and transformed by lecturers and senior lecturers, the assessors of quality and excellence, the agents responsible for the management and governance of the Academy and the political panels for the finance of research (Rorty, 1994). Actors that, of course, had been expanding their own room for manoeuvre throughout their professional careers and that, through consolidation of their power in the structure, moulded the structure towards their interests and ensured that the new was integrated into their already constructed territories. Therefore, I observed that very particular types of interdependence were being created, configurations that linked some actors with others and did not appear to be reduced to those that I could experience directly or perceive consciously. In the university context that was hierarchical and conservative, my consciousness as an actor was sometimes blurred by relationships of inequality, domination and power (Beverly, 2000). My capacity as an assistant lecturer gave me a dependence on others who did not depend on me. I was the witness to a struggle and a distribution of power where the personal and academic-professional careers of the university’s members were interwoven. I observed an academic *Kula* where reputation, standing, recognition, room to manoeuvre etc. took on a value dependent upon circulation, on an exchange that materialised in alliances and mutual commitments, very often inspired by the “prisoner’s dilemma”.

In this context, I found it truly difficult to guide the development of my project in this structure. And not only because of the presence of specific obstacles, which were explicit or malicious, but because of my inability to play the cards, to find the way to do so. The survival of my project was condemned to search for strategic insights to adapt it to the management and assessment models, so that I could show academic “achievements” that had value within the structure and recognised praise that would increase my chances of prospering in the game or, at least, not be eliminated from it. In a certain way I felt like a slave, not to a necessary and

constructive permanent *accountability*, but rather to a particular one. I had to produce, publish, participate in projects, attend conferences and congresses...and in the best-case scenario begin to build my own burrow or hut where I could grow my own crops. At the same time, I had to take on new responsibilities in my job as assistant lecturer, some which were clearly *appropriate* and others that were inevitably *appropriated* in this academic *Kula*.

The structure defined its times for me. My academic lineage imposed their rhythm on me, and there were constant bombardments that sometimes made my “romance” with knowledge wobble, my urge to continue with my project and bear my responsibility as a researcher and as a trainer of educators, teachers and researchers.

I still find it hard today to keep a straight course.

3. Presenting my project within the research structure

My research was developed with the economic support of a Personal Research Training Grant from the Regional Government of Aragon, which later led me to reconsider whether my concept of reach had been a little distorted up to that point. The luxury that I had enjoyed as a pre-doctoral student could not continue as a researcher and university lecturer. In my new capacity, maintaining or integrating the development of my research seemed quite difficult. This made me reconsider my new responsibilities regarding research, raising an extremely insidious question: What was research for? Could this service be substantially different in the field of social sciences and, specifically, in educational research?

I had already observed in 2005, as a research intern at the Educational Research and Documentation Centre, a considerable reduction in scientific production from educational research to assessment research. In 2009 and 2013 I also participated in very diverse research projects, some of which were completely unconnected to my interests (see [My Research Reports](#)). This experience enabled me to gradually understand my problems in reconciling the purpose and role of my possible contributions to scientific-social research with my survival, working and meritocratic strategies in an ethically consistent way. I was experiencing the structure as a strong constrictive force. However, I also recognised that it was the structure that in turn could provide me with opportunities for new actions.

Faced with the problems that I had to bear, I began to understand that educational research was going through a period where it was monopolised by politically correct thinking. Politically correct research was absorbing methodologically correct research, meaning that political-economic interventionism was establishing certain philosophies that favoured one way of thinking in educational research and, consequently, in educational realities, both formal and informal (Sabirón & Arraiz, 2010). If you wanted to have chances to carry out research, you had to adapt to this way of thinking. However, my worldview was based on the assumption that research should enrich the understanding of our study subject, generating pluralistic discourses about the same social reality, which is also plural, facilitating dialectics and criticisms between these discourses, suitably avoiding one way of thinking...therefore...faced with the dominant way of thinking...should I play or not?

If I didn't play I wouldn't do any research.

And if I did play, how would I do it?

I was faced with many questions:

If the responsibility of scientific-social research is to serve the interests of society and if these interests are defined by a certain scientific policy, what happens to research that attempts to enrich the intelligibility of its study subject from a position that is critical of these interests?

Would holding firm to this other responsibility as a researcher entail costs for our academic-professional projects? Would these costs finally alter our worldview and the self-determination of our projects?

I also became aware of other deeper questions.

Is an interest and reaffirmation of macro levels of scientific-social research in favour of objective structures strictly a theoretical choice regarding the social ontology?

Is distrust in the consciousness of social actors and a reaffirmation of expert analysis regarding obscured and hidden aspects of social reality related solely to a more solid theoretical position than that shown by the limitations of profane consciousness in the production of the social realm? To what extent did my crisis not relate to my new interests as a member of a recently-formed community of experts?

Does the approach that see social actors as unified, continual, lineal identities provide a scientific-social “solution” that meets what “things in themselves are”? Or perhaps is it more comfortable if actors assume this identity for more efficient order and social engineering?

Is an evolutionary view of the history of human beings and societies the best and most varied solution? Or is that what enables us to more comfortably structure our analysis in our capacity as experts?

If the role of the social sciences is driven by social engineering that discovers the “truth” in order to travel towards the “better”, with this engineering being defined by one sole scientific rationality, perhaps the human species, that is the social scientist, will have to internalise these premises if they wish to be recognised as such and if they therefore pursue social appreciation of their scientific production (Golejac, 2007).

As a novice researcher, the ethical vertigo paralysed me, limiting me to nurture the research structure that I had been given. And it was in this context of submission, of a lack of courage, where I discovered some analysts that enabled me to understand the crisis in my worldview.

4. A moderate reaffirmation of my worldview

In 2010, at the halfway point of my crisis, five occurrences helped me to revise my work.

First occurrence. Methodological individualism

At the end of that year I participated in the coordination of the double edition 7-8 of the *Ethnography and Education European Review*, a monograph about “Ethnography and Science” (Berbegal, Boumard & D’Armento, 2010). The reaction to my research from certain scientific community caused the tackling of this project.

The nature of this reaction said quite a lot about the possible contributions of my work. In a certain way it touched a sore point about the scientific value of ethnographic studies. My research, its drafting and questions that sometimes rubbed against methodological and theoretical pestilence to value its scientificity, invited a necessary analysis regarding the institutional aspect of qualitative research in general, and ethnographic in particular.

In the various countries where the researchers that comprised the European Society of Ethnography and Education were working, there was great difficulty in achieving recognition for their qualitative research studies. We could see that the scientificity of ethnographic studies was often questioned, arguing a lack of data, or of certain data, which led to great fragility in the generalisation of their results. The question was as follows: How can we explain this vacuum between the theoretical and institutional level? Isn't it true that there is a privileged scientific rationality? This double edition did not enter into a pure epistemological debate, in philosophical terms (the entire 20th Century had been nurturing these controversies), but rather investigated, based on testimony, descriptions and empirical and/or theoretical reflections, whether ethnography could reclaim a part of science or even an autonomous scientific approach.

This project gave me the chance to assess other studies and to analyse my research within the parameters of this problem (Berbegal, 2010c).

I had received my education within the framework of a new constructivist sociology (Corcuff, 2011). However, in view of scientific accountability that demands a doctoral thesis, my research faced a great variety of constructivist sociological schools of thought, currents and trends that seemed as similar as family differences.

This interconnection led me to discover, in the German tradition of comprehensive sciences, in the phenomenology of Husserl, the socio-phenomenology of Schütz and the ethnomethodology of Garfinkel, a way of justifying what was for me already the sterile dichotomy between positivist and non-positivist science (López, 1994; 1995). Symbolic interactionism worked with less elaborate and persuasive constructs in terms of justification, and institutional analysis had become an interesting and attractive ghetto since the end of the 1980s, as a costly reincarnation “*hors les murs*” of the University of Paris-8. Determined to justify the approach based on the understanding of interactions towards structures and not the reverse, I abandoned other constructivist sociologies such as those of Pierre Bourdieu, Jürgen Habermas, Norbert Elias and Anthony Giddens. This socio-constructivism defined interactions in a constrictive mechanism that ended up benefitting the objective structures, something which went against my worldview in education. In my crisis, feeling the power of structures made me wonder if perhaps I should return to these approaches.

The exploration of Complexity, Multi-referentiality and Trans-disciplinarity was derived from this phenomenological rhetoric. However, these were intuitive metatheoretical platforms, whose persuasive power did not manage to penetrate any further than strictly philosophical terrain (Morin, 1986; Cilliers, 1998; Nicolescu, 2002).

Complexity changed the ethnographic “listening”. It opened the window for me. However, it did not tell me how to look through it.

Complexity appeared to me to be another type of rationality, a new way of understanding social epistemology, of overcoming classical dichotomies. However, it did not provide me with a practical conceptual tool that I could use to understand my study subject.

Complexity dominated trans-disciplinarity. However, my lack of deep knowledge of disciplinarity and an obviously philosophical approach hindered my scientific defence.

In other words, within the context of a doctoral thesis, an embryonic approach did not guarantee a typical scientific accreditation.

On the other hand, the tradition of international monographic studies, handbooks and qualitative and ethnographic research could support my work, but none of them gave me a specific defence that would enable me to justify a general theory of action with any degree of scientific rigour.

Instead of dispersion as the natural effect of an attempt to understand a pluralistic social reality being assessed without assumptions, this dispersion was seen as an obstacle.

All of these pleas for mitigation came from a radical methodological individualism (Leca & Birnbaum, 1986). This was a consequence that fuelled the arrival of my crisis and that therefore made me question the excess and naivety of my ethnographic research.

In my work (Bergebál, 2008), meaning developed only insofar as the description of the “Other” led to the understanding of one’s self and vice versa. That is, the method, guided by rigour and a systematic approach through “phenomenological reduction” was “reductionist”. Therefore, experience was a slave to a disproportionate consciousness, that of the researcher. The vital essence that experience could contain was tainted by excessive intellectualism.

Also, there was a premeditated, forced confusion between the “sociologist” and the “social subject”, between the “author” and the “actor”, destroying the classic Emic-Etic distinction. A debate was opened therefore about whether the condition of *member* made it difficult to expand and compare meanings beyond one’s own experiences.

All of the above condemned me to an epistemological “autism”. I disregarded other social actors and their permanent definitions of the situation, as I did not see them as co-authors of the analysis of “our” social reality. The conflictive construction of their *definitions of the situation* (Thomas, 1923) was filtered solely through ethnography. The epistemological alteration represented by the return of the analysis to the protagonists was avoided and, therefore, intersubjectivity was truly limited. The experiencing subject was restricted due to a self-serving reason.

Analysing my crisis, I can now say that my worldview confused methodological individualism with ethical individualism, the “what is” with “what should be”.

The naivety of my methodological individualism had no interest in discovering anything about any things that occurred in supra-individual entities, whether these existed in addition to or despite individuals. I should have considered a more mature and responsible position that recognised the existence of these entities at the same time as defending and developing the idea that everything that threatens the individual should not exist: the institutionalisation of romantic relationships, gender, class and role differences, the existence of institutions etc. (Muguerza, 1990).

I noticed that in certain sectors of educational research this ideal had become militancy, formulating the production of knowledge in a different way regarding educational systems and institutions, both formal and informal, and regarding educational processes for guidance, assessment, socialisation, the integration of personality and acculturation.

In general, the project was ethically healthy insofar as it made a serious attempt at an epistemological opening. However, the justification for this opening led me to develop this attitude of “being with” the social realm from inside a trap.

I also fell into the usual trap of a young writer whose first novel is pretentious and baroque. That was what my first research project was like in theoretical terms. Perhaps a mistake that I needed to make.

As we will see later, I would now carry out this project in a different way to avoid this naivety from tainting it at times.

Second occurrence. The person

This event was a fundamental, vital experience for me.

Not only was the useful and trans-disciplinary nature of my project revealed unexpectedly and by chance, but also the revelation itself and its later development would make me question myself more deeply about the aforementioned aspects.

The [Beti Gizartean Foundation](#) – always present in society (Vitoria, Alava, Spain), found the [online publication of my project](#) located on the website of the University of Zaragoza (Beregal, 2008). Attracted by the understanding of the social-educational accompaniment proposed in it, the foundation contacted me and invited me to participate as a speaker in training courses about [Community Mental Health](#) that it was organising in partnership with the National University of Distance Education (UNED-Madrid) and the Department for Employment and Social Affairs of the Regional Basque Government. It seemed that the way that the social-educational accompaniment had been analysed in my project could contribute a lot to the training of educators and professionals that accompany people with mental health problems and at risk of social exclusion. The result of these courses was published as a book, outlining my participation in one of its chapters (Beregal, 2012d).

The sensitivity that this foundation showed towards my work, composed of people with a humanistic approach and vast experience and specialised training in various sectors of social exclusion, was a key analyst for me. The foundation, which was based on the affirmation of the single and unique value of the person, whatever their psychological, physical or social condition, improving their possibilities in life as far as possible, made me rethink my ethical individualism and the limitations of methodological individualism of my research, which was baroque and slightly cryptic.

I realised that I had fallen prey to a scientificist rhetoric in my work and had lost sight of the person or, in general terms, the vitality of my fieldwork. I had dissected people, contravening one of the essential humanistic principles that should have guided my ethnographic “way of seeing” and “way of listening”: the person.

The person.

I realised the implications for the method and methodology if we start from the person.

The person is what breaks down disciplinary frontiers, something that is always beyond our intelligible networks and structures of scientific understanding.

The person is what makes us, as scientists, not lose sight of the underlying ethics of all epistemological construction.

The person destroys all our virtuous and correct abstraction models. Although certain scientific-social premises help us to move towards an opening of the "Other" in the concept of our fundamental and applied research, this opening is not fully resolved. We are condemned to live with a production of knowledge about a subject that resists being a prisoner of its own epistemological construction.

The person poses a problem for us in terms of the security and comfort of a neutral Truth. There are no longer any pre-organised approaches that can understand the discourse of social reality.

The person demands that we revisit the ontological implications that underlie our intervention models and programmes, which are polished, stored and then regenerated by social research.

The man-person cannot therefore be reduced to the roles or positions of “agent”, “actor”, “subject” or “individual”, usually even formulated by the most critical and radical social sciences. From this condition, the subject becomes author, the author is the person and the person is the principle.

A critical scientific-social approach based on Complexity and Trans-disciplinarity presents certain convergences with the Christian confession care and intervention approaches of the Beti Guizartean Foundation. The ambiguous, polyhedral concept of the person, increasingly adopted by the social sciences, is also the theological nucleus of Christianity. Our research commitment shared some of these ethical approaches. This was a commitment that included human historicity and was a demand for humanisation as a whole, free act that was not reducible, either through a purely intellectual action or through a theoretically misguided militancy. Commitment to the person is based on a trans-subjective nature.

This convergence made me rethink the phenomenological-existential “*carrefour*” that was whipped up based on intuited Complexity and Trans-disciplinarity, which until then had been key factors in the preparation of my worldview. The connections between a purely anthropological or sociological approach surprised me, tinged with insistent “suspicions” towards everything metaphysical (Marx, Nietzsche, Freud), and a theological approach (Domingo, 1985). As a victim of a process of secularisation and organised in a different way, the most critical social sciences appeared to wish to assume the same.

I realised that if the social sciences wished to organise themselves based on the ontological approach of the person, they must include the underlying ontology in their understanding (Bergebál, 2012d). In my case, my worldview had to revise the way of connecting an *epistemology of the upcoming*, ridding itself of a logic of purely scientific *verification* and *checking* (explanatory, objective, predictable and effective) and assuming an interactive and critical relationship between scientific logic and philosophy (understanding, intersubjective, projective and descriptive). Therefore, an *unstable situation in analysis and intervention models*, suffered artificially as *a paradox and pandemonium*, became a *stable situation in analysis and intervention model creations*, experienced naturally as *a paradigm and multireferentiality*.

Unlike the *model, model creation* meant a phenomenological relationship between theory and practice (social, educational), with the same status of theory and practice and therefore, of scientific understanding and the application of its approaches being prepared in a different way. The key of *model creation*, is part of a “*coming-between*” of *theory and practice (involvement)* and a “*becoming-between*” the “*Other*” and the “*Self*” (*commitment*), in harmony with an *attitude of “being with” the social realm*. A highly reflective position to which it is difficult to remain faithful within the already analysed institutional and research structures. From the external position of the researcher it is truly difficult to maintain this commitment and not to renounce to “listening” to the life-world, an epistemology of the upcoming.

I can now state that my work yielded in part to this commitment.

In the end, my worldview was not sufficiently mature to transcend the banal and focus on the essential.

I can now state that the methodological consequences, especially in qualitative research, must be open to the “listening” and “seeing” stance, beyond the verification or comparison in the execution of an academically selected, artificial theoretical framework. This sensitivity represents an “attitude” that brings with it, in scientific-understanding research about social

reality itself, an ethical “engine” that will enable social sciences to discover a strong commitment regarding the society that they are attempting to understand.

Third occurrence. The reference

The crisis in my worldview needed to untangle a strong modern-day controversy.

In June 2011, I had the honour of asking Jacques Ardoino a question that had been bothering me for some time, in the queue in the dining room of the Paris office of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). I was there to attend an international conference entitled “*La recherche en éducation dans le monde, où en sommes-nous? Thèmes, méthodologies et politiques de recherche*”, organised by the French-Speaking [Association for Scientific Research in Education](#) (AFIRSE). Despite Mr Ardoino’s interest in talking to me, the circumstances did not allow us to go into the subject.

The question was going to be as follows:

In an age that disowns Great Tales... where is our reference?

If social reality is complex and we recognise a plurality of points of view, then could the approach of using an articulation of multiple references in an attempt to understand it lead us to an absolute relativism? What is the price of this approach for the social sciences and for the sciences of education? Is it true that we cannot defend any reference to prepare our scientific-social approaches? Through which reference did we decide to research into education? And which one to educate?

And, finally, if such a reference existed, would we not contradict the basis of a multireferential approach?

Novice researchers, and some not so new ones, feel asphyxiated by these questions. We end up choosing meta-theoretical platforms (sometimes not even that) and theoretical frameworks that inspire the approach of our methodological designs and our interpretation processes for results. There we can see what we wish to see and we assure ourselves that the research process will triumph over the emerging nature of our analysis units and categories (Pandora’s box) in order to reaffirm ourselves (or comfort ourselves) in the discourses associated with them. In short, we end up dealing with the first ethical commitment with an intellectual exercise that is more or less faultless and rigorous and that will stand the rhetoric of our results. And we usually do this from the outside (as much as we presume to be within the researched question) and through a reduction of the entire epistemological value in the verification and comparison of a theory that appears attractive to us because of its marginality and its critical potential, or that is safe and a winner because it is widely shared.

My constructivist approach towards this question consumed me from inside, not letting me rest for a moment. If scientific-social interpretation creates social reality, if we recognise that there is no major distinction between interpreting and transforming, if we are travelling towards a social constructivism that attempts to reveal an epistemology of injustice, then a thin line separates us from radical relativism (Putnam, 1990; Goodman, 1996; Rorty, 1999). Does recognising a plurality of points of view regarding social reality reject all objectivity regarding social reality, just like the science through which we carry out science?

The socio-phenomenological approach of my research did not make anything easy, as although it explained the anthropological structures of understanding and the epistemological rule of the social sciences, it was in a certain way threatened by a relative constructivism that rejected a search for criteria to compare interpretations and assess their closeness to “real” social reality. To a certain degree it settled for a descriptive analysis, a typology of the social world, without adequately defining the attitude that we adopt in everyday life regarding the constitutive structures of the social world.

I was a little trapped.

Assuming that the social world is the product of our representations was flirting with scepticism and nihilism, which are incompatible not only with the scientific approach, but also with a “science with conscience”, with an ethical science (Morin, 1982; 2004). I began to understand that we should use this ethical science not only as a replica of technical and positivist worldviews, but also as a regulator of an irresponsible explosion that confuses the plurality of the understanding of our study subject and its discourses with an *equal validity* that paralyses all political-scientific reconstruction.

During this time, I had to struggle with the subtle characteristics of the *social reflexivity*, of the *theoretical effect* and of the *interactive nature* of the classes and classifications that the social sciences use (Searle, 1995; Hacking, 1999). As I got to know them, by exploring another kind of scientificity, I had to correct myself about the seductive ability of post-modernist discourse (Cilliers, 2005).

In the end, a moderate position did not appear cowardly, just more responsible.

The revision of my project enabled me to discover, after many mirages and ghosts, that strictly technical problems had to be transformed into political problems (Beck, 1996). However, although constructivism could be used as a weapon against social and political conservatism, opening new realms of possibility for human action (especially for the most oppressed), the constructions had to be studied under material conditions of possibility that could not be reduced to mere representation but rather to a rigorous and intersubjective understanding through which, in, and with what already exists (which must be understood scientifically) and towards, with, and for the new (which must be proposed scientifically). These scientific forms did not necessarily have to respond to one sole rationality. Not due to integrating in them ideological and axiological dimensions, these forms had to stop being scientific (Berbegal, 2010c).

In other words, the possibility that the technical would open the way for the political in scientific understanding did not represent an opportunistic and progressive approach, quite common in some post-colonial, feminist and multicultural movements by supplying oppressed cultures with tools that, protected by an absolute relativism, will allow them, alone, to defend themselves from the perhaps unfair representations of the dominators (Boghossian, 2006). In contexts of ethnographic research, this approach leads us to populism and folklorism (Berbegal, Sabirón & Arraiz, 2009) that consecrate and even organise a hierarchy for popular cultures compared to majority cultures (Grignon & Passeron, 1989).

The constructivism that was maturing had to guarantee the preparation of pluralistic discourses about a plural reality, but it also had to take responsibility for opening a level of reality that

would make criticism viable (Laudan, 1996). If each has his own truth, then we neutralise criticism.

On the other hand, these questions made me think that the underlying social ontology of the social sciences was a political and aesthetic problem insofar as it affected the entire possibility of transformation and creation (Berbegal, 2011b). For the sciences of education and educational research, the questioning of these possibilities of transformation and creation were of enormous relevance. For the way of thinking of educators too.

Closer to a Deleuzian reading than a Marxist one (Berbegal, 2011a), in a situation where capitalism constantly needs the new, despite always producing the same, led me to ask questions such as the following: How can the new arise? How can the new happen between two disputes that block it? How is it possible to generate the new that will undermine the identical repetition of the “novelty” guided by capital? How is it possible to propose political strategies that are not an identical repetition of the hegemonic political structure? How can we prepare the way for arts and sciences that will not be subordinate to either the market or to dominant ideas? This is where I returned to the meaning of ethnography as a movement that leads us politically and aesthetically in the analysis of interactions and structures to the aesthetics or the creation of other perceptive and political structures through intervention.

My research, until this point constructed through methodological individualism, had not clarified these questions.

However, it is at this point that I consider that the crisis of my worldview is temporarily overcome from a moderate constructivist position as a new form of realism that, by making it possible to question the given, leaves a space for a diversity of personal and social realities whose relationships should be studied.

Fourth occurrence. Trans-disciplinarity

Thanks to the initiative of a childhood friend, Rubén Blasco, who is an industrial engineer and researcher, I began to collaborate with his research group [HowLab](#) in 2010. This group from the University of Zaragoza belongs to the area of electronic engineering and design and manufacture and focuses on the research and development of technology that is centred on people and their environments.

We believed that this could contribute something regarding the assessment of design processes, the development and implementation of technological assistance to improve the quality of life of sick or disabled people.

My immersion in another area of knowledge and in a worldview totally different from research represented an interdisciplinary apprenticeship for me of the highest order that, in turn, enabled me to study a trans-disciplinary approach to research more deeply.

I now see that one of my main contributions was to open the door to qualitative assessment research in a scientific area which was completely unaware of its possibilities. From a concept that was very close to research-action, we attempted to justify and develop a working methodology that would connect all the stages of design, development and implementation of technological assistance, integrating participants in the co-design and co-development of the technological solutions and therefore, guaranteeing ourselves that we understood the cultures of

illness and disability of people, their family and care environments, their daily routines and lives and the professional and institutional care cultures. The bringing together of the entire research and development process through a research-action approach and the understanding of the cultures where the technological logistics of the solutions designed had to be adapted would require a qualitative approach. We had to understand the feelings and meanings of the various people involved to guarantee that the technology at their service did not only work, but substantially contributed to an improvement in their quality of life through an individual, non-standardised understanding of the care situations. This new concept of research also changed all the processes, due to important questions that were very ambiguous, such as the concepts of quality of life and progress, sometimes approached from a perspective that was strictly technical and technological (Berbegal, Blanco, Casas, Falcó & Vaquerizo, 2011).

Innovation as change, improvement, optimisation or alternative did not immediately represent virtue and progress. Innovation for innovation's sake sometimes reduces an abusive assessment of *difference*, where the subject as author is stifled in the sterile opposition between one's self and the "Other". Through interactive understanding with innovations, I attempted to escape this dichotomy by preparing a responsible and committed approach of *normalisation*. Instead of difference, I stressed *diversity*. The subject stopped being a user and became a person who brought innovation into the world and integrated it as a way of life.

My contribution attempted to be sensitive to the idea that innovations cannot be reduced to the purely technical. Beyond ridding ourselves of responsibility, my approach was based on reflection that included the position or perspective of people. The description of interactions with innovation encourages simple social actors or users of technology to become the real authors of their lives, people. Therefore, to escape the dilemma of triumphalism or resignation from innovations, scientific-social reflection had to focus on the bringing together of innovations and interactions into everyday construction that was local and individual, regarding academic, therapeutic, healthcare, assistance, residential and home situations. Hence the importance of analysing how decision making was formed, how the situation was described by the involved parties, from inside, from the local environment, from the situation, being configured with and through innovation. The innovative practices understood through the disorganisation of the everyday could then be considered as the principal elements of a micro-social description.

This production of knowledge appeared to be of great importance in the criteria, objectives and specifications to be considered by the research group in order to invest its know-how and effort in technological assistance to improve people's quality of life.

The "broken telephones" and the problems in integrating this new approach were large. Problems that ranged from the mutual understanding between very different ways of conceiving research to the way of integrating the production of qualitative knowledge into the decision making for the design and development of projects.

The reader will notice that many of my previous personal developments, all of them derived from my first research project, were already coming to the fore in this collaboration.

Fifth occurrence. Complexity and training

I held the post of assistant lecturer until 2012. It was in 2013 when my position, fulfilling the demands of assessments and accreditations, became that of Ph.D. Assistant Lecturer.

I have begun to redirect my educational duties prudently and responsibly in the teaching of primary and nursery degrees and master's degree in educational research.

In this sense, the crisis in my worldview and its slow maturity had to serve a key idea: How do I see the training of education professionals and of future researchers in this field? Although answering this question is a road that I have yet to travel, education demanded that I quickened my step in order to inter-connect the training of people that were under my care in a consistent way.

In the field of education, and following the line of my area of knowledge, I begin from the assumption that a progressive approach to "complex skills" is necessary (Morin, 2000). The contexts and situations where professional educational skills acquire value and meaning are influenced and co-constructed both by social and educational policies and by individual cultural substrata that give a dynamic and situational meaning to skills. In this sense, the question "what type of education professionals should we be producing and therefore, how should we design their training?" is as dense and difficult as it is inescapable.

After the contents that had been influenced to some extent or another throughout the history of the sciences of education and of teacher training, I am attempting to make my education be organised through a consistent worldview that nourishes the important line arising from my research: the way of thinking of educators. The complexity, the intersubjective and multireferential construction of educational reality, the first reference, although ambiguous, of our professional involvement, must be present in training processes, generating attitudes founded on my students towards the person and society.

Following the line opened by the lecturers Sabirón and Arraiz, the area of Research Methods and Diagnosis in Education at the University of Zaragoza, where I currently participate, is attempting to compile an ethnographic student assessment portfolio with the objective of designing and redefining a social constructivist and complex education for education professionals (Educational Ethnography Research Group, 2007). As a university lecturer, I face the great challenge of defining the nature of required skills and of ensuring that they are developed by my students. I wonder about how to promote complex and higher-order thinking processes that will enable them to analyse, assess and create suitable responses to real learning situations, which by definition are full of dilemmas and paradoxes. I am currently developing this line that has close ties with my revision of my professional, educational and research worldview regarding education.

In the master's degree of research, the institutional demands invited me to assume the training of researchers in quantitative methodologies, specifically in the *ex post facto* and survey research designs. An ironic situation that will allow me to learn more about my natural language in the social sciences through other epistemological languages of social research. However, I have also recently participated in seminars on the drafting of qualitative research reports for my students (Bebegal, 2013). The book by Lyn Richards and the previous publication of my work have been fundamental references for their organisation.

In daily contact with my students, facing the challenges of each class, the questions that opened my work for me and their concept of social research continue to feed the development of a reflexive education professional.

5. At present

My research meant studying an approach to social research and the way of thinking of educators through the action of accompaniment. At these levels, the continuity of my project can be seen in terms of research problems. The way of thinking of educators has revealed to me the mechanism that makes it possible to provide feedback to training and research.

Having seen its progress throughout my academic-professional project, the lines or fields of work that appear to have finally revealed themselves from this problem are as follows:

- The revival of a critical tradition, through the reformist tradition, changing from anti-authoritarian to socio-political, from educational thinking in our present societies, so that we can re-embodiment the intelligibility of our study subject in the individual contexts that we experience and enrich reflection about education and the way of thinking of educators. This line is fully focused on my educational work, committed to the training of reflexive professionals that do not take interactive and constructed entities such as schools, colleges and universities or other informal educational spaces for granted, that will reconsider educational policies and their future duty in society through justified discourses, as well as an unambiguous identity of the person and of their “domestication”, which can be extended to the reflexive use of resources, techniques, instruments and professional strategies for the purposes of assessment, guidance and transmission of knowledge processes.
- The study of training and assessment processes of future education professionals and educational researchers within the university context. My troubled worldview will try to understand assumptions, question them and, only then decide to keep it, recreate it or both at the same time. This line is fused with the previous one, but is focused on an understanding of teaching, assessment and guidance work in higher education, now my natural environment.
- The creation, development and establishment of a less conservative institutional and research structure that will include and facilitate the organisation and visibility of constructivist and qualitative approaches that are understanding, vital and committed by students, researchers and professionals in education. This line is a long-term aspiration and I sense that it could be a responsibility to take on. If we wish to overcome one way of thinking in the social sciences, which has an inevitable theoretical effect on studied social realities, we must create epistemological infrastructures that will enable the pluralistic preparation of discourses that not only promote communication and mutual criticism, but also enrich the intelligibility of education and the understanding, which by definition is unstable and contradictory, of the person and our societies.

After many winding paths, it seems that I am back with my initial worldview. Although I have partly kept it, I have had to redirect it.

Regarding the above clarifications, below I present the reader with an account of how I would deal with my first research project if I had to carry it out now ([see Sage Publication, Section II – link](#)).

References

- Ardoino, J. (2000). De l'accompagnement en tant que paradigme. *Pratiques de formation/Analyses*, (40), 5-19
- Ardoino, J. & Lecerf, Y. (1986). Ethnometodologies, *Pratiques de Formation – Analyses*, 11-12, Université de Paris-8
- Bamberg, M. (2007). *Narrative. State of the Art*. New York: John Benjamins
- Barnes, B., & Bloor, D. (1982). Relativism, Rationalism and the Sociology of Knowledge. In Martin Hollis & Steven Lukes (eds.), *Rationality and Relativism* (21-46). Cambridge: The MIT Press
- Beck, U. (1996). *The Reinvention of Politics. Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Berbegal, A. (2004a). *Journal Formation. Traces d'un séjour ethnographique (Rennes-Paris)*. Unpublished. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2004b). Sous un regard étrange(r), *Les IrrAductibles: L'école et l'université en question*, 5, 71- 84. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2005a). Le voile: à la recherche de la tête perdue, *Les IrrAductibles: Des Dispositifs II*, 7, 353-375. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2005b). Fieldwork Diary – *Diario de campo de una intervención con menores*. Unpublished. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2008). “Déviance” y Educación: el acompañamiento de menores desde dentro. Tesis doctoral. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza-TDR/Zaguán
- _____ (2009). Methods in Practice - Inside the companionship for minors: troubles and weaknesses of an ethnographic approach to Deviance and Education, in Richards, L. (coord.). *Handling Qualitative Data: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage. Retrieved from <http://www.uk.sagepub.com/richards/references4.htm>
- _____ (2010a). “Linking Ethnographic knowledge and professional know-how: An Attempt at Socio-Educational Intervention in Deviance and Minors”, *8th International Qualitative Research Conference*, 6-8 September 2010 Talbot Campus, Bournemouth University
- _____ (2010b). Una etnografía ingenua. Apertura e indolencia epistemológicas, *Ethnography and Education European Review / Revue Européenne d'Ethnographie de l'Éducation*, 7-8, 59-72. [PDF](#)
- Translated Italian edition, Un etnografía ingenua: apertura e indolencia epistemologiche, in Boumard, P. & D'Armento, V. (ed.) *ETNOGRAFIE: Resoconti Scritture Prospective, vol. I* (103-118), Roma, Aracne, 2012. [PDF](#)

- _____ (2011a). *Hans-Georg Gadamer, Roland Barthes y Gilles Deleuze. Representation and creation: hermeneutic and ontological drifts and ruptures - Hans-Georg Gadamer, Roland Barthes y Gilles Deleuze. Representación y creación: derivas y rupturas hermenéuticas y ontológicas*. Unpublished. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2011b). *Utopia and Education – Utopía y Educación: De la contradicción político-epistemológica de la perfectabilidad humana y social*. Unpublished. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2012a). *Deviance: Negative Analysis Approach to Social Rules - La desviación. Una ausencia reveladora: aproximación a las reglas sociales desde un análisis negativo*. Unpublished. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2012b). *Rationality and Complexity – Racionalidad y Complejidad*. Unpublished. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2012c). *Opening Rationality: towards a Necessary Complementarity – Apertura de la racionalidad: hacia una necesaria complementariedad*. Unpublished. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2012d). *Acompañamiento socio-educativo. Apertura y definición: tensiones en el seno de su profesionalización*. In Marcos, A. & Topa, G. (coord.), *Salud Mental Comunitaria* (195-244). Madrid: UNED. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2012e). *Un etnografía ingenua: apertura e indolencia epistemológica*, in Boumard, P. & D'Armento, V. (ed.) *ETNOGRAFIE: Resoconti Scritture Prospective, vol. I* (103-118), Roma, Aracne, 2012. [PDF](#)
- _____ (2013). *Qualitative Research Report. Seminars and Lectures*. Zaragoza: University of Zaragoza. [PDF](#)
- Berbegal, A., Sabirón, F. & Arraiz, A. (2009). *Malabarismos lapassadianos, caricatura y sentido: del activismo folclórico al activismo etnográfico*, Actes du Colloque Hommage à George Lapassade, *Ethnography and Education European Review / Revue Européenne d'Ethnographie de l'Éducation*, 6, 15-20. [PDF](#)
- Berbegal, A. & Doncel, D. (2010). *La Evaluación de la Docencia y del Profesorado en la Universidad Española*. In Ferreira, J., Mendes, A. y Carapeto, N. (coord.), *Pós-Graduação e avaliação: impactos e perspectivas no Brasil e no cenário internacional*[165-198]. Brasil-Campinas: Mercado das Letras. [PDF](#)
- Berbegal, A., Boumard, P. & D'Armento, V. (2010). *Introduction. Coordination éditoriale de la monographie "Ethnographie et Scientificité"*, *Ethnography and Education European Review / Revue Européenne d'Ethnographie de l'Éducation*, 7-8, 5-46. [PDF](#)
- Berbegal, A., Blanco, T., Casas, R., Falcó, J. & Vaquerizo, E. (2011). "Assessment of Assistive Technology: How to Make It Effective", *26th Annual International Technology and Persons with Disabilities Conference (CSUN 2011)*. March 14-19, 2011, San Diego. [PDF](#)
- Bertaux, D. (1997). *Les récits de vie*. Paris: Nathan

- Beverley, J. (2000). Testimonio, Subalternity, and Narrative Authority. In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research - 2nd ed.* (555-565). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage
- Boghossian, P. (2006). *Fear of Knowledge. Against Relativism and Constructivism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Boumard, P., Lapassade, G., & Lobrot, M. (2006). *Le mythe de l'identité: apologie de la dissociation.* Paris: Anthropos
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Raisons pratiques : sur la théorie de l'action.* Paris: Seuil
- _____ (2001). *Science de la Science et Réflexivité (Cours et travaux).* Paris: Raisons d'agir
- Cilliers, P. (1998). *Complexity and Postmodernism: Understanding Complex Systems.* London: Routledge
- _____ (2005). Complexity, Deconstruction and Relativism, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22(5), 255-267
- Corcuff, P. (2011). *Les nouvelles sociologies.* Paris: Armand Colin
- Delory-Momberger, C. (2000). *Les histoires de vie. De l'invention du soi au projet formation.* Paris: Anthropos
- Domingo, A. (1985). *Un humanismo del siglo XX: el personalismo.* Madrid: Editorial Cincel
- Educational Ethnography Research Group (2007). *El portafolio-etnográfico: un instrumento para la evaluación de competencias.* Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza
- Elias, N. (1987). *Involvement and Detachment. Contributions to the Sociology of Knowledge.* Oxford: Blackwell
- Elster, J. (1985). *The Multiple Self.* Cambridge: CUP
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist As Author.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Goldman, A. (2010). Social Epistemology. In Zalta, E.N. (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* [<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/epistemology-social/>]
- Golejac, V. (2007). *Itinéraires de sociologues. Histoires de vie et choix théoriques en sciences sociales (Raymond Boudon, Michel Crozier, Georges Lapassade, Danilo Martuccelli, Max Pages, Jacques Rheaume, Alain Touraine).* *Changement social N° 1.* Paris: L'Harmattan
- González, J. (2008). Approches non-francophones des histoires de vie en Europe, *Analyses: Pratiques de Formation*, 55, Décembre
- Goodman, N. (1996). Notes on the Well-Made World. In MacCormick, P. (ed.), *Starmaking: Realism, Anti-realism and Irrrealism* (151-160). Cambridge: The MIT Press
- Grignon, C. & Passeron, J.C. (1989). *Le Savant et le populaire, misérabilisme et populisme en sociologie et en littérature.* Paris: Seuil – Gallimard
- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The paradigm dialog.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage

- Hacking, I. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Hollis, M. (1994). *The philosophy of social science: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Ibáñez, I. (1989). Perspectivas de investigación social: el diseño en las tres perspectivas. In García, M., Ibáñez, J. & Alvira F. (dir.), *El análisis de la realidad social: métodos y técnicas de investigación* (49-83). Madrid: Alianza
- Lapassade (1971). *L'arpenteur: une intervention sociologique*. Paris: Epi
- _____ (1994). Présentation du numéro: court traité de microsociologie, *Pratiques de Formation* (28), 27-60
- _____ (1998). *La découverte de la dissociation*. Paris: Loris Talmart
- _____ (2001). L'observation participante, *Ethnography and Education European Review*, 1, 9-26
- Laudan, L. (1996). *Beyond Positivism and Relativism: Theory, Method and Evidence*. Oxford and New York: Westview
- Leca, J., & Birnbaum, P. (1986). *Sur l'individualisme*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po
- Legrand, M., Gaulejac, V. & Lejeune, P. (2000). Les récits de vie, *Sciences Humaines*, 102, 21-37
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1991). *The detached observer and the passionate participant: Discourses in inquiry and science*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago
- López, M.C. (1994). *Investigaciones fenomenológicas sobre el origen del mundo social*. Zaragoza: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza
- _____ (1995). La sociofenomenología de A. Schütz: entre el constructivismo y el realismo, *Papers*, 47, 55-74
- Morin, E. (1982). *Science avec conscience*. Paris: Fayard
- _____ (1986). *La méthode: La Connaissance de la connaissance (t. 3)*. Paris: Le Seuil
- _____ (2000). *Les sept savoirs nécessaires à l'éducation du futur*. Paris: Seuil
- _____ (2004). *La méthode: Éthique (t. 6)*. Paris: Seuil
- Muguerza, J. (1990). *Desde la perplejidad. Ensayos sobre la ética, la razón y el diálogo*. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica
- Nicolescu, B. (2002). *Manifesto of transdisciplinarity*. New York: SUNY Press
- Olivier de Sardan, J. P. (2008). *La rigueur du qualitatif: Les contraintes empiriques de l'interprétation socio-anthropologique* (Vol. 3). Paris: L'Harmattan
- Ortiz-Osés, A. (1989). *Metafísica del sentido: una filosofía de la implicación*. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto
- Peneff, J. (1990). *La méthode biographique. De l'école de Chicago à l'histoire orale*. Paris: Armand Collin

- Pineau, G. (1998). *Accompagnements et histoires de vie*. Paris: L'Harmattan
- Putnam, H. (1990). *Realism with a Human Face*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling Qualitative Data: A Practical Guide (2nd edition)*. London: Sage
- Rorty, R. (1994). Does Academic Freedom have Philosophical Presuppositions? *Academic Freedom and the Future of the University, Academe, 80(6), 52-63*
- _____ (1999). *Philosophy and Social Hope*. New York: Penguin
- Rubinstein, D. (1981). *Marx and Wittgenstein. Social Praxis and Social Explanation*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Sabirón, F. & Arraiz, A. (2010). À l'intérieur de la recherche en éducation: de la recherche correcte à une recherche corrigée. *La recherche en éducation, Revue de l'Association Francophone Internationale de Recherche Scientifique en Éducation, 4*. Revue électronique / PDF
- Sartre, J. P. (1967). *Questions de méthode*. Paris: Gallimard
- Searle, J.R. (1995). *The construction of Social Reality*. New York: The Free Press
- Thomas, W.I. (1923). *The unadjusted girl. With cases and standpoint for behavior analysis*. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown

Electronic Sources

Personal web pages

My University web page: <http://unizar.es/aberbegal>

My Academia.edu web page: <http://unizar.academia.edu/AlfredoBerbegalV%C3%A1lquez>

My Research Group

EtnoEdu Research Group web page:

<http://socioconstructivismo.unizar.es/index.php/etnoedu/miembros>

My University Reference Group

Socioconstructivism web page: <http://socioconstructivismo.unizar.es/>