Making the Implicit Explicit. The Documentary Method in Research on and in Schools
Symposium, 29. August 2024, ECER, Nikosia

Chair: **Jan-Hendrik Hinzke** (Justus-Liebig-University Gießen)

Discussant: **Tanja Sturm** (University of Hamburg)

School actors, especially teachers and pupils, are faced with the challenge of meeting different demands associated with various functions that a school as an institution fulfills (Fend, 2006). This does not always work smoothly. Teachers have to deal with structural tensions and constantly make decisions, such as in which situations they are more likely to follow a subject logic or turn to the needs of the pupils (Helsper, 2021). Pupils must find a way to deal with the demands they are confronted with while they go through processes of identity development, learning and Bildung, in which peer milieus have an effect (Breidenstein & Jergus, 2008). Neither teachers nor pupils are determined how they will deal with such tensions. However, they have to make decisions and thereby have to deal with uncertainty, or, in Luhmann's term, with double contingency (Vanderstraeten, 2002).

Uncertainty is a central feature of communication and interaction in the classroom. On the one hand, when teaching contents and skills, teachers cannot predict with certainty what consequences their actions will have for their pupils. On the other hand, dealing with topics and requirements that are new to them includes the potential for uncertainty for pupils and they must learn to deal with the freedom of choice they are given.

Research shows that teachers and pupils develop routines and habits that enable them to deal with uncertainty and contingency (Hinzke, 2018). Routines are characterised by the fact that no decisions have to be made. Instead, established solutions to problems are used, which is often based on implicit, habitualised knowledge (Kramer & Pallesen, 2019). At the same time, it is a requirement of the professionalism of teachers to constantly reflect on routines for their appropriateness. Routines are also evident in the classroom when a stable social practice is formed through repeated procedures and a more or less fixed organisational framework.

The *Documentary Method* is a research method allowing to analyse empirically this mixture of uncertainty on the one hand and routines and habitus on the other. This method is based on the Praxeological Sociology of Knowledge (Bohnsack, 2018) – a methodology that goes back to Karl Mannheim's Sociology of Knowledge but is also based on Harold Garfinkel's Ethnomethodology, Pierre Bourdieu's concept of habitus and theorems of System Theory of Niklas Luhmann. Against this background, the *Documentary Method* distinguishes between communicative and conjunctive knowledge. While the former can be explicated, e.g. by teachers, conjunctive knowledge cannot be explicated so easily. This knowledge is implicit, has partly sunk into the body and structures the thoughts and actions of school actors. The *Documentary Method* makes it possible to reconstruct implicit knowledge via the interpretation steps of formulating and reflecting interpretation (Bohnsack et al., 2010). In the context of school

research, one of the questions of interest is which implicit knowledge underlies the perception of uncertainty and how school actors and prospective teachers deal with it.

The aim of the symposium is to present the *Documentary Method* and the *Praxeological Sociology of Knowledge*, as it has been increasingly developed for school research in recent years, especially in German-speaking countries (Hinzke et al., 2023), to a European audience, to demonstrate the opportunities and limitations of the method using exemplary research projects in the field of school research and to discuss connections to other (qualitative) research strategies used in Europe. To this end, a basic introduction to the methodology and method of the *Documentary Method* will be given before three current research projects demonstrate the results that the method can produce in the field of school research. The discussant opens a transnational conversation.

References
Bohnsack, R. (2018). Praxeological Sociology of Knowledge and Documentary Method. In D. Kettler & V. Meja (eds.), The Anthem Companion to Karl Mannheim (p. 199-220). Anthem Press.
Bohnsack, R., Pfaff, N., & Weller, W. (eds.) (2010). Qualitative Analysis and Documentary Method in International Educational Research. Budrich.
Breidenstein, G., & Jergus, K. (2008). Doing Pupil among Peers. In H.-H. Krüger et al. (eds.), Family, School, Youth Culture (p. 115-132). Lang.
Fend, H. (2006). Neue Theorie der Schule. VS.
Helsper, W. (2021). Professionalität und Professionalisierung pädagogischen Handelns. Budrich/UTB.
Hinzke, J.-H. (2018). Lehrerkrisen im Berufsalltag. Springer VS.
Hinzke, J.-H., Gevorgyan, Z., & Matthes, D. (2023). Study Review on the Use of the Documentary Method in the Field of Research on and in Schools in English-speaking Scientific Contexts. In J.-H. Hinzke, T. Bauer, A. Damm, M. Kowalski & D. Matthes (eds.), Dokumentarische Schulforschung. Schwerpunkte: Schulentwicklung – Schulkultur – Schule als Organisation (p. 213-231). Klinkhardt.
Kramer, R.-T., & Pallesen, H. (2019). Der Lehrerhabitus zwischen sozialer Herkunft, Schule als Handlungsfeld und der Idee der Professionalisierung. In R.-T. Kramer & H. Pallesen (eds.), Lehrerhabitus (p. 73-100). Klinkhardt.
Vanderstraeten, R. (2002). Parsons, Luhmann and the Theorem of Double Contingency. Journal of Classical Sociology, 2(1), 77-92.

Presentations of the Symposium

Originating the Dialogic Teaching: Documentary Interpretation of the Narratives of Teachers Participating in the Wroclaw Tutoring Programme

Slawomir Krzychała (DSW University of Lower Silesia)

Dialogic teaching is more than talk; it embodies a unique dialogic approach to knowledge, learning, social relationships, and education (Alexander, 2020). In this line, Wegerif (2016) argues that

educational theory should transcend the dictionary and epistemological level of dialogue analysis and expose the ontological status of the dialogue as a mutual transformation of the person and the world. Nevertheless, the reconstruction of dialogic teaching is still dominated by the analysis of classroom talks and interactions (Calcagni et al., 2023; Hennessy et al., 2021). The presented reconstruction of dialogic teaching exceeds the analysis of situationally separated and interactively explicit dialogues. The documentary reconstruction of teachers' praxeological knowledge (Bohnsack, 2017; Bohnsack et al., 2010; Krzychała, 2019) made visible the dialogical structure of pedagogical performance extending over a long-time process of teacher-student interaction. The dialogical structure arises primarily from the sociogenesis of the interplay of teaching and learning processes rather than the mere fact of conducting a discussion. The study included narratives (12 group discussions and 54 individual in-depth interviews) collected in an already completed research that addressed the implementation of the Wroclaw Tutoring Programme between 2008 and 2016 (Krzychała, 2020). Dialogical teaching was not the subject of the study, but in the reflecting interpretation of the interviews, the initially latent polyphonic structure of pedagogical activity became explicitly evident. Two categories of descriptions of tutor-tutee interactions can be distinguished in the data: (1) interactions in the short term, related to working on a specific problem or goal set by the student; (2) relationships developed in the long term, covering the entire school period. In all cases, as will be shown in the presentation, dialogicity is not readymade from the beginning, even when teachers and students are already talking and interacting. A germ form of dialogic teaching emerges when educators experience a tension between their own professional perspective and the revealing perspective of their tutees. The teachers remain aware of the separateness and insufficiency of these perspectives and create space for a new transformative experience: "The dialogic relation of holding two or more perspectives together in tension at the same time always opens up an unbounded space of potential perspectives" (Wegerif, 2007, p. 26). In the 2023/2024 school year, the results of this analysis are tested in a pilot study by two physics and mathematics teachers for designing and evaluating classes.

References:

Alexander, R. (2020). The dialogic teaching companion. London: Routledge. Bohnsack, R. (2017). Praxeological sociology of knowledge and documentary method. In D. Kettler & V. Meja (eds.), The Anthem Companion to Karl Mannheim (199–220). Anthem Press. Bohnsack, R., Pfaff, N., & Weller, W. (ed.) (2010). Qualitative analysis and documentary method in international educational research. Budrich. Calcagni, E., Ahmed, F., Trigo-Clapés, A. L., Kershner, R., & Hennessy, S. (2023). Developing dialogic classroom practices through supporting professional agency. Teaching and Teacher Education, 126, 104067. Hennessy, S., Kershner, R., Calcagni, E., & Ahmed, F. (2021). Supporting practitioner-led inquiry into classroom dialogue with a research-informed professional learning resource. Review of Education, 9(3), 85. Krzychała, S. (2019). Professional Praxis Community in a Dialogical Perspective: Towards the Application of Bakhtinian Categories in the Documentary Method. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung, 20(1), Art. 17. Krzychała, S. (2020). Teacher Responses to New Pedagogical Practices: A Praxeological Model for the Study of Teacher-Driven School Development. American Educational Research Journal, 57(3), 979-1013. Wegerif, R. (2007). Dialogic Education and Technology: Expanding the Space of Learning. Springer. Wegerif, R. (2016). Dialogic Education. In R. Wegerif (ed.), Oxford research encyclopedias. Oxford University Press.

Professional Cooperation in the Field of Tension: Reconstructive Case Comparisons in Swiss Primary Schools

Katharina Papke (PH FHNW)

As Luhmann (2002, p. 149 [transl. KP]) points out, pedagogical practice contours as an unspecific "mediating role" which centers around an intended transformation through learning – "from uneducated to educated". Against the background of a lack of direct intervention, this takes place under conditions of uncertainty. In consequence, the knowledge of the professions consists less in rules than in the availability of a sufficiently large number of complex routines (ibid.). It is precisely that underdetermination which characterises professional practice and which creates the space for appropriate actions with a view to the pupils' (learning) needs. Herein the interaction system of teaching gains its complexity. As Bohnsack (2020, p. 38 [transl. KP]) exposes, this interactive practice is contoured in difference to its environment with its norms. On the other hand, however, these norms are brought back into the interactive system – as an "orientation framework in the broader sense". While the handling of the tension between norm and interactive practice, between propositional logic and performative logic, is a characteristic of every situation, this is exacerbated in areas with the claim of professionalised pedagogical action, since here – in addition to the general norms and expectations – the programs codified by school as well as the identity and role expectations processed therein must also be dealt with (ibid., p. 39). Further intensification arises when teaching practices are organised in the co-presence of two or more professionals. For this case, Bohnsack (2020, p. 21 [transl. KP]) highlights the challenge that "in cooperation in the area of professional acting with its compulsion to decide, there can ultimately only be one joint practice that routinely 'enforces' junctions". The present contribution uses the empirical data collected within the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF) supported project "Primary Schools Caught between Inclusion and Educational Standards" ("Primarschulen im Spannungsfeld von Inklusion und Bildungsstandards") (2020-2024) to analyse how this (cooperative) practice takes shape. Based on classroom video recordings, which are being analysed as part of a dissertation project (Papke, 2021) and using the Documentary Method (Bohnsack, Pfaff & Weller, 2010; Sturm, Wagener & Wagner-Willi, 2024), the aim is to examine how (regular) teachers, special needs teachers and social pedagogues jointly deal with the above-mentioned tension in situ. This will be pursued against the background of the programs of educational standardisation and inclusion/integration implemented in the area of Northwestern Switzerland (Köpfer, Wagner-Willi & Papke, 2021; Papke & Wagner-Willi, 2024).

References:

Bohnsack, R. (2020). Professionalisierung in praxeologischer Perspektive. Zur Eigenlogik der Praxis in Lehramt, Sozialer Arbeit und Frühpädagogik. UTB. Bohnsack, R., Pfaff, N., & Weller, W. (eds.) (2010). Qualitative Analysis and Documentary Method in International Educational Research. Budrich. Köpfer, A., Wagner-Willi, M., & Papke, K. (2021). Dokumentarische Methode und inklusive Schulentwicklung. In E. Zala-Mezö, J. Häbig & N. Bremm (eds.), Die Dokumentarische Methode in der Schulentwicklungsforschung (p. 77-96). Waxmann. Luhmann, N. (2002). Das Erziehungssystem der Gesellschaft. Suhrkamp. Papke, K. (2021). ,Organisierte Inklusion?' Description of the dissertation project. Available under https://bildungswissenschaften.unibas.ch/de/phd/doktorierende/katharina-papke/ Papke, K., & Wagner-Willi, M. (2024). Professionalisierte Unterrichtsmilieus. Zur Herstellung und

Bearbeitung einer konstituierenden Rahmung in unterrichtlichen Kooperationen. In R. Bohnsack, T. Sturm & B. Wagener (eds.), Konstituierende Rahmung und professionelle Praxis. Pädagogische Organisationen und darüber hinaus (p. 135-162). Budrich. Sturm, T., Wagener, B., & Wagner-Willi, M. (2024). Inclusion and Exclusion in Classroom Practices: Empirical Analyses of Conjunctive Spaces of Experience in Secondary Schools. In G. Rissler, A. Köpfer & T. Buchner (eds.), Space, education, and inclusion. Interdisciplinary approaches (p. 142-160). Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

WITHDRAWN The Development of an Inquiring Attitude among Student Teachers: Reconstructions in the Context of German Teacher Education

Jan-Hendrik Hinzke (Justus-Liebig-University Gießen)

Teachers in Europe are faced with a variety of tasks: migration and flight of refugees, multilingualism, digitalisation and education for sustainable development are some of the current challenges that require a change in teaching. One condition for being able to tackle the new and the uncertain in a productive way is the development of an inquiring attitude among teachers. Inquiry-based learning is a didactic concept that is increasingly being implemented in university teacher training programmes in Germany and internationally (Pedaste et al., 2015). At its core, it is about "learners (co-)designing, experiencing and reflecting on the process of a research project [...] in its essential phases" (Huber, 2009, p. 11 [transl. JHH]). Various goals are associated with inquiry-based learning, including the development of an inquiring attitude. Such an attitude can be summarised as a critical questioning stance, which represents a disposition that must be acquired and is effective in the long term (Huber & Reinmann, 2019). There are connections to the structural theory of professionalism, in which an inquiring attitude is associated with a scientifically reflective habitus. Such a habitus is part of the professional habitus and refers to the systematic acquisition of knowledge and reflection on professional practice (Helsper, 2008). Previous research produced ambivalent findings. Several studies indicate that some student teachers show aspects of an inquiring attitude, others not (e.g. Feindt, 2007; Artmann, 2020; Paseka et al., 2023; internationally Smith, 2005; Han et al., 2017). However, there is a lack of studies analysing the development of an inquiring attitude in a longitudinal way by comparing different university locations. Such studies would provide a better understanding of the conditions under which an inquiring attitude develops. Against this background, the results of a study will be presented that examines the extent to which an inquiring attitude develops throughout inquiry-based learning courses. The study is based on the ReLieF study, funded by the German Research Foundation, in which 15 group discussions were conducted at the universities of Hamburg and Bielefeld at two points in time. The results, generated by using the Documentary Method (Bohnsack et al., 2010), revealed three orientations at the beginning of the courses and two orientations at the end of the courses in terms of how the student groups negotiate research and inquiry-based learning. The types exhibit different relationships to an inquiring attitude, which can be defined in more detail by, among others, forms of reflection.

References:

Artmann, M. (2020). Forschen lernen im Forschenden Lernen. Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung, 15(2), 69-88. Bohnsack, R., Pfaff, N. & Weller, W. (eds.) (2010). Qualitative Analysis and

Documentary Method in International Educational Research. Budrich. Feindt, A. (2007). Studentische Forschung im Lehramtsstudium. Budrich. Han, S., Blank, J. & Berson, I. R. (2017). To Transform or to Reproduce: Critical Examination of Teacher Inquiry within Early Childhood Teacher Preparation. Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 38(4), 304-321. Helsper, W. (2008). Ungewissheit und pädagogische Professionalität. In Bielefelder Arbeitsgruppe 8 (eds.), Soziale Arbeit in Gesellschaft (p. 162-168). VS. Huber, L. (2009). Warum Forschendes Lernen nötig und möglich ist. In L. Huber, J. Hellmer & F. Schneider (eds.), Forschendes Lernen im Studium (p. 9-35). UVW. Huber, L. & Reinmann, G. (2019). Vom forschungsnahen zum forschenden Lernen an Hochschulen. Springer VS. Paseka, A., Hinzke, J.-H. & Boldt, V.-P. (2023). Learning through Perplexities in Inquiry-Based Learning Settings in Teacher Education. Teachers and Teaching. Pedaste, M. et al. (2015). Phases of inquiry-based learning: Definitions and the inquiry cycle. Educational Research Review, 14, 47-61. Smith, M. S. (2005). Helping Preservice Teachers Develop Habits of Inquiry: Can It Be Done? Reading Research and Instruction, 45(1), 39-68.