

Self-reflection in the "field": positive and negative aspects of pairwork

Научный руководитель – Гарифзянова Альбина Раисовна

Бижмухаметова Зухра Мухаррамовна

Студент (бакалавр)

Елабужский институт (филиал) Казанского (Приволжского) федерального
университета, Елабуга, Россия
E-mail: zukhrabe1612@gmail.com

Research questions

Last year my colleague and I took part in the first stage of the project realized by the research Centre for youth studies in HSE. It was my first real "field" work. In this report we pay attention to "research debut" and peculiarities of coworking in the "field" with a more experienced explorer. The "field" totally changes its nature when there are two or more researchers. Moreover, during the reflection, you start to realize that you've been studying not only informants, but a workmate as well. So, it's possible to speak about the existence of several parallel "fields" during one research [4]. According to Garifzyanova A. the presence of two or more persons in the "field", on the one hand, it gives support, and on the other, the presence of colleagues in the "field" could cause negative emotions, especially when there is a misunderstanding in the study process [3]. This tension is most strongly felt when there are researchers with different experience in one field. The researchers' routines are mixed with positive as well as with negative emotions. However, sometimes you really feel how important your workmate's experience and that you depend on it (Garifzyanov A. R. - candidate of philosophical Sciences, a member of regional sociology center "Region"), but at the same time you understand the importance of being responsible for both of you and your collective work. Moreover, the fact your workmate in the "field" is your university teacher and scientific tutor rises a lot of questions from the viewpoint of methodology. How organize the relationships under such conditions? One has to agree with the words of H. Pilkington, that once you've entered and left the study context, it is impossible to remain the same man you've been before starting this study [2]. Maybe being in "the field" force you to go against yours principles or rethink your views and left "the field" as a new person.

Methodology/research instrument or data sources used

The discourse draws on autoethnographic material received during a pilot testing within the "Creative Fields of Interethnic Interaction and Youth Cultural Scenes of the Russian Cities" realized by research centre in HSE, acting as a part of overt observation. According to Gottlieb, when the private life details belong to the studied question, the main object of study in autoethnography becomes the self-knowledge of researcher. One of the way to represent the reality is to keep a diary. The researcher describes not only his thoughts, feelings, but also self-reflects over everything what he has heard or has seen [1]. In this case the researcher becomes a "witness" of all events and all changes, and first of all, in his own inner world. Moreover, when the researcher actualizes memories, fixes his thoughts, he can find answers for many questions as many things become visible. To sum up, autoethnography allows to coordinate external emotions and internal experiences of the researcher. As a result, the method of overt observation in autoethnography transformes into self-observation and self analysis.

Conclusions

After a pilot testing phase it's became clear that it is impossible to keep formal relationships with your workmate being in a "field". But it is necessary to keep in mind what kind of relations were between researchers before the "field". That's why during the research the character of relations can vary the connection of "the teacher - the student" and vice versa, and it's caused by proficiency which one has and the other only on his way to it. So, we should note that during the "field " these borders between eternal and external are erased. Equal work conditions, , same routines , impressions and experience, bring researches, workmates together. Of course, it has influenced on the research results and self-reflection. However it should be noted that in this report have been revealed conclusions of young researcher for whom this report's "field" was a debut. What internal difficulties more skilled researcher had, having worked with the less experienced one ,studying the youth? It is a question of further methodological research.

Источники и литература

- 1) Готлиб А.С. Введение в социологическое исследование. Качественный и количественный подходы. Методология. Исследовательские практики.[Электронный ресурс]: учеб. пособие/ А.С.Готлиб. – 3-ие изд., стер. – М. :ФЛИНТА, 2014. – 382 с.
- 2) Пилкингтон Х. Позиция антрополога при исследовании проблем ксенофобии // Антропологический форум, №8, 2008. - С. 97 - 98.
- 3) Albina Garifzianova and Hilary Pilkington, Elena Omel'chenko . Russia's skinheads: exploring and rethinking Subcultural Lives. – Routledge, 2010,p.200-211
- 4) Blackman, S. (2007) "Hidden Ethnography": Crossing Emotional Borders in Qualitative Accounts of Young People's Lives', Sociology, 41(4): 699-716.