

## Qualitative Research in Sociology

**Nikos Nagopoulos**

University of the Aegean, School of Social Sciences, Department of Sociology,  
Address: Lofos Xenia, 81100 Mitilini, Greece.

**Abstract:** The article examines the sociological turn which is based on phenomenological approaches and on reflective aspects of the interpretative tradition. It as well critically examines the limits of a socially constructed reality which is, according to this claim, based through the expression of the world of everyday life. At the same time, it explores the sociological interest in the deeper experiences and internal processes as to produce intersubjective meaning that is interwoven in parallel with reflective searches in the way society functions as a whole. Beyond the theoretical remarks, these limits become more distinct in the field of qualitative research in which the interests of phenomenological vision towards social problems flow into. Finally, the article discusses the framework of studying qualitative research and empirically grounded theories in Sociology.

*Keywords*—Social Phenomenology, Qualitative Research, Subjectivity, Empirically grounded theories

## Introduction

In the tradition of phenomenological thinking social science is founded on the attempts of reconstructing the meanings arising from the general and inalterable basic formal structures of the life-world, which supports the core of its methodology. These ontological class features of the life-world may, however, be explored and analyzed in an interpretative and reflective way through the specific semantic flow in the conscious world, in the body of subjects involved in everyday social life.

In this approach, the main starting point for the investigation can be grounded in the ways people give meaning to objects, events, experiences, etc., which simultaneously indicate or reveal the cognitive and perceptual systems prevailing in various historical periods. In this context, the qualitative social exploration constitutes an increasingly widespread practice in conducting sociological research. It constructs the precedence and scientific affirmation of a different cognitive and practical research interest in the study of the subject and social reality. Qualitative research largely serves as a scientific and theoretical background of the social phenomenological vision while its approaches and implementation tools are remarkably diversified.

The article examines the above issues through the sociological turn which is based on phenomenological approaches and on reflective aspects of the interpretative tradition. It critically examines the limits of a socially constructed reality through everyday life. In parallel, it explores the sociological interest in the deeper experiences and internal processes as to produce intersubjective meaning (Hedström, 2005, Beck, 1992) that is simultaneously interwoven with reflective searches in the way society functions as a whole. Aside from theory, these points become more distinct in the field of qualitative research where the interest in the subjective view of social problems flows into. Similarities, relationships and differences between the interpretative approaches of sociology - as well as of the social phenomenology - and the basic principles of the qualitative method will be discussed in this framework.

## Social Phenomenology and Qualitative Method

The relation between phenomenological perspective and sociological tradition shall be dealt with through examples which consider qualitative research *par excellence* as to the depth of the interpretive mechanism of the concerned subjects. The logical distinction between methods and the application of qualitative approaches highlight the distinctive scientific interest as to the conceptualization of the category «underlying», which is a linguistic entity that contains codes and captures, replicates and enriches the person (Butler, 2001, 15). In this context, the research is conducted subjectively and it is expended in each if a generalized- theoretical approach is not specified whereas, normative views and perspectives are absent.

On the other hand, the social phenomenology supplies the complementary and abstract understanding of the collective conscious world of social and symbolic meanings by involving the interpretative tool to establish theories of sociological content. Apart from the useful recent remarks of a distinction between the interpretative tradition and the qualitative social research

the common point of reference is the understanding of the content of meaning and how this can be presented. The distinction pertains matters of compatibility, immediacy and codification of meaning through the research process (Hitzler, 2016). Thus, the common point is examined either subjectively, by focusing on the experiential part of the meaning (Schütz, 2004, 127), or normatively, by using interpretive tools to do research on the objectives which reconstruct new social forms of meaning (Overmann, 1979).

Except for the distinction mentioned above, the initial interest for qualitative research methods is broken down into different interpretations regarding the criteria of delimitation between the specific method and its relation to the theory. For example, the theory of research is either carried out before or constituted at a later date through the analysis of research material. According to our judgment, the latent disjunctive placement of the methodological issue makes it difficult to maintain an unbroken relation. This objective is achieved through the widely acceptable principle of the combination of epistemology regarding research that can be applied to multiple levels and also through the clarification in the quality of the expected results derived from the research process during the planning stage.

As demonstrated below, the correlations between the production data and the theoretical categories are created through a parallel meeting of the available interpretive depth and meaning. Albeit limited, the qualitative data are evaluated by reducing the high degree of abstraction of the general sociological theories.

### **Before the sociological turn. First couplings**

The specific research examples certify different approaches to using qualitative methods with a view to identifying weaknesses, shortcomings and strengths of this use. On the methodology of social sciences the reconstruction of such subjective perceptions constitutes a tool for investigating the general principles, according to which the person organizes his experiences (Schütz, 1962, 59, 208-210). On the other hand, from the perspective of social scientists, everyday perceptions and knowledge form the basis for the development of a more formulated and generalized "version of the world" through broader interpretive shapes that attempt to elevate the subjective meaning in the fields of multiple forms of reality.

Particularly with the sociological turn in phenomenology there were efforts to analyze these features clearly in the context of how the history of space and time is experienced (Schütz/Luckmann, 1979, 1984). In this sense, the sociological perspective maintains an archetypal basis which meets the necessary standards of fundamental components of the lifeworld by methodological approaches of social science. On the other hand, the sociological perspective attempts to highlight the actual, historical and expressive forms of signification in different spheres of social life and the visibility of the conceptional contents of operations undertaken by the subjects (Luckmann, 1980, 9-55).

This theoretical trigger also determines, to a large degree, the issues relating to the selection of qualitative methods in social research. Of course, the approach of investigation and theory of knowledge on the part of the subject had already occurred before its expression in sociological disciplines. They are, however, quite attractive during a period in which qualitative methods

<http://jrdsjournal.wixsite.com/humanities-cultural>

were connected with modern sociological directions, which provide theoretical documentation of the purpose and need for this option.

In fact, apart from the set of distinct points, a common trait characterized the cognitive-theoretical schools regarding the influence of the sociological point of view which is applied in research. The arguments developed by the latter extend to the choice of appropriate methods of social research. The approaches are related to individuals and not social and historical subjects, or structured and coherent groups of people, as a totality or even societies (Dilthey, 2006). Thus, in contemporary epistemology and in social research there has been a strong sociological transition in cognitive-theoretical issues, as knowledge is studied as social knowledge, the individual as a socio-historical subject and the behavior as a social action. This turn connects the theory of Knowledge and the theory of action with the sociological perspective.

However, this turn was not particularly prominent, at least in the field of research. During the early sociological theory of action and the development of classical models of socialization an undifferentiated methodological discussion of the terms "action" and "behavior" prevailed. This marked the research perspective of social science and the suitability and compatibility of the technical tools it develops. The attempted assimilation of the above conditions, on a deviation from Weber's terms of formation of a "verstehende Soziologie" (Weber, 1980, Schütz, 2004), simultaneously highlighted behaviors as a research interest focused exclusively on external manifestations of human activity.

According to this argument the social and natural sciences apply the same principles in the collection and analysis of data on a methodological level. The only world which can be scientifically studied is the natural world of social phenomena, namely the world manifested in human activities and attitudes. These are visible phenomena that are perceived by the senses and which are justified with the principled neutral manner, while at the same time they constitute the appropriate cognitive material for forming and controlling scientific theories. In this way the research process captures the research procedure from the penetrating glance of researchers. These persons eventually collect and process those data refer and recommend unique "events" in the same objective and principled neutral way. For this purpose, the research procedures are standardized as far as possible away from the scientific precarious, interpretive process that could claim a particular and striving methodological validity.

In early sociological theory, interest in the "inner meaning" (Weber, 1980) was narrowed. The mainstream sociological trend (Parsons, 1968) in data analysis through systems of norms and values is internalized by the subjects through incentive structures stimulation procedures. The polysemy of deliberate, rich in meaning, acts of the subjects may vary and may not correspond with the behaviors that are manifested by the same people. In this way the research subject of an early dominant sociological trend focused mainly in ways that indicate individual choices and facilitate social adjustment. This tradition at the same time, examined the individual and social problems as to the structural features that are found in an objective and independent from the subject's intentions.

The scientific legitimacy of the sociological hypotheses, but ultimately the validity of the theory of proposals that make up the form, writing and the content of research hypothesis stemmed in conditions of the reigning (natural) science, a positivist or a socio-centered and largely

<http://jrdsjournal.wixsite.com/humanities-cultural>

institution-centered methodology. The observance of the principles of specific methods maintained an epistemological character and control of decisions not only with respect to the formal perfection but as to how to formulate research hypotheses, as well as to the verifiability of the content meaning of sociological theories. The meaning, in short, of a sentence coincided with the verification of this proposal, namely as a meaning (or meaningless) of the technical and methodological (and therefore scientifically) successful testing of sociological cases (Neurath, 1932).

To a large extent the recognition, the scientific explanation and by extension the interpretation of social problems and their associations are treated and judged in terms of technical and cumulative methods, with general categories of meanings resulting from classifications and groupings of uniform behavior that are manifested by the research subjects. What is indicative is the absence of an interpretation of the subject in specific trends occurring in the science of psychology and history.

Specifically, this project coincided with the peak of interest in the science of psychology for a behavioral theory of socialization and learning, which might be formed from guided elements of action. The coincidental development has determined the content of the impact from the side of the *general sociological theory of social action* (Parsons, 1968) in the interest of psychology to a large extent. It is about the effects on individual topics relating to socialization problems, development of personality, theories of roles and gaming, and generally in those areas where a new psycho-physiological (Hommans, 1958) meaning supported that the modern scientific psychology derived from a traditional vernacular psychology. Bourdieu's theory about "habitus" opposes this argument (Bourdieu, 1977). Psychology has been filtered socially and historically, and it is not a simple performance. Since this period the explanatory research psychology was founded as an objective and experimental branch of natural science with the purpose of predicting and controlling the behavior of living organisms, including humans. In addition, since it was removed from the interpretative approaches of human consciousness it was associated more with a sub-complex (unterkomplex) and simplistic behaviorism adopting the methodological standards of individualism while it was keen on the juridical shapes that can be derived from the observation of bodies (Nagopoulos, 2006). These surveys were limited to an observable manifestation of a behavior, i.e. the relations between external stimuli and reactions of the organism, while the study of a conciliation procedure concerning native prepositional functions and internal processes that yield a meaning were absent (Savvakis 2014, 53-67).

This methodological trend showed that for a natural- science -oriented investigation of human activity the concepts of action (das Handeln) and behavior (sich verhalten) are identical. Thus, the emphasis is on the causal connection of independent actions and not in an interpretative understanding of executing a predesigned action in accordance with the internally prepositional actions. In order to establish social science as an applied science there must be a causal and behavioral explanation by initially proclaiming experimental psychology following cognitive sciences and neurosciences as the core sciences of analysis and reduction sciences.

The failure of such an approach can be confirmed from the fact that the similarity in the meaning from different social relations does not disclose common psychological odds anyway to end in this similarity regardless of the high technological standards of the operation and its general usefulness.

A similar methodological orientation is detected in historical research on which stands the fact itself and not its interpretation. This is an approach which constitutes an early withdrawal from the social factor, but also from the historical realisation of certain fundamental principles, such as freedom and human rights. Those concepts are associated with the progress of political and social democracy. Thus, they also attempt to make the story susceptible to rational understanding and to identify it as compatible with the objectives of the social scientific research, so as to make the redefinition of the privileged field foundation of social sciences distinct (Kouzelis / Psychopedis (1996). The focus of the new optical research involved acts of people and groups that include consistency in meaning and quality content which is intersubjectively constituted comprehension and identifies with a social situation.

### **Social data and subjective meaning**

The primary issue in every case is whether the theoretical conception of the object of research that falls within the interest of the researcher (goal) with the option of scientific tools and techniques (means) for achieving these goals. Thus, the question which arises and leads to distinct methodological approaches is about the independence theory of the original documentation of a social problem, or the consequential set of empirical generalizations. In the latter case, and in accordance with this claim, the meaning of a sociological theory is tested and ultimately arises from the possibility of verification or refutation of the theory.

On the other hand, making general assumptions though subject populations and social sets of social research in the context of policy development and administration of the State and rationalization of institutions met to a degree the objectives of a general sociological theory.

However, the opposing course to this methodological standard that emphasizes the focus on subjective judgment and constructs new theories on this basis was absent.

Following the premise which was analyzed above, against this subject-independent world which is tested with methodologies whose scientific and technical excellence coupled with the acclaimed reliability and validity qualifies as a scientific validation tool and a parallel paradigm is developed and it examines a different world. It is a world made up by the hand of the subject, a world of the past subjective experience which is cast out through the multiple symbolic structures of meaning in everyday life, forming their social reality (Berger/Luckmann, 1969). A common reference point is the argument that the acquisition of knowledge about the world is not merely a visual representation of the data, but also the contents which are "manufactured" through a process of active production in accordance with internal, deliberate actions (Anscombe, 1957, Schütz, 1962, 5).

In this context the cognitive function is related to the way in which we organize the world of our experience, while not claiming the unique and ultimate truth through ensuring that they provide the methodological tools for capturing an objective reality which is independent of human action. On the contrary, cognitive function connects organically with the living experience, in the sense that it should be linked with the world of experience that they possess and contribute to its construction (Glaserfeld, 1992, 30).

However, this world remained invisible to the scientific point of view, at least as a structured entity, as a collective reconstruction of multiple meanings and reference systems of individuals. Qualitative research methods, especially those originating from the arguments of social phenomenology and generally those who are not limited in the application tools, seek affirmation of the importance of theory by attempting to make this world visible. The presence of qualitative research was not noticeable by chance in a period of high social differentiation and occupational mobility, with the emergence of multiple identities of the subject and the fact that the person becomes a useful unit (voter, consumer etc) for politicians and others who assert power. In this way the qualitative research focuses on the concepts and interpretations that emerge through the intersubjective representations in everyday life. In this the direction of the sociological analysis was starting from the phenomenological emergence of subjective state and the identification of the world through subjective actions, attaches particular importance to the effects of subjects as to the construction, taking and making action plans within a collectively conscious society.

By this phenomenological approach, the Interpretive Sociology studies the actions of individuals as social phenomena that are synthesized by second semantic structures from the interpretative aspects of personal meaning. Through this perspective, the way in which the various systems of meaning interact with the empathy of certain subjective meanings through selected acts of individuals in their social lives is examined.

The meaning which is conveyed through various experiences meets the semantic aspects of conscious actions which are cast out in first-class couplings that add social relevance in the individual conscious flow. On this basis, one understands and distinguishes between *Handlung* and *Handeln* as the first retains the characteristics of possibility and relativity, to the extent that the stimuli, motivation and especially the compelling reasons vary which agree and justify the taking of predesigned acts, while they articulate the context of the common meaning of having relevance reference systems.

According to this approach the socio-scientific theories which are based on the stream of collective meaning categories constitute second-degree constructions which are based on specific time and space subjective meanings that constitute daily life first-degree constructions. This view emphasizes that scientific knowledge which refers to second –degree structures always rely on opinions of the everyday life of the subjects (first- class constructions).

In this way the scientific explanations in the field of social sciences should be standardized on subjective interpretations of the meaning of social acts. In each case the events are gaining importance only through their selection and interpretation after they acquire meaning through human mediation and the corresponding mental activities performed. In general, all our knowledge about the world, the common perception but also scientific thinking, involves constructions, i.e. a set of abstractions, generalizations, shapes of idealization, and preferences concerning the relative level of organization of thought (Schütz, 1962, 5).

At the level of research in the interpretation of meaning primarily through narratives of the subjects recommends the creation process and the promotion of qualitative data. During the interview process the experience of subjects is interpreted by researchers, it is being rebuilt from the perspective of a particular research issue and transported/written to a symbolic world – in social science texts. This procedure does not claim confirmation of grade, according to which the

experiences have taken place with the format exposed. Through this, however, the calibration of context is pursued empirical material which emerges from the subject's story, but also from the interpretations which are developed in the research process.

The distinction made by Schütz between everyday and scientific (i.e. methodological socio-scientific) constructions clarifies that scientific knowledge in the social sciences is always based on everyday knowledge in the field and constructions made by the participants. When these structures function as the basis for daily activity, they are more specific, while working as construction models of scientific theories is more abstract.

The degree to which a certain description of the world or of the self is maintained through time does not depend on the objective validity of the description but from the adventures of social processes, which ultimately affect what will survive as a valid or useful explanation.

The language itself plays a central role in the establishment of conditions used by researchers but these conditions are also influenced by their use in relationships and in the reference field (Habermas, 1981). Knowledge is constructed through social interaction processes and it is based on the role of language in relations and, above all, it has social functions. The research activities are also part of the social construction of the object of the research.

By formulating this phenomenological emphasis on sociological analysis it recognizes, but also it exceeds Weber's distinction between "meaning and causality" (Sinn-und Kausaladäquanz) (Weber 1972, 5). It attempts to demonstrate the inclusion of causality in subjective meanings of social acts (Schütz, 1974, 330, Eberle 1999). This finding corresponds to a consequence that must be preserved between the constructions of social science and forms of everyday life. This forms a constitutional claim for any attempt of a social science which refers to acts of individuals as meaningful, in order to make the explanatory interpretation appropriate to the scientific practice (Schütz, 1982).

It also becomes clear that these circumstances do not meet the scientific principles of Behaviorism, which derive from explanations of acts that have already been carried out in accordance with the stimuli that are causing them to happen and not on the basis of inner and deliberate actions (Eberle, 1984, 323, 361). Something similar is true for structural theories which imply that behind the subject and decisions for action undertaken there are objective structures (Berger/Luckmann, 1967) with their rules that define the reference framework and determine the form and content of action.

The very concept of objectivity is a dynamic concept and it is accepted under limitations (Weber, 1995). It is here judged in terms of its content consisting of a creative process and opens up the possibilities of experience (Esser, 1996), which span the cultural and ethnological multifarious worlds. The newly-launched interpretations of subjective meaning is focused in any case to specific domestic situations that are triggered in the conscious world of separate subjects. However, they reveal semantic structures of meaning, duration and social validity. So this particular and peculiar world of experience of the subject expands through a phenomenological subtractive approach that penetrates in collective conscious flows (Grathoff, 1989, Srubar, 1988).

In social phenomenology the various representations of a subjective sense re-emerge in empathetic structures of meaning in the world (Schütz, 1974, 19) and in this way the social phenomena are explained through the action of subjects. At the same time, regarding the rules



which can be rebuilt, the texts of interaction constitute the objective structures of meaning. These structures represent the latent structures of the meaning of interaction itself.

These structures of interactive texts are models of objective social structures in general, they are real, in detail (although not through experience) regardless of the specific and deliberate representation of meanings of interaction from the perspective of subjects involved in the interaction (Oevermann et al., 1979, 379).

In order to refit rules and structures, various methods are applied for the analysis of objective meanings, which are released from the concrete subjective odds. Especially the objective interpretations, following Oevermann and others (1979), received widespread attention. There is, however, an unsolved problem in the theoretical basis of this approach: it is the ambiguous relationship between subjects and the extracted structures. Lüders and Reichertz (1986, 95), for example, criticize the structures of metaphysics those which are considered almost "structures with an autonomous action" (Flick, 2014).

Such a position would result in the simplistic assumption of an equation of the text that attempts to capture the world of interpretation of meanings ("the world as a text") with the real world of explanations arising from the subjective rendering of specific meanings understood. In this way, approaching a structured model of analysis formed in the opposite path, i.e. the case studies to derive meanings from social representations contained in structures that are produced by the selection activities. These can deal with the problem of influences from common cultural and value standards and knowledge in individual ways of perception, experience and action.

In a similar context, social representations enable subjects to seek broad forms of acts within the material/social world and conquer it. They also make the terms and conditions of a communication between members of a community feasible giving them the ability to form codes of interactive projects, as well as a code for the clear definition and classification of various aspects of the world they create and their individual and collective history. For example, there are approaches that put the focus of qualitative studies upon the social construction of phenomena, such as in health or mental illness and the changes brought about in the daily life of people (Tzanakis et al., 2016). The interesting thing here is the level of representation on the above topics which are derived from members of professional groups (General doctors-nurses), as representations differ between groups – and therefore it is not individual but social – and how they affect their work and their attitude to elderly patients. For research purposes and from a methodological point of view, various forms of interviews and participant observation are used.

### **The framework of studying qualitative research in Sociology. Empirically grounded theories**

According to the argument that shows the logic that governs the conduct of qualitative research, the goal becomes more visible, as the research tries to construct a social relationship primarily focusing and keeping a reference axis content with the material resulting from the analysis of narratives. Whether exploited or not, the available material of different social sources of the essential point of discrimination concerns precisely this as a starting point, as an attempt of

correlation of multiple narratives with theoretical classes, at least those that aspire to sociological and factually interesting and general context type material.

The main interest is expressed well in the field of interconnections that are attempted between fields that constitute reference points of deliberate subjective processes and the multiple symbolic structures of meaning with the sociological generalizations type that articulate a collective symbolic level of the individual perceptions. This connection might not be necessary if the perception is not included nor sought in sociological type generalizations. The qualitative empirical material could i.e. maintain its scientific significance in the micro-level of interpretation of specific empirical data obtained from these narratives.

When, however, the empirical material of the individual qualitative approaches seeks the required redrafting to a level of generalization and sociological theory, then this process can be achieved in two ways: With either the production theory, which tries to be constructed with the available empirical material, or through the use of empirical material and comparison of theories and research hypotheses that have preceded the production of qualitative data.

In the first case, the production of theory through research process is in our opinion a difficult attempt of generalization. Whether on the basis of the argument of the logical separation of methods, the strict limitations of the positivist methodology can circumvent. As for the qualitative research the terms of credibility are redefined and the validity and verifiability criteria of this methodology are not recognized.

In the second case the utilization of the qualitative data on the basis of a theory or a research hypothesis that has preceded through the utilization of secondary material-and finds the general aspects of the issue to be investigated. The problem which often arises here is that theories that qualify are so general that they the necessary compatibilities with the empirical data are not visible. The general models of action a general sociological theory cannot easily identify specific and historical material arising from qualitative interviews and narratives of certain people of everyday life.

We need to construct theories, which, on the one hand, must meet the general application which embody the scientific principle of Sociology; on the other hand, the generalization must include meanings that emerge from the real social life of interaction between the subjects. This project is not necessary to be done in each investigation conducted. The results of individual surveys, especially when they have kept at the level of separate methods with the safe scientific process are already important and can be exploited further. However, when the coupling is attempted then it should be applied with a new synthetic purpose which is clear in its early stage and mainly focuses on the sociological significance of the issue which is investigated and the combination of research methods that serve this purpose.

Our stance is that the distance to establish substantiated theories empirically must be elapsed simultaneously from the existing theories, i.e. from generalizations that have been made to explain and interpret social phenomena and of the multiple forms of meaning that individuals attach to the same phenomena, therefore, from the perspective of the social subject.

The parallel course which must be completed and be sociologically fruitful certain conditions that usually prevent such attempts must be considered. These obstacles relate primarily to:

A) Confirming or rejecting general assumptions relating to social problems with investigations targeted and structured to be directed to people, who are called to respond exclusively and without much room to deviate from the framework of a structured process.

In this case, although the range of references is able to offer reliable implications the interpretive depth of responses remains limited de facto. The question arising here is whether it is necessary to continue the further interpretative process and if the enrichment of structured questionnaires with open questions can achieve an even weaker attempted expansion of the interpretative effort. Moreover, this effort can be translated as an attempted coupling method.

It is interesting to note that the denial of such an assumption comes mainly from those groups of supporters of qualitative research who adhere to separate this kind of logic research claim that qualitative research seeks solely to generate new data (from experiences, stories, perceptions and beliefs). The process, in accordance with this claim concerns separate research methodology, always from the perspective of subjects, and a possible attempt to construct new theories on this basis.

This project is motivated by the arguments developed through research attempts with reference to the subject, in which the assembly of theories empirically occurs solely through the material of the interviews. These approaches refuse the validity of existing theoretical shapes before conducting qualitative empirical research, and highlighting conclusions through the subject's reason because these are inevitably connected to theoretical preconceptions and prejudices of the researcher and guide the research process largely regardless of how they would assess and they would eventually categorize the same procedure subjects involved in research as interviewees. The allegation is linked to the operation of the heuristic qualitative method, the (re) construction of empirical data in terms of theory and the criticism on authoritarian characteristics of dominant discourse that intrude on the wording of the general theoretical shapes and to confirm assumptions.

B) The weakness of closed internal logic in the application of discrete methods, when they don't balance between a grueling confirmation of the correctness of technical resources and research tools with the equally grueling relevance of concepts and social meaning that emerges from the study of the object to be investigated. This inability is expressed in both methods differently.

In the case of the positivist methodology the weakness relates to the observance of a process in which the methodological soundness but usually the basis is largely judged along with the sociological context of significance. Of course in larger scale surveys and the projected design by the research team this weakness can be alleviated.

On the other hand in the case of qualitative research, theoretical categories that emerge from the empirical data do not exceed the number of descriptive findings and reworking this because the heuristic conceptually similar shapes, in the best of cases, more on theoretical narrative, derivative of empirical material rather than an established theory with comprehensive relevance in meaning that touches the problem both on existing dimensions and the of subject's perception.

C) The nature of the object of research in combination with the detection of perception which determines the method which will be selected. As interest is focused on healing narratives, due to the nature of the object and of the research hypothesis that supports it (e.g. social factors related to the hiring of illness, mental health etc) the person is expected to highlight his aspects to

investigate the problem and not the research process of confirmation items or undo-general cases in which people simply respond to structured questionnaires. The qualitative method, in this case, is chosen because it is keen to penetrate the way the understanding of the problem from the side of the suffering subject. It does not start from a general theoretical assumption on the disease.

However, the nature of the object of the investigation makes the emergence of an empirically based sociological theory quite difficult. To elaborate, by following inductively and cumulatively the course from the separate analysis of empirical material of past emotions to individuals and with the acceptance of the assertion that the qualitative method is a logically distinct research capability whatsoever, the construction theory ought to converge on common experiential worlds against a concept not defined completely socially, or constitutes a network of new concepts, a new data interface. The consistency of the theory involves the convergence and common performance problems from the narratives. Otherwise the result will be lined narratives and a weak comprehensive theory.

Unless appointed at the outset otherwise (i.e. social conditions), so the path should be opposite, from creating a theory on social factors affecting or exacerbating the symptoms of an illness. In this case, the qualitative method remains at best complementary or weakened, as what is sought is the confirmation or the disproof of the research hypothesis with a different methodology. This failure as to the emergence of an established sociological generalization concerns, however, the specificity of the object of research.

Instead, the investigation of another object, such as unemployment or immigration/refugee, depending on the perspective of research on the use of qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods, is offered more for the development of empirically acquired theories. On the phenomenon of unemployment and structural dimension various theories are developed and general investigative cases are formulated but the subject matter of the investigation can be the unemployed himself, namely solely to investigate the experiences concerning the understanding of an objective situation where there is a possibility to be presented theoretically. As Flick mentions (2014), a way to study the complex issues through qualitative research is to design methods to be sufficiently open to the complexity of the object of a study. In such cases the object being studied is the factor that determines the choice of a method and not vice versa.

## Conclusions

What is being discussed and proposed herein concerns first of all the documentation of sociological significance in the choice of research affairs and the couplings between the reference of the underlying systems and the sociological generalization types. Initially, the problem is not addressed in terms of semantics from the perspective of subjects in a supposedly unsuspecting perspective of the objectives of research and then a safe generalization or a strictly empirical, grounded theory can be attempted.

The subjective views of people participating in research can enhance the efforts of interpreting the problems, to override even the specific perspective design research or to topple the building blocks of speech in accordance with which it is built. However, the production of an empirically

based theory is not a cumulative case type and this is not only due to the methodological-payment of induction. It is mainly rested upon the failure of sociologically articulate the collective construction of meaning from the specific cases. At this level an interesting secondary type thoughts can arise which refer, however, to specific research material, in particular subjects, but not all who represent the entire target group. Those perceptions will either need to be considerations involving the specific sample examined. Alternatively, they should be generalizations of a sample denatured in general second-level theory beyond the specific theoretical investigations and absence of standard methodological terms, as described above.

In conclusion, through the specific text the implementation of a probationary practice relating to those items are supported for which a sociological theoretical generalization is feasible and the possible conceptualizations, in time before conducting research in the field. Otherwise, the emergence of empirical data to theoretical categories through inductive logic is found as a precarious generalization and more generally as an inefficient manufacturing process of a sociological-type coherent narrative. This also applies to the fragmentation of general sociological assumptions and theories in order to respond to the semantic content of subjective judgment. The goal ultimately is not the retreat of sociological theory, but the empowerment and enrichment with new empirically grounded theories (and not well-established theories) that meet the general application, alongside the specifics of the science of sociology as a critical understanding of what makes society possible in its antinomies and discontinuities

**References:**

1. Anscombe, G.E.M. (1957). *Intention*. Oxford: Blackwell.
2. Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
3. Berger, P., & Luckmann, Th. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality; A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin
4. Berger, P., & Luckmann, Th. (1969). *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie. Mit einer Einleitung zur deutschen Ausgabe von Helmuth Plessner*. Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag
5. Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press
6. Butler, J. (2001). *Psyche der Macht: Das Subjekt der Unterwerfung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
7. [Cohen R. S.](#), & M. Neurath (eds.) 1983. *Otto Neurath: Philosophical Papers*. [Reidel](#) (Neurath, O. (1932). *Protokollsätze* (Protocol statements).In: *Erkenntnis*, Vol. 3).
8. Dilthey, W. (2006). *Die Geistige Welt. Einleitung in die Philosophie des Lebens*. Erste Hälfte: Abhandlung zur Grundlegung der Geisteswissenschaften, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen (Bd.5).
9. Eberle, Th. (1984). *Sinnkonstitution in Alltag und Wissenschaft: der Beitrag der Phänomenologie an die Methodologie der Sozialwissenschaften*. Bern.
10. Eberle, Th. (1999). Sinnadaequanz und Kausaladaequanz bei Max Weber und Alfred Schütz. (Adequacy of Meaning and Adequacy of Causality in Max Weber and Alfred Schütz). In R. Ritzler, J. Reichertz & N. Schroer (Eds), *Herrnneutische Wissenssoziologie* (pp. 97-119). Konstanz: UVK.
11. Esser, H. (1996). Die Definition der Situation. *Koelner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 48, 1-44.
12. Flick, U. (2014). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (5rd ed.). London: Sage.
13. Glaser, B.G. (1992). *Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis : Emergence vs.Forcing*. Mill Valley, CA : *Sociology Press*
14. Glaser, B.G. (2002). Constructivist Grounded Theory? *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung /Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(3), Art. 12.
15. Glaserfeld, E. von (1992). Questions and Answers About Radical Constructivism. In M.K. Pearsall (Ed.), *Scope, Sequence, and Coordination of Secondary Schools Science*, Vol. 11, Relevant Research (pp. 169-182). Washington DC: NSTA.
16. Grathoff, R. (1989). *Milieu und Lebenswelt: Einführung in die Phänomenologische Soziologie und Phänomenologische Forschung*. Frankfurt/ Main. Suhrkamp
17. Habermas, J. (1981). *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns* (Bd.1: Handlungsrationalität und Gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung, Bd. 2: Zur Kritik der Funktionalistischen Vernunft). Frankfurt a.M. Suhrkamp.
18. Hedström, P. (2005). *Dissecting the Social: On the Principles of Analytical Sociology*. Cambridge University Press.
19. Hitzler, R. (2016). Zentrale Merkmale und Periphere Irritationen Interpretativer Sozialforschung. *Zeitschrift für Qualitative Forschung*, 17, Jg, H. 1 2, 171-184.
20. Hitzler, R., & Honer, . (Ed.) (1997). *Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik: Eine Einführung*. UTB, Opladen.
21. Hommans, G. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597-606.

22. Knoblauch, H., Flick, U., & Maeder, C. (2005) : Qualitative Methods in Europe: The Variety of Social Research. *FQS* 6(3), Art. 34.
23. Kouzelis G. & Psychopedis . (1996). (Ed.). *Epistemology of Social Sciences* (543-562), Athens, Nisos
24. Luckmann, Th. (1980). Über die Grenzen der Sozialwelt. In Th. Luckmann (Ed.), *Lebenswelt und Gesellschaft* (pp. 56-92). Paderborn: Schöningh, pp. 56-92.
25. Lüders, C., & Reichertz, J. (1986). Wissenschaftliche Praxis ist, wenn alles funktioniert und keiner weiss warum – Bemerkungen zur Entwicklung Qualitativer Sozialforschung. *Sozialwissenschaftliche Literaturreisenschau*, 12, 90-102.
26. Nagopoulos N. (2015). *Knowledge, Method and Social Action*, Athens, Kallipos
27. Oevermann, U. et. al. (1979). Die Methodologie einer “Objektiven Hermeneutik” und ihre Allgemeine Forschungslogische Bedeutung in den Sozialwissenschaften. In Hans-Georg Soeffner (Ed.), *Interpretative Verfahren in den Sozial- und Textwissenschaften* (pp. 352-433). Stuttgart: Metzler.
28. Parsons, . (1968). *The Structure of Social Action*. New York: Free Press.
29. Savvakis M., (2014), “Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methodologies: A Critical Overview”, *Statistical Review*, 8 (1-2): 53-67.
30. Schütz, A. (1982). *Das Problem der Relevanz* (Richard M. Zane Ed.). Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp (stw 371).
31. Schütz, A. (1974). *Der Sinnhafte Aufbau der Sozialen Welt*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
32. Schütz, ., & Luckmann, . (1979, 1984). *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp. Band 1, 2.
33. Schütz, A., & Luckmann, Th. (2003). *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*. Konstanz: UVK.
34. Sprondel W. M (ed.1977). *Alfred Schütz –Talcott Parsons Zur Theorie sozialen Handelns. Ein Briefwechsel*. Suhrkamp: Frankfurt am Main.
35. Srubar, I. (1988). *Die Genese der Pragmatischen Lebenswelttheorie von Alfred Schütz und ihr Anthropologischer Hindergrund*. Suhrkamp. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp
36. Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research : Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. London : Sage Publications
37. Tzanakis M., Savvakis M. & Alexias G., (2016), “Mastectomy and Voluntarism: From the Individualized Self to Solidarity Groups in Greek Women with Breast Cancer”, in Armstrong W., (ed.), *Breast Cancer: Assessment, Management and Perspectives*, London: Nova Publications: 51-88.
38. Weber, M. (1980). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. Tübingen: Mohr.
39. Weber, M. (1995). *Die Objektivität Sozialwissenschaftlicher und Sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis*. J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen 1904. Schutterwald: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.