

Slide 2

The main purpose of our presentation is to present some key findings from the research project “The Archive of Research on Everyday Life” (archiwum.edu.pl) funded by the National Programme for the Development of Humanities [NPRH], which is supervised by Prof. Marek Krajewski. This project was set up in 2014. **It aims to identify, digitise, and describe valuable texts and research materials on everyday life and make them available online.** The texts include graduate thesis, research reports, research articles and books and the research materials are transcripts of interviews, field notes and observation notes as well as diaries. Currently we are collecting materials in Poznan, Lodz and Warsaw.

Slides 3 and 4

This slide lists the results returned by the search engine in response to typing “television” and the next slide contains a description of one of the diaries that has been archived. The searcher has access to basic information about the publication (e.g. abstract) as well as to the table of contents, keywords or the author's biography.

Slide 5

It should be noted that the aim of the online archive dedicated to the study of everyday life in Poland was threefold. **Firstly, the archive aimed at preserving valuable research materials** (e.g. Jan Bujak's diary from Polityka) as well as making them available to other researchers for a variety of purposes such as comparative analysis, complementary analysis, secondary analysis or bibliographic references.

Secondly, the ABNŹC project aims at reconstructing the traditions of research on everyday life in Poland. Therefore, it provides analysis of the gathered archive materials, and as well as a collection of studies on everyday life undertaken by Polish researchers of everyday life. We will discuss it in detail later during this presentation.

Finally, **the third objective of our project is to conduct our own studies that would be inspired by the best traditions of Polish research on everyday life.** For instance, we have recently started a project on hospitality based on in-depth interviews (IDI) conducted in three cities in the Lubuskie Province (Drezdenko, Sulęcín and Lubsko) and diary competitions.

Slide 6

We will now present the findings of a study based on **30 individual in-depth interviews** with renowned experts in the field of everyday life. In 2015 and 2016, the members of our research project talked to sociologists, – such as the late Prof. E. Tarkowska and Prof. R. Drozdowski, with the experts on the history of social thought – such as late Prof. J. Szacki, as well as with historians who specialise in everyday life (such as Prof. J. Kochanowski) as well as anthropologists of everyday life (such as Prof. R. Sulima or Prof. W. Burszta). Additionally, we interviewed editors of journals that publish many texts on everyday life as well as a library specialist. The latter provided us with useful advice on where to look for some valuable research materials and articles.

The sampling of the experts was purposive. At first, we performed a preliminary library search in order to identify the interesting works on everyday life. Subsequently, we talked to researchers recommended by the experts in the field whom we had interviewed before.

Slide 7

The interviews helped to **reconstruct the most important Polish traditions** of studying everyday life. We encouraged our interlocutors to talk about the most important people and research projects that have shaped the field. In most cases, the experts also **discussed theoretical concepts** that underlie the studies on everyday life in Poland. We asked our interviewees about **the most adequate definitions, research topics and methodology** for studying everyday life as well as the challenges and opportunities for the field. Last but not least, **we accessed valuable research material** created by our interlocutors, their colleagues and students.

Unfortunately, interviewing all influential Polish researchers in the field was not possible due to health issues of some of the senior experts, as well as the limited time and financial resources of our project. However, we believe it is interesting to discuss the opinions of 30 sociologists, historians and anthropologists who agreed for the interview. Their often humorous and emotional accounts provided a deeper insight into the emergence of everyday life studies in Poland. As the majority of the experts emphasised, **the history of the discipline in our country is short, but its traditions are very long.**

Slide 8

Almost all our experts agreed that interdisciplinary approach is necessary in studying everyday life. Our interlocutors emphasised that this field must involve sociologists, historians or anthropologists as well as psychologists, social geographers or economists. It was also widely recognised that the first three disciplines – history of everyday life, anthropology of everyday life and sociology of everyday life – are particularly interconnected. The crucial moments to understand the development of everyday life studies came when the boundaries between these three disciplines were most blurred and open for influence. The Annales School, which combines historical and social perspective, is a good example. Many experts consider this school as one of the first and most important impulses that prompted increased interest in everyday life. Other example are so called “anthropological sociologists” – the name that was given i.e. to Prof. A. Siciński’s team. Moreover, the relations between anthropology of everyday life and sociology of contemporary culture were underlined.

To conclude, interdisciplinarity is more than a theoretical claim – it is first and foremost the foundation of studies on everyday life and the core of its long tradition.

Slide 9

In addition to the interdisciplinary character of the studies of everyday life, **three other factors were most crucial for the development of this field.** The first and most important was the **emergence of new theoretical concepts.** The experts explained how some social theories – e.g. phenomenology or ethnomethodology – or schools – such as the Annales School - developed in the West and then diffused and gained popularity in Poland. As our expert historian – said:

(...) the problem of the history of everyday life in Poland was that it was very receptive or even imitative. New concepts mostly came from outside Poland.

The experts considered historical events and political transformations that took place in Poland after I World War II as the second important factor. They mentioned famous October 1956, the Solidarity carnival in 1980 and the political revolution in 1989. According to our interlocutors, these moments oriented them towards research on everyday life or, on the contrary, to withdraw from such studies.

Finally, generational change was the third contributory factor to the development of the studies on everyday life. Young researchers were more inclined to look for “white spots”

and research perspectives that had been neglected by their older colleagues. In their search for their own academic path, they sometimes decided to study everyday life.

Slide 10

The three discussed factors are usually interrelated. For instance, political factors, such as censorship, affected the dissemination of Western social thought in communist Poland. There were times in Polish post-war history when the access to western academic literature was easier and times when free circulation of scientific thought was more difficult.

Our interlocutors also noted that studies of everyday life were sometimes perceived as trivial and unimportant– e.g. during the institutional ban for sociology in the fifties, before 1956). They also had a feeling that preference should be given to the analysis of “big history/ big social transformations”. This was the case of sociologists during political and social transformation since 1989 and historians – after the archives of communist secret internal services were open). However, on other occasions (e.g. in 1981) a decision to study everyday life was perceived as a safe choice, an escape from the communist ideology and requirements. Adopting new theoretical concepts was also related to the generational change. New generations of researchers challenged the prevailing Marxist, macrostructural and quantitative paradigms. Many of our interlocutors described how fascinated they were when they first read books of E. Goffman or H. Garfinkel in the 1970s. They admitted that those works inspired them to challenge the prevailing style of research in Poland and, sometimes, even oppose their professors. One of the strongest generational conflicts occurred between ethnology professors and their younger colleagues, who preferred to focus on anthropology of the contemporary (phenomena). As one of our interlocutors put it: “We finally wanted to do something else than the old pricks! (laugh) (...) This need was motivated by the exhaustion of the folk culture paradigm (...). It all started in the mid seventies, when it was already possible to use western theoretical inspirations a little bit more [than beforehand].”

The presented factors demonstrate that the perspective of sociology of knowledge may be useful in the analysis of the history of research on everyday life. The interviews with our experts reveal that factors shaping the emergence of a new discipline are varied and sometimes unexpected.

Slide 11

The next issue, I would like to refer to is the way how research on everyday life is conducted. I will speak here above all about sociologists and anthropologists, or researchers who use similar research tools. **The vast majority of our interviewees associate the studies of everyday life with qualitative methods**, for example with the biographical method and its variations the diary method, the monographic method, grounded theory, participant observation, the visual and the phenomenological method. Anthropologists noted that in the case of their scientific discipline the inseparable combination of qualitative research with research on everyday life is due to the specificity of anthropology itself. In ethnographic research, qualitative methods are characteristic of the whole discipline, and not just for the research on everyday life, and have been used since the beginning of its existence.

In the research on everyday life conducted by sociologists, the turn towards qualitative research is often referred to as a retreat from quantitative research, and this phenomenon is in our view due to three factors. Firstly, the so called quantitative method does not provide answers to questions which are the most interesting for researchers of everyday life, that is how people function in everyday life? It was necessary to redefine the whole research process and the role of the actors involved in quality research. In quantitative research the examined persons are becoming objects and torn from their world, in qualitative research they become co-authors of the research process. Researchers, however, had to change from outside observers into engaged participants, who in the most radical form begin to live together with those they study. Secondly, turning the sociology of everyday life towards qualitative methods results from its relationship with other disciplines and with research schools within sociology itself. Sociology of everyday life was shaped by researchers influenced by anthropologists, and on the other hand developed from such research schools as symbolic interactionism or humanistic sociology. So already by its place in sociological tradition was it from the very beginning of its existence related to qualitative methodology.

Thirdly, as one of our interlocutors observes, a return to qualitative research derives from the fact that qualitative research is easier to perform. On the one hand, it is cheaper, and on the other it allows an "eternal beginning" by releasing researchers from "trying to get the results of the research accumulated and complemented by each other." However, it is important to note that our interviews also included a number of voices suggesting the need to combine qualitative with quantitative methods.

Slide 12

In our conclusion, we would like to **focus on research topics** which are (according to our respondents) characteristic of the research on everyday life. The people we interviewed focused mostly on issues such as the research subject or the nature of "everyday" social practices. In the first case, the researchers of "everyday life" are interested in average people, the so-called "normal" people as Giddens said (Giddens 2005), *kleine Leute* as Lütdtke called them (Lütdtke 1995), or the ordinary people (*zwyklaki*) as one of our interlocutors (Drozdowski) said. According to the interviewees, these individuals were previously viewed as having no influence on history, social change or social structures (e.g. children, seniors, but also women), as individuals acting under the influence of external factors not shaped by them. Due to their insignificance they have remained so far heroes of the second or even the third plan, which rarely became a field of exploration for historians or sociologists. The purpose of everyday researchers is to restore their history or to make them visible in current narratives – the point is to make them subjects which made choices that affected as well their own lives as the reality surrounding them.

Our conversations show that researchers of "everyday life" are interested not only in average people, but also in their opposites: individuals or groups which are unique, exceptional, distinguished from society. Often they are people who raise common curiosity and controversy, such as people speaking an underworld slang (*grypsera*), truckers, musclemen or members of reconstruction groups. Respondents answering the question about the subject of research on everyday life also drew attention to the nature of activities undertaken by individuals in everyday life. In the case of practices, researchers focus on what is common, habitual, and repetitive, on what is transparent, even not visible to the individuals themselves. The interviewees, however, point out that these practices, which are considered unimportant and trivial, devoid of any significant influence or influence on reality, however, have a significant influence on the shaping of social structures or on the course of the most important social processes.

Last but not least, it's worth to mention that in the context of the research topic, our interlocutors pointed out: on the one hand, research on materiality and relationships that occur between active individuals and the surrounding objects and their objects, and on the other, research on emotions.