

## Interviewing – a final contribution

Emilie Morwenna Whitaker

Paul Atkinson

We are, of course, grateful to Martyn Hammersley for his contribution to this exchange, and for his taking the time to address our observations here and in our original paper. We are conscious of the fact that such debates can become protracted, of interest only to the protagonists themselves. We shall, therefore, be brief, while again aiming to be constructive.

It is clear that the appropriate analytic approach to interview-generated materials is not a matter of perfect consensus. The interview is a terrain where differences in approach are played out. In our original paper and our subsequent comment, we have tried to avoid the rigid adoption of a single position. Indeed, we are sceptical about ‘positions’ in general. As we have explained, our own approach is based on an eclectic array of ideas. Our interest is in the productive analysis of data, and not methodological purism.

We do not, therefore, try to assert that the data derived from interviews should only be analysed from just one perspective. The contemporary literature amply demonstrates that there is analytic purchase to be gained from narrative analysis, ethnopoetics, discourse analysis and discursive psychology. We certainly do not advocate a primarily ethnomethodological or conversation-analytic approach. We definitely do not subscribe to the view that interview talk should *only* be inspected for its discourse features, without concern for its referential functions.

We make no apology for our brief comments on the essential reflexivity of methods. We are, surely, all agreed that there are no methods that stand outside the implications of reflexivity. A recognition that research methods contribute to the framing of the phenomena that can be identified is hardly revolutionary. It is not a recognition that leads to a sterile kind of relativism or epistemological stasis, however. We shall ourselves be exploring the implications of epistemic, disciplinary and methodological reflexivity in a Palgrave Pivot we are currently preparing. Styles of interviewing and the analytic strategies that are brought to bear self-evidently affect what such research can be made to yield. Finally, we would hope that all readers of this journal, together with the contributors to this discussion, would insist on analyses that go well beyond just undigested gobbets of interview data, superficial content analysis, or the ‘discovery’ of themes that do little more than reflect the interviewer’s questioning.