



HAL
open science

The BMS partners with the "Mixed Methods" team in Rennes

Sophie Duchesne, Ahmed Fouad El Haddad, Viviane Le Hay

► **To cite this version:**

Sophie Duchesne, Ahmed Fouad El Haddad, Viviane Le Hay. The BMS partners with the "Mixed Methods" team in Rennes. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique / Bulletin of Sociological Methodology*, 2023, 160 (1), pp.6-8. 10.1177/07591063231196159a . halshs-04380668

HAL Id: halshs-04380668

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04380668>

Submitted on 10 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The *BMS* partners with the “Mixed Methods” team in Rennes

What makes a journal interesting, if not the articles it publishes? Journals with a high international profile can count on a large number of submissions and select articles that conform to the scientific canons that, for ease of reference, are referred to as “mainstream”. For “niche” journals such as the *BMS* (Duchesne et al., 2023), they have a specific editorial project that makes them less visible, but also requires them to be in contact with authors likely to respond to this editorial project. The best way to do this is to form partnerships with institutions or colleagues who can put the journal in direct contact with these authors. Historically, the *BMS* entered into a contract with RC33, the logic and methodology network of the International Sociological Association (ISA), at a time when the tools and techniques for collecting and analysing data in the social sciences were still of interest only to a very limited number of colleagues. This partnership continues, as shown by the autumn edition of the RC33 Newsletter published at the end of this issue.

More recently, when Karl van Meter entrusted the journal to us and we refocused the editorial project on the reflexive narration of research experiences, we approached Nonna Mayer and Samy Cohen, who run a seminar at Sciences Po with a similar ambition. Together we created a section named after this seminar – ‘Social sciences in question’ – in which so far half a dozen articles have been published (Baczko, Dorronsoro and Quesnay, 2021; Cohen and Mayer, 2019; Coppedge et al., 2019; Fourment, 2019; de Maillard, 2019; Offerlé, 2019). A new article in this section, by Benjamin Tainturier, Charles de Dampierre and Dominique Cardon, also appears in this issue. The authors discuss how they attempted to measure anti-Semitic discourse on YouTube, using an ‘imprinting’ approach based on machine learning methods and the training of an automatic language processing tool.

With the digitalisation of the world, but also the development and professionalisation of the social sciences, survey methods continue to diversify, so that the divide that structured their development – the opposition between qualitative and quantitative approaches – may now seem outdated. For a time, the notion of mixed methods was even interpreted by some qualitative researchers as an attempt to standardise their survey methods, inspired by the quantitative approach. But those days seem to be over. Today, the links between methods, apparently drawing on different epistemologies, seem to open the way to innovative and varied experimentation. In order to get closer to a pool of authors focusing on these issues, we gladly accepted an invitation from the three founders of the ARENES laboratory’s ‘Mixed Methods in the Social Sciences’ summer school, Thomas Aguilera, Tom Chevalier and Benoit Giry, to come and present the

journal. The idea soon came to make the partnership a lasting one by also creating a section, this time entitled "Mixed methods". Coordinated by our three colleagues, this section will bring together articles on the design and implementation of research strategies that combine quantitative and qualitative methods. Researchers who have used this type of combination in their individual or collective research will present their theoretical and methodological reflections on the way in which they have designed and concretely implemented their research strategy, and will put them into perspective with the results obtained in order to highlight their specific contributions as well as their limitations. The aim of this section is not so much to promote the use of mixed methods. Rather, it will be to take a reflective and theoretical approach to them, explaining the conditions for the feasibility of this type of innovation, from the perspective of cumulativity and the debate on the production of social science research.

Articles for this new section may be submitted via various channels: during participation in the Mixed Methods in Social Sciences summer school, which will be organised every year in Rennes; via the ARENES Mixed Methods research group; via unsolicited submissions to the *BMS* board or the section coordinators: Thomas Aguilera (Sciences Po Rennes, ARENES, thomas.aguilera@sciencespo.fr), Tom Chevalier (CNRS, ARENES, Sciences Po Rennes, tom.chevalier@sciencespo.fr) or Benoit Giry (Sciences Po Rennes, ARENES, benoit.giry@sciencespo-rennes.fr).

In addition to the RC33 Newsletter and the article by Tainturier and his colleagues which brings issue 160 of *BMS* to a close, our readers will find three other articles. Larisa Barkhatova's article remains in the world of mixed methods, as she describes how she succeeded in combining several research techniques, both quantitative and qualitative. By leveraging the possibilities offered by computational analysis, she convincingly demonstrates the numerous advantages of quantitative methods in enriching online ethnography, providing a complementary perspective to traditional qualitative approaches. The study focuses on a sociological online community of Russian speakers, effectively highlighting the points of intersection between computational analysis and ethnography, thus fostering a constructive dialogue between these two approaches. The article rigorously details the implementation of content analysis, network analysis, and thematic modeling while deeply reflecting on their analytical capabilities within the context of online ethnography.

As for Taylor Beauvais's article, like Tainturier and his colleagues and Barkhatova, he too tackles issues linked to the digital world, in this case the sampling of online communities. The proposed research method artfully combines hybrid probability sampling techniques, incorporating network theory, stratified sampling, theoretical saturation, and publicly available social media activity statistics. The article successfully illustrates the application of these methods to obtain a representative sample from a digital political ecosystem with a substantial population of eight million individuals.

The issue begins with a very different article, rooted in real-world exploration methods. Alicia Jacquot discusses how, as part of her dissertation, she sought to set up a multi-level qualitative survey to analyse how two social worlds (national education and popular education) interact within a scheme to prevent school drop-outs.

Enjoy your reading!

Sophie Duchesne, Ahmed Fouad El Haddad and Viviane Le Hay

References

- Baczko A, Dorransoro G and Quesnay A (2021) The epistemological privilege of fieldwork: A collective investigation in war-torn Syria. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 151: 96-116.
- Bryman A (2006) Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done? *Qualitative Research*, 6: 97-113.
- Cohen S et Mayer N (2019) Les sciences sociales en question: grandes controverses épistémologiques et méthodologiques. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 142: 75-77.
- Coppedge M, Gerring J, Knutsen C H, Krusell J, Medzihorsky J, Pernes J, Skaaning S-E, Stepanova N, Teorell J, Tzelgov E, Wilson S L and Lindberg S I (2019) The Methodology of ‘Varieties of Democracy’ (V-Dem). *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 143: 107-133.
- Deacon D, Bryman A and Fenton N (1998) Collision or collusion? A discussion and case study of the unplanned triangulation of quantitative and qualitative research methods. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 1(1): 47-63.
- Duchesne S, El Haddad A F, Le Hay V and Itcaina X (2023) Une revue de niche et fière de l’être. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 157–158: 3-13.
- Fourment E (2019) Une « dinosaure chercheuse » dans le milieu libertaire allemand. Effets d’une double casquette de chercheuse et de militante. *Bulletin de méthodologie sociologique/Bulletin of Sociological Methodology*, 144: 55-75.
- Lemercier C and Ollivier C (2011) Décrire et compter: Du bricolage à l’innovation : questions de méthode. *Terrains & travaux*, 19(2): 5-16.
- Maillard J de (2019) Faire parler les policiers. Retour sur deux enquêtes par observations et entretiens. *Bulletin de méthodologie sociologique/Bulletin of Sociological Methodology*, 144: 55-75.
- Offerlé M (2019) Faire parler les patrons, faire parler des patrons. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 142: 78-96.