
OUTLINES - CRITICAL PRACTICE STUDIES

• Vol. 16, No. 2 • 2015 • (01-14) •
<http://www.outlines.dk>

Studying the fabric of everyday life

Niklas A. Chimirri

Department of People & Technology, Roskilde University
Roskilde, Denmark

Jacob Klitmøller

Department of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences, University of Aarhus
Aarhus, Denmark

Pernille Hviid

Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen
Copenhagen, Denmark

What determines our judgment, our concepts and reactions, is not what one man is doing now, an individual action, but the whole hurly-burly of human actions, the background against which we see any action.

Seeing life as a weave, this pattern (pretence, say) is not always complete and is varied in a multiplicity of ways ... And one pattern in the weave is interwoven with many others. (Wittgenstein, 1967, §567-569; as cited in Curry, 2000, pp. 106-107)

The fabric of everyday life

We live our lives as part of the ‘whole hurly-burly of human actions’, a weave which is incomplete, varied and interwoven with an unfathomable number of other weaves. Philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein pointed out this interwovenness of everyday life as action, its multiplicity and complexity, its ever-changing, processual nature. At the same time he developed concepts that help us grasp how human beings against this background come to make judgments, communicate, create and maintain meaning with one another – from within the fabric of everyday life, as cultural geographer Michael R. Curry termed it

in a book chapter on Wittgenstein's significance for his field. *Life as a weave*, thus, does not only connote human ephemeral creation and transformation, but also maintenance and persistence: "If life is 'a weave', that weave is at once evanescent and enduring" (Curry, 2000, p. 107). The weave connotes both everyday life's temporal and spatial qualities as well as its intricate contradictoriness, out of which for instance *places* are both "created and maintained through the everyday actions of everyday life" (p. 110).

Outlines: Critical studies of the everydayness of practice

It is this focus on human action in its spatio-temporal contradictoriness, as both creation and maintenance, which is at the heart of this special issue of *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*. After all, the 'whole hurly-burly of human actions' is precisely what the term *practice* most commonly denotes, ergo the entirety of human production and reproduction. The concept therefore sets the stage for scientifically studying human actions and doings as both creating and maintaining everyday life. Meanwhile, such *studies* do not merely describe in order to accurately reproduce the everyday they study: They *critically* engage with the practice they study or, drawing on Marxian philosopher and social scientist Henri Lefebvre (1987, 2014), they critically engage with the *everydayness* of the everyday. For Lefebvre, industrialized modernity is characterized by the fact that even the possibilities of resisting totalities are themselves entirely rationalized, linearized, functionalized, pre-fabricated, and controlled. His multi-faceted, materialist post-Cartesian analytic frame remains invaluable for sketching out the fleeting and contradictory two-sidedness of contemporary everyday life and thereby countering those one-sided reductions of lived experience which Lefebvre feared. The most fundamental of these contradictions regards *repetition* and *change*: "The days follow one after another and resemble one another, and yet – here lies the contradiction at the heart of everydayness – everything changes" (1987, p. 10). In order, though, to regard this assertion as a potentially productive opening for studying change in repetition and vice versa, as is the case in the issue at hand (cf. especially **Hybholt**, 2015), the totality of Lefebvre's dystopic continuation of the passage ("But the change is programmed: obsolescence is planned" [Lefebvre, 1987, p. 10]) needs itself to be critically questioned, scrutinized and conceptually renegotiated.

Alternatives to such totalizing critiques of the everyday can in fact be *outlined*, as the contributions to this special issue demonstrate. In this sense, the present issue presents conceptual and empirically informed work which sheds light on general facets of the fabric of everyday life, while at the same time acknowledging that the practice of research is just as any other practice situated and epistemically limited and partial. Paraphrasing Lefebvre, such studies seek the perennial in the ephemeral, while being aware of the ephemerality of the perennial; or with inspiration from Curry (2000): the research presented in this issue forms weaves interwoven with uncountable other weaves, aware that it is easily and evanescently engulfed by other weaves and that it can only endure if it accepts and departs from its very own situated interwovenness with the everyday life it sets out to study.

Situating approaches to the study of the fabric of everyday life across social scientific disciplines

All contributors of this special issue explicitly or (via the conceptual developments they propose) implicitly acknowledge that they study everyday life from within the fabric they

are themselves a thread of. Simultaneously they develop concepts that shed light on how human beings attempt to temporarily solidify the weave which they themselves are spinning through patterns of actions and routines, while simultaneously being spun by the ever-changing world.

This acknowledgement was central for the organizers of the conference from which this special issue emerged alongside other follow-up publications. The international conference was entitled *Psychology and the Conduct of Everyday Life* and held at Roskilde University (Denmark) from June 26 to 28, 2013. It took recent psychological work on the concept *conduct of everyday life* as point of departure for inviting presenters from critical social psychology and neighboring disciplines (social and cultural anthropology, work sociology, childhood sociology, political sciences, among others) to discuss situated approaches to critically investigating everyday life:

The conference attempts to substantiate a critical situated approach to the experiences and actions of practicing human life in today's social and technological world, and to debate how the study of subjects in the context of their everyday life can contribute to the development of psychological theory, methodology and practice. (Højholt, Kristensen & Schraube, 2013)

Albeit explicitly grounded in an interest to develop psychology through situated studies of the everyday, the conference emphasized the necessity to seek inspiration and collaboration across related disciplines. This is mirrored in the publications emanating from the conference, such as the *Nordic Psychology* journal special issue on *Psychological perspectives on children's conduct of everyday life* (Højholt & Røn Larsen, 2015) as well as the eponymous anthology *Psychology and the Conduct of Everyday Life* (Schraube & Højholt, 2016). A review of the latter publication is included in the current issue (Suorsa, 2015b). While the *Nordic Psychology* special issue focuses on questions of development and children's everyday life and encompasses contributions by contextual developmental practice and childhood researchers, the edited book gathers chapters written from within psychology, anthropology, sociology and political sciences. The special issue at hand understands itself as similarly reaching across the boundaries of theoretical psychology, presenting the work of one trained sociologist (Eisenraut, 2015) as well as a number of psychological practice researchers who build ontological, epistemological and methodological bridges to sociology, anthropology, political sciences as well as health and design research.

Conduct of everyday life: An originally sociological concept for transdisciplinary qualitative psychology

The concept *conduct of everyday life* has played a pivotal role for this disciplinary opening. It is a concept which originally built on sociologist Max Weber's concept *life conduct* (e.g., Weber, 1952), was applied and further developed by the Munich group of subject-oriented sociologists particularly in the 1980s and early 90s (for an overview: Jurczyk, Voß & Weihrich, 2016), and finally discovered and reconceptualized for psychology by critical social psychologist Klaus Holzkamp (1995, 2013) in the last years of his work before his death in 1995. In Holzkamp's version, the focus of research turned from the sociological analysis of the pressures of modernization and its implications for how individuals conduct their everyday lives to the study of human beings' subjectivity,

their possibilities for imagining, acting and thereby conducting their everyday lives irrespective of these pressures and structural complexities (cf. Chimirri, 2014). Meanwhile the concept undoubtedly calls for a more extensive collaboration across sociology, psychology and related fields of social inquiry.

Holzkamp's unfinished introduction of the conduct of everyday life into psychology was authored as a critique of the way research of the everyday had largely been ignored by psychology. He identified a lack of systematic psychological practice studies of everyday life across those relatively institutionalized spatio-temporal arrangements human beings participate in.¹ Grounding and situating the study of human experiences and actions in everyday life was, instead and interestingly, in particular proposed from within sociology and other social sciences. This may be due to the thorough critique of the grand structural theories of the 19th and 20th century, or to invoke Norbert Elias: it may be due to the "attempt to correct the one-sidedness of objectivist tendencies in sociology" (Elias, 1998, p. 168). The analytical focus shifted toward openings or uncertainties of the everyday which arguably transcended the modernist-rationalized structuredness or fabricatedness of everyday life, a focus which gave rise to complementing sociological macro-perspectives with the bottom-up micro-perspectives on lived everyday life and its contradictoriness: With inspiration from Michel de Certeau (1984), for instance, communication researcher Roger Silverstone advocated for letting research questions be formulated 'from below upwards', *de bas en haut* (Silverstone, 2005, p. 2; cf. also Chimirri, 2015); precisely to bring the lived contradictions of everyday human meaning-making and actions within fabricated structures to the analyst's attention, without, however, downplaying human agency and resistance.

A similar epistemic as well as political ambition of situating research in the everyday life lived by human beings, an everyday life that transcends the rational-cognitive imperatives of modernist thought and interweaves it with the more-difficult-to-verbalize, polyvalent complexities of feeling and experiencing, can be found in a recently published special issue of the journal *Sociology*, in whose introduction the editors write: "It is the realm of the everyday that brings the structure-agency knot directly into view, but more than this it brings close the immediacy and intensity of being in, and part of, social worlds" (Neal & Murji, 2015, p. 819). This ambition is certainly not novel, for instance when considering the groundbreaking sociographical, longitudinal study of unemployed people's everyday life in the Austrian town of Marienthal (Jahoda, Lazarsfeld & Zeisel, 1933). However it has gained new thrust since the second half of the 20th century, and found theoretical and methodological expression in ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism, grounded theory and similarly innovative approaches paving the way for more anthropologically-ethnographically inspired, largely qualitative studies of lived everyday life.

This opening and recalibration of sociology in order to unfold a more two-sided approach to the structure-agency interrelationship was essential for rediscovering everyday life in psychology. Even though psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud had already demonstrated a clear interest in investigating the everyday of his patients and himself (cf. Highmore, 2001), just

¹ We consider Holzkamp's analysis of the state of psychology as a general statement, and agree with it as such. The early developmental work of the Hans Werner group, such as Marta Muchow's studies of children's *lebensraum* in Hamburg in the years up to 2nd world war (May & Gunther, 2015) or ecological psychological analyses such as Barker & Wright's (1951) work at the Midwest Field Station are here mentioned as exemplary exceptions to this general analysis.

as much as Clara and William Stern described and analyzed from a developmental point of view the everyday life of their children via a longitudinal diary study (Stern, 1914; cf. Hoppe-Graff & Kim, 2007), the interest in the everyday had since withered away in particular due to the experimental-scientific, behavioral-cognitivist, positivist-empiricist turn that came to dominate psychology throughout most of the 20th century. As Hodgetts, Drew, Sonn, Stolte, Nikora & Curtis (2010) argue in their introductory book to *Social Psychology and Everyday Life*, everyday life has never really ceased to be investigated in particular throughout the history of *social* psychology. Instead, (social) psychology has rather failed in explicitly acknowledging its interwovenness with everyday life by positing itself as a natural science producing unambiguous facts. For too long a time, (social) psychology thus followed positivist science ideals and the implied *voyeuristic tradition* (Mol, 2008), which strives for the detachment of its research from the very same everyday life it seeks to investigate.

The concept of the *conduct of everyday life*, as introduced by Holzkamp and developed by Ole Dreier (e.g., 2008, 2011), has helped putting investigations which take departure in everyday life back on psychology's agenda. These investigations are theoretically and politically never impartial and acknowledge the always already situated, particular perspectivity on lived everyday life. As the contributions to the special issue underline through their varied uses of the concept, it is neither intended solely to prescriptively guide the researcher's analytic focus, nor to be understood as a concept whose definition can be conclusively and exhaustively formulated. Instead, it is an opening and broadening concept which is reaching out to other qualitatively working disciplines and renders it possible to continuously and critically inquire into everyday life's contradictoriness, its relative fabricatedness and the always already immanent potentiality for weaving new weaves and reweaving already existing ones.

All special issue contributions that explicitly draw on and work with the conduct of everyday life concept agree that it continues to require further specification and conceptual development. Lefebvre's above mentioned concept of interwovenness of repetition and change in everyday life, for instance, implicitly pervades all discussions relating to the concept itself. This becomes most obvious in Lisbeth **Hyholt's** (2015) contribution: How can the relationship between *cyclic routines* and *real life*, both mentioned by Holzkamp as constitutive of the conduct of everyday life but never fully elaborated on, be visualized and better understood? Is this differentiation of any analytical value? Teemu **Suorsa** (2015a) widens the scope of this debate by discussing the concept through Heidegger's phenomenology and in particular solution-based therapy, a development of systemic family therapy. Kasper A. **Kristensen** (2015) explores the meaningfulness of introducing the conduct of life concept into health psychology, while Niklas A. **Chimirri** (2015) argues for its significance when designing co-research inquiries into the child-technology relationship. Peter **Busch-Jensen** (2015) only briefly mentions the concept, nevertheless strongly emphasizing that it requires a reformulation that reflects how *power* (sensu Foucault) is deeply interwoven with human conduct of everyday life. Laila Colding **Lagermann's** (2015) contribution calls for a similar conceptual extension, reading the conduct of everyday life concept through Axel Honneth's *recognition theory* as well as Judith Butler's and Bronwyn Davies' critical feminist perspectives.

Countering the fabricatedness of everyday life: On Technology, Power and Order

Although not all the contributions explicitly work on developing the concept of conduct of everyday life, they all engage in the multitude of power relations at work in the fabric of everyday life. Hence they share a common concern with many of the above mentioned sociological investigations: How to counter the ubiquitous rationalization of everyday life? How to widen the openings that the contradictoriness of everyday life offers? This touches both upon questions related to the organization of time and space, as Lefebvre points out (cf. also Burkitt, 2004), ergo the relationship between repetition and change as well as the persistent and the ephemeral. It is of little surprise that many of the sociologists of everyday life have been investigating architectural processes and structures, or technological artifact creation more generally, as they offer comprehensive and comprehensible evidence of the irreducible interplay between time and space, the evanescent process and the enduring structure.

Following de Certeau, we need to look attentively at the subtleties and depth of everyday life in order to discover its opening cracks, its movements and heterogeneity:

However, beneath the fabricating and universal writing of technology, opaque and stubborn places remain. The revolutions of history, economic mutations, demographic mixtures lie in layers within it, and remain there, hidden in customs, rites and spatial practices. The legible discourses that formerly articulated them have disappeared, or left only fragments in language. This place, on its surface, seems to be a collage. In reality, in its depth it is ubiquitous. A piling up of heterogeneous places. Each one, like a deteriorating page of a book, refers to a different mode of territorial unity, of socioeconomic distribution, of political conflicts and of identifying symbolism.

The whole, made up of pieces that are not contemporary and still linked to totalities that have fallen into ruins, is managed by subtle and compensatory equilibria [including infinitesimal movements, multiform activities] that silently guarantee complementarities. (de Certeau, 1984, p. 201)

What understandings of power, of possibilities for renegotiating sociomaterially stabilized power relations, are implied here? How to overcome totalizing accounts that reproduce the grand structures sociology sought to counter and relativize? Perhaps, as **Busch-Jensen** (2015) argues, power itself needs to be redefined, situated in everyday life in and beyond work organizations, as one's capacity for action and social participation. Similar to Chimirri and in line with practice psychologist Erik Axel (e.g., 2011), Busch-Jensen furthermore suggests that conflicts should be regarded as unavoidable, potentially productive and necessary points of departure for a democratic and democratizing social inquiry. **Chimirri** (2015) emphasizes this democratization through social inquiry as well, underlining that even when working with very young human beings, doing research as conducting everyday life requires to be conceived of as co-inquiry that comes to benefit all co-researchers irrespective of age. Such psychological practice co-research must, according to its own ambitions, have lasting beneficial effects for the children's everyday life as well, which can only be attained by mutually learning from one another and thereby striving for both emancipatory and arguably also technical relevance for everyone involved. While design research with very young children demonstrates the dilemmas engrained in doing co-research and offers important methodological propositions on how

to resolve them, psychology can offer the thorough conceptualization of children's subjectivity also needed for tackling these dilemmas.

Lagermann (2015) investigates the way in which 'teaching-as-usual' acts as a potentially marginalizing practice for ethnic students, thus connecting young people's positions and perspectives within the school and their life outside school. Based on a similar analysis of how everyday life within and outside school are interwoven, Raquel **Guzzo**, Ana Paula **Moreira** and Adinete **Mezzalira** (2015) argue for an explicitly interventionist psychological approach to countering ostracizing power asymmetries in the child-adult relationship. Against the backdrop of extreme social and educational inequality in Brazil, they propose a developmental practice project that renders it possible for psychologists to help school children with overcoming difficulties across their everyday life contexts. Psychologists are to become an integral part of the school system, and are to critically intervene and negotiate with institutions and stakeholders when the best interest of the child is not heeded, overlooked or ignored. Insights into how school children draw on technologically mediated interaction orders, while also renegotiating and partly breaking with them, is elucidated in Steffen **Eisentraut's** (2015) primarily methodological contribution. He studies how teenagers make sense of mobile phone interaction with their peers. While the technology itself co-creates the order of the interaction situations, their rules and expectations, this order is produced and reproduced by the teenagers themselves – as well as by the nominal researcher throughout his investigations.

Suorsa (2015a) also underlines the importance of focusing on the individual's personal conduct of everyday living, including that of the researcher – however in a solution-focused therapeutic setting. In order to more purposefully grasp the societal mediatedness of everyday life problems articulated in a therapeutic setting, should not only the client's *fabric of grounds* be analyzed and worked on, but also those of important others who are relevant for co-articulating and implementing alternative futures or utopias. Albeit the standpoint of the subject on its everyday living is still the immovable point of departure for any analysis, is therapy reconceptualized as a collective endeavor instead of a purely personal one. This can be related to **Kristensen's** (2015) critical discussion of dominating theories of health, which tend to individualize subjectivity and thereby the sufferings clients experience. This goes hand in hand with a conceptual separation of somatic and psychological afflictions. Both of these reductions compartmentalize health and divide it up instead of acknowledging the interwovenness of personal and societal problems, of somatic and psychological afflictions. The dominating understanding of subjectivity in health theories must be overcome in order to more meaningfully help suffering human beings.

Fabricating situated methodology: The way – and the fact – that we as researchers are part of the weave

The power relations and asymmetries that the contributions of this special issue come to investigate and write up against can – as mentioned several times already – not be regarded and studied as phenomena detached from the nominal researcher's everyday life, her-his subjectivity and life conduct. As **Holzkamp** (2013) underlines via an example from an experimental researcher's conduct of everyday life: How an experimental test-subject behaves or performs at a research lab depends on all those events or scenes that shape its everyday life, all that which the test subject experienced up to the experiment, throughout its previous life as well as the respective day of the experiment, throughout the experiment

in interaction with the lab workers, the social and material arrangement of the lab and what it means to the test subject, as well as the test subject's imaginations of what will be happening after the experiment, the rest of the week, the rest of its life. Similarly, the nominal researcher's conduct of everyday life, past, present and future scenes, are embodied in the test situation, interwoven with what s-he intends to discover. All this complexity, which is constitutive of human beings' subjectivity and everyday life, however, is systematically shut out from the methodology of such an experimental set-up.

This is a somewhat squared example based on experimental psychology, but two parallels to sociological structural analyses can be drawn: Firstly, the choice of method, be it an experiment, a survey, etc., largely precedes the question of what the subject matter in question actually is, as the researcher is to determine it beforehand via the study design; secondly and tightly related: everyday life as the subject matter in question cannot be structurally analyzed through positivist methodology, as there are too many aspects of human everyday life that elude the structuredness or pre-fabricatedness of everydayness – including the researcher's unintended human influence on the very same aspects of being human s-he embarks on exploring.

The humble acknowledgement of a researcher's own vulnerable situated interwovenness with everyday life within, across and beyond academic practice as necessary point of departure has most prominently been promoted by feminism and Science & Technology Studies (e.g., Haraway, 1991). It is also wonderfully argued for by social psychologist John Shotter (2015); among others strongly inspired by Wittgenstein as well as Barad's agential-realist approach (e.g., Barad, 2007). Shotter underlines that we as human beings are sociomaterially entangled with the flow of activity we seek to investigate and act upon, undoubtedly overlooking many relevant aspects of it, uncertain of what lies ahead, and yet, contradictorily, we are usually able to draw conclusions, judge and meaningfully act upon situations:

Buffeted by the wind and waves of the social weather around us we inhabit circumstances in which almost everything seems to merge into everything else; we do not and cannot observe this flow of activity as if from the outside. Indeed, it is too intimately interwoven in with all that we are and can do from within it for it to be lifted out and examined scientifically as an object — for after all, wherever we move, we will still find ourselves within one or another region of it. We are too immersed in it to be aware of its every aspect. We are thus continually uncertain as to what the situation is that faces us, and how we might act within it for the best.

Yet we are not often taken totally by surprise. We are aware that certain situations are more conducive to actions we desire than others; we know in some vague general sense that different surroundings 'call out from us' different kinds of activities. (Shotter, 2015, p. 62)

This poetic contradictoriness of human acting from within everyday life needs to also be methodologically acknowledged in research practice. Among other approaches, Shotter's work has been inspirational for *relational ethnography*, which departs from autoethnography and extends it towards engaging in reflexive dialogue from within research relationships (Simon, 2013). Other anthropological accounts that invite for reflexive exploration of one's interwovenness with everyday life can be found in the works of sociomaterial anthropologist Tim Ingold (e.g., Ingold, 2016), in the multimodal ethnographies of Sarah Pink (e.g., Pink, 2012), as well as in the critical ethnographic practice proposed by Jean Lave (e.g., Lave, 2012).

As mentioned was the opening of sociology and psychology to anthropological methodology significant for overcoming the primacy of positivist methods and focusing on how human beings actually act in everyday life. Erving Goffman's take on symbolic interactionism, for instance, was of crucial importance for the disciplinary opening of sociology and a more 'bottom-up' approach to exploring everyday life. **Eisentraut** (2015) draws on Goffman's *interaction order* concept and combines it with a grounded theory approach, as he is interested in uncovering the meanings teenagers and their peers draw on and create when interacting through and in relation to mobile phones. At the same time, Eisentraut underlines the necessity of further developing the concept, also so as to increase the researcher's awareness towards his-her own active involvement in creating the meaning s-he seeks to investigate, thereby calling for more reflexive approaches to investigating interaction orders.

Other contributions reflect this active involvement of the researcher in both research process and product, ergo its results. However, each contribution proposes a different take on how to turn this situatedness of the researcher into a productive asset of a transdisciplinary, qualitative study of the fabric of everyday life: **Guzzo, Moreira & Mezzalira** (2015) argue for a direct and explicit, institutionally supported involvement of psychological researchers in Brazilian schools. With inspiration from Ignacio Martín-Baró, Paulo Freire and Participatory Action Research, the authors implemented a developmental project that intervened in the school practice on behalf of children in difficulties. **Chimirri** (2015) on the other hand suggests that emancipation cannot be attained on behalf of someone, be it children or any other human being. Instead, theoretical concepts and research methodologies need to be developed that render a mutual inquiry process of problems (in his case related to technological artifacts) across age thresholds possible. The methodological proposal is that throughout this process, all involved co-researchers, children and adults, come to learn methods for dialogically engaging with one another in purposeful ways. These methods can be enacted by the co-researchers even after the nominal research project is terminated, thereby ensuring the sustainability of its outcomes.

In a similar vein, **Busch-Jensen** (2015) advocates for a *mobile ethnography* and a *hermeneutics of practice*, which understand conflicts as heuristics for studying how they connect and relate to underlying societal conditions and its openings. His proposition for situating practice research is to follow people, practices and problems, irrespective of where they take the nominal researcher. Albeit unfolding a more conceptual argument on subjectivity and health this time, **Kristensen** (2015) has done precisely what Busch-Jensen suggests: He followed homeless to the places that mattered to them, with an interest in what problems they pinpoint as relevant for their everyday life. His contribution on health builds on insights from these practice studies, concerned that issues of health are discussed on behalf of marginalized groups such as homeless, instead of together with them. Also **Suorsa's** (2015) approach to solution-focused therapy wants to follow the clients' problems to wherever they take the researcher as well as the therapeutic practitioner. Practitioners are exactly to learn that problems can never solely be tackled from within the therapeutic set-up, but point to and are interwoven with other contexts, practices, and people. The theoretical and methodological challenge lies here in relating subjective experiences to societally produced meaning structures and processes via clients' fabrics of grounds.

Finally, dissemination of everyday life research, its strategies for engaging in future dialogue with colleagues and other stakeholders, creates itself methodological challenges. Because even if researchers are aware of the processual-cyclical nature of everyday life, its infinitesimal movements and multiform activities, what they most commonly come to produce are texts that reinsert a linear and necessarily reductive logic into the fabric of everyday life. Arguably, this problem can (also) be tackled on the conceptual plane, further developing concepts such as the conduct of everyday life which are not prescriptive, but invite for processual-relational renegotiations of what comes to matter in everyday life. Another approach is presented by **Hybholt** (2015), who prototypes the presumably first visualization or diagram ever used in *Psychology from the Standpoint of the Subject* (on iconoclastic tendencies in subject-science, cf. Wieser & Slunecko, 2013, p. 453). This can be regarded as an invitation to multimodally engage with not only the research collaborators throughout one's study, but also afterwards via creative modes of dissemination and communication.

Conceptual outlines: Prototyping concepts and methods for studying the fabric of everyday life from within

The foundational intention of this special issue of *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies* has been to present research that makes it possible to meaningfully and purposefully study the fabric of everyday life from within its tightly knitted weaves of action. Albeit primarily grounded within practice psychology, it draws on and reaches across qualitatively working human and social sciences. Just like the concept *conduct of everyday life*, it is to invite fellow research collaborators and practitioners to situate their critical explorations in the interwovenness of everyday life itself. It invites to tie new knots, weave new weaves, acknowledging that these emerge from those weaves our very own everyday life is tied into.

Hence, the contributions of this special issue propose conceptual and methodological developments that may help in meaningfully investigating and reporting on the fabric from within, while aware of one's own epistemological limitedness as researcher as yet another participant of everyday life with a particular set of interests, experiences and feelings. But irrespective of the partiality and particularity that a situated approach entails, general weaves in movement can be identified and purposefully collaborated on in processual and relational ways. Some of the contributors suggest capturing weaving movements on a more conceptual level of argumentation, while others give more specific advice on how to empirically undergo such investigations.

Overall, the special issue at hand suggests ways to embark on research journeys that are sensitive to some of the common features of the investigations presented in this issue:

1. Openness to transdisciplinary approaches across the human and social sciences which conceptually situate the study of the sociomaterial fabric of everyday life within the very same practice that is constitutive of the everyday life it seeks to investigate. Conduct of everyday life can be understood as a conceptual prototype that invites for further dialogical explorations across nominal disciplines (psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc.) and fields of investigation (health studies, design studies, Science & Technology Studies, etc.).

2. Engagement in approaches that critically investigate the everydayness of everyday life and herewith the seemingly ubiquitous, all-encompassing and rationalizing structuredness or pre-fabricatedness of it.
3. Design of situated methods of inquiry which take its point of departure in the interwovenness of the nominal researcher with the subject matter s-he sets out to study, i.e. the researcher's own embeddedness in the fabric of everyday life. This includes acknowledging the situated partiality and particularity of doing research and the ensuing need to experiment with relational ethnographies and other longitudinal and dialogical approaches that take the affective, multimodal and collaborative dimensions of human everyday living seriously. Furthermore, such methodologies remain open for renegotiation with those others the nominal researchers come to collaborate with.

References

- Axel, E. (2011). Conflictual cooperation. *Nordic Psychology* 63(4), 56–78.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. London: Duke University Press.
- Barker, R. G., & Wright, H. F. (1951). *One boy's day: A specimen record of behavior*. Harper: University of California.
- Burkitt, I. (2004). The time and space of everyday life. *Cultural Studies*, 18(2-3), 211-227. doi: 10.1080/0950238042000201491
- Busch-Jensen, P. (2015). The production of power in organisational practice: Working with conflicts as heuristics. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 15-25.
- Chimirri, N. A. (2015). Designing Psychological Co-research of Emancipatory-Technical Relevance Across Age Thresholds. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 26-51.
- Chimirri, N. (2014). *Investigating media artifacts with children: Conceptualizing a collaborative exploration of the sociomaterial conduct of everyday life* (PhD thesis). Roskilde: Roskilde University.
- Curry, M. R. (2000). Wittgenstein and the fabric of everyday life. In M. Crang & N. Thrift (Eds.), *Thinking space* (pp. 89–113). London: Routledge.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dreier, O. (2008). *Psychotherapy in everyday life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dreier, O. (2011). Personality and the conduct of everyday life. *Nordic Psychology*, 63(2), 4–23.
- Eisentraut, S. (2015). Researching teenagers' (mobile) interaction orders: Methodical and methodological reflections on a challenging field. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 52-70.

- Elias, N. (1998). On the concept of everyday life (original work published in 1978). In J. Goudsblom & S. Mennell (Eds.), *The Norbert Elias reader* (pp. 166–174). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Guzzo, R. S. L., Moreira, A. P. G., & Mezzalana, A. S. C. (2015). Everyday life and public elementary school in Brazil: A critical psychological intervention model. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 71-87.
- Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Highmore, B. (Ed.) (2001). *The everyday life reader*. London: Routledge.
- Hodgetts, D., Drew, N., Sonn, C., Stolte, O., Nikora, L. W., & Curtis, C. (2010). *Social psychology and everyday life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoppe-Graff, S., & Kim, H.-O. (2007). Von William T. Preyer zu William Stern: Über die Durchführung und Nutzung von Tagebuchstudien in den Kindertagen der deutschen Entwicklungspsychologie. *Journal für Psychologie*, 15(2).
- Holzcamp, K. (1995). Alltägliche Lebensführung als subjektwissenschaftliches Grundkonzept. *Das Argument*, 212, 817–846.
- Holzcamp, K. (2013). Psychology: Social self-understanding on the reasons for action in the conduct of everyday life. In E. Schraube & U. Osterkamp (Eds.), *Psychology from the standpoint of the subject: Selected writings of Klaus Holzcamp* (pp. 233–341). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hybholt, L. (2015). Routines and concerns in conduct of everyday life. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 88-102.
- Højholt, C., Kristensen, K. A., & Schraube, E. (2013). *Psychology and the conduct of everyday life: Conference abstract booklet*. Roskilde: Roskilde University.
- Højholt, C., & Røn Larsen, M. (2015). Psychological perspectives on children's conduct of everyday life. *Nordic Psychology*, 67(3), 169–176. doi: 10.1080/19012276.2015.1062254
- Ingold, T. (2016). The maze and the labyrinth: Walking, imagining and the education of attention. In E. Schraube & C. Højholt (Eds.), *Psychology and the conduct of everyday life* (pp. 99–110). New York: Routledge.
- Jahoda, M., Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Zeisel, H. (1933). *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal: Ein soziographischer Versuch über die Wirkungen langandauernder Arbeitslosigkeit*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Jurczyk, K., Voß, G. G., & Wehrich, M. (2016). Conduct of everyday life in subject-oriented sociology: Concept and empirical research. In E. Schraube & C. Højholt (Eds.), *Psychology and the conduct of everyday life* (pp. 34–64). New York: Routledge.
- Kristensen, K. A. (2015): The conduct of life as an important concept in health psychology. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 103-125.

- Lagermann, L. C. (2015). Ethnic minority students in – or out of? – education: Processes of marginalization in and across school and other contexts. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 139-161.
- Lave, J. (2012). Changing practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 19(2), 156–171.
- Lefebvre, H. (1987). The everyday and everydayness (translated by Christine Levich). *Yale French Studies*, 73, 7–11.
- Lefebvre, H. (2014). *Critique of everyday life* (Vol. 1–3). London: Verso.
- May, G., & Gunther, H. (Eds.) (2015). *The life space of the urban child: Perspectives on Martha Muchow's classic study*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Mol, A. (2008). I eat an apple. *Subjectivity*, 22, 28–37.
- Neal, S., & Murji, K. (2015). Sociologies of everyday life: Editors' introduction to the special issue. *Sociology*, 49(5), 811–819.
- Pink, S. (2012). *Situating everyday life*. London: Sage.
- Schraube, E., & Højholt, C. (2016). *Psychology and the conduct of everyday life*. New York: Routledge.
- Shotter, J. (2015). On 'relational things:' A new realm of inquiry. Pre-understandings and performative understandings of people's meanings. In R. Garud, B. Simpson, A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The emergence of novelty in organizations* (pp. 56–79). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simon, G. (2013). Relational ethnography: Writing and reading in research relationships. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 14(1), Art. 4. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1735/3457> (date of access: Nov. 26, 2015).
- Silverstone, R. (2005). Introduction. In *ibid.* (Ed.), *Media, technology, and everyday life in Europe: From information to communication* (pp. 1–3). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Suorsa, T. (2015a). Solution-focused therapy and subject-scientific research into the personal conduct of everyday living. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 126-138.
- Suorsa, T. (2015b). Toward a psychology of everyday living. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2), 162-171.
- Stern, W. (1914). *Psychologie der frühen Kindheit bis zum sechsten Lebensjahre. Mit Benutzung ungedruckter Tagebücher von Clara Stern*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer.
- Weber, Max (1952). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Scribner.
- Wieser, M., & Slunecko, T. (2013). Images of the invisible: An account of iconic media in the history of psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, 23(4) 435–457.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1967). *Zettel* (translated by G. E. M. Anscombe & G. H. von Wright). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the organizers of the 2013 conference *Psychology and the Conduct of Everyday Life*, Charlotte Højholt, Kasper A. Kristensen and Ernst Schraube, for creating the wonderful opportunity to get sustainably inspired. Furthermore, we are very grateful to the peer reviewers of this special issue, without whose invaluable assistance this special issue would never have seen the light of day.

About the authors

Niklas A. Chimirri is assistant professor at Roskilde University's Department of People & Technology. His research centers on psychological, sociomaterial studies of technology, communication and design in everyday life. Currently he investigates young children's actions with technology and develops participatory approaches to qualitative inquiry across age groups.

Contact: Department of People & Technology, Roskilde University, Email: chimirri@ruc.dk

Jacob Klitmøller is assistant professor at the Department of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences at Aarhus University. His research areas are student experiences in education, teacher uses of instructional techniques and qualitative analysis.

Contact: Department of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences, Aarhus University, Email: jaklit@psy.au.dk

Pernille Hviid is associate professor at Copenhagen Center of Cultural Life Course Studies, Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen. Her research focuses on developmental processes; children's development and experiences of their lives and development in the educational and managerial practices, aiming at caring for and educating children.

Contact: Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen. Email: pernille.hviid@psy.ku.dk