Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra sociologie

Diplomová práce

Bc. Benjamin Petruželka

„Prodávání drog" v Praze a Frankfurtu:
zkoumání možností sekundárního, kvalitativního,
mezinárodního a mezijazykového výzkumu

"Drug handling" in Prague and Frankfurt: questioning the horizons
of secondary, qualitative, international, and interlingual research

Praha 2016   Vedoucí práce: doc. PhDr. Jiří Buriánek, CSc. Doc.

Poděkování / der Danksagung / Acknowledgements

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracoval(a) samostatně a výhradně s použitím citovaných pramenů, literatury a dalších odborných zdrojů.

V Praze, dne 1. srpna 2016

[vlastnoruční podpis]

…………………………..

Jméno a příjmení

Abstrakt (česky)

Tato magisterská práce má dva cíle. Prvním z nich je diskutovat srovnávací přístup k analýze, (znovu)užití kvalitativních dat a jejich kombinaci. Na tyto přístupy se zaměřuji, protože ty se v posledních letech staly podstatnou součástí metodologického diskurzu společenských věd. Druhým cílem této práce je uvést příklad srovnávacího přístupu k (znovu)užití kvalitativních dat, který by měl stimulovat rozvoj těchto přístupů, protože příklady (znovu)užívání dat nejsou časté. Využití těchto přístupů je demonstrováno na analýze srovnávající produkci členských kategorií "drogovými dealery" v Praze a ve Frankfurtu. Analýza odhalila podobnosti i rozdíly. Podobnost užití kategorií a jejich predikátů je založena v podobnosti konverzační situace (výzkumné interview) a v podobnosti sociální pozice respondentů (relativně vzdělaní, netrestaní). Mimo uvedeného podobné použití členských kategorií naznačuje to, že v obou případech je omnirelevantni kategorie drogový dealer relevantní a že je jí přisuzován podobný význam. Když respondenti používají kategorie, tak kategorizují určité prvky společenského života jako za hranicemi nebo jako neakceptovatelné (např. nemít práci, mít určitý typ výdělku). Tímto použitím členských kategorií se pokoušejí o udržení své identity jako právoplatných členů společnosti. Rozdíly v použití členských kategorií mohou být vysvětleny rozdílným společensko-kulturním vývojem obou míst. Ve Frankfurtu respondenti jinak kategorizují jednotlivé drogy, používají lokální členské znalosti a predikáty, jako je schopnost mluvit domácím jazykem či slovo "Kanake", které označuje jedince s tureckým migračním původem.

Tato diplomová práce je rozdělena do čtyř částí. První část je zaměřena na vybrané aspekty srovnávacího přístupu a (znovu)užití kvalitativních dat. Druhá část popisuje použití těchto přístupů na konkrétním výzkumném procesu, na jeho problémech a jeho řešeních. Třetí část je zaměřena především na prezentaci výsledků analýzy. V závěrečné části diskutuji svou zkušenost s komparativním přístupem k (znovu)použití kvalitativních dat a ohledávám horizonty tohoto přístupu.

Abstract (in English):

This master thesis has two major purposes. First purpose of this master thesis is to discuss qualitative and comparative approach to analysis, qualitative data (re)use, and their combination because, in recent years, these approaches have become increasingly important in the discourse of social sciences being related to the contemporary methodological discussions. The other purpose of this master thesis is to introduce the example of comparative (re)use of qualitative data because data (re)use is rather low and the example of this approach will contribute to its development. I discuss the application of this combination on the example of the membership categorization analysis that was focused on the comparison of member categories use by "drug dealers" in Prague and Frankfurt. The analysis revealed similarities as well as differences in the local production of member categories. The similar use of member categories and their predicates is based in the similar occasion (research interview) and in the similar social situation of interviewees (educated, not penalized). Furthermore, the similar use of categories suggests that, in both cases, the omnirelevant member category of drug dealer is relevant and have similar meanings. In order to sustain their identity as a legitimate members of society, interviewees resist to be members of category dealer in the MCD of "deviants". To do that, interviewees categorize certain aspects of social life as out of the borders and as unacceptable (for example not having a job, having profit). The differences between uses of member categories might be attributed to different socio-cultural development of both places. In Frankfurt, interviewees categorize drugs differently, use local member knowledge, use predicates such as ability to speak the language and "Kanake" for the individuals with non-German origin, more specifically, of Turkish descent.

This master thesis is divided into four main sections. First section discusses the selected aspects of comparative approach and qualitative data (re)use. The second section of this master thesis moves on from the general description of these approaches to their application. To describe the application of these approaches, the research process of my investigation is discussed. Specifically, I discuss the problems that I encountered and the solution that I used to address them. Third section presents the results of the comparative approach to analysis. In the last concluding section, questioning the horizons of this approach, I discuss my experience with the comparative approach to qualitative data (re)use.

Klíčová slova (česky)

Dealer; drogové trhy; užívání drog; srovnávací analýza; sekundární kvalitativní analýza; znovuužití dat; členská kategorizační analýza; Praha; Frankfurt; Česká republika; Německo.

Klíčová slova (anglicky):

Dealer; drug markets; drug use; comparative analysis; secondary qualitative analysis; data use (reuse); member categorisation analysis; Prague; Frankfurt; Czech Republic; Germany.

OBSAH

1 Introduction

The purpose of this master thesis is to introduce the comparative approach to analysis, qualitative data (re)use, and their combination because these approaches have become increasingly important in the scientific community being related to the contemporary discussions in social science methodology. Prominently, the qualitative data (re)use is hotly discussed. These methodological discussions are focused on issues such as how to investigate the phenomena in global and the interconnected world (see the first chapter),[1] how to archive and share scientific results using modern technologies (see the second chapter). Furthermore, the quali-quanti divide discussion (see Bryman 2015), which pertains to the basic division in social sciences, and the discussion about ethnomethodological inputs for the research interviews (see Roulston 2006 for the overview) which questions the nature of the data, is related to these approaches. These current methodological discussions are important not only because of their value to the development of social science methodology but also because they are part of the attempt to answer the challenges that presents a contemporary interconnected world. The other purpose of this master thesis is to describe the example of comparative (re)use of qualitative data because data (re)use is rather low and the example of this approach will contribute to its development. In the Czech academic community, the qualitative data (re)use and data archiving is even lower than in other countries. It is apparent on the MEDARD archive that consist of 12 data sets (Nesstar 2016). The actual data re(use) is also low.[2] I discuss the application of this combination on the example of the member categorisation analysis which was focused on the analysis and comparison of use of member categories by "drug dealers" in Prague and Frankfurt.

The core of this master thesis was written during my one year stay at Goethe University in Frankfurt, which was supported by Deutsch-Tschechischer Zukunftsfonds. I was awarded with this scholarship to carry out the project that was along with other issues focused on the comparison of drug markets. Thus, this master thesis is result of a situation when I was confronted with two data sets of interviews with the task to compare them. One data set is the result of the work of the research team which is located at Centre for Drug Research (CDR) at Goethe University Frankfurt. Analyzing the other data set which was gathered for my bachelor thesis I expound on my previous work.

---

[1] For the seminal work which made this issue relevant in Ethnography see Marcus (1986).

[2] I base this fact on on the email conversation with MEDARD staff and on the webpage of MEDARD (2016).

This master thesis is divided into four main sections. First section discusses the selected aspects of comparative approach and qualitative data (re)use. I do not make a comprehensive review of these discussions because it is beyond the scope of this master thesis. Furthermore, I do not discuss the theories of social deviances and of "drug dealing" because it is not purpose of this master thesis. Instead, I focus on the theoretical and methodological aspects of comparative (re)use of qualitative data that were relevant for my own research and that are the most significant in these discussions. The second section of this master thesis moves on from the general description of these approaches to their specification application. To do this, the research process of my investigation is described. Specifically, I discuss the problems that I encountered and the solution that I used to address them. Third section presents the results of the comparative approach to analysis. In the last concluding section, I discuss my experience with the comparative approach to qualitative data (re)use and I question the horizons of this approach.

2 International comparative research

In this chapter, I introduce and discuss the issues of international comparative research in social sciences, focusing prominently on the issues significant for the development of my research. Firstly, I offer a brief excursion into the history of this approach, introducing its social organization. In the next section, I discuss the problematic definition of this approach. To conclude, I evaluate pitfalls and benefits of this approach.

2.1 Brief excursion into the history of comparative approach in social sciences

To introduce the topic, I briefly describe the historical development of comparative approach. Regarding early development, John Stuart Mill is considered to be the founding father of the comparative method (see Hantrais 2008). At the end of 19th century, his approach was critiqued and developed by Durkheim (for extended discussion see Hantrais 2008). Generally, the forefathers of sociology considered comparison as a vital component of sociology; however, later on, this emphasis had been understated (see Hantrais 2008; Rokkan 1964 in Kohn 1987). In second half of 20th century, the importance of Mills' work is evident of his influence on the field of comparative social science. His work was further developed and discussed by Lijphart (1971), Ragin (2014), and Lieberson (1991). The advent and comeback of comparative approach in the second half of the century is attributed to the social change: advancing globalization, development of global institutions, and technical development (Hantrais 2008). To face advancing globalization, researchers

are forced to develop and use distinctive methodological approaches (Spector et al 2015; Hantrais 2008). While considering the development of global institutions, the establishment of the UN, WHO, and EU stimulated the development of international analysis because these institutions supported and demanded international analysis and indicators. The development of communication and informational technologies, which has extended a potential to collect, archive, communicate and analyze data, has also stimulated a rapid development of comparative analysis. However, Oyen (1990) criticizes that the comparative research has not been able to catch up with the development.

In Europe, the development of comparative research was stimulated by two institutional arrangements: the gradual development of European Union and the division of Europe between Western capitalistic countries and Eastern communistic countries. The latter institutional arrangement was coupled with the tendency to compare both systems (see Hantrais 2008, Kohn 1987) which has, to some degree, continued even after the disintegration of the Eastern bloc. Considering the former arrangement, European institutions stimulated research in the area of policy learning and policy transfer because of their stakes in policy production (Hantrais 2008). The European institutions have been opening calls for researchers, firstly, to stimulate international activity and cooperation, and secondly, to provide the knowledge base for EU policies (see Hantrais 2008). The development of comparative analysis within EU was further stimulated by the enlargement of the European Union towards "Eastern countries". The technocratic impetus for the development of international comparative research might lead to the dominance of policy oriented research. This dominance is apparent from the example of Crossnational research papers series, which was focused almost exclusively on policy oriented research.[3] Furthermore, the relative lack of qualitative comparative studies (Mangen 1999) might be attributed to this technocratic tendency. Similarly, Savage and Burrows (2009) argue that the EU gives priority to the research focused on the use of survey data, which attributes the differences to the national context, omitting within-country variance and transnational influences.

2.2 The definition of international comparative research

The initial point for the discussion of the definition of the international comparative research is its problematic state. There are multiple labels and competing definitions of

---

3 The overview of this series is available here: http://www.xnat.org.uk/.

comparative research with international dimension. At this point, I define this approach provisionally by the common use of it. Using the different labels and definitions, researchers usually denote a specific approach which is based in the comparison of large macrosocial units (Ragin 2014). This field of study is poorly organized because researchers from different disciplines and different parts of the world with different approaches and traditions are involved in it (Hantrais 2008). Furthermore, the definition of international comparative research is problematic because the introduction of international and comparative aspect into research design intensifies basic research problems and complicates the entire research process.

In the first part of this section, I introduce the most common labels associated with international comparative research, stressing out the problematic nature of the definition. In the second part, I discuss the problems underlying the definition of international comparative analysis. To conclude, I answer the question what the defining aspects of international comparative research are.

2.2.1 Multiple labels linked with international comparative research

To highlight the confusion in the field, I introduce a few of the most common labels of international comparative research. These labels are used to signal the characteristics of a given approach to comparison and its allegiance to a certain tradition or paradigm. Characteristically, these labels consist of two segments, for example "crossnational". The first part of the label (prefix) signals the approach to comparison while the second part of the label refers to the unit of analysis.

First part of the label usually consists of three prefixes: "cross", "inter", and "trans" (Hantrais 2008). According to Hantrais (2008), there are two basic differences between the use of "cross"and "inter". The first difference is in regard to the tradition of use – the "inter" prefix is preferred in Europe while "cross" is more common over the Atlantic Ocean. The other difference lies in the approach to comparison. The use of "cross" was criticized by the proponents of "inter" because it implies functional equivalence between phenomena whereas "inter" brings in the notion of context.

This criticism is, however, no longer valid because the contemporary approaches acknowledge the significance of context (Hantrais 2008). Use of the "trans" prefix is not as frequent as the other prefixes. It signals a focus on interdependencies and the aspects transcending national states (Hantrais 2008). Similarly, Kohn (1987, 715) defines

transnational studies as treating "the nations as components of larger international systems".[4]

There are two basic options of the second part of the label, i. e. nation and culture, because these two are frequently contrasted (Hantrais 2008; Kohn 1987). Hantrais (2008) attributes one aspect of their difference to the affiliation with discipline. Sociological and political research is based in the national perspective while psychological and anthropological research in the cultural perspective. These two labels also refer to different unit of analysis. The suitability of the unit for the purpose of comparison is a basis of the discussion. Hantrais (2008) evaluates the concept of culture as too particularistic (highlighting idiosyncrasy) and, consequently, as not fit for comparison.[5] Furthermore, the concept of culture is regarded as "too wide" (Kohn 1987) or as "slippery" (Hantrais 2008). In contrast to culture, the national state is considered to constitute institutionally delimited unit (Teune 1990 in Hantrais 2008). However, it is questionable whether the national state is a suitable unit for comparison. Firstly, it is difficult to compare national states because they have different structures (different degree of state segments autonomy). Secondly, the social life does not respect the state boundaries. Thus, using national unit, the within-state variance is underplayed. Responding to the latter critique of national perspective, Hantrais (2008) argues that this critique was taken into account.[6] According to Hantrais (2008, 4), "the term 'cross national comparative', research is [...] understood to mean comparison across legally delimited and administratively implemented national boundaries, recognizing that different countries, societies or cultures are contained within increasingly fluid border". However, this definition raises two questions: How is this approach applied in practice and why the notion of culture that was refused as slippery is used to define international comparative research?

2.2.2 Issue underlying the definition of international comparative analysis

The basic problem underlying the definition of international comparative research, especially the qualitative one, is based in the under-conceptualization of the qualitative research process. To investigate this problem, I discuss Hantrais' (2008) definition: "*Intention of using the same research tools to compare systematically the manifestations of*

---

[4] The prominent example of this kind of analysis is theory of world system, see Wallerstein (2011).

[5] Hantrais (2008) evaluates this concept as a part of anthropological and ethnographical approaches.

[6] To define this approach to the matter, Hantrais offers Galtungs conceptualization of this issue, distinguishing two meanings of nation: political entity in terrotorial space; sociocultural entity in non-territorial space, characterized by a shared culture.

phenomena in more than one temporal or spatial sociocultural settings." This definition consists of four key aspects:

1) Intention,
2) same research tool,
3) systematic comparison,
4) manifestation of phenomena in more than one temporal or spatial sociocultural settings.

In the next parts of this section, I discuss prominently the second and the fourth aspect of the definition because these aspects are under-conceptualized in relation to qualitative research process.

2.2.2.1 Comparative study or a case study?

To introduce the basic problem of this definition, I present these statements:

"Comparative sociology is not particular branch of sociology; it is sociology itself, in so far as it ceases to be purely descriptive and aspires to account for facts." (Durkheim 1938, 139 in Hantrais 2008, 26)

"Virtually all empirical social research involves comparison of some sort." (Ragin 2014)

"Virtually every social scientific study is a case study or can be conceived as a case study, often from the variety of viewpoints. " (Ragin & Becker 1992)

These statements seem to be contradictory. On the one hand, comparison is considered as an integral part of social science, but, on the other hand, all social science studies are regarded as case studies. However, this seeming contradiction can be easily resolved because, in practice, social scientific study has a comparative and a descriptive/case study aspect depending on the stage of research process and on the perspective taken. For example, national surveys could be considered as a case study of a particular country or as a comparative study of individuals. This seeming contradiction partially stems from the descriptions of the research process as a non-problematic execution of an ahead-planned research design which is carried out in neat subsequent, discrete and homogenous stages. In this perspective, the researcher should use one approach (the same methodological and conceptual tools) which was chosen in the beginning during the whole research. On the contrary, especially, qualitative comparative research is messy. Researchers move back and forth between different stages of research, abandoning particular lines of research (See Hammersley 1997). For example, the

researcher may choose to apply different methodological tools than he expected to use for data analysis. To conclude, the major problem of this comparative research definition is its static nature. Hantrais (2008) assumes that the "same research tools" are used throughout the whole research process.

2.2.2.2 What is the case?

The question "What is the case?" is more troubling for comparative researchers because they move beyond boundaries of one case to study *"phenomena in more than one temporal or spatial sociocultural settings"* (Hantrais 2008). Comparing the cases, researchers are forced to carefully conceptualize the cases in order to establish equivalence between the cases in different settings. Contrary to the expectation, the concept of case is frequently "taken-for-granted". It is neither used coherently nor defined adequately (Ragin & Becker 1992). "It is used to refer to data categories, theoretical categories, historically specific categories, substantive categories, and so on. " (Ragin & Becker 1992) The problem is that different categories are conflated. For example, the theoretical category may be conflated with the unit of analysis or the observational unit is conflated with the analytical (explanatory) unit (see Ragin 2014).

The challenge is not only to conceptualize the case at the level of different categories but also to do it coherently. This process of building a bridge between different categories is inevitably dynamic and, thus, conceptualization of the case could change during the research. For example, qualitative researcher may start the investigation having national state as the unit of analysis, but, later on, it is replaced by a specific process or institution (Ragin & Becker 1992). This process of case reconceptualization is called casing (Ragin & Becker 1992; Ragin 2004). It is characterized by the interplay of different categories, strategically applied by researchers. The interplay of different categories is essential for the successful application of qualitative comparative analysis. Omitting the dynamic aspect of a research process, a vital aspect of qualitative research – building a bridge between theoretical and empirical aspect of research – is not explicitly taken into account and, thus, it is not adequately worked out. In result, it hinders the primary goal of qualitative research – theory development.

To conclude, the answer to the question "What the case?," is what was not provided by collective efforts of group organized by Ragin and Becker (1992). However, they demonstrated that it is imperative to ask this question during the course of the research. To answer this question, according to Ragin and Becker (1992), it is crucial to do the casing.

Taking this dynamic aspect into account, I argue that the researcher understanding of *"phenomena in more than one temporal or spatial sociocultural settings"* could change as the result of casing.

2.2.3   Definition of international comparative research

Defining the decisive moment which warrants to the study label international comparative research, I am in consent with the definition by intention. I, however, prefer to use the term "analytical strategy" which points out the fact that the intention is systematically and analytically applied. The rationale is that the comparativeness does not lie in analyzing data from at least two settings or in the use of the same research tools but in the intention to explain some aspects of the phenomena, attributing them to macro social phenomena (Ragin 2014). The centrality of the strategy of explanation is illustrated by the example of one research that uses the international comparative research label to describe different settings but does not convey any comparison in the publication (see Hantrais 2008).[7] Similarly, Kohn (1987) distinguishes between general approach (investigation going beyond national boundaries) and specific approach (systematically comparing data), preferring to save the international comparative research label for the latter. To conclude, in agreement with Hantrais (2008), I argue that there is no comparative method per se but rather there is a comparative approach. I define this approach as characterized by the analytical strategy, explaining (non)variance in more than one setting.

2.3   The promises and perils of international comparative research

In the last section of this chapter, I discuss the benefits and pitfalls of the international comparative research with a focus on qualitative research. First of all, I deal with the basic pitfall of comparative analysis. It is the challenge to establish equivalence between cases. To conclude, I discuss the problems and benefits that stem out of the necessity to move between general and specific

2.3.1   Comparing like-with-like?

Basic pitfall of comparison is to establish equivalence between cases (Hantrais 2008). However, it is important to note that full equivalence is only an ideal. It is only approximated because the comparative researcher does not compare like-with-like due to

---

[7] The example of this approach are studies where there are only placed chapters on the same topic from different countries while there is no systematic attempt to compare them (Hantrais 2008).

the fact that overall system and concepts are not entirely equivalent in different contexts (Lisle 1985). The researcher begins with the idea that phenomena in both settings "may parallel each other sufficiently" (Ragin 2004, 2) This assumption is tested and the researcher could decide during the process of casing to drop cases or category of cases, find new cases or to broaden the scope of guiding concept (Ragin 2004). To conclude, it is more appropriate to describe the process of achieving equivalence as a search for the point of intersection between empirical categories and a guiding concept. In the next part, I focus on two main pitfalls of this process and on different solutions to address them.

First, I discuss the pitfall of conceptual equivalence. The challenge is to find a concept that fits to different contexts. To achieve this fit, it is vital to use the concepts that travel well throughout the contexts. However, it is important to find a suitable level of generalization for concepts: to not climb too high and to not stay too low on the "ladder of generalization" (Sartori 1970). Furthermore, to fit the concept to context, it is advised to find relations between concept and broader socioeconomic and political context because, in the contemporary international comparative research, context is regarded as key to establish conceptual equivalence and because it helps to reduce complexity (Hantrais 2008). The requirement to do this, particularly for a qualitative researcher, is to acquire linguistic and cultural competencies (Mangen 1999). The last "trick" to make this process more manageable is to limit a study to smaller and more homogenous areas (see Dogan & Pelassy 1990).[8]

Another problem is to achieve equivalence of empirical categories from different settings. The empirical categories are based in the data set, which is a result of data production. The basic problem of data production is sampling and data collection. First of all, I briefly focus on the linguistic problem because it comes up intensively during the preparatory stage and the data collection stage, which are both characterized by heightened communication between different settings and actors. The main linguistic challenge, which is the variation of the basic problem to establish equivalence between different settings, is translation. Mangen (1999) considers this problem as almost insurmountable because language is a particular style of discourse. However, using different strategies, researchers regularly manage to deal with this problem (see Hantrais 2008; Mangen 1999). The linguistic problem is also central to the data collection because questions are frequently

---

[8] "That's what a trick is—a simple device that helps you solve a problem (in this case, the device of looking for the network in which definitions arise and are used). Every trade has its tricks, its solutions to its own distinctive problems, easy ways of doing something lay people have a lot of trouble with." (Becker 2008)

used to gather the data. Using open ended questions, foreign interweaver, who does not have cultural and language competences, is susceptible to misunderstandings. Interweaver can offend respondent, create halo effect, and omit important questions (Mangen 1999).[9] The problem of translation also comes up when the gathered empirical material is transformed – transcribed (Cameron 2003) – into the research protocol. The other problem of data production is that samples are unlikely comparable in all aspects (Spector et al 2015). Plausibly, the differences between samples are the results of sampling. The problem is that differences between samples hinder comparison because it is easier to generalize on the basis of homogenous population (Brannen & Nilsen 2011). Significantly, this problem is central to small scale qualitative crossnational research (Mangen 1999). To achieve sample homogeneity, the solution is typological sampling. However, this procedure has a caveat – similarity may hinder interesting variance (Manning 1993 in Mangen 1999).

The equivalence of empirical and conceptual categories and their intersection is significant because it conditions the data analysis and interpretation. The concept that fits to different contexts is needed to analyze and interpret data. In addition to that, this concept must fit with empirical categories. Also the empirical categories in both settings ought to be equivalent. Furthermore, data collection equivalence is critical for the interpretation because discovered variance between cases could be attributed to differences in data collection (Kohn 1987; Spector et al 2015). The more equivalent the data sets collection is, the more we can assume that the differences are not artificial. Considering the similarities, it is less tricky to interpret them because it is unlikely that they are produced by methodological differences (see Kohn 1987).

2.3.2 Between general and specific

In the last part of this chapter, I focus on the already mentioned pitfall which is the necessity to move between general and specific. To conclude, I discuss what profit could be gained from the interaction between general and specific.

The problem is to grasp each phenomena in their detail to localize them and to establish general properties in a variable social context in order to compare them. The first pitfall is the requirement to have the specific knowledge which is necessary to grasp the specifity of each case. In addition to that, as already discussed, the researcher ought to

---

[9] Using the structured close-ended question, the main issue is to translate the question with regard to linguistic as well as functional equivalence.

gather empirical material which has the potential to be generalized and, at the same time, to keep the information about specific case. On the top of that the problem, is to link all different levels of analysis (Brannen & Nilsen 2011) because operating on the different levels "seems to raise more interpretive problems than it solves" (Kohn 1987, 713). The main challenge is to acquire specific knowledge because it is costly in terms of time and money (Kohn 1987). Especially arduous is to take into account historical, social, and cultural specifities. This problem is prominent for qualitatively oriented researchers because focus on the detail is one of the founding stones of qualitative research. The researcher has to encapsulate a thorough understanding of two settings, which does not mean only to describe "idiographic intimacy and fine detail" (Troman & Jeffrey 2007), but also to understand the other setting, to "get inside the skin" (Cameron 2003). However, the challenge to avoid the "danger of culturally bound misinterpretation and interpretation" (Grootings 1986 in Hantrais 2008) is also valid for quantitatively oriented researchers. It is apparent from the examples of crosssection survey design and analysis, which is done without the knowledge of local context.[10]

Overcoming the sketched pitfalls, comparative research offers many promises. These are based in the fact that researcher is pushed to take into account other settings than his or her domestic one. Firstly, it stimulates the researcher to develop international contacts (Hantrais 2008). Secondly, it stimulates the researcher's thought process. The incentives are differences and contrasts between settings. Researchers attempting to understand the differences or non-differences are forced to move between specifity and universality: *"Broad and diverse environment forces the researcher towards generalizations and to focus more on explanation then description."* (Dogan & Pelassy 1990). Comparing different cases, instead of system-specific explanations, universal explanations are sought (Grimshaw in Hantrais 2008). In turn, these universal explanations are checked by specific modalities. For example, the bogey man of "ethnocentrism" is hoped to be scared away (Dogan & Pelassy 1990; Hantrais 2008), because the researcher learns about the importance or non-importance of national state (Kohn 1987). Furthermore,

---

[10] First case shows the problem of research design and the neccessity to know forms of local drug use (what kind of drug are used and how to call them). In Eurobrarometr 233 (2008), there was no question about metamfetamin, which is one of the most prevalent drugs in Czech. Thus, the possibility to compare Czech situation with any other country was effectively thwarted. The study of Olszewski et al (2010) shows the problem of data interpretation in international context. Olszewski et al (2010 are not able to interpret their results because they do not posses specific konwledge. Czech republic is placed within the cluster of countries with long drug histories while the Olszewski et al (2001) are surprised with that and not able to interpret that because they do not acknowledge long history of drug use in Czech republic.

qualitative comparative researchers are forced to pay attention to complexity, detail, and context, challenging "culture of fragmentation" (Coffey & Atkinson 1996 in Mangen 1999). To conclude, similar reviews of benefits by Hantrais (2008) and Gilbert (2015) make apparent that the agreement on them is wide. Both of them cite Landmann (2008, xviii) summarizing sentence: "Systemic comparative case studies within and across disciplines can be used, inductively or deductively, as an instrument to generate, interrogate or support hypothesis and theory".

3 Qualitative data (re)use and archiving

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I focus on the contemporary discussion about (re)use and archiving of qualitative data. First, I briefly introduce the development of this discussion, which is characterized by different positions taken towards the issue. In the second part of this chapter, I discuss Heaton's (2004) definition of secondary analysis, which is significant because it provided reference point for other members of the debate and because it touches crucial question: what is the qualitative data (re)use? To conclude, I discuss main pitfalls and promises of qualitative data (re)use.

3.2 Contemporary debate about (re)use and archiving of qualitative data

The formation of the debate is located in the United Kingdom of Britain and it is attributed to the events of the early 1990s (see Heaton 2004; Mauthner & Parry 2009). The most important event was the establishment of the Qualitative Data Archival Resource Centre, which have not only informed but also promoted qualitative data archiving (Moore 2006). Later on, this development was coupled with Economic and Social Research Council Datasets Policy. This policy demanded researchers who were granted with ESRC funding to archive data in the central archive (Parry & Mauthner 2005). These demands have been met by qualitative researchers with "mixed reactions" (Mauthner & Parry 2009, 290). Consequently, the different standpoints stimulated the debate about possibilities of data (re)use (Hammersley 2010; Corti 2006). These events led to the development of the literature body, model for data archiving (Corti 2006), and to the growth of the number of archived datasets (Parry & Mauthner 2005). However, sharing and reusing of other researchers data has been low (Heaton 2004; Henwood and Lang 2005; Thompson 2000; Mauthner and Parry 2009).

The "mixed reactions" towards (re)use of qualitative data are explained differently. In this section, I divide these explanation into basic categories. One category of these explanations is based in the assumption that researchers perceive differently based their relation to the data. In the first perspective, some researchers are reluctant to provide their material because they do not want to expose their research process in full (Bishop 2007) or because they consider research material as their intellectual property (Broom et al 2009). These reservations towards the archiving of data are complemented with the opposite point of view. In this perspective, the research material is a matter of public property (see Broom et al 2009). It is apparent that a point of contention is the authorship towards data. The concept of authorship brings in the question of power, ownership – claiming the right towards the material – or prestige (see Foucault 1994 and Barthes 2006). It suggests that the power struggle over the research material is one source of the "mixed reactions". Another category of these explanations is based in the notion of conflict. Slavnic (2013) explains the "mixed reactions" as the result of political and ideological clash: "mixed reactions" arise because the archiving policy was imposed on researchers and qualitative researchers feel that their academic freedoms are threatened by another attempt to control them by non-academic institutions with non-academic values. The other conflicting explanation of these "mixed reactions" is based in the notion of paradigmatic conflict. In this perspective, some qualitative researchers disapprove the transfer of epistemological considerations from quantitative paradigm (see Mauthner and Parry 2009). According to Mauthner and Parry (2009), this transfer is a consequence of the qualitative data archiving institutions affiliation to international data preservation and sharing movement, which is based in quantitative epistemological assumptions and practices, namely in foundationalism.[11] However, there is no broad agreement in the fact that (re)use and archiving of qualitative data is based in the quantitative paradigm (see Moore 2007). On the contrary, according to Moore (2007), Mauthner's et al (1998) approach is covertly positivist because it is based on the assumption that data is "out there". In turn, Mauthner and Parry (2009) label Moore's (2007) account as covertly foundationalist. The locus of wider disagreement, which is exemplified by dispute of Moore (2007) and Mauthner (see Mauthner 1998; Mauthner and Parry 2009), is based in different standpoints. Mauthner's (ibid.) standpoint is that the division between qualitative and quantitative approach is

---

[11] According to Mauthner and Parry (2009), foundationalists regard data are separable from subjectivities generating them.

insurmountable.[12] From this standpoint, qualitative data are regarded as "socially constructed through interpersonal relations between researcher and respondents" (Slavnic 2013, 2) while quantitative data is considered to be separated from these relations. However, in accordance with Moore (2007), I find the argument compelling that all data are in certain aspects naturalistic and interactional. Furthermore, the quali-quanti divide is questioned and discussed in contemporary discourse (for the overview of the issue, see Bryman (2015). Last category of explanations is based in the different evaluation of the cost-benefits. For example, in the hindsight, researchers evaluate promoted advantages of data re-use (cost and benefits of (re)use, actual use of the datasets) as not delivered (Parry and Mauthner 2005).

3.3   *Secondary qualitative analysis or data (re)use?*

In this section, I focus on one aspect of the discussion about qualitative data archiving and (re)use, which is the quarrel about the label secondary qualitative analysis. There are advocates and critics of this label: Heaton (2004) and Hammersley (2010) then Moore (2007), respectively. This quarrel is significant because it touches the crucial question what distinguishes secondary analysis. In addition to that, it reveals other points of contention and disagreement. To address this quarrel, I discuss features of Heaton's (2004) definition:[13]

"Secondary analysis is a research strategy which makes use of pre-existing qualitative data or pre-existing research data for the purposes of investigating new question or verifying previous studies." (Heaton 2004, 16)

First of all, I put under scrutiny the notion of "pre-existing research data" because it is the central and problematic element of this definition. The problem is that the notion of "pre-existing data" is "taken for granted", and, consequently, it is not sufficiently defined. This under-conceptualization reinforcesthe problematic distinction between "primary use of data" and return to the "pre-existing" data. This problem is brought up by Moore (2007) who points out that the data is not "out there" completed at one moment but that data is co-constructed in the course of research process in the complex relationship between the material and the researcher. Thus, re-using the data is re-contextualization and

---

[12] This position is also represented in the discourse of qualitative researchers, for example see Flick et al (2008).

[13] This definition is significant because it was included in the Heatons (2004) monography which was the first one about (re)use of qualitative data.

reconstruction of the data rather than the analysis of "pre-existing" data. Pointing out that data are constructed solves otherwise puzzling question, what is the moment when the (re)turn to the data constitutes secondary analysis, with the answer that it is always reconstruction. However, according to Hammersley (2010), to regard data as co-constructed is another under conceptualization because it is plausible to assume that data are "out there" in the form we all can relate to. In this sense, it is useful to note that data are "objective" but the data are also co-constructed when they are turned into evidence by the researcher who infers on their bases and who relates to them. To conclude, taking position of critical realist, I assume that data are "out there" as well as constructed during the analysis. However, the notion of "pre-existing" data is not useful for definition of secondary analysis because data always "exist" before analysis for "primary" as well as "secondary" analysis.

Other way to define the secondary analysis is by the purpose for which the data are used. Namely, it is defined by other purposes than the former ones (Heaton 2004). In the above cited definition, these other purposes are specified as investigation of a new question or verification of a previous one. The problem of this definition is an assumption that the "pre-existing data" are used exclusively for other purposes than the ones that were precisely defined in advance. To be a "primary analyst", the researcher is not allowed to diverge from the plan. The problem is that this aspect of definition is not compatible with conceptualization of qualitative research process for which it is typical to move back and forth between data and research questions, modifying the latter (Bishop 2007).

In this paragraph, I focus on other aspect of definition that is also brought up by Heaton (2004) but which is not explicitly mentioned in the citation. Heaton (2004, 13) cites different definitions of quantitative secondary analysis, which contain similar aspects. The secondary analysis is distinguished from other analytical procedures by personal arrangement: the researcher who produced the data does not analyze them. However, this distinction is problematic in contemporary socio-technical organization of science because the research teams are common arrangements in "primary" research.[14] Basically, the researchers deal with data collected by others (Hammersley 2010). It is even acknowledged by Heaton (1998 in Heaton 2004, 64): "Indeed, primary researchers working in teams arguably face similar issues of interpretation to secondary analysts in terms of having to make sense of data that were collected by other team members." To

---

[14] The issue of research teams is discussed by Mauthner& Doucet (2008).

conclude, on one hand, authorship is important for the evaluation of academic work, but, on the other hand, in a contemporary setting, it is plausible to doubt that authorship of data could base the definition of secondary analysis.

To summarize, there is no sufficient definition of qualitative secondary analysis. Even proponents of this definition, note that secondary analysis is a nebulous concept and that "distinctions are not always clear cut" (Heaton 2004). To provide such a definition, first of all, it would be necessary to offer a lacking definition of primary analysis. However, instead of this, it is much more useful to note that there is no absolutely clear dividing line (Hammersley 2010, Broom et al (2009) between "primary" and "secondary" analysis. Taking this into account, it is productive to apply Moore's (2007) notion of data (re)use. In this perspective, the (re)use of data takes different forms which differ accordingly to the specific research organization and situation. Plausibly, these different forms of data (re)use potentially suffer the similar problems in different degree. The degree of the problems that researchers encounter is the function of the specific procedure and context. For example, Fielding (2004) notes that all qualitative data are incomplete. However, understandably, some data are more incomplete than others. Ceteris paribus, reusing the data while not being involved in their production is the situation when the problem of incomplete data comes up with highest intensity. To offer the future path, it would be useful to focus on different modes of research in specific settings rather than try to produce such an artificial typology. This would require researchers to (re)use qualitative data and report about it.

3.4   The promises and pitfalls of qualitative data (re)use

3.4.1   Introduction

In the last section of this chapter, I illustrate the benefits and pitfalls of qualitative data (re)use. In the first part of this section, I examine two basic shortcomings that are also central issues of data (re)use discussion (see Hammersley 2010). This is an issue of context and of data fit. Furthermore, the issue of ethic and confidentiality is one topic of this discussion but I do not go into the detail because my analysis is in-line with the basic ethical principles. For the discussion of basic ethical principles in the case of data (re)use see Bishop (2009). In the last part of this section, I discuss the benefits of data (re)use. To provide the context of the discussion about date (re)use benefits, I briefly introduce on the example of European Commission (2012) and OECD (2007) papers how the advantages of

data sharing are envisioned in the broader data policy movement. To conclude, I present the potential benefits of qualitative data (re)use.

3.4.2 Pitfalls of qualitative data (re)use: context and data fit

The pitfall of data fit is not exclusive to data (re)use. On the contrary, it does hamper all research endeavors (Hammersley 2010). However, it is prominent in the case of data (re)use because researcher relies on already gathered data. The issue significant for research endeavors in this area is whether the data do fit to the research question or not. Considering the re-use of qualitative interviews, the problem of data sets is the composition of sample and the danger of missing data (Heaton 2004). Working with more than one data set, the problem is fit of these sets. The fit is based on the convergence of research procedures, the sampling and data collection method. In the case of qualitative interviews, data fit is conditioned by questions asked (Thorne 1994) and answers delivered. Solutions to the problems with lack of fit are to reshape data set: to use only segments of data sets, to limit the analysis to certain topics and themes (Heaton 2004).

(Re)using qualitative data, the researcher does not directly participate in the data collection process. This unusual position stimulates heated discussion about the problem of "not having been there" (Heaton 2004). The point of contention, which is discussed in this section, is the relation between participation in the data collection and interpretation of data. One position is that "not having been there" is beneficial or manageable. Fielding (2004) notes that data are more convincing when the researcher does not directly intervene in their collection. Furthermore, Mason (2007), with reference to the research of Savage (2007), hints that the distance could be regarded as beneficial for interpretation. The other position is that the lack of participation undermines the ability to interpret data. In this perspective, "not having been there" causes the lack of contextual knowledge. The position of sceptics towards (re)use of data is characterized by suspicion that researcher will not find out "real meaning" (see Slavnic 2013) or will misinterpret contextual clues (see Broom et al 2009). In his prominent critique of data (re)use, Mauthner et al (1998) regard the relationship between researcher and participant as locus of context and reflexivity and, thus, decisive for interpretation. Furthermore, insisting on unintelligibility and indescribability of the context, Mauthner et al (1998) questions the possibility that further

documentation will compensate for the lack of participation in data collection process.[15] However, I question the usefulness of this approach because, in the end, unintelligible aspect cannot be reflected by the researcher. In addition to that, I am in content with one of the respondents from Broome et al (2009) research who said that researcher stressing the unintelligibility of qualitative research experience tends to mystify it. Criticizing Mauthner's et al (1998) approach, Moore (2006; 2007) stresses out that the point of data (re)use is not to re-construct past research situation but to re-contextualize data. In addition to that, in Mauthner's et al (1998) perspective, the context is reduced to data collection situation reflexivity (Moore 2006). However, context and reflexivity has more dimensions (see Bishop 2006). To conclude, on the one hand, in accordance with Heaton (2004), I find problematic lack of intense and prolonged contact with field, but, on the other hand, the possibility to re-contextualize the data is apparent.[16] Taking another approach towards the issue of context, using ethnomethodological trick, Holstein and Gubrium (2004) note that the context is best used as "interpretive resource rather than a deterministic condition". In this perspective, the context should be built out of the respondent's answers rather than to be assumed by the researcher.

3.4.3   Promises of data (re)use?

This section will examine the promises of qualitative data (re)use and archiving. It begins by overview of the policy papers that provide general recommendations for data policy. This section then moves on to the scholarly discussion of these promises.

Discussing the OECD (2007) and The European commission (2012) papers, I introduce the data sharing international movement. In the perspective of the European commission (2012), science is accelerated with rapid circulation of research results (publications and data). This vision is based in the idea of free knowledge circulation and in the idea of responsible research that is characterized by openness and transparency. According to the European commission (2012, 3), the increased accessibility to data and publications will:

"– accelerate innovation (faster to market = faster growth);

– foster collaboration and avoid duplication of effort (greater efficiency);

---

[15] Mauthner et al (1988) even assumes that it is highly problematic to re-use own data because the researcher awareness of the relationships inevitably fades away, the data are becoming "cold".

[16] For the example of this re-contextualization see Bishop (2007) or Savage (2007).

– build on previous research results (improved quality of results);

– involve citizens and society (improved transparency of the scientific process)."

According to OECD (2007) perspective, the global science system ought to address global challenges. To face them, the cost-effective use and access to the research data should be established. The databases as spine of the science system should foster the access to the data, interconnection and collaboration of scientists. In the OECD (2007) perspective, data are defined as a source for scientific research, as a validation for research findings, and as a representation of the subject being investigated. The archiving of other research documents that are not regarded as the data is discouraged. To discourage the archiving of other documents does not match with qualitative approach towards analysis because, according to Konopásek and Kusá (2000), for the purposes of qualitative research it is vital that the archive contains in as many forms as possible. The diverse data types and documents should be included into data archives because archiving of different kinds of data will promote flexibility and, consequently, it will heighten the potential of the data to be used in different research projects. Thus, in agreement with Mauthner and Parry (2009), the perspective of this policy papers does not entirely match with the perspective of qualitatively oriented researchers.

In the last section of this chapter, I discuss the promises of data (re)use from the perspective of qualitative researchers. As follows, I provide a brief summary of the Heaton's (2004) review of qualitative data (re)use benefits. For the full list of benefits of qualitative as well quantitative secondary analysis benefits see Heaton (2004, 27). Heaton (2004, 28) lists the main benefits of qualitative data (re)use as follows:

1) Re-use of existing data helps to avoid over-burdening of population by permanent researching.

2) It potentially facilitates more research on hard-to reach groups and sensitive topics.

3) It promotes the generalizability of data.[17]

4) The data are not lost. On the contrary, re-use and archiving could salvage data.

Furthermore, the promises of data (re)use are also the functions of it. According to Heaton (2004, 8-12), the potential functions are as follows:

1) investigation of new or additional research question;

2) verification, refutation, refinement of existing research;

---

[17] The discussion of this is led within the paradigmatic quarrel whether it is compatible with qualitative research paradigm (see Fielding 2004).

3) synthesis of research.

One of the main promises that I have not discussed yet are the cost-benefits. In the optimistic perspective, it is more economic to (re)use the data than to create data. In addition to that, the benefit of the archiving is only the act of it because researcher is forced to thoroughly document and organize data collection (Fielding 2004). However, Mauthner and Parry (2009) points out that the issue of cost-benefits is not so clear. The question is whether the costs of archiving are compensated by gains from re-use of qualitative data. For example, the archiving and (re)use of the data is costly. Researcher reusing data needs to get familiar with them and that requires a lot of time (Corti 2006).

To summarize, I introduce the classification of the qualitative data promises. The promises may be classified on the basis of its relation to different actors: researcher, population (subject of research), and public. Population as the subject of the research is relieved from the repeated contact with researchers. In the perspective of international policy document, the public benefits from the improved system science that provides cheaper results and is better equipped to face advancing globalization. In addition to that, the scientific results could be communicated more easily with public, the generalizability could be enhanced by archiving of data, and the public could reclaim ownership of the data. The researcher should benefit from the fact that the sharing of data foster the collaboration between researchers (Konopásek and Kusá 2000). Furthermore, access to different kinds of data should stimulate the research process. It opens new possibilities for the researchers because data are not lost and; thus, they can be used in other projects. The access to the data fits with logic of qualitative research because, according to Mason (2007), qualitative research is about seeking and utilizing different data to investigate the phenomena. In addition to that, the availability of the different kinds of data sources has a potential to foster the possibility to carry out forms of research that transcends one place and time. For example, the (re)use and archiving of data could stimulate comparative research (Broom et al 2009).

4 The Research Methodology

4.1 *Doing comparative (re)use of qualitative data*

In this chapter, focusing on the pitfalls of comparative reuse of qualitative data, I discuss the research process of this investigation. First of all, I briefly introduce characteristics of this investigation research process. These characteristics match with the

above described ones of qualitative and comparative approach to research. The research process of my investigation was neither neat nor gradual but it was rather a complex process of seeking solutions to the encountered problems. Moving back and forth between different research stages, I recurrently approached problems with varying success. However, in the end, I managed to find a solution to these pitfalls and to produce coherent framework. This chapter is divided into two parts that describe how I dealt with different pitfalls. In the first part of this chapter, I discuss how I dealt with two most prominent challenges of data (re)use and comparative analysis: contextualization and establishment of data fit. In the second part of this chapter, I describe how I dealt with the challenge to find unifying framework for data, concepts, and my analytical interest – comparison.

4.1.1 Contextualizing and establishing data fit

The one of the pitfalls I had to face was the lack of contextual knowledge, which is conceptualized in case of data (re)use as problem of not "not being there" and in the case of comparative analysis as problem of "getting under the skin" in different settings. In the case of this investigation, to contextualize the data from Prague was not troubling task because I carried the whole research out. The problem was to contextualize the data from Frankfurt because I was reusing the data from the environment with which I had no experience. To address the lack of contextual knowledge, taking on the work of Bishop (2006), I investigated different levels of context. I used Bishop's (2006) manual for data archiving as the guideline for this investigation, focusing on the conversational, situational, institutional/project, and institutional/cultural level of context. The records of the situational level and conversational level were limited. I was provided only with transcripts and with little other information, which were recorded in the research protocol. Considering the institutional/project aspect of the context, upon request, I was granted access to the project documentation. The problem was also the lack of knowledge on the level of institutional/cultural context because I had almost no previous knowledge or experience of it. To acquire lacking competencies and to fill the gaps in contextual knowledge, I used these strategies:

1) I got familiar with the data, reading transcripts and other documents. I printed them out and worked thoroughly through the material word by word. Attempting to understand the transcripts from Frankfurt, I focused on the conversational level, taking inspiration from ethnomethodologically informed approaches to talk. For the summary of these approaches see Roulston (2006).

2) I discussed two aspects of transcripts and documentation with colleagues (research team members, fellow students). First aspect was meaning of the respondents utterances, particular words and sentences. Furthermore, I asked CDR team members about methodology of their project.

3) Aim of the last strategy was to acquire lacking cultural competencies. I explored local context, reading available literature about youth subcultures, drug policies, and drug use in Frankfurt and Germany, visiting places of drug use in Frankfurt (Hauptbahnhofviertel, clubs, raves), and listening to local music.[18]

In this section I focus on the other problem, fit between both data sets. It is significant to establish fit because it allows the researcher to compare, to produce more than a description of both data sets. This section is divided into two parts. In the first part of this section, I describe the differences of research procedures because the fit between data sets is strengthened by their similarity. In the second part of this section, I discuss how I dealt with differences in research procedures.

The table nr. 1 shows the basic characteristics of both research procedures. It is apparent that some aspects of research procedures are similar while other aspects differ. Generally, CDR team had wider opportunities and more resources. As a result, the research sample and set of used methods was broader. The temporal context of data collection is equivalent enough not to influence the subject matter of the research. The sampling method was also similar; however, it does not ground the equivalence because the "snowball" strategy was slightly different. Considering the data collection, CDR team used more diverse methods. In addition to the semi-structured qualitative interviews, CDR team used quantitative interviews. The qualitative interviews were carried out similarly. The topics of interviews were partially conceptualized similarly (see appendix). The interviewer role was sufficiently equivalent because the method of semi-structured interviews ascribes specific role to the interviewer and because, in Frankfurt, the interviews were collected by students while, in Prague, I collected the data, being also student at that time. Considering the method of analysis, CDR team used partially different analytical approach but it was not significant for the analysis because I did not use their codes.

This section follows on from the previous chapter, which outlined the differences in the

---

[18] For example, one significant artist from Frankfurt music scene is Schwesta Ewa. See Schwesta Ewa (2001).

research procedures. In this section, I discuss how I dealt with these differences. The first one to manage was the difference between snowball strategies. The snowballs were distinguished by the targeted populations, which were different in two aspects. In Frankfurt, the research team included drug dealers into the sample as well as drug users while, in Prague, I targeted only drug dealers. To address this difference, I selected interviews with "drug dealers" (users having vast experience with drug handling). To identify such respondents, I used categorisation of respondents produced by CDR research team.[19] The other difference was that, in Prague, I targeted the population related to the club culture environment. However, this difference does not seem to be significant because, in Frankfurt, respondents frequently mentioned visits to club and preferences for club music. Otherwise, the samples were aimed on respondents with similar characteristics. Respondents were fairly educated, had residence in a town, and were not incarcerated or using the services of helping institutions. However, some respondents from Frankfurt sample were clearly from the milieu of problematic users. These respondents procured significant amount of violence, used drugs intravenously, and had vast experiences with state institutions. Thus, they were not included into the analysis.

---

[19] Respondents were categorized by their income from drug dealing. I selected interviews with respondents who earned more than 2000 euros in one month during at least one month during their life.

Characteristics of research procedure		
	Prague	Frankfurt
Data collection period	2012-2013	2010-2012
Sampling method	Snowball	Snowball
Data collection method	Semi-structured qualitative interview	Qualitative (semi-structured) and quantitative interview
Interwiever	Researcher	Team members (students), students
Method of analysis	Grounded theory	Qualitative content analysis

Table 1 This table shows characteristic of both research procedures.

Sample characteristics		
	Prague	Frankfurt
Sample size	Not given in advance (4 interviews)	More than 200 interviews (13 selected interviews)
Subcultural affiliation	Clubculture	Not given in advance (affiliation to subculture, and clubculture)
Position in drug market	Lower in the drug business	Drug users and drug dealers
Age	Under 30	Not given in advance
Education	Vocational or higher education	At least vocational training
Contact with official institutions	Not penalized	No experience with therapy or helping institutions
Drugs sold	LSD, MDMA, Cocain, weeed	Not given in advance
Residence	Residence in city area	Permanent residence

Table 2 This table shows sample characteristic of both research.

The other problem was the difference between actual content of interviews, which was based in the different conceptualization of topics. To manage this difference, I started to work with the interview transcripts to find out whether there were discussed similar questions and topics or not. I shifted my focus from one data set to another and back. Basically, I was re-reading interviews from Prague and reconstructing my former analysis while looking for similar topics in interviews from Frankfurt. Doing this, I developed a database considering similar topics from both data sets and, in turn, I found out that some similar questions and topics came up during the interviews.[20] Gathering the data about similar topics, I basically did content analysis of the interviews. It is important to note that these topics were based mostly in my former research: moral borders of respondents and experience with social control.

4.1.2   Answer to the question: What is this case of?

In this section, I describe how I moved on with the analysis when I dealt with the basic pitfalls of comparative reuse of qualitative data. The next stage of the research process was characterized by the search for analytical framework because I had the comparable data but no theoretical and analytical framework to compare them. During this stage, the main questions were: How to compare data from both settings? What is the explanatory unit? What is this case of?

First of all, I tried to answer these questions with reference to the aspects of broader institutional environment (state, city). Focusing on the level of the state, I found out that the state is not suitable for the comparison because both cases are too different to compare. Czech Republic is small and non-federative state while Germany is federative state, which consists of 16 different Bundeslands.[21] However, I took the level of the state into consideration as a vital aspect of the context because it forms institutional, legal, and linguistic environment. Seeking suitable conceptualization, I focused on the level of the

---

[20] I excluded one interview from Frankfurt because it did not contain information necessary for analysis.

[21] The regions in Germany have different history and traditions. Furthermore, they have autonomy to decide about certain areas of policies, for example education.„Each state has a large degree of autonomy, particularly in budget distribution, but also at a strategic and policy level as to how educational initiatives and policies are implemented within the different education sectors (secondary and vocational) and also how these policies are financed and delivered witorhin that state.“ The Implementation of ECDL in the German Federal School System. (2016).

city. It seemed appropriate because the city is more controllable and less complex environment than a state. In addition to that, the city is suitable for the comparison because it is described as a locus of the drug problem, for example see Kübler and Wälti (2001), and because it is locus of research into drug use and related issues, for example Venkatesh (2008), Bourgois (2003), Bless et al (2000). However, I realized that the city was also not suitable because the data did not represent the city. Thus, I decided to take it into account as another level of context.

Being unable to find the unifying framework at the level of institutional and geographical units, I shifted my attention towards the data. Looking for suitable approach to analyze the data and for unifying framework, I made significant decisions. Gradually, I decided to drop the theme of experience with social control and to focus on the topic of moral borders because it seemed too complicated to deal with expression of experiences in two languages and because this topic is more psychological than sociological. Furthermore, I also gradually shifted from the approaches based in the interpretive paradigm (Kaufmann 2010) and in the discursive analysis (Clarke 2005) towards the ethnomethodologically (EM) informed approaches. I decided to use the EM informed approaches because it provided me with theoretical framework for interpretation of moral borders. In addition to that, it facilitated my understanding of interviews and "getting familiar" with interviews from Frankfurt. In the end, I decided to use Membership categorisation analysis (MCA) because this approach allowed to me frame moral borders as locally produced membership categories. It was significant for the analysis because this concept was general enough to allow comparison and, at the same time, to take into account local specifics. To conclude and to answer the question, the case to be analyzed is local production of membership categories (social order) by specific individuals (affluent and non-problematic drug dealers in urban environment) in specific context (similar research situation and different institutional/cultural context).

4.2   Analytical approach – Member categorisation analysis

In this chapter, I briefly discuss the analytical approach that is used to compare. In the first section of this chapter, I provide the overview of the grounds on which I based my decision to use this approach. In addition to that, I briefly introduce basic concepts of Membership categorisation analysis (MCA). In the second section of this chapter, discussing the "hows" and "whats", I move on to specifications of the analytical approach to the data.

4.2.1 The basic MCA concepts and grounds to use it

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, I decided to use MCA (Schegloff 2007; Housley & Fitzgerald 2015) because it is methodological approach that is fit to adopt for this particular investigation. For the above mentioned reason, it helped me to overcome the encountered pitfalls. I used this approach to overcome the pitfall of comparative analysis that is the answer to the question, what are these cases of. This approach provided me with the answer to it in the form of unit of analysis that is: local production of member categories (local social order). I used the unit of analysis to analyze preliminary results which had previously lacked a coherent analytical framework. In turn, it allowed me to carry out a comparative analysis. Furthermore, the EM informed approaches helped me deal with the pitfalls of data (re)use, because taking on them I was able to conceptualize the context of interviews in both settings (see the previous chapter).[22] The other reason to use this approach was that MCA with its analytical focus on categories, which are essential aspect of social life (Bowker & Star 2000; Housley & Fitzgerald 2015), provides sociologically relevant insight into the organization and use of social knowledge (Housley & Fitzgerald 2015), production of social and moral order (Baker 2000). To summarize, using MCA, I was able to focus on the "whats" (categories) as well as the "hows" (conversational, interactional aspect of the conversation) of the research interviews.[23] The last reason to use and discuss MCA is that there is a rising tendency between researchers using interviews to take inspiration from ethnomethodologically informed approaches (Roulston 2006).

This paragraph provides brief overview of MCA basic concepts. The central concept (Mlynář 2016) or lynchpin (Housley & Fitzgerald 2015) of MCA is Membership category device (MCD). MCD is a collection of member categories and rules of their application (see Hester & Eglin 1997). The member categories which are classifications or social types used to describe persons are characterized by classes of predicates (category-bound activities, attributes, entitlements, obligations etc. (see Hester & Eglin 1997), which are imputed to the categories. However, as I demonstrate below, the categories are not only used to describe persons but also other aspects of social life (see also Housley & Fitzgerald 2015). Significantly, member categories are used within these interactions and only within

---

[22] The ethonomethodlogy informed approaches often work with the data which could be regarded as secondary (see Heaton 2004).

[23] I use the classification of „hows" and „whats" that was proposed by Holstein and Gubrium (1995).

these interaction the use membership categories makes sense, because the relevance emerges from it.

4.2.2   The "hows" and "whats" of research interview

In the first part of this section, I describe the specification of analytical approach, which is based in the general analytical interest of comparison. The next two parts discuss the analytical approach to interviews from the EM informed perspective.

Comparing the local production of member categories, I put more focus on "whats" than "hows" because in order to compare, I have to de-contextualize and generalize some aspects of talk which is locally caused. Thus, I am interested more in the "configuration of categories and their associated predicates" rather than on their "unique configuration" (see Housley's and Fitzgerald's discussion of Sacks (2015, 4). It seems to be incompatible with principles of EM informed approaches. However, I am in accordance with the criticized tendency of Sacks towards production of decontextualized accounts (see Housley & Fitzgerald 2015, 10). Furthermore, I am also in agreement with EM informed approaches because I position these "whats" in "hows" and because I build the context of "whats" out of the interviews. To conclude, I do not apply the orthodox version of this approach. However, this use of MCA corresponds with its description as an analytical tool rather than as a tightly defined formula: "Rather the relevant analytic tools are assembled by the analyst in relation to the particular data being examined, as occasioned by the data." (Housley & Fitzgerald 2015, 15)

In the two last sections of this chapter, drawing on EM informed approaches, I specify my approach to the research interviews. The first part of this section discusses general "hows" of the research interviews while the second part moves on to "hows" that are specific to the analyzed interviews. Analyzing the data from research interviews, I diverge from the usual object of EM informed approaches – data occurring in "natural" situation. Doing this, I take on the emerging body of literature that is concerned with the EM informed analysis of research interviews (see Roulston 2006). In agreement with Roulston (2006) and De Finna (2009), I argue against the notion that the research interviews are not natural interactions. It is not time out from social life (Roulston 2006). On the contrary, research interviews are interactional events; although, they are in some regard different than other interactions (de Finna 2009, 236-237). To conceptualize these differences, I define research interview interaction as a specific instance of institutional talk. For the research interview it is typical that at the beginning the researcher explains the

general intention of the research and assigns the role to each of the participants. The interviewees are frequently categorized as informants about their social world and experts in it. The task on their hand is to mediate their social world to the researcher. Thus, I assume that it is typical to discuss different member categories and their predicates because they are the basis of their social worlds. Furthermore, it is characteristic that talk about member categories is not „innocent". It is linked to the identity project of the interviewee. The research interview is also characterized by the fact that the interviewee interacts with the interviewer on the basis of the assumptions about the interviewer's knowledge (see de Finna 2009). Plausibly, the interviewees assume that interviewer's knowledge is based in stereotypes and prejudice which are available to interviewer.

In this section, I turn to the "hows" of particular interviews. I conceptualize the "hows" of the interviews, using the notion of omnirelevant categories because the similar categories were significant for large portion of the talk.[24] Namely, the omnirelevant categories were drug user and drug dealer. These categories were relevant because the interviewers categorized the interviewees as the members of the category drug user and drug dealer when they asked them about being a dealer and their drug use habits. Furthermore, their relevance is apparent on the list of interview questions and topics (see appendix). The interviewees worked with these categories mostly as responses to the questions, which were oriented on topics such as morality (acceptability, borders) and dealer bounded activities (with whom do you handle drugs, how do you deal drugs, what safety precautions do you have). The interviewee's use of omnirelevant categories was based on the assumptions about knowledge of interviewer. Specifically, these assumptions are based on predicates predominantly used with the category of dealer, which is part of MCD of "deviants". The category of dealer as folk devil is fundamentally and dominantly understood as part of this MCD. This negative categorisation of the dealer as deviant is described since 70s by Blum (1971), Szasz (2003), Atkyns and Hanneman (1974), and more recently by Coomber (2010). Benso (2010) even describes the image of the dealer as a stereotype in collective consciousness and object of unanimous aversion. As such a powerful category, it is exploited by politicians and, on the top of that, it is the corner stone of antidrug laws: "Soft on the user, hard on the dealer", "Get the dealer" (Blum 1971). In this perspective, dealer has predicates such as an active seducer, selling to youths

---

[24] The omnirelevant category is potentially relevant for the whole interaction, permeating all different levels of it (see Housley & Fitzgerald 2015).

(at the schoolyard) and to the vulnerable, doing it for profit, and also ensnaring people consumed by addiction. On the basis of this discussion, I assume that respondents as „the bearers of a stigmatized identity recognize the definitions which are directed to them" (Juhila 2004) and, in turn, they use the categories in reaction to these definitions. This use of categories might be interpreted as the neutralization technique (Sykes & Matza 1957) or as talking back to stigmatized identities (Juhila 2004).[25] The fact that the omnirelevant categories and their predicates are one of the most relevant topic of the interviews is apparent on interviewee's answers. Interviewees discuss these member categories thoroughly and produce social order which is based in these categories. It is exemplified by one of the respondents: "I felt certainly that there is some border which if I cross, I will enter into another area."[26] Some categories are linked with predicates as being acceptable, proper, and right. Other categories are linked with predicates as being unacceptable, bad, and improper.

To conclude, I treat interviewee's responses as specifically situated and, at the same time, as representing the ways in which the member categories are organized in the stock-of-knowledge of respondents. It is also plausible to assume that interviewees are in similar situation in other interactions when the omnirelevant categories are made significant. Thus, I assume that analysis of the interviews is relevant for these situations.

5   Results of the analysis

In this chapter, I present the segment of data analysis results which was relevant for the comparison of both cases. In the first part of this chapter, I provide the results of membership categorisations analysis, focusing mostly on the category of the drug dealer. I elaborate on the ways in which respondents work with this category. The next two sections move on to discussion of use of different categories, drugs and local categories. These categories are also used as predicates for the category of drug dealer but I discuss them separately to highlight their significance. Furthermore, the categories could be used as predicates and vice versa (see Schegloff 2007). To conclude, synthetizing the results of the analysis, I infer the more general principles of social order.

---

[25] According to Juhila (2004), interviews are suitable to study talking back to stigmatized identities because respondents are selected as representants of these identities.

[26] *"Určitě jsem cejtil nějakou hranici, kterou když překročím, tak vstupuju do nějaký jiný oblasti."*

In this chapter, I present the citations from the analyzed interviews to illustrate the results of the analysis. In some cases, I give the answer and questions to highlight the interactional aspect of interviews. I provide the translation of one example from both environments (first is from Frankfurt and second is from Prague) when the issue is made relevant in both settings. Otherwise, I give only examples from one setting. However, I provide only provisional translations which could be treated more as a paraphrases of the original talk because they reflect my understanding of it.[27] In some cases, I give brief and additional paraphrases of the dialogue to supplement the examples. Furthermore, these examples and paraphrases are supplemented by another one in the appendix. For the reader interested in the original citations, I provide them also in the appendix.

5.1.1 Dealer as the membership category

In this section, I discuss different uses of member category dealer with focus on category bound activity drug dealing. The interviewees relate to the predicates of the dealer from the MCD "deviant" that is, as they assume, brought up by the interviewer. In reaction to this category, they use the category of acceptable dealership ("within the borders", "safe", and controllable), which is characterized by the features that I discuss in this section, and they frequently contrast less and more acceptable categories. Furthermore, there are another MCDs in play. The other significant MCD in use is "drug market" that contains categories like: dealer, junkie, acquaintances, strangers, and policeman. At the end, I also present one of these categories that is significant for both MCDs, junkie.

5.1.1.1 Handling drugs with acquaintances

The drug dealing that is linked with predicates as within the borders and safe was also linked with predicates as being done with acquaintances. The category of acquaintances is predicated by possibility to control the "partners in crime", having specific morals, and specific drugs and contrasted with category of strangers. For example, Peter attributes to handling drugs with acquaintances that he was never "ripped off". Practice of this strategy is described by Soul: being asked by people he did not know, he pretended that he does not have any drugs. Similarly, Lola reports, not selling to unknown people. The morals of acquaintances are specified as being careful, having borders, not talking too much. Some of the morals, I will discuss in the sections that follows.

---

[27] For the broad treatment of the cultural translation problematic, which informed my work, see seminal work collected by Clifford and Marcus (1986)

Interviewer: *"Can you describe the charecteristics of your suppliers? Did they have ties to "real" criminal world?"*

Cornholio: *"It was also important for me to be able to identify myself with the people to know that they also have moral borders… or that I am also not going to be robbed… because I made such an experience with it."*

Interviewer: *"You told me that there is some border..."*

S: *"Eh?"*

Interviewer: *"... that you do not cross..."*

S: *"I think, I feel that the border is there when you sell to the people who you do not know or when they are some friends of your friends. Then, I think that there is the border… And when you are only just up to make some money as fast as possible and when you do not care about anything else and you sell to everybody who comes to you… then there it is…."*

5.1.1.2 Handling with specific drugs

The drug dealing that is linked with predicate as within the borders and having moral is also predicated by type of drugs, as I discuss in next section of this chapter, and by handling with drugs that are known to respondents as good and used by respondents themselves. For example, as Kiffer (16) notes, he is able to sell good drugs because he buys them from the people he trusts and knows and because they pass information between each other. The sharing of information is also highlighted by Peter (13) who notes that significant feature of good dealing is to be honest about the quality of the drugs they sell.

Interviewer: *"Only because you use that or because you do not find that acceptable?"*

Willsten: *"I do not know whether it is acceptable. I have not use that. I am not able to say. Therefore, I cannot sell that… Also I am not interested in the Heroin and such…. because to put it simply… I have experience with other people, who had used heroin. One friend of my sister… they were bit crazy and that was too much for me…"*

Interviewer: *"How do you look at the people that buy drugs? Do you have any uncomfortable feelings about that?"*

S: *"[…] I would not sell methamphetamine. I do not like the people around. It is too*

destructive. It fucks you up badly. And it is also more addictive. All the acquaintances that I had around me they all hit the rock bottom because of it. They ended badly. I had not seen them for the half of the year and then I was not able to recognize them, how they were fucked up. I would not sell this. I always sold what I thought that is good more than it was business-oriented…"

5.1.1.3 Ability to withstand demands of society.

In addition to already discussed aspects, the acceptable and safe drug handling mode is linked with predicates, which I conceptualize as ability to withstand demands of society. Namely, it is having a job, not doing other crime and deviant activities, not being addicted, not being an object of police interest, having family life, speaking the local language, and being educated. Using these predicates, the acceptable and safe drug handling is contrasted with people behind the border. For example, Richard (8) contrasts the category of acceptable and safe drug handling mode with "untrustworthy people"[28], which are, in this case, predicted by having purely financial motivation and by procuring other crime. The significance of ability to work is highlighted in Young's (1971) description of the evaluation of drug use:

"In the last chapter I analyzed the factors which determined the social valuation of a particular form of drug taking. I concluded that it was not the drug per se, but the reason why the drug was taken that determined whether there would be an adverse social reaction to its consumption. The crucial yardstick in this respect is the ethos of productivity. If a drug either stepped up work efficiency or aided relaxation after work it was approved of; if it was used for purely hedonistic ends it was condemned." (Young 1971)

Interviewer: *"And when you sell, how does that happen? Do they call you, come to your crib or do you meet them somewhere?"*

Puma: *"Yeah, you know weed heads, they do not smoke alone. They are always connected within different groups, it is fast known when somebody sells or so. To give somebody a number is really asocial, the best is when the person is introduced, he is this and this, then he can have the number. That is actually the best way to do it. And to stay undetected, I would say to that when you have a steady job, and when you deal only by the way. Because when you have dealing as your main job, that it is shit because you are then*

---

[28] *"[..] unseriosen Leuten [..]."*

probably Hartz 4…"

Interviewer: *"And how?"*

M: *"The majority of problems is stemming out of the fact that it is illegal and somebody will always piss you of. People are untrustworthy, there are no contracts. You have to find a good crew, otherwise on the street the rule is that who makes more than other or is not afraid of violence than he has an advantage. I try to stay away from that. I have friends and people who smoke weed. You are part of the community which wants the product and you sell it for better price. Everybody uses it."*

The difference between Prague and Frankfurt

The difference between Frankfurt and Prague comes up when interviewees, in Frankfurt, predicate the category of not acceptable and trustworthy dealer using the predicates of German language and specific derogatory word "Kanake" (see Kanake 2001) for the individuals with non-German origin, more specifically, of Turkish descent. However, there are two categories of foreigners, which are contrasted. Category of safe and acceptable foreigners is predicated by their ability to speak German and their education – ability to integrate in German society while the other, by lack of it. This categorisation did not come up in Prague and, plausibly, this difference in categorisation work stems from a different composition of the population.

Interviewer: *"Can* you d*escribe them?"*

Hustler Hard (11): *"They were different. One was Kanake who barely speaks English, who is here for twenty year. The other one is martial artist, had even FH studied, he is cool. I trust only him."*[29]

5.1.1.4 Profit?

In this section, I discuss the profit as a predicate of dealer because it came up frequently in interviews and because it is significant predicate of dealer as a part of MCD "deviant". The relevance of this predicate is apparent on the example of Jan's answer. Jan considers profit

---

[29] FH referes to Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences.

as defining feature of dealer:

Interviewer: *"When did you consider yourself as a dealer?"*
Jan: *"During the times when I had something home and when I sold for profit."*

It is evident on following citations that respondents describe drugs and drug handling as predicated by money, acknowledging that economic considerations are important aspect of the drug handling.

Puma: *"Yes, what does it mean profit that is the issue, you have different price for different people, at least I do, I have no fixed prices, but I always have a profit. I do not give it for free, therefore, there is always profit…"*

Interviewer: *"When you sell it and they buy it, do you have any feeling considering the people and considering you. Do you reflect it?"*
J: *"I was thinking a lot about that, if is morally acceptable, if I can do it and the initial point is that it is not acceptable, it is said that you should not do that. I always tried to distinguish who are the people and what is the drug. And the drug, it was always with some profit, with monetary motivation, and that was MDMA exclusively and I consider it as one of the safest substances in drug world, and there is a risk, and there is a risk, that somebody will take it too often and so I always thought, what feeling I have about this guy, if I should give it to him or not…"*

For the interviewees the problem is that drugs and handling with drugs is predicated by money and, at the same time being oriented on profit predicates not safe and acceptable drug dealing. For example, Richard (8) predicates "untrustworthy people"[30] as having only financial motivation. Thus, the respondents categorizing themselves as doing safe and acceptable drug handling are in the situation when the member categories do not fit together. Bringing in "friendly" predicate of acceptable drug dealing, Kaiser Soze (3) exemplifies this contradiction. On the one hand, he reports uncomfortable feeling handling drugs at "purely business basis" because it has a „criminal touch" but, on the other hand, he reports doing it "in spite of that".

---

[30] *"[..] unseriosen Leuten [..]."*

Kaiser Soze: *"[….] When you talk just about it and when you meet just because of this, then, it has rather criminal touch. Oh yes, there is this and that but, in the end, I did it in spite of that. It is also about making money."*

To solve this contradiction, interviewees produce two different categories of dealer which are predicated by specific kind of profit. One category is "full-time" dealer (profi) and the other one that does it just "by the way".

Lars P.: *"[…] the one is Profi and he makes money with that and the other one does it just by the way to cover his own use and for his friends […]"*

"Full-time" dealer is predicted as "not-within the borders", as having "purely financial motivation", and as having profit that is „big", „enriching", „enough to make living out of it". In contrast to this, the safe and acceptable drug handling mode is predicated by profit only supporting lifestyle, by making only small profit (extra cash), by financing own consume, by not making oneself rich, by profit that is only pleasant side effect or by the profit that is just „by the way". In addition to that, profit is not only described as a "small" or "big" but the monetary aspect is also taken out of the consideration. "Monetary" aspect is put aside and helping dimension is highlighted. Profit is not categorized as a profit but as "doing a favor" and helping or „only intermediating "to the subculture and friends.

Interviewer: *"How would you describe your todays handling?"*
Soul:*"As favor."*

Interviewer: *"How would you categorize yourself?"*
M: *"[…] it is nice extra income, but the work does not give you anything unless you are interested in growing. It does not give you anything in your life."*

5.1.1.5 Junkies

The other frequently used member category is "junkie" which is part of the MCD "chemo", "heroin", and "crack" scene and of the MCD deviant. It is predicated by drugs (Heroin, Crack), by intravenous use of drugs, and by omnipresent resentments. It is often

contrasted to the "normal" scene. In Frankfurt, as I discuss bellow, it is often predicated by the "street" and Hauptbahnhofviertel.

Interviewer: *"Because they caught you?"*
Jan: *" [....] and this is not that junkie scene, but rather it is this normal, the people that have normal life and they want to party a bit or sometimes, somehow to drop out"*

Interviewer: *„What do you think about drug users?"*
K*: "[...] Intravenous use, I take as well as the majority of this nation people as behind the border. It is somewhere else, something else. I would think bad stuff about that."*

5.1.1.6 Conclusion

In both cases, the "within the borders" drug dealer was predicted by doing it with acquaintances and not with junkies, by the specific conceptualization of profit, by selling specific drugs, and by the ability to withstand social demands. The categories and their predicates were used similarly in both samples. Only significant difference was use of the predicates such as language, and "Kanake", which points to the significance of different composition of population for drug markets.

5.1.2 Membership categorisation of drugs

In this section, I discuss the MCD of drugs, which consists of different categories – kinds of drugs. Significance of drugs for membership categorisation is apparent because different kinds of drugs were frequently mentioned as one of the borders. As was pointed out in the previous section, the drugs were used to categorize different "kinds of the worlds", predicting (non)acceptable drug dealing. Thus, I focus on how the collection of drugs was divided into different categories and what predicates belong to these categories.

Interviewer: *"For example, is it acceptable to sell heroin? Oder do you draw border somewhere?*
Lars P.: *„So, that is not my world. Honestly, I have to say, eh, eh, I would not do it by myself"*

Interviewer: *"Why did you sell only this?"*

K: „[…] To summarize, I sold it to people around me and to my friends, and if I would like to start to sell something else, my friends would have to change, I would have to move to another environment."

5.1.2.1 Cannabis

In both samples, cannabis smoking is described as a first border, which was crossed. It was the first experience with illegal drugs for respondents. Predicates linked with cannabis are friends, peer groups, youth experiences, and not "dangerous people". To conclude, cannabis is predicated as "friendly" and widely accepted, unproblematic drug.

Miu Miu (10): *"The weed heads or the party people they are different kind of people. We could say that they are more chilled."*

S: *"At the elementary school, when my friend came, he brought some villager weed, we got stoned during the afternoon lessons, or something like that."*

5.1.2.2 Chemical and natural substances

The other two member categories are "chemical" and "natural" substances.[31] Latter member category is predicated by specific drugs (cannabis, mushrooms) and by acceptability. Former category is discussed in the next part of this section.

Soul (3): *"I did not want any chemicals, no pills, nothing like that... later Ecstasy and Speed."*

S: „*That was same with weed. Somebody came […] most of the time somebody came with it, not that I was looking for it. Yeah, shrooms, it is still natural, and I still took it as natural and not as chemical.*"

---

[31] It is mentioned by all respondents in Czech context and brought up by some in German context for example He-man, Ganja Mania and Cornholio, Peter Positiv, Richard, Soul, Kaiser Soze
are similar to categories: "hard" and "light" drugs

5.1.2.3 **Chemical substances**

In this part of this section, I discuss chemical substances as a collection of categories which consists of categories as follow. In both samples, MDMA is predicated by acceptability and by "being safe". Speed is only mentioned in Frankfurt and it is also not predicated as problematic. Predicates as danger (dangerous people, dangerous when used) and lack of control are linked to some chemical substances. In Prague, respondents predicate the world not within borders by pervitin (Methamphetamine) and heroin while in Frankfurt it is predicated by crack-cocaine, cocaine, and heroin. In Frankfurt, cocaine is predicated by danger, dangerous people, police, guns, gangs, and criminality. For example, the "cocaine folks" are contrasted by interviewee Willsten Habe with "marihuana folks". At this point, I bring up the difference, which is discussed below, between Bockenheim dealers and respondents from CDR sample. Bockenheim dealers reject to sell the drugs which are predicated by the category of Techno scene (Bucerius 2007, 686).

Interviewer: *"Is there any kind of trafficking that you would not do?"*
Willsten: *"Yeah, things that I do not take personally. Heroin, crack, that is it…"*

Felix da House Cat: "*When there is hundred gs of cocaine you can have easily gas pistol or real pistol pointed at your head […] it is often in the hand of Albanians and they have relatively few scruples.*"

Interviewer: "*What is behind the border that you mentioned?*"
J: „*Methamphetamine, Heroin. And it is not defined so much by the particular drug but more by a lifestyle. You need to make a lot of money to get drugs, you are in the cycle of addiction…*"

5.1.2.4 **Conclusion**

Significantly, there are similarities and differences in both cases. The category of cannabis and contrast between chemical and natural substances is used similarly. The difference lies in the collection of chemical substances. In Frankfurt, heroin, crack-cocaine, and cocaine is significant for the categorisation work while, in Prague, it is methamphetamine and heroin. It is plausible to assume that this difference relates to different historical and cultural development of both cities. While in Prague the

Methamphetamine use has its historical and cultural place and is regularly used (see Miovský 2007; Csemy et al 2002), in Frankfurt, the crack-cocaine and heroin is traditional (Langer et al 2004).

5.1.3 Membership categorisation and spatial aspects

In this section of the chapter, I discuss the use of member categories, considering the member knowledge of geography.[32] I am not focusing only on personal features but also on the location formulations (see Hester & Eglin 1997). In the first part of the section, I broaden the notion of local geography, investigating general location formulation, which is not related to any particular place in the city. It is the category of the "street", which is used in the category of the "street dealer". "Street" is linked with predicates such as being desperate, selling for profit, and violent behavior. It is apparent on the following quotes. In Frankfurt, as Lola notes the street is only for desperate:

Lola: *"I have not sold on the street... I had never needed to do so, when you have a good stuff, the people come by themselves […]"*

In Czech sample, the category of the *"street"* is contrasted with the friendship group. The predicates of street is in this case violence, lack of reliability, and the rules of business.

M: *"The majority of problems is stemming out of the fact that it is illegal and somebody will always piss you of. People are untrustworthy, there are no contracts. You have to find a good crew, otherwise on the street the rule is that who makes more than other or is not afraid of violence than he has an advantage. I try to stay away from the street. I have friends and people, who smoke weed. You are part of the community, which wants the product, and you sell it to hem for better price. Everybody uses it."*

In the last part of this section, I discuss use of local geography knowledge. In Prague, one interviewee puts dealing in the club with dealing outside at the Václavák to the same MCD – deviant. It is linked with predicate "selling for profit":

Interviewer: *„Selling drugs at party?"*

---

[32] For the example of member geography knowledge analysis see Drew (1978),

K: "No, no… that is related to other drugs, and such. The weed that includes. That includes that I went there with friends. They would buy the one gram somewhere else. I did not sell to strangers, strangers did not asked me frequently. There is competition and there is small odds that they will guess that you sell drugs. It is an exception. Definitely, I would not go to party and I would sell out everything and made a lot of money. I did not do that. I could go to Wenceslas square no I would not do such a purposeful activity even in spite of that fat that I know that I could earn a lot of money. I have not practiced that."

In Frankfurt, more relevance was given to the specific local categories. Namely, the places in the city center were frequently mentioned: Hauptwache and Hauptbahnhof. These two places are practically interchangeable because they are part of open drug scene and drug market in the city center. Furthermore, respondents predicate these parts of the town practically in the same manner. These places were mentioned not only by respondents from CDR sample but also by specific group of Bockenheim "dealers" (see Bucerius 2007; 2010). The members of this group are described as second-generation "lower class immigrant youths" (Bucerius 2007), operating local drug market in the specific part of town – Bockenheim (Bucerius 2010). The spatial category plays central role in their categorisation work. *"Although the Youths are not directly selling drugs in Bahnhofsviertel, the existence of Bahnhofviertel plays crucial role in the identity building of actors in the investigated group."*[33] (Bucerius 2010, 157)

The category of Hauptbahnhof Junkie is linked with predicate being "dirty". Moreover the dealer become "dirty" by the contact with junkies. Talat quite expressively describes his opinion about "junkies":

*"[*Question: But don't you make money out of that?*] »But it is not with this freaks. I am not at Bahnohof. That is big difference«*"[34] (Bucerius 2010, 165)

"But when you say that you deal at Bahnhof, then it is completely… How should I put it? It

---

[33] "*Obwohl die untersuchten Jugendlichen und jungen Erwachsenen nicht direkt im Bahnhofsviertel ihre Drogen verkauften (oder erwarben), spielte die Existenz des Bahnhofsviertels für die Identitätsbildung der Akteure in der Untersuchungsgruppe eine zentrale Rolle.*" (Bucerius 2010, 157)

[34] "*»Also das ist doch echt abgefuckt, dass die denen da Räume geben und so. In der Türkei wird's so was nicht geben, die würden da richtig durchgreifen. Und die Deutschen machen da alles für diese Junkies. ›Hier habt ihr 'nen Raum, macht's euch mal schöngemütlich, ich bring gleich das Essen‹. Das ist doch abgefuckt [...]!« [Frage: Aber du verdienst doch auch Dein Geld damit?] »Aber nicht mit diesen Missgeburten. Ich bin ja nicht am Bahnhof. Das ist ein Riesenunterschied.«*" (Bucerius 2010, 165)

is the bottom of the barrel.”[35] Bucerius (2010, 165)

Spatial categories are also significant in categorisation work of CDR interviewees. In this case, Hauptbahnhof and Hauptwache is predicated by different category-bounded activities. The two predicates linked with this place are brought up by Richard who predicates Hauptwache by individuals that "Dreck am stehen haben" and with "Hartz 4 Empfänger". "Hartz 4 Empfänger" is the individual who does not work and just collect social benefits.[36] The individuals from these parts of town are predicated by being unemployed. Using this predicate, Richard emphasises the value of ability to sustain a non-drug oriented work life. Other predicate "Dreck am stecken haben" means that the persons has some criminal past and does not have proper morals. (Redensarten-index 2016; Essig 2008) Interviewee Lasershow also links the Bahnhofviertel with similar predicates. Bahnhorvietel is predicated by fighting, going to bars, and to brothels.

Lasershow: *„It was just too harsh... These are the people that like to fight, to go to Bahnhofviertel bars and there they fight or they go to whorehouse. That is too much for me.”*

The analysis of locality based categorisation points to the fact that these categories are used differently not only in different cities but also by different „drug dealers". Not having "straight" work life as a value, the Bockenheim dealers predicate the Bahnhof and Hauptwache by uncleanness of junkies. In contrast, CDR dealers predicate Bahnhof and Hauptwache by "not being employed" and by being a criminal. The city based difference in the use of locality was that, in Prague, the particular places were not given such a relevance. Plausibly, in Prague, there is no place that is so strongly considered to be a place for deviant activities. In contrast to that, In Frankfurt, the Hauptbahnhofviertel has a tradition as the coherent space of deviant activities (see Benkel 2010) and the deviant activities are visible (services for drug users, brothels, crack-cocaine smokers). However, to confirm that locality based categories are not this relevant, more data need to be collected. This need for more research reveals the lack of systematic research concerning

---

[35] "*»Bockenheim hat zwar diesen krassen Ruf und so ... und jeder ... wenn Du nur sagst, Du kommst aus Bockenheim ... jeder denkt gleich, du bist krass und so. Aber wenn du jetzt sagst, du checkst am Bahnhof, das ist halt echt total ... wie soll ich sagen? Unterste Schublade so.«*" (Bucerius 2010, 165)
[36] It is member knowledge that I acquired when I discussed these terms with my colleagues in Frankfurt.

the "deviance" within borders of Prague. On the contrary, In Frankfurt, for example, the whole publication was devoted to Hauptbahnhofviertel (see Benkel 2010).

5.1.4 Conclusion

My analysis revealed similarities as well as differences in the local production of member categories, which, I interpret, as the expressions of locally produced moral orders. Some of the categories were used similarly, suggesting that the omnirelevant member category of drug dealer is relevant and have similar meanings in both cases. The similar use of member categories and their predicates is plausibly based in the similar occasion, research interview and in the similar social situation of Interviewees. The interviewees are educated and not penalized. Thus, the use of these categories represents the "moral order" of doing crime in the specific segment of society. It is characterized by specific use of categories, for example by contrasts of specific categories (junkies, untrustworthy people). Categorizing the certain aspects of social life as out of the borders and as unacceptable, they resist to be members of category dealer in the MCD of "deviants". Bringing up the values such as is ability to keep a job, in order to sustain their identity as a legitimate members of society, they resist to be members of the MCD "deviants". I assume that interviewees talk back but this talking back is also relevant in other situations. In their own word, interviewees produce "two worlds", which are frequently contrasted. These two worlds are not in same in both cities. In Frankfurt, interviewees categorize drugs differently, use local member knowledge, use predicates such as ability to speak the language and "Kanake". This differences might be attributed to different socio-cultural development of both places.

On the basis of the analysis results, it is plausible to infer ideal types of the two moral worlds which are represented by two modes of drug dealing. I call the first mode "tuff boys", using Hustler Hard label "krasse Junge". Tough boys are characterized by ability to intimidate others, doing other criminal activity, using violence, and being purely financial motivated (selling drugs to anybody, to unknown people), not being trustworthy, not having job, and linked to more deviant subculture and its values. The other "friendly" mode is based in leisure values and in the ability to withstand demands of society. Crucial feature of this mode is to "stay low", not to draw unwanted attention, to be "responsible", and to have a "self-control". The leisure values base the interwievees preference to sell the drugs that they like and the other preferences that were not mentioned in this analysis, for example to spend the money with friends at parties. Work of Bucerius (2010) suggests that,

at least in Frankfurt, these ideal types reflect the reality and are not just virtual. However, the specific predicates of categories might reflect more stereotypes about other group then the values of other group.

6 Discussion: questioning the horizons of secondary, qualitative, international, and interlingual research

This concluding chapter relates my experience with this approach to theoretical and methodological discussions. The first section of this chapter presents the characteristic features of the research process of this investigation. The next two sections move on to the evaluation of problems and promises of this approach. The concluding sections discusses the horizons of this approach.

My experience with comparative (re)use of qualitative data matches with one typical characteristic of the data (re)use and comparative approach: uncertainty of research plan. The research process of this investigation corresponds with Hammersley's (1997, 136) description of research process in the case of qualitative research: "Particular lines of investigation often have to be abandoned, and planned ones never get started, while quite different possibilities emerge over the course of the investigation." (ibid.) Furthermore, the permeability of the research phases („moving forth and back"), which is typical for qualitative and comparative research (see Yom 2015; Ragin & Becker 1992), is significant feature of this investigation research process. Research process of this investigation is characterized by the fact that I was moving "back and forth" between different stages of research process and switching between different lines of investigation. For example, contrary to the plan, I used different approach for data analysis. This characteristic of research process could be regarded as sign of not rigorous research. However, in the case of the data (re)use, it is almost inevitable because researcher usually does not know exactly what data he will encounter. It is not only almost inevitable but it is also beneficial for research process because researcher is forced to focus on the casing – to bridge theoretical and empirical aspects – and, in turn, to produce new theoretical insights.

This section evaluates promises of comparative qualitative date reuse. First to evaluate are the promises of comparative approach. I evaluate the promise that this approach stimulates networking of the research community and the research process. In my case, the first of these promises was certainly fulfilled. The other promise was also realized because the research process of this investigation was stimulated by inclusion of

international and comparative feature. Adding this feature, I was able to compare the use of member categories in different settings. The results of this analysis suggest that, in the "western world", there are common features of member categories and that, in the specific situation, "dealers" use categories similarly. This finding could be verified by meta-synthesis (for the overview of the method see Walsh & Downe (2005) of similar data sets from other countries.[37] In addition to similarities, I also discovered differences between the use of the member categories. Further investigation of this differences could be significant for understanding of fluid and divergent drug markets in Europe. The promises linked with qualitative data (re)use were also fulfilled. I used the potential of data sets that would not be fulfilled otherwise. The ability to carry out research on hard-to-reach group and sensitive topics was also stimulated. In addition to that, I was not over-burdening population with additional research. Significantly, (re)use of data allowed me to investigate new research question and, at the same, to refine previous research. To conclude, data (re)use stimulated the research process and based the possibility to carry out comparative research.

To evaluate the problems of comparative qualitative reuse of data, it is important to note that I have managed them and; thus, that they are manageable. However, there are also some problematic issues that need to be highlighted. In my experience, this approach is time consuming and it is difficult to assess time demands of this approach in advance. Furthermore, it is difficult to plan due to the above described uncertainity that is based in the fact that the research (re)uses data. The other problem is availability, quality, and completeness of data records. I encountered this problem but I was able to manage it because I could discuss the data with CDR research team. However, it is important to stress out that data was not suitable for other analytical approaches. For example, transcripts were not adequate for the analysis of fine conversational details because these details were not systematically recorded, for example short pauses. Other problem of the data sets (re)use was data fit. For example, I was not able to pursue one promising line of investigation because the same question did not appear in both samples (Do you consider yourself as a dealer?). My experience also suggests that it is difficult to use the comparative qualitative secondary analysis to investigate relation between policies and individuals. It was one line of the investigation that I did not pursue.

---

[37] There are studies that could be potentially used for meta-synthesis. For example it is the work of Jacinto et al (2008) and Moyle (2013).

The horizons of the comparative and qualitative approach to (re)use of data are based in the ability to establish a position of this approach within the scientific community and in the ability to make this approach palpable for funding institutions. The ability to do this is conditioned by the successful management of following problems. First problem is the communication with funding institutions because, in the current situation, there is the lack of predictability caused by nature of this approach, by lack of long-term experience with this approach, and by relative lack of standards and guidelines. The other problem is time-consuming nature of the archiving and data (re)use because the needed amount of time is in conflict with the amount of time consumed by other activities (Hammersley 1997).[38] Beside other issues, the problem to establish the position of this approach within community of qualitative researchers is related to the lack of robust body of literature (standards, guidelines, and examples of data (re)use). I assume that both problems could be solved by the communication of research process accounts, which will provide material for the establishment of the basic guidelines for different modes of data (re)use, and by presentation of successful results of this analysis. I hope that this master thesis will provide one of such examples.

To conclude, I highlight the role of the approaches oriented on the investigation of situational aspects of the data collection (for example EM inspired approaches) for the development of data (re)use. They are suitable for this task because they have a potential to clarify the specifics of the particular research situation and, thus, they support the ability of the researcher to recontextualize data.

---

[38] Hammersley (1997) even predicted that the data reuse will be not applied due to rise of other obligations. His prediction have become real and it is confirmed by the lack of attention to reuse of data.

7 List of References

Atkyns, Robert L. & Hanneman, Gerhard J. (1974). Illicit Drug Distribution and Dealer Communication Behavior. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 15 (1), 36-43.

Baker, C.D. (2000). 'Locating Culture in Action: Membership Categorisation in Texts and Talk'. In *Culture and Text: Discourse and Methodology in Social Research and Cultural Studies* (99–113). Allen & Unwin.

Barthes, R. (2006). Smrt autora. *Aluze,* 10, p. 75-77.

Becker, H. S. (2008). *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While You are Doing It.* University of Chicago Press.

Benkel, T. (2010). *Das Frankfurter Bahnhofsviertel: Devianz im öffentlichen Raum.* Springer-Verlag.

Benso, Vincent (2010): User-Dealer, Those Who Have Been Forgotten By Harm-Reduction. *Suchtmagazin,* (5),34–36.

Bishop, L. (2006). A Proposal for Archiving Context for Secondary Analysis. *Methodological Innovations Online*, *1*(2), 10-20.

Bishop, L. (2007). A Reflexive Account of Reusing Qualitative Data: Beyond Primary/Secondary Dualism. *Sociological Research Online*, *12*(3), not paginated.

Bishop, L. (2009). Ethical Sharing and Reuse of Qualitative Data. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, *44*(3), 255-272.

Bless, R. J., Kemmesies, U. E., & Diemel, S. (2000). *3rd Multi-City Study: Drug Use Trends in European Cities in the 1990s.* Council of Europe.

Blum, Richard (1971). Drug Pushers. A Collective Portrait. *Society* 8 (9-10), 18–21.

Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (2000). *Sorting things out: Classification and Its Consequences*. MIT press.

Bourgois, P. (2003). *In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge University Press.

Brannen, J., & Nilsen, A. (2011). Comparative |Biographies in Case-based Crossnational Research: Methodological Considerations. *Sociology*, *45*(4), 603-618.

Broom, A., Cheshire, L., & Emmison, M. (2009). Qualitative Researchers' Understandings of Their Practice and the Implications for Data Archiving and Sharing. *Sociology*, *43*(6), 1163-1180.

Bryman, A. (2015). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.

Bucerius, S. M. (2007). "What Else Should I Do?" Cultural Influences on the Drug Trade of Migrants in Germany. *Journal of Drug Issues*, *37*(3), 673-697.

Bucerius, S. M. (2010). Da musst du schon ganz unten sein. In *Das Frankfurter Bahnhofsviertel* (157-181). Springer-Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Cameron, Claire (2003). *CrossNational Qualitative Methods - Proceedings of a Workshop*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Clarke, Adele (2005). *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn*. Sage.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (1986). *Writing Cultures*. University of California Press.

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. Sage.

Coomber, Ross (2010). Reconceptualising Drug Markets and Drug Dealers — the Need for Change. *Drugs and Alcohol Today* 10 (1), 10–13.

Corti, L. (2006) 'Editorial', *Methodological Innovations Online*, 1(2), 1-9.

Csemy, L., Kubička, L., & Nociar, A. (2002). Drug Scene in the Czech Republic and Slovakia During the Period of Transformation. *European addiction research*, *8*(4), 159-165.

Dogan, M., & Pelassy, D. (1990). *How To Compare Nations: Strategies in Comparative Politics*. Chatham House Pub.

Drew, P. (1978). Accusations: The Occasioned Use of Members' Knowledge of Religious Geography' in Describing Events. *Sociology*, *12*(1), 1-22.

Dunn, C. S., & Austin, E. W. (1998). Protecting Confidentiality in Archival Data Resources. *ICPSR Bulletin*, *19*(1), 1-8.

Fielding, N. (2004). Getting the Most from Archived Qualitative Data: Epistemological, Practical and Professional Obstacles. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *7*(1), 97-104.

Flash Eurobarometer 233. (2008). *Young People and Drugs among 15-24 Year-olds.*

Flick, U., Kardorff, E. V. & Steinke, I. (2008). *Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch*. Rowohlt.

Foucault, Michel (1994). *Diskurs, autor, genealogie.* Nakladatelství Svoboda.

Galtung, J. (1990). "Theory Formation in Social Research: a Plea For Pluralism". In *Comparative Methodology* (99–113). Sage.

Gilbert, N. (2015). *Researching Social Life*. Sage.

Hammersley, M. (1997). Qualitative Data Archiving: Some Reflections on its Prospects and Problems. *Sociology*, *31*(1), 131-142.

Hammersley, M. (2010). Can We Re-use Qualitative Data via Secondary Analysis? Notes on Some Terminological and Substantive Issues. *Sociological Research Online*, *15*(1), not paginated.

Hantrais, L. (2008). *International Comparative Research: Theory, Methods and Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hartnoll, R. L. (2004). Drug Epidemiology in the European Institutions: Historical Background and Key Indicators. *Bulletin on Narcotics,* 55 (1), 53-71.

Heaton, J. (2004). *Reworking Qualitative Data*. SAGE.

Henwood, K. & Lang, I. (2005) "Qualitative Social Science in the UK: A Reflexive Commentary on the 'State of the Art'." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 6(3), not paginated.

Hester, S., & Eglin, P. (1997). *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. University Press of America.

Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J.F. (1995). *The Active Interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2004). Context: Working It Up, Down and Across. In *Qualitative research practice* (297-311). Sage.

Housley, W., & Fitzgerald, R. (2015). Introduction To Membership Categorisation Analysis. In *Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis* (1-21). Sage.

Hyman, H. H. (1972). Secondary Analysis of Sample Surveys: Principles, Procedures, and Potentialities. Wiley.

Jacinto, C., Duterte, M., Sales, P., & Murphy, S. (2008). "I'm Not a Real Dealer": The Identity Process of Ecstasy Sellers. *Journal of Drug Issues*, *38* (2), 419-444.

Juhila, K. (2004). Talking Back to Stigmatized Identities Negotiation of Culturally Dominant Categorisations in Interviews with Shelter Residents. *Qualitative Social Work*, *3*(3), 259-275.

Kaufmann, J. C. (2010). *Chápající rozhovor*. Sociologické nakladatelství (SLON).

Kittel, Bernhard (2006). "A Crazy Methodology? On the Limits of Macroquantitative Social Science Research." *International Sociology*, 21(5), 647-677.

Kohn, M. L. (1987). Crossnational Research as an Analytic Strategy: American Sociological association. *American Sociological Review*, *52*(6), 713-731.

Konopásek, Z., & Kusá, Z. (2000). Re-use of Life Stories in an Ethnomethodological Research. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 1, (3), not paginated.

Korf, D. J., Bless, R., & Nottelman, N. (1998). Urban Drug Problems, Policymakers and the General Public. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, *6*(3), 337-356.

Kübler, D., & Wälti, S. (2001). Drug Policy-making in Metropolitan Areas: Urban Conflicts and Governance. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *25*(1), 35-54.

Landman, T. (2008). *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*. Routledge.

Langer, A., Behr, R., & Hess, H. (2004). *Was dir der Stein gibt, kann dir keine Nase geben": Crack auf der Frankfurter Drogenszene.* Forschung Frankfurt.

Lieberson, S. (1991). Small N's and Big Conclusions: an Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases. *Social forces*, *70*(2), 307-320.

Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. *American political science review*, *65*(03), 682-693.

Lisle, E. A. (1985). Validation in the Social Sciences by International Comparison. *International Social Science Journal*, *37*(1), 19-29.

Mangen, S. (1999). Qualitative Research Methods in Crossnational Settings. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *2*(2), 109-124.

Marcus, G. (1986). Contemporary Problems of Ethnography in the Modern World System. In *Writing cultures* (165-194). University of Californa Press.

Mason, J. (2007). 'Re-Using' Qualitative Data: on the Merits of an Investigative Epistemology. *Sociological Research Online*, *12*(3), not paginated.

Mauthner, N.S., et al. (1998). The Data Are Out There, or Are They? Implications for Archiving and Revisiting Qualitative Data. *Sociology* 32(4): 733-745.

Mauthner, N. S., & Doucet, A. (2008). Knowledge Once Divided Can Be Hard to Put Together Again' An Epistemological Critique of Collaborative and Team-Based Research Practices. *Sociology*, *42*(5), 971-985.

Mauthner, N. S., & Parry, O. (2009). Qualitative Data Preservation and Sharing in the Social Sciences: On Whose Philosophical Terms?. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, *44*(3), 289-305.

Mauthner, N. (2012). Are Research Data a 'Common' Resource?. *Feminists @ law*, *2*(2), not paginated.

Miovský, M. (2007). Changing Patterns of Drug Use in the Czech Republic during the Post-communist Era: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Drug Issues*, *37*(1), 73-102.

Mlynář, J. (2016). Pluralita identit v autobiografickém vyprávění československých Židů žijících v zahraničí. *Historická sociologie*, (*1*), 33-51.

Moore, N. (2006). The Contexts of Context: Broadening Perspectives in the (Re) use of Qualitative Data. *Methodological Innovations Online*, *1*(2), 21-32.

Moore, N. (2007). '(Re)using Qualitative Data'. *Sociological Research Online*, 12, (3), not paginated.

Moyle, L. (2013*). An Exploration of How the Social Supply and User-Dealer Supply of Illicit Drugs Differs to Conventional Notions of Drug Dealing and Consideration of the Consequences of this Policy.* (PhD thesis, University of Plymouth, UK).

Nožina, M. (1997). *Svět drog v Čechách*. Koniasch Latin Press.

OECD (2007). *OECD Principles and Guidelines for Access to Research Data from Public Funding*, OECD Publishing.

Olszewski, D., Matias, J., Monshouwer, K., & Kokkevi, A. (2010). Polydrug Use Among 15to 16year Olds: Similarities and Differences in Europe. *Drugs: Education, Prevention, and Policy*, 17(4), 287302.

Oyen, E. (1990). *Comparative Methodology: Theory and practice in International Social Research*. Sage.

Parry, O., & Mauthner, N. (2005). Back to Basics: Who Re-uses Qualitative Data and Why?. *Sociology*, *39*(2), 337-342.

Petruželka, B. (2013). *„Dealeři" – koncová distribuce drog*. (Bachelor thesis, Charles University, Czech Republic).

Ragin, C. C., & Becker, H. S. (1992). *What is a case?: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge University Press.

Ragin, C. C. (2004). Turning the Tables: How Case-oriented Research Challenges. In *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (123-139). Rowman & Littlefield.

Ragin, C. C. (2014). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press.

Roulston, K. (2006). Close Encounters of the 'CA' Kind: a Review of Literature Analysing Talk in Research Interviews. *Qualitative Research*, *6*(4), 515-534.

Sartori, G. (1970). Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. *American Political Science Review*, *64*(04), 1033-1053.

Savage, M. (2007). Changing Social Class Identities in Post-war Britain: Perspectives from Mass-Observation. *Sociological Research Online*, *12*(3), not paginated.

Savage, M., & Burrows, R. (2009). Some Further Reflections on the Coming Crisis of Empirical Sociology. *Sociology*, *43*(4), 762-772.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A Tutorial on Membership Categorisation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(3), 462-482.

Slavnic, Z. (2013). Towards Qualitative Data Preservation and Re-use—Policy Trends and Academic Controversies in UK and Sweden. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 14, (2).

Spector, P. E et al (2015). Methodological and Substantive Issues in Conducting Multinational and CrossCultural Research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*,*2*(1), 101-131.

Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *22*(6), 664-670.

Szasz, Thomas (2003). *Ceremonial Chemistry. The Ritual Persecution of Drugs, Addicts, and Pushers.* Syracuse University Press.

The European Commision (2012). *Towards Better Access to Scientific Information: Boosting the Benefits of Public Investments in Research.* The European Commission.

Thompson, P. (2000) 'Re-using Qualitative Research Data: A Personal Account', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(3), not paginated.

Thorne, S. (1994). Secondary Analysis in Qualitative Research: Issues and Implications. *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*, 263-279.

Troman, G., & Jeffrey, B. (2007). Qualitative Data Analysis in Cross-cultural Projects. *Comparative Education*, *43*(4), 511-525.

Venkatesh, S. A. (2008). *Gang Leader For a Day: A Rogue Sociologist Takes to the Streets*. Penguin.

Waal, H., Clausen, T., Gjersing, L., & Gossop, M. (2014). Open Drug Scenes: Responses of Five European Cities. *BMC Public Health*, *14*(1), 853.

Wallerstein, I. (2011). *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. University of California Press.

Walsh, D., & Downe, S. (2005). Meta-synthesis Method for Qualitative Research: a Literature Review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *50*(2), 204-211.

Yom, S. (2015). From Methodology to Practice Inductive Iteration in Comparative Research. *Comparative Political Studies*, *48*(5), 616-644.

Online resources

ECDL Foundation. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from http://www.ecdl.org/media/German_Education_System.pdf

Essig, R. -B. (2008). Dreck am Stecken haben In *Deutschlandradiokultur*. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from http://www.deutschlandradiokultur.de/dreck-am-stecken-haben.1306.de.html?dram:article_id=193549

Schwesta Ewa. (2001-). In *Wikipedia: the free encyclopedia*. San Francisco (CA): Wikimedia Foundation. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schwesta_Ewa

Kanake. (2001-). In *Wikipedia: the free encyclopedia*. San Francisco (CA): Wikimedia Foundation. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kanake

Medard. (2016). *Medard*. Retrieved July 23, 2016, from http://medard2.soc.cas.cz/

Nesstar. (2016). *Nesstar*. Retrieved July 23, 2016, from http://nesstar.soc.cas.cz/webview/

Redensarten-index. (2016). In *Redensarten-index*. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from

http://www.redensarten-

index.de/suche.php?suchbegriff=Dreck+am+Stecken+haben&bool=relevanz&suchspalte%

5B%5D=rart_ou

8 List of Illustrations

9 List of Abbreviations

UN	United Nations
WHO	World Health Organization
EM	Ethnomethodology
MCA	Membership categorisation analysis
EU	European Union
MCD	Membership category device

10 Appendix

10.1 Questions and interview topics

10.1.1 Frankfurt based research

Distribution illegaler Drogen – Leitfaden für das qualitative Interview *(bitte vor dem Fragebogen durchführen!)*

- **Können Sie mir bitte – möglichst chronologisch – erzählen, wie sich Ihr Drogenkonsum von den ersten Drogenkontakten bis heute entwickelt hat? Bitte gehen Sie dabei auch darauf ein, wie Sie jeweils an die Drogen gekommen sind.**
  - Wann und wie haben sich die ersten Drogenkontakte ergeben? (nähere Erläuterungen zu Umständen und Motivationen; wie, wo, warum etc.)
  - Von wem haben Sie die ersten Drogen erhalten und wie? (gekauft, partizipiert, geschenkt)
  - Wie hat sich das dann fortgesetzt? Z.B.: wann das erste Mal selbst gekauft?
  - Wie hat sich der Konsum weiterentwickelt, wie die Beschaffung? Evtl.: weitere Drogen ausprobiert?
- **Hat sich in der Folgezeit – bis heute – ihr Konsumniveau wesentlich verändert? Hat sich etwas daran geändert, wie Sie an ihre Drogen kommen?**
  - Hier auch nach dem Verhältnis von selbst gekauften und unentgeltlich konsumierten Drogen fragen
  - Ggf., z.B. bei stärkeren Schwankungen, weiter chronologisch nacherzählen lassen
- **Wie finanzieren Sie ihren Konsum? Hat sich im Laufe der Zeit daran etwas geändert?**
- **Bitte beschreiben Sie typische Situationen, in denen Drogen unentgeltlich konsumiert werden.**
  - Bezogen auf eigenen unentgeltlichen Konsum und/oder einen unentgeltlichen Konsum anderer
  - Ggf. auch Situationen, in denen Drogen verschenkt werden
  - Wird in irgendeiner Form eine Gegenleistung verlangt? Wie bewerten Sie solche Gratiskonsum-/ Schenkungssituationen?
- **Bezogen auf diejenigen, von denen Sie Ihre Drogen erhalten: Wie stellt sich hier das Bekanntschaftsverhältnis dar?**
  - Kennen Sie diese Person(en) als Dealer oder sind es eher Freunde/ Bekannte (bereits vorher bekannt)? (ggf., bei mehreren unterschiedlichen Dealern, differenzieren)
  - Wie hat sich das Bekanntschaftsverhältnis im Zusammenhang mit der „Geschäftsbeziehung" entwickelt? Wie lange dauern derartige Beziehungen an?
  - Wie häufig sind die Kontakte? Wie oft geht es dabei um Drogen?
- **Können Sie bitte eine (oder mehrere unterschiedliche) typische Drogenkaufssituation(en) beschreiben?**
  - Kontaktanbahnung, Treffen (Ort, Zeit, Setting etc.); ggf. Unterschiede beim Kauf unterschiedlicher Drogen
  - Ergreifen Sie irgendwelche Sicherheitsvorkehrungen/ Vorsichtsmaßnahmen bezüglich etwaiger Strafverfolgung sowie, um den Kauf von Fake-Drogen bzw. Drogen schlechter Qualität zu verhindern? Wenn ja, welche?

- o Wie lange dauert es gewöhnlich, bis Sie Drogen kaufen können (gerechnet von der ersten Kontaktaufnahme)?
- **Gab es Gelegenheiten, bei denen Ihnen größere Mengen angeboten wurden, als Sie kaufen wollten? Oder andere Drogen als die, die Sie kaufen wollten? Bitte die Situation(en) beschreiben**
- **Haben Sie schon einmal Drogen von Dealern gekauft, die in der Öffentlichkeit aktiv sind? Z.B. Straße, Club, Park, sonstige (halb) öffentliche Räume**
  - o Hier geht es um Personen, die dem Betreffenden nicht oder allenfalls sehr flüchtig bekannt sind - Welche Drogen haben Sie dort gekauft?
  - o Woher wussten Sie von diesen Dealern und wie sind Sie in Kontakt getreten?
  - o Welche Erfahrungen haben Sie damit gemacht? Wie spielen sich typische Kaufsituationen ab?
- **Haben Sie selbst schon einmal mit illegalen Drogen gehandelt?**
  - o Falls diese Frage gleich verneint wird: vorsichtig nachfragen, ob nicht evtl. „mal anderen was mitgebracht" wurde; nicht-profitorientierter Handel/ Sammelbestellungen
    - o Ggf. derartige nicht profitorientierte Handelssituationen schildern/ erläutern: an wen, wann, wie, aus welcher Motivation heraus etc.
    - o Nachfragen, inwiefern solche Aktivitäten tatsächlich nicht profitorientiert sind/waren: z.B. Mengenrabatt? Kleineren Anteil abgezweigt?
  - o Ansonsten: wann das erste Mal, Situation näher beschreiben etc.

Falls keine Dealerfahrungen vorliegen oder diese sich auf einzelne nicht profitorientierte Gelegenheiten (max. 5) beschränken, nur noch folgende Frage stellen:

- **Haben Sie jemals erwogen, selbst Drogen zu verkaufen? Wie denken Sie darüber? Evtl.: warum haben Sie es nicht getan?**

<div align="right">→ <i>danach zum Fragebogen übergehen</i></div>

~ NEJKONIV ku a/

Für alle anderen:

- **Wie sind Sie dazu gekommen, mit Drogen zu handeln? Mit welchen Drogen handeln Sie/ haben Sie gehandelt?**
  - o Zunächst nach den Gründen/Motiven beim Einstieg in den Handel fragen
  - o Wie bewusst war die Entscheidung, selbst mit dem Handel zu beginnen? Von wem/ was angestoßen/ausgelöst? Hatten Sie sich vorher schon mal darüber Gedanken gemacht, selbst in den Handel einzusteigen?
  - o Mögliche Motive (auch im weiteren Verlauf): Z.B. Eigenbedarfsdeckung, Profitorientierung, ideelle/ politische/ individuelle andere Gründe
- **Wie hat sich Ihre Handelsaktivität über die Zeit hinweg entwickelt?**
  - o Hat sich an Ausmaß (Kunden, Drogenmenge) und Art und Weise des Handels etwas geändert? Wodurch motiviert?
  - o Falls sich das Ausmaß im Zeitverlauf erhöht hat: Wie kam es dazu? Haben Sie sich aktiv darum bemüht, ihre Handelaktivitäten zu steigern? Wenn ja, wie? Z.B.: wurden Sie nach größeren Mengen gefragt? Wie schwierig war es, größere Mengen zu besorgen?
  - o Konsumieren Sie (teilweise) Ihre eigene Ware? Wenn ja, in welchem Ausmaß?

- Beschreiben Sie bitte eine (oder mehrere unterschiedliche) typische Drogen**ver**kaufssituation(en): Kontaktanbahnung, Treffen (Ort, Zeit, Setting etc.), ggf. Sicherheitsvorkehrungen/ Vorsichtsmaßnahmen o.ä., ggf. Unterschiede beim Verkauf unterschiedlicher Drogen
  - Falls der/die Befragte seine Handelsaktivität eingestellt hat: Was war der Grund für das Aufhören? Wie haben sich Konsum, Versorgungslage und anderweitige Lebensumstände nach dem Aufhören entwickelt?
- **Woher bekommen Sie selbst die Drogen, die Sie verkaufen?**
  - Groß-/ Zwischenhändler? Erzeuger? Wie hoch sind die gehandelten Mengen des Lieferanten? Wissen Sie, woher die Drogen jeweils stammen?
  - Können Sie bestimmte Charakteristika Ihrer Lieferanten beschreiben? Evtl. Verbindungen in „echtes" kriminelles Milieu?
  - Wie haben Sie Ihre Lieferanten kennengelernt? Z.B.: aktiv danach gesucht oder „zufällig" kennengelernt? Wie lange dauern die Geschäftsbeziehungen an?
- **Wie schätzen Sie das Risiko ein, für Ihre Handelsaktivitäten rechtlich belangt zu werden?**
  - Machen Sie sich Gedanken über das Entdeckungsrisiko? In welchen Situationen?
  - Haben Sie Strategien/Techniken, das Entdeckungsrisiko zu minimieren? Welche?
  - Gab es in Ihrem (privaten oder geschäftlichen) Umfeld Personen, die erwischt wurden?
- **Wissen die Personen aus Ihrem näheren sozialen Umfeld (Partner(in)/ Eltern/ Kinder/ sonstige Familie/ enge Freunde) von Ihren Handelsaktivitäten? Wenn ja, wie denken diese über Ihre Handelsaktivität?**
- **Wie denken Sie selbst über Ihre Dealertätigkeit?**
  - Welche anderen Arten von Handelsaktivität würden Sie nicht machen? Gibt es für Sie eine subjektive Grenze zwischen akzeptablem und nicht akzeptablem Handel?
  - Wie denken Sie über anderweitige kriminelle Aktivität? Haben Sie jemals damit zu tun gehabt?
- **Sind Sie im Zusammenhang mit dem Drogenhandel jemals in kritische Situationen geraten?**
  - Dies betrifft insbesondere Erfahrungen mit physischer Gewalt, Bedrohung, Raub etc., auch selbst ausgeübte Gewalt, Bedrohung etc.
  - Außerdem ggf. Begegnungen mit Polizei o.a. Ordnungsbehörden → rechtliche Konsequenzen?
- **Betrachten Sie sich selbst als „Dealer"?**
  - Falls nicht: wie würden Sie Ihre Handelsaktivitäten sonst bezeichnen?
  - Wenn ja: ab welchem Zeitpunkt haben Sie sich als Dealer betrachtet?

10.1.2 Prague based research

"1) trávení volného času;
2) vztah a zapojení do klubové kultury, subkultury;
3) vztah k drogám – iniciace a průběh deviantní kariéry při prodávání a užívání drog;
4) vztah k normální práci;
5) čas strávený činností dealera;
6) vztah k lidem užívajícím drogy, vztah k lidem neužívajícím drogy – přátelé, rodina;
7) pohled na ostatní dealery;
8) hodnocení současné situace týkající se drog – s čím nejsou nespokojeni, reflexe drogového trhu v Čechách, jak vnímají případ ‚předávkované' dívky;
9) ‚příručka dobrého dealera' – jak být dobrý dealer;
10) morální reflexe jejich situace a výhled do budoucnosti." (Petruželka 2013, 42)

10.2 Citations

10.2.1 Dealer as the membership category

10.2.1.1 Handling drugs with acquitances

Interviewer: *"Kannst du bestimmte Charakteristika deiner Lieferanten beschreiben? Eventuell Verbinugen ins 'echte' kriminelle Millieu?"*
Cornholio: *"[...] Mir war einfach auch wichtig, mich mit den Leuten identifizieren zu können, zu wissen, dass sie auch eine moralische Grenze haben. Oder dass ich niemals so abgezockt werden könnte. Weil ich halt eine einschlägige Erfahrung damit gemacht hatte."*

Interviewer: *"Tys řikal, že tam je nějaká hranice..."*
S: *"Eh?"*
Interviewer: *"Kterou nepřekračuješ..."*
S: *"Asi když, jakoby mám pocit, že to je tam, když to dáváš lidem, který neznáš a nebo který už sou ob dvě kolena vod někoho koho znáš, tak myslim, že tam je ta hranice a tak... když to jakoby řešíš, jak na tom jakoby nejrychleji vydělat nějaký peníze a jakoby nejde o nic jinýho a dáváš to komukoliv kdo přijde... tak tam..."*

10.2.1.1.1.1 Additional examples

Interviewer*: "Triffst du betreffend der Starfverfolgung Sicherheitsvorkehrungen? Est is ja illegal."*
Neo: *"Ja, nicht am Telefon zu labern Quasi nur persönlich reden. Nicht in der Öffentlichkeit oder halt im Auto [...] Ja, und ich wollte meien Dealer auch näher kennelernen, wollte wissen, wie die so drauf sind. Ich wollte nichts mit Leuten zu tun haben, die zu unvorischtig sind."*

10.2.1.2 Handling with specific drugs

Interviewer: *"Einfach nur, weil du das selbst nich nimmst, oder weil du es nicht akzeptal findest?"*
Willsten: *"Ich weiss nicht, ob es akzeptabel ist. Ich habe es nicht genommen, ich kann es nicht sagen, deswegen kann ich es nicht verkaufen … Also das interessiert mich nicht, Heroin und so... weil einfach... ich habe da schon viel gesehn so von andere Leuten, die Heroin genommen haben. Der Freund von meiner Schwester … halt ziemlich verrückte Leute, un das war mir dann zu krass."*

Interviewer: *"Jak se díváš na lidi co kupujou? Nepříjemný pocity ohledne toho?"*
S: *"[...] piko bych neprodával. Nemám rád ty lidi kolem. Je to hrozně devastující věc. Toho člověka to semele hrozně. A podle mě je to i víc návykový. Všechny známý, co kolem mě byli, na tohleto dojeli. Dopadli šíleně. Neviděl sem je půl roku a pak jsem je nepoznal, jak byli v prdeli semletý. Tohle bych fakt neprodával. Vo tom si myslím svý. Já jsem vždycky nějak prodával to, co mi přišlo dobrý, než aby to bylo byznysový, i když vím, že bych to moh střílet jak čurák. A tady už by mě asi tížilo svědomí. Což je trochu překvapující."*

10.2.1.2.1.1 Additional examples

Kiffer: *"Gut, harte Drogen seh ich bedenklich, aber ich bin halt auch kein Kosument, ist es eigentlich auch logisch, dass ich selbst keinen Handel damit betreiben würde. Ich würde nur handeln, was ich auch konsumiere. Bei Cannabis kann jeder machen, was er will, das läuft gesetzlich einiges schief von Seiten des Staates. In meinen Augen ist die Abgabe von grossen Mengen nicht mehr verwerflich als die Abgabe von kleinen. Irgendwo muss es ja herkommen."*

M: *"Vždycky jsem prodával, co jsem měl rád."*

10.2.1.3 Ability to withstand social demands

Interviewer: *"Und wenn du dann verkaufst, wie gehst du dann vor? Rufen die dich an, kommen die bei dir vorbei oder triffst du dich irgendwo mit denen?"*
Puma: *"Ja, ich meine Kiffer, kiffen ja nie alleine, die sind in verschiedenen Kreisen immer drin, das spricht sich halt schnell herum wenn man verkauft oder so. Nummer weitergeben ist eigentlich recht asozial, am besten wenn man Leute direct vorstellt das ist der und der, kann der die Nummer haben. Das ist eigentlich immer am besten. Und um unerkannt zu bleiben würde ich mal dazu sagen wenn man einen festen Job hat, und unr so nenbenbei dealen tut. Weil wenn man halt dealen als sein Hauptberuf sieht, ist dann halt scheisse. weil man hat ja dann Hart 4 wahrscheinlich..."*

Interviewer: *"A jak?"*
M: *"... Většina problémů vychází z toho, že je to ilegální a vždycky tě někdo bude srát. Lidi jsou nespolehlivý, nejsou smlouvy. Musíš si najít dobrou partu, jinak na ulici platí, že kdo udělá víc než druhý, nebo se nebojí násilí, má výhodu. Já se toho snažím vyvarovat. Mám kamarády a mám lidi, co hulí. Jsi v komunitě, která chce produkt, a ty jim ho dáváš za lepší cenu, všichni ho používaj."*

10.2.1.3.1.1 Additional examples

Interviewer: *"A vnímáš to z nějakejch jinejch hledisek, než jen z toho odposlouchávání telefonu?"*
S: *"Nevim, tak moje teorie těhletěch drog, který se vyskytujou na vokraji je , že nahrazujou nejakej nedostatek něčeho… a hmmm a mám pocit, že lidi který sou s nima ve styku. Sou taky v takovejhle oblastech. Tak když to dealujou, takovýty malý dealeři, sou takový oblasti, kde ty lidi, kde ty lidi třeba nepracujou, nebo nedelaj nic jinyho a mozna tim vynahrazujou nějakou absenci nějakejch socialních struktur."*

10.2.1.4 The difference between Prague and Frankfurt

Interviewer: *"Kannst du bestimmte Charakteristika von denen bennen?"*
Hustler Hard: *"Unterschiedlich. Der eine ist Kanacke, der kaum Deutsch spricht, seit 20 Jahren hier ist. Der andere ist Kampfsportler, hat sogar studiert an der FH, der ist cool, Ich vertrau auch nur ihm."*

10.2.1.4.1.1 Additional examples

Cornholio: *"Also ich hatte beispielweise jemanden, da habe ich zwei, drei mal Piece gekauft, der war auch mit den Hells Angels verbandelt. Da war auch Knarre auf dem Tisch, wenn ich zu ihm gekommen bin, da war das der Fall. Aber das war nicht mein Styl, ich wollte das nicht. Deswegen bin ich auch nur selten da hingehen. Die Grausleute hatten keine. Der eine war hochgebildet, iranischer politischer Flüchtling, der hatte auch eine Holand Connection aufgemacht, wie das funktionert, ähm, weiss ich nicht. Das andere war eben der Cousin, der war 30, ganz bürgerlich, ganz integriert, ganz normal aussehend, also dem hattte man das nie angesehen. Und die anderen beiden waren Studenten. Also mit ganz normalem Hintergrund. Also es war nie reduziert auf diesen reinen Geschäftskontakt, dass ich gesagt hatte ich geh dahin, leg das Geld auf den Tisch und gehe wieder… Mir war enfach auch wichtig, mich mit den Leuten identifizieren zu können, zu wissen, dass sie auch eine moralische Grenze haben. Oder dass ich niemals so abgezockt werden könnte. Weil ich halt eine einschlägige Erfahrung damit gemacht hatte."*

10.2.1.5 Profit?

Interviewer: *"Zu welcher Zeit hast du dich als Dealer gesehn?"*
Jan: *"Zu der Zeit, als ich zu Hause hatte und auf profit verkauft hab."*

Interviewer: *"Wie gesagt, wenn du öfters mal Kumpels einfach mal was mitbringst wenn du eine grössere Menge holst das ist dann halt schon was anderes als wenn du weiss nicht, wie viel da abgezwackt wird und wie viel Gewinn du da halt wirklich darauf machst."*
Puma: *"Ja, was heisst gewinn, ist immer so eine Sache, man macht halt bei verschiedenen Leute verschiedene Preise, also ich zumindest, ich habe halt keine Festpreise, aber ich mach halt immer schon Gewinn, ja. Umsosnst gebe ich es auf keine Fall weg, also Gewinn ist auf jeden Fall immer drin. Bei dem einen meht bei dem anderen weinger. Der eine der halt gut verdient der zahlt naturlcih ein bisschen meher, dem es halt nicht so weh tut… Ja sehe ich mich selbst als dealer… Was soll ich dazu sagen? … Nein wäre eine Lüge, ja, abr*

ich selbs sehe ich mich nicht halt so... Von sichte, aus anderen Personen dann auf jeden Fall, aber aus meiner Sicht eigentlich nicht so. Ich tue den Leuten ja einen Gefallen, die wollen es ja haben.. Sagen wir so, ja… gefallen ?"

Interviewer: *"Když takhle dáváš nějakým lidem a voni si to od tebe berou, máš nějaký pocity vůči těm lidem a vůči tobe, jak to reflektuješ?"*
J: *"Řešil sem to hodně, jestli je to morální, jestli to můžu dělat a nějakej výchozí bod je asi, že ne, tak se to jako říká, že by se to asi dělat nemělo. Já sem to měl tak, že sem se snažil rozlišovat, co je to za lidi a za drogu. A droga to vždycky bylo s nějakým ziskem, s tou finanční motivací, to bylo to mdma výhradně a považuju to za jednu z nejbezpečnějších substancí v tom drogovym světě a je tam riziko, že to tam někdo bude brat moc často a jakoby vždycky sem si řikal, jakej mám pocit z toho člověka, jestli bych mu to měl dávat a jestli ne..."*

Interviewer: *"In welchem Verhältnis standest du denn zu den Leuten, mit denen du gehandelt hast, und hat sich über die Zeit da etwas verändert?"*
Kaiser Soze: *"Manchen waren einfach gute Freunde schon vorher. Ich hab aber auch durch das Konsumieren und durch den Handel auch andere gute Freunde gemacht. Aber mit anderen war es auch oftmals auf einer reinen Geschaftsbasis, die irgendwann dann auch leicht unangenehm war. Wenn man sich echt nur darüber unterhält und sich auch nur deswegen trifft, dann hat das schon viele eher einen kriminillen Touch. Naja, es gibt halt solche und solche, aber im Endeffekt hab ich es trotzdem gemacht. Es ging ja auch um Kohle machen."*

Lars P.: *"Ja, alle die es konsumieren, und damit unseren Alltag bestreiten, im kriminillen Bereich. Aber der eien ist halt, wenn du so willst, Profi, und verdient damit sein Geld, und der andere macht es so halt nebenbei, um seinen Eigenkonsum und was für die Bekannten abzudecken, abzuhaschen. Also, äh, ich mache das schon, isch denle, da ist ein Unterschied zu erknnen, im Handeln. Ob jetzt einer 5 kg in der Garage hat, oder einen Sack von, ich sgae mal 100g zu hause hat. Das macht schon einen Unterschied, glaube ich."*

Interviewer: *"Jak by si zařadil sebe?"*
M: *"Fajn přivýdělek, ale ta práce ti víc nedává, pokud se nezajímáš o nějaké pěstování, nic ti to nepřináší v živote, týpek přijde a hm, hmhmhm..."*

Interviewer: *"Wie bezeichnest du denn Heute deinen Weitergabe?"*
Soul: *"Als Gefallen"*

10.2.1.5.1.1 Additional examples

Interviewer: *"A když se k tomu dostáváme, jak být správnej dealer?"*
S: *"[...] jak bejt správnej dýler... dobrý kontakty, ceny a sehnat odběr, to je důležitý a to je vo tom jak chce kdo, ten kámoš z benátek, ten to hrotil, jezdil do klubu jenom s tim, že tam bude prodávat. Což už je takový... prodáváš lidem, co vůbec neznáš, to už mi přijde docela vohubu za každou cenu..."*

Lola: *"Ja, das is so, dass ich teilweise deale, also wieder. Ich hab ja sehr lange aufgehört und hab jetzt vor kurzem quasi wieder angefangen. Um den Konsum auch zu finanzieren, ja ähm und früher war es mein Taschengeld, also mein Geld zum Leben halt. Da hab ich*

immer was abgezwackt um was zu kaufen."

Lars P.: *"Also, wenn ich meinen Eigenbearf decke, dann ist es fur mich nicht wirklich dealen. Dealen is für mich Geld verdienen – profesioneller Kaffehändler . Wenn einer das macht, keine Ahnung, um sinene Eigenkonsum abzudecken, oder einem Kumpel auszuhelfen, ist das für mich nicht dealen... Was bin ich dann? Ja? Ich habe kleinen Schnapp gemacht. ALso Geschaftsmann bin ich dann, glube icht, noch nicht."*

Interviewer: *"Jak by si popsal klasickej den z tý doby, kdy si prodával?"*
K: *"Ani se nelišil... to se nedá říct. To byly dny, kdy sem neprodal, neměl sem to za nějakou živnost. Když sem někde byl, tak tam za mnou někdo přisel. Málokdy se stane aby vyhledal někdo konkrétně tebe pokud nemáš něco, super ceny nebo něco extra super. Všude po Praze cena je dvěstě. Mě se málokdy stávalo, že by me někdo konkrétně vyhledával. Den stejnej jako každej, jako teď. Někde sem seděl a kecal s ostatníma, někdo mi řek o jedničku nebo ne a já sem mu ji předal nebo ne. Můj den se neměnil ... jinej den, něco spešl, kolikrát to znamenalo že sem se musel zvednout, když to bylo pět jedniček, pětikilo. Ukončil sem program a někam sem jel. To byl jeden z důvodů proč sem se na něco takovyho vyprdnul. Nebylo to fakt omezující a takovej výdělek to nebyl a hulil sem o to vic páč sem na to prachy měl. Jediný, co mi to dalo mi, to zaplatilo, co sem vyhulil. Výdělek to byl nulovej. Když sem přestal, sem na tom stejně."*

Soul: *"Ich hatte nichts gestreckt mit irgendwelchen Dingen. Wenn ich gewusst hab, dass irgendwas irgendein Rotz ist, dann hatte ich es auch nicht weitergeben konnen. Ich hatte halt keine Luete abgerippt. Ich hab nie Leute abgerippt. Jeder der mehr als 100 gramm pro Monat verkauft. Jemand, der sich daran bereichrt. Wenn ich heut 100 Gram kaufe, kriegen zwei, drei Leute davon was, und da verdiente ih manchmal zehn, zwanzig Euro dran, manchmal auch nichts. Das bezeichne ich nicht als dealen, weil ich mache es nicht aus Bereicherung. Die Zeiten haben sich halt geandert. Ich hol mir halt meinen Vorrat für zwei, drei Monate, und wenn jemand was bei mir holt, darn verringert sich halt mein Vorrat, manchmal auch eben um einen Monat dann gleich, aber das macht ja nichts."*

Interviewer: *"Nevydělal si na tom?"*
K: *"Já sem se uklidňoval, že to je normální cena. Když se zeptaj na Vaclávaku maj za dvojnásobek a polovinu. Takze mi to nepřislo nefér. Když si vzali kontakt a viděl sem s nima příště tak sem ji to dal levnějc. A sou američani a hulej čistý a byl to výdělek, bylo to nárazový, sezonní.. na Erasmus třeba. Pak to ustalo. Kamrády kterejm sem prodával mi to rozhodne nevydělalo. Pokud na tom co sem zhulil vydělal něco navíc tak na něco co sem spotřeboval v hospodě kde sem byl. Seděl sem v X od rána do večera a byl sem tam jedinej. Dneska sou tam tři, čtyři lidi. Šla za mnou celá Y, tyhle lidi. Prišlo za mnou deset lidí a koupili jedničku. To byl zrovna litr a ten litr sem tam nechal za panáky. Odcházel sem domu s uplně stejnym. Teď nesedim v X celej den a teď sem na tom stejně. Vydělá ti to a utratíš to. Utratíš vždycky. Já sem to utratil v souvisloti s tou činností samou od sebe. Člověk by moh, není to jako v práci ze dostaneš výplatu a deš. Výplatu v průběhu dne. Dostal sem kilo, čtyři panáky a padlo to."*

Interviewer: *"A když ne živnost, tak co to bylo?"*
K: *"No ta byla spojená s tim prostě kalením jako takovym, pařením a to byl doplněk toho že už tam sem. To bylo to co sem řikal, že už tam sem tak prodám. Proto sem začal, moji původní životni náplní bylo že sem pařil, zní to divně. Životni náplň, škola, kamarádi a tak.*

S tim bylo spojený tak že ve škole se dá prodat, kamarádm a na pařbě. Někde sem něco delal přitom někde něco dělaní se dalo prodat."

Kaiser Soze: *"Ein Dealer? Also ein Dealer is fokusssiet darauf mit Drogen Geld zu verdienen und das ist seine einzige Motivation. Bei mir war es eigentlich anders:.Bei mir war das immer auch mit Konsum verbunden. Zeitweise hab ich mich schon auch als Dealer gefühlt. Ich war technisch gesehen auch ein Dealer. Ich hab mich eher in einer Subkutlur als gemeinschaftlicher Helfer gesehn. Manchmal ist es mir auch passiert, das ich an Deals uberhaupt nichts verdient hab. Ich wollte Leute auch einenn Gefallen tun, deswegen hab ich mich nie zu 100 Prozent als Dealer gesehn, auch wenn die Mengen grosser wurden und so Zeug."*

10.2.1.6 Junkies

Interviewer: *"Weil du erwischt wurdest und so?"*
Jan: *"[...] Und das ist halt die etwas, nicht diese Junkieszene, sondern die normale, die halt ein normales Leben und aber trotzdem Bock hat auf Feiern doder irgendwie mal auszuflippen [...]"*

Interviewer: *Co si myslíš o uživatelích drog?*
K: *"[...] Pokud je to tvrdší droga, pokud bych zjistil, že můj kamarád hulí deset gramů denně a do toho fetuje tak asi spíš ze bych si něco pomyslel tak bych se mu snažil pomoct pokud by to proste... Injekční podání, já stejně jako většina národa, lidi to berou jako druhej břeh. To je někde jinde, něco jinýho. O tom bych si myslel ty špatný věci. ..."*

10.2.1.6.1.1 Additional examples

H: *"[...] mrtě kontaktů sem měl, co sem odpískal, jako ten kilař, kterej má ten problém s policajtama, půjde si sednout, chytli ho s kilem, byl provařenj, polykač ten byl v televizních novinách , měl sem od nej parkrat hašiš co vozil ze Španělska, měl v sobě kilo a chytli ho v Boleslavi, pak si občas šlehal herák a byl vyfetlo a byl to člověk s kterym si nechtěl bejt viděnej a byl celkově provařenej.. seděl doma přilítli mu dvě kila voknem vzal pytel s penězma a shodil ho zpátky z vokna. To sou lidi co sem vodpískal, chvíli sem s nima to a pak sem na to radši vysral, že s tim nechci bejt spojovanej[...]."*

Russe: *"Die haben das nicht gespritzt oder so, die warren jetzt nicht diese typischen Bahnohofsjunkies oder so..."*

10.2.2 Membership categorisation of drugs

Interviewer: *"Zum Beispiel, Heroinhandel ist auch akzeptabel? Oder ziehst du irgendwo eine Grenze?"*
Lars P.: *"Also, es ist nicht meine Welt. Muss ich ganz ehrlich sagen, äh, äh, ich würde es selbst nie machen."*

Interviewer: *"Proč si prodával jen tohle?"*

K: *"[...] Shrnu. Prodával jsem to lidem ve svým okolí a kamarádům, a pokud bych chtěl začít prodávat něco jiného, moji kamarádi by se museli změnit, musel bych se přesunout do jinýho okoli."*

10.2.2.1 Cannabiss

Miu Miu: *"Die, die Kiffen, oder die, die feiern sind ein anderer Schlag Menschen finde ich. Du hast, die einen, die gechillten, ja sagen wir das mal so."*

S: *"Na zakládce v deváté třídě, když přišel kámoš, ty vole, přines nějakou první vesnickou čudku, tak jsem se zhulil během vodpoledky, snad něco takovýho."*

10.2.2.1.1.1 Additional examples

M: *"Marihuana častěji tak v sedmnácti, třeba každý měsíc od sedmnácti. A každopádně jsem byl vždycky v té skupině lidí, kde všichni hulili. Nikdy jsem si nepřipadal nějak nenormálně, vždycky jsem byl v partě, kde někdo hulil víc než já."*

S: *"[...] daný kámošema. Všichni začali hulit a všichni hulili. Když sme šli ven, tak jsme šli na brko. Bylo to takový, že si ani na něj neměl chuť, tak sis ho jen dal. Tak sis na to zvyk."*

J: *"Párkrát jsem si zahulil něco lepšího. Tamta základka, prvák, to byly takový čudky. To se vylepšovalo. Tak konec prváku jsem už fakt docela to, no, jako že fest [...] No možná až střední. Další lidi, takový zázemí. Aby si mohl dál hulit. Zas chodili lidi s brkama. Takže to bylo takový příležitostný, až pak jsem si k tomu vybudoval takovej vztah."*

Cornholio: *"Also ich hatte beispielweise jemanden, da habe ich zwei, drei mal Piece gekauft, der war auch mit den Hells Angels verbandelt. Da war auch Knarre auf dem Tisch, wenn ich zu ihm gekommen bin, da war das der Fall. Aber das war nicht mein Styl, ich wollte das nicht. Deswegen bin ich auch nur selten da hingehen. Die Grausleute hatten keine. Der eine war hochgebildet, iranischer politischer Flüchtling, der hatte auch eine Holand Connection aufgemacht, wie das funktionert, äh, weiss ich nicht. Das andere war eben der Cousin, der war 30, ganz bürgerlich, ganz integriert, ganz normal aussehend, also dem hattte man das nie angesehen. Und die anderen beiden waren Studenten. Also mit ganz normalem Hintergrund. Also es war nie reduziert auf diesen reinen Geschäftskontakt, dass ich gesagt hatte ich geh dahin, leg das Geld auf den Tisch und gehe wieder... Mir war enfach auch wichtig, mich mit den Leuten identifizieren zu können, zu wissen, dass sie auch eine moralische Grenze haben. . Oder dass ich niemals so abgezockt werden könnte. Weil ich halt eine einschlägige Erfahrung damit gemacht hatte."*

Peter: *"Also bei Gras war es immer in der Regel so, immer Freunde."*

10.2.2.2 Chemical and natural substances

Soul: *"Ich wollte keine Chemie, keine Medikamente. kein nichts ... später Pillen und Pep."*

S: *"To bylo taky jak s tím hulenim. Někdo přišel [...] to fakt většinou bylo, že s tím někdo přišel, ne že bych to vyhledával. Jo, houbičky, to je ještě přírodní, a pořád jsem to bral jako přírodní, jako že žádná chemie."*

10.2.2.2.1.1 Additional examples

H: *"To bylo úplně jasný. Skončil jsem s podnikáním. Holou prdel a hodně závazků. Já jsem makal a tohle byl přivýdělek. A začalo to tím, že jsem začal pěstovat. A nechtěl jsem jako vůbec prodávat tvrdý drogy, jako vůbec ne. Chtěl jsem si jet jenom to hulení."*

J: *"Věděl jsem, že si chci zkusit trávu a houbičky, to se mi zdálo v pohodě."*

Kaiser Soze: *"Da hatte ich auch sehr viele Reserven, mir irgendwelche chemische Substanzen reinzuziehen in meinen jungeren Jahren."*

10.2.2.3 Chemical substances

Interviewer: *"Gibt es irgendeine Art von Handel, den du nicht betreiben wurdeszt?"*
Willsten: *"Ja, sachen die ich selbst nicht nehme. Heroin, Crack, irgendwie das alles.."*

Interviewer: *"Co je za tou hranicí, kterou jsi zmiňoval?"*
J: *"Pervitin, heroin. A jako není to až jako vymezený tou drogou nebo tím výčtem, a spíš tím životním stylem a že jakoby potřebuješ sehnat hodně peněz na to, abys měl drogy, točíš se v nějakým cyklu závislosti [...]."*

Felix da House Cat: *"Bei 100 Gramm Kokain kannst du auch mal schnell eine Gasknarre, oder eine echte Knarre am Kopf haben... Und ich meine, da machen manche Menschen schon was dafür, vor allen Dingen wenn das meistens in so Händen von Albanern und so was ist, die haben da relativ niedrige Hemmschwellen."*

10.2.2.3.1.1 Additional examples

S: *"Že to nemám rád, piko bych neprodával. Nemám rád ty lidi kolem. Je to hrozně devastující věc. Toho člověka to semele hrozně. A podle mě je to i víc návykový. Všechny známý, co kolem mě byli, na tohleto dojeli. Dopadli šíleně. Neviděl sem je půlroku a pak jsem je nepoznal, jak byli v prdeli semletý. Tohle bych fakt neprodával. Vo tom si myslím svý. Já jsem vždycky nějak prodával to, co mi přišlo dobrý, než aby to bylo byznysový, I když vím, že bych to moh střílet jak čurák. A tady už by mě asi tížilo svědomí. Což je trochu překvapující."*

Lola: *"Das hab ich generel Respekt vor."*

Theo: *"[...] damit wollte ich nichts machen. Das war mir zu gefährlich von den Leuten, die da drinhingen."*

Ganja Mania: *"[...] der Koksteufel [...]"*

Puma: *"Also kokst kriegst du immer im Bordell, würde ich mal sagen... Also in solchen*

Kreisen kriegt man immer was ja. Da kommt man nicht drumherum. Das ist unsere Polizei zu schwach in Deutschland, sie greift nicht hart genung durch um so was zu ändern."

Interviewer: *"Gibt es da Unterschiede beim Kauf von unterschiedlichen Drogen?"*
Willsten Habe: *"Hmmm. Nicht wirklich, also es kommt drauf an, es gibt halt überall unterschiedliche Dealer, oder bei welchem Menschen man kauft... also, wenn ich jetzt bei einem Menschen Koks hole, dann ist der schon paranoider als wenn ich bei einem Menschen Gras hole. Die Grasleute sind da eher so, "komm ich heu net, komm ich moje", und die Koksleute, die denken sich, oh Gott, Polizei, die wollen mich haben... die sind da schon ein bisschen mehr schräg drauf."*

Puma: *"Ich mein Kokain ist auch, wenn du Kokain legalisierst, Legal wäre, würde es weniger Kriminalität gegeben auf jeden Fall. Weil das ist so Droge Nummer 1., wo es am meisten Kriminalität gibt, weil es um grosse Geldbeträge geht, weil da fangen die Beträge ab Kilo, fangen sie an ab... was kostet so ein Kilo... 20000-30000 Euro je nachdem, wo es halt kauft. Und wo es halt auch viele grosse Beträge sind, da hat man halt auch Waffen und so Sachen dabei, man braucht ja irgendwelchen Schutz, das ist nicht so ganz einfach wenn man jemanden bestehlt oder so, sollte man aufpassen mit der Droge [...]"*

Lars P.: *"Also es ist nicht meine Welt, muss ich ganz ehrlich sagen, äh, äh, ich würde es selbst nie machen. Ähm, ich denke aber, es gibt Leute, die kommen sogar mit der Droge klar. Also, es gibt ja Leute, die konsumieren das und schaffen es noch, arbeiten zu gehen. Ihr Geld zu verdienen und normal zu leben, ja? Es gibt Leute, die schaffen das leider nicht. Ah, für mich ist das nichts. Ich würde auch nicht mit Kokain oder Pillen dealen."*

10.2.3   Membership categorization and spatial aspects

Lola: *"[...] auf der strasse verkauft noch nie... Das hatte ich nie nötig, wenn du gute Zeug hast kommen die Leute von allein... Und selbst da vielleicht ein paar mal auf der Strasse, wer macht das nicht, wenn du wirklich mal verzweifelt bis [...]"*

M: *"Většina problémů vychází z toho, že je to ilegální a vždycky tě někdo bude srát. Lidi jsou nespolehlivý, nejsou smlouvy. Musíš si najít dobrou partu, jinak na ulici platí, že kdo udělá víc než druhý, nebo se nebojí násilí, má výhodu. Já se toho snažím vyvarovat. Mám kamarády a mám lidi, co hulí. Jsi v komunitě, která chce produkt, a ty jim ho dáváš za lepší cenu, všichni ho používaj."*

Interviewer: *"Prodávání drog na party?*
K: *"Ne, ne... to se týká jiných dorg, tanečních a podobně. Ta tráva ta zahrnuje. Ta zarhnuje to že sem tam šel s kamrádama ty by si tu jedničku koupili jinde. Cizim sem neprodaval, nikdo se me moc neptal. Je tam konkurence a za třetí vytipujou tebe že bys prodával málokdy. Je to výjimka. Rozhodně sem nešel cíleně na akci, že bych rozprodal a vydělal, to sem nedělal. Moh sem udělat že bych si stoupnul na Václavák. Ne, takouvoudle záměrnou činností, I když vim, že to vydělá dost.. Nikdy sem to nepraktikoval."*

Lasershow: *"Einfach zu kras..Das sind dann Leute, die sich gerne pruglen gehen, gern auch mal ins Bahnhofviertel in eien Absteige gehen, sich da boxen oder auch in Puff."*

Russe: "*[...] Die haben das nicht gespritzt oder so, die warren jetzt nicht diese typischen Bahnohofsjunkies oder so...*"