

Visual Experiencing and Communicating. Visual Sociology as a truly comprehensive scientific experience.

by **Roberto Cipriani** (University Roma Tre, Rome, Italy)
and **Emanuela C. Del Re** (University Niccolò Cusano, Rome, Italy)

Abstract – PART I: 1. An introduction: the idea of abduction from observed facts; 2. Surrender and catch: a style of visual research; 3. Catch and understanding. PART II: xxxx

Abstract

The paper offers a new way of interpreting visual sociology in line with the new developments in the field. The new developments refer to the fact that in recent years Visual Sociology has become an approach also used by those who were traditionally considered the “object” of sociological research. They have therefore become the “active subject”, through a process of development of the need for self-portrayal which is considered a formidable value added and a natural evolution of the accessibility of the technical tools used in Visual Sociology, especially in relation to studies in sociology of Religion. Moreover, individuals make use of the new visual through the expansion of their ability to communicate, therefore transforming the technological instruments and the new social media as a personal means of communication.

Referencing the recent Israeli film-documentary “Haifa’s answer”, which illustrates the relationship between visual sociology and religion, the authors will analyse visual sociology as a form of communication with the aid of their own experiences as researchers. Through the exploration of the complex relation between researchers, the “object” of the research, and the context, a multifaceted and fascinating alternation of roles with both objects and subjects emerges, posing both intellectual and emotional challenges.

The issues that arise from this totalizingly scientific and human experience are of a methodological nature. Finding the next step is the crucial challenge.

Part I

by Roberto Cipriani

1. An introduction: the idea of abduction from observed facts

Despite the specificity of visual sociology, the sociological examination must reflect the criteria that characterizes sociological analysis, and therefore must be based on data. It is in fact the data which is seen as the preliminary reference point to any scientific inquiry that must be explained. This task can be achieved by following the more than a century old theories of a scholar such as Peirce, who has recently been rediscovered with a scholarly credit which was denied to him during his academic and scientific activity. We want to recall here, as an introduction to this study, the fundamental contribution of Charles Peirce (1839-1914) to social sciences, in particular for his concept of “abduction”. The concept of “abduction” indicates the situation in which a limb or a part of it – such as a thumb, for instance – distances itself from the normal position of rest; Peirce’s interpretation and use of the concept is different, as we shall see.

Let’s proceed in a certain order. First of all it is opportune to restate that: “all our knowledge may be said to rest upon *observed facts*” (Peirce, 1957, p.235). Before Pierce, Auguste Comte (1798-1857) was already convinced of that, and not by chance he used to begin his teaching course on Positive Philosophy by affirming to be convinced of: “the necessity that always exists for some theory to which to refer our facts, combined with the clear impossibility that, at the outset of human knowledge, men could have formed theories out of the observation of facts. All good intellectuals have repeated, since Bacon’s time, that there can be no real knowledge but that which is based on

observed facts. This is incontestable, in our present advanced stage; but, if we look back to the primitive stage of human knowledge, we shall see that it must have been otherwise then. If it is true that every theory must be based upon observed facts, it is equally true that facts cannot be observed without the guidance of some theory. Without such guidance, our facts would be desultory and fruitless; we could not retain them: for the most part we could not even perceive them” (Comte, 1853, 2009, p.27). Mentioning Bacon is pertinent, especially if the connection is to stress the importance of data through observation.

It can be assumed that Peirce himself must have kept in mind, even though he did not quote it, the above-mentioned passage by Comte, whose works Peirce knew well. This emerges clearly from Peirce’s writings in which on one hand he emphasizes and on the other criticizes some of Comte’s statements, while recalling, just like Comte, the contribution of Bacon, which was intended to free the mind from misleading idols such as those derived from the human nature, the individual, the language and the dogmata of tradition. The English philosopher was therefore applying a sort of abduction-estrangement from normal habits (it is the case to underline that the lemma *abduction* appears in documents in French language already in the XVIth century, and in English in 1626, the year in which Bacon died) and his intention was to support the scientific activity in which there was a convergence between the nature of things and the human mind, that is, between an actual fact and the intellectual speculation-observation.

Going back to Peirce, one can say that he is a continuator of positivism under another perspective, that is pragmatism, intended as an overcoming of rational logic substituting it with a concrete, practical, active and practically useful verification. The starting point, however, is not only the fact in itself, but also the fact as an object of observation. In other words, the visibility, or rather the visual dimension of the fact, “captured” through observation, offers the possibility to exercise a certain control over the fact itself, and on the main circumstances that accompany it. This offers a number of opportunities:

- a. In this way a fact observed by a sociologist with the help of technologically advanced tools is fixed once and for all. This happens thanks to the visual processes that have been activated, and remain at disposal for any further cognitive route. The risk of mistakes and manipulations is hence reduced, although it cannot be completely avoided.
- b. Furthermore, in this way one offers also to other scholars the opportunity to accede evidence, verifications, and controls.
- c. Finally, the bias of the object and subject is also limited.

Peirce proposed the concept of abduction considering it as a: “preference for any one hypothesis over others which would equally explain the facts, so long as this preference is not based upon any previous knowledge bearing upon the truth of the hypotheses, nor any testing of any of the hypotheses, after having admitted them on probation. I call such inference by the peculiar name, *abduction*, because its legitimacy depends upon altogether different principles from those of other kinds of inference” (Peirce, 1957, pp.236-237). It must be nevertheless specified that while for Peirce induction is a mathematical demonstration and deduction can be either accompanied by quantitative elements or not, abduction instead includes any kind of procedure through which “theories and conceptions” can be produced (Peirce, 1957, p.237), in a non-conventional form, not previously tested, and *abductively* different from other known inferences.

Nevertheless, the basic premise remains, the opportunity to be able to verify directly and to observe by oneself the object of the analysis. From this point of view sociologists and anthropologists have an advantage over historians, given that the latter are not able to be present to what they are studying: almost the whole past, whether more or less remote, cannot be perceived except through a

third narrating person, through pictorial representations, or other surreptitious forms. Indeed, only some relatively recent events are depicted visually in testimonies that are numerous and dynamic, diverse and comparable, and can be selected. Indeed, only relatively recent events are depicted visually in testimonies that are both numerous and dynamic, diverse and comparable, and able to be selected.

Under another perspective, Peirce suggests to choose the option which is the most time efficient. This also favors the visual social-anthropologist because the observed data is immediately available, traceable, re-visitible, re-examinable, in “real-time”, and “in person”, which allows for immediate reproduction. Indeed, there are some motivations of time and economical nature that might cause the preference of a film to a written story, given that the former provides a notable number of qualitative significant data. This does not mean that one aprioristically excludes an in depth analysis of the contribution offered by the person that explains orally the result of her/his visual perception: there will certainly be more interesting data to be discovered. It is a question of choosing between experiences already absorbed and those still absorbable.

A fact, an event, or a phenomenon which undergoes a visual approach, still implies the presence of given contextual conditions in which that given fact, event or phenomenon has had a role, an influence, (and) a weight compared to what has been observed. Yet, the influence provided by the observation (and even more so in an observation recorded by video) is related to the opportunity of not only perfectly reconstructing the framework which constitutes the set of the events, but also allows a connection and relationship with the frame in which the perception is that of a visual social-anthropologist.

In such case, the operational function of the senses helps to build up perceptive objects or *perception*, which acquire a strategic value in the perspective of the visual analysis.

It must be said, in the end, that abduction acquires, according to Peirce, many diversified meanings. He does not provide one single definition of it. Abduction can also be equivalent “to observing a fact and then professing to say what idea it was that gave rise to that fact” (Peirce, 1957, p.244): anyhow abduction does not prescind from the observation of the fact, and only afterwards it proceeds to identify the idea that has originated the fact itself.

In the mean time, however, various diverging solutions have emerged as regards this issue, amongst which the option proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) is certainly preeminent due to their *Grounded Theory*, a “research style” that can do without theory, because its aim is in fact to construct a theory funded on and derived from the facts that have been found, observed, and recorded. Also visual sociology has taken some fundamental indications from the *Grounded Theory*, which it has adequately used and applied through procedures that directly recall it, in order to experiment innovative research routes, where there is more operational space for visual perspectives. In this regard a relevant position is occupied by Krzysztof Tomasz Konecki (2011) according to whom: “Grounded Theory can therefore be treated as an abductive methodology because it includes rational reasoning on empirical data to formulate a theoretical argument, which continues to be tested experimentally. This idea, which combines the methodology of grounded theory with abduction is presented in the later work of A. Strauss, which refers to the concept of there, i.e., Charles Peirce’s abduction. [...] Abduction is the process of innovation by modifying the emerging theory and new segregation of elements of present knowledge. Scientific discovery always requires the integration of previous knowledge with new experiences. Reconstruction of existing knowledge in new ways with the addition of new observations builds abductive inference” (Konecki, 2011, p.132, note 1). The suggested model of visual analysis is “multislice imagining”, “assuming that visual data are multi-layered. All layers should be analyzed in order fully to

conceptualize the visual processes” (Konecki, 2011, p.139). All this implies: “to organize the meticulous analysis of visual data. It structures the research process and allows for the development of abstract features of categories” (Konecki, 2011, p.151). The Polish sociologist uses a complete Grounded Theory procedure (coding, memoing, sampling) in his visual data analysis. But much remains to be done in terms of a specific visual perspective (Banks, 2007; Kissmann, 2009; Knoblauch, Schnettler, Raab, Soeffner, 2009; Margolis, Pauwels, 2011; Rose, 2011; Nathansohn, Zuev, 2012; Pink, 2012), towards “an integrated framework for visual social research” (Pauwels, 2010, p.547-568, especially Fig. 1, p.549).

It must be recognized that many steps forward have been moved since the times in which Allen D. Grimshaw experimented the “Sound-Image data Records” (SIR) that he considered: “a valuable and still largely neglected data resource for sociological research” (Grimshaw, 1982, p.121), stressing both the relevance of the “density of interaction” (Grimshaw, 1982, p.132-133) and the role of the investigator as a participant subject (Grimshaw, 1982, p.137-138) and the fact that “continuous full-body filming (to the extent maximally possible consonant with other requirements) and sound recording of all participants become more difficult as larger numbers of actors are involved” (Grimshaw, 1982, p.133). Another pioneer of contemporary visual sociology has been Leonard M. Henny (1986), a kind of missionary during international congresses, well aware of problems such as the “visual dimensions of social interaction” (Henny, 1986, p.47-48), “sociological cameraman” (Henny, 1986, p.49-50; Rouch, 1975), and “ethics of intrusion with the camera” (Henny, 1986, p.57-59). Nonetheless, there is no doubt that the most classic reference must be to the manifold work of Howard Becker (1974; 1995), who already in the 1960s had worked with Anselm Strauss in an inquiry that represents an *ante litteram* attempt of a Grounded Theory derived from data supported by examples related to the data themselves (Becker, Geer, Hughes, and Strauss, 1961). Furthermore, it is necessary to go back to the works of Bateson and Mead (1942) to find the original roots of the visual approach, which was carried out through the comparison between photo-cinema images of all kinds, with a rigorous methodology and a referential theory.

To mention a couple of contemporary attempts that can already be considered classics, one can refer both to the book of Bourgois and Schonberg (2009) on homeless heroin-addicts in San Francisco, to the film by Duneier and Brown, and to the photos of Carter (*Sidewalk*, 2007) on street vendors along the Sixth Avenue in the Greenwich Village in New York: all talk about marginalized individuals through a difficult participant observation based research and a strong visual character. It is a kind of “filming observation” (Lallier, 2011, p.107) that implies a true social relation between the observer who is filming/recording, and the person who is filmed/recorded. In other words, filming is a performing act that creates a relationship between a fully aware observing subject, and an observed subject who is not always fully aware of what is going on. This gives birth to an observed situation of exchanges between subjects, who create situations of exchange and express themselves socially in such situations (Lallier, 2011, p.113) but have different interests, in what they can win or lose in this interaction. Moreover, “the act of filming is related to a state of perception, to putting oneself at disposal in order to be able to understand the situation. This implies that one has to give up any presumption to be an expert about the world that one observes. This approach can be acquired by putting aside the “natural” perception of things that translates indeed into the act of captation. One must suspend any judgement, in the way that has been described by Edmund Husserl” (Lallier, 2011, p.109). In fact what is needed is not to be excessively sympathetic, but to rationally distance oneself, *engagement distancié* or *neutralité engagée* (Lallier, 2011, p.114-115), because one must understand a unique situation that remains irremediable irreversible, although it can be revised and re-examined many times thanks to the available recording. It must also be considered that in the end, the observer who films is at the same time excluded and included in the relationship with her/his interlocutor: it is as Lallier calls it, a “non-interaction modalisée” (Lallier, 2011, p.125). In fact, “visual research requires immersion in the subjects’ worlds and

developing a rapport where subjects take the camera for granted. For the researcher, immersion is surrender to the moment, following subjects on a journey deeper in their world and its meaning” (Grady, 2007, p.2988; see also Grady, 1996).

Another contribution to be taken into consideration is that of Stephen Spencer (2011) who, being very keen on the methodological aspects, offers some cause for reflection also in relation to the visual analysis applied to the religious phenomenon. For instance, Spencer quotes the case of a Church of Las Vegas that appears as a “dialectical image” - as described by Walter Benjamin - in which unrelated sacred and secular are mixed as there are pornographic images that accompany, without any clear separation, the unconnected religious content: this creates “inherent paradoxes” and “an ‘anxious’ ambiguity” (Spencer, 2011, p.176). More useful are the indications of Spencer (2011, p.82-109) on the method of “walking with camera” in terms of “vicinity walk”, that is an ethnographic approach based on the everyday life of a local church, followed step by step. Finally, an empirical study by Roger Canal deserves to be mentioned: his study on the Venezuelan divinity Maria Lionza presents a “creative and relational dimension” (Spencer, 2011, p.232), thanks to the relationship established between the analysis of the image seen as an object, the use of the image as a research method, and the analysis of the image as a discourse (Richter, 2012, p.177).

2. Surrender and catch: a style of visual research

Surrender and Catch: Experience and Inquiry Today, published by Kurt H. Wolff (1976), was the outcome of a long incubation; it had been originally “formulated” (Wolff’s term) in the 1950s and impregnated, long before that, presumably inspired by Karl Mannheim’s influential teaching in the early thirties.

The “surrender-and-catch” formula has evident roots in the classical, philosophical approach of ancient Greek culture, where the idea of ἐποχή implied procrastination and suspension, which was an attitude typical of the thinking of the skeptics, later to become the Latin *assensionis retentio* (postponing a decision) of the Romans.

“Surrender” is connected, of course, to phenomenology (intended as the evidence of things, but first of all the intentional dimension to create a relationship), and Husserl’s (as well as Schütz’s) writings, besides Scheler’s idea of a “relatively natural world view”. Today “phenomenology asks us not to take our received ideas for granted but to call them into question – to call into question our whole culture, our manner of seeing the world and being in the world in the way we have learned it growing up” (Wolff, 1984, p.192).

“Surrender and catch” is also a “sociology of understanding”, a definition which recuperates the German *verstehende Soziologie* though it makes a distinction between “surrender” and “surrender to”. It is not just a theory, it is a methodology. It is also viable because it can be practically applied, as a number of scholars have demonstrated through their empirical experiences (Backhaus 2003). The notion of “Surrender and Catch” also makes a fruitful contribution (like a new paradigm) to sociology at large, but particularly to visual sociology. “Surrender” may be declined as love, “cognitive love”, “total involvement” or “faith”, while “catch” may be considered as “a new perception, a flash of insight, a new idea, a work of art and so on” (Arlene Goldbard: arlenegoldbard.com/2008/12/13/surrender-and-catch/).

In a visual approach it is possible to implement a willingness to surrender, to trust the other and have faith in his/her substantial otherness (Wolff, 1994). It follows that the main epistemological and methodological slant consists, in fact, in surrendering any expression of personal views as a researcher, saving, obviously, one’s initial operative choice, an option which appears to be basically a declared qualitative one (Corradi, 1987).

Surrender is something one experiences existentially in a number of fields, from the nature of empirical research to the art of theoretical reflection, from philosophy to history to sociology. In Wolff's own words, "to surrender means to take as fully, to meet as immediately as possible whatever the occasion may be. It means *not* to select, *not* to believe that one can know quickly what one's experience means, hence, what it is to be understood and acted on: thus it means *not* to suppose that one can do justice to the experience with one's received notions, with one's received feeling and thinking, even with the received *structure* of that feeling and thinking it means to meet, whatever it may be, as much as possible in its originariness, its itself-ness" (Wolff, 1976, p.20).

From a strictly methodological point of view this excerpt indicates the precise pathway to follow is that of non-selection of the situations and materials to be investigated prior to investigation. Data should be accepted and observed for what it is, an almost natural given fact, to which to entrust oneself without qualms. At the same time one must renounce drawing up preventive, anticipatory hypotheses of any kind. The only expectation is that of awaiting developments, triggered by the dynamics of the situation. Otherness is not grasped at first glance. One cannot expect to understand, to "catch" the other during the first explorative observation-encounter. Otherwise the experiences of the scholar prevail over those of the interviewee, who, on his/her part only allows him/herself to be captured slowly, in any case only partially, in fact very partially. It is not licit and there is no point in making suppositions regarding the nature, the profile of others.

Capture (catch) occurs much later, when the dialogue established is such as to allow the interviewer and the interviewee to share knowledge and experience, in a new vision of reciprocity which appears as a new beginning and a new way of existing in the world. Therefore catch is not necessarily just a concept, because it can turn out to be much more, from an option to a work of art, from a change of attitude to a clarification, even an encounter with surrender, from which to seek escape (Bennett, 1992).

There are five characteristics of surrender. The first requires maximum suspension of acquired socialization in an effort to understand someone or something. The second is that the understanding of even a sole, unique experience can never exhaust the entire experience, which still remains to be acquired. The third refers to the double nature of truth: scientific and existential; it is the truth of surrender, in line with rigorous examination of the most important experiences. Existential truth is related to ecstasy, the fourth aspect of surrender, which soars above everyday life in a spirit not very unlike that of poetry, as it too leads beyond reality. The fifth characteristic of surrender is, finally, respect for mystery, in a dialectical relationship between the uncertainty of analysis, recognition, and of the indefectible nature of the mysterious. This is due to a weakening or even a disappearance of norms, principles, guidelines or traditions that have become, in fact, labile. From this stems the need to start the quest for what to believe in anew, having laid aside one's previous cultural heritage. But one cannot surrender to investigation without first accepting the idea that mystery is inexhaustible. Therefore, catch cannot place limits on the cognitive process, as it is catch that actually leads to further surrender and so on. In short, surrender and catch are indissolubly intertwined with each other.

Surrender is innovation, aimed at understanding and integration. It is, above all, an instance of "cognitive love, which enables one to see, does not blind", according to an expression used by Wolff himself, who outlined its five features: 1) total involvement, because whoever loves, feels totally at one with the addressee of his/her love, in a situation totally similar to that experienced during surrender, which creates a state of tension, or, in any case, of concentration; 2) surpassing what has been learnt to date; 3) the pertinence of every aspect that strikes the researcher's attention, whereby the person who loves takes an interest in everything regarding his/her beloved/lover; 4)

identification, whereby those who love, lose themselves in love to find themselves again; 5) the risk of causing damage, because those who proceed through surrender seek change, which is not devoid of consequences at relational, inter-subject level (including esteem) so, with surrender one must take into account having to face hurts and affronts of all kinds.

3. Catch as understanding

Once more the main route remains that traced by the German School of Sociology of Understanding (*verstehende Soziologie*) with all its significant variations. On the one hand, Berger and Luckmann showed a tendency to “think as usual” while, on the other hand, Wolff sought to avoid this very same tendency, to provide for a more ample understanding of otherness, especially through shared discussion; thus, it is not by chance that this has become a characteristic of a qualitative-type methodology like visual sociology.

The process of surrendering is accompanied closely by a kind of “cognitive love” which helps one to overcome the initial difficulties of surrendering and allows one to reach, grasp and understand it thanks to results that are at the same time cognitive and existential. In other words, surrender is also a conversion (which also entails ecstasy), as well as a rebellion against the past and tradition, in order to look, instead, to the future, in a creative mode bent to the acquisition of further knowledge and know-how.

Surrender is almost artistic and religious in character, given that in this cognitive procedure the love and attention it implies towards the other is great according to Wolff. Little by little, experience, through a maieutic operation, is made to yield to concepts which are useful to understand (one cannot fail to notice in this a process belonging *also* to Glaser and Strauss’s *Grounded Theory*). Furthermore, the distinction between offering and accepting a given situation is fictitious, as it is simply instrumental to understanding the event. In reality, the distinction derives from what has occurred, and one becomes aware of it only afterwards.

The mirror term of surrender is catch, a concept that Wolff (1976, p.20) defined as follows: “By ‘catch’ I mean the cognitive or existential result, yield, harvest, *Fang* (catch), *Begriff* (concept, from *con-cipio*) of surrender, the beginning (*Anfang*), new conceiving or new conceptualizing which it is. What is caught (comprehended, conceived), what catching (‘conceiving’) means cannot be anticipated – otherwise surrender would not be as unconditional as it is, and the catch would be no beginning”.

First of all, it is important to point out that Wolff might have done better had he referred to the precise Latin core of the word “concept”, which has as its root in the infinitive of the verb *cum capere*, which literally means “take with” or “take together”. This conveys Wolff’s term even more, as it alludes directly to a joint capture of the interlocutor, of the encounter, of the interview, and of the visual approach; but reaping, collecting, harvesting are also joint actions, which imply and mean pooling the results obtained through the initial option of surrender, a veritable window opening onto the world of the other, the other’s point of view, the different mind-sets operating in society. Comprehension represents a kind of harmony established between an I and a You, between two generalizations placed face to face and responding to each other through their reactions, perceptions, attitudes, answers, and deductions. The novel conceptions, of continuous *cum capere* set in motion through an inter-personal relationship, is amply justified by the initial (somewhat initiatory) decision to embrace surrender, trust, and disinterested acceptance, devoid of any kind of blackmail whether economic, affective or any other type. The final outcome cannot but be followed by a positive appreciation of the route taken, despite being basically unforeseeable and lacking expectedly previous reassuring experiences.

All this is possible thanks to the fact that a human being is free to ask (Wolff 1976, 31): “when am I, when is man, in the fullest exercise of his reason and freedom?, and he may find his answer in surrender, finding it as he surrenders and finding further meanings in his answer as he examines his experience. Thus, ‘surrender as a response to our crisis’”.

This leads, at this stage, to a scenario related to religion (Wolff, 1976, p.37): “religion may well appear as the mood embraced in an effort to come to terms with two unanswerable questions – it is the phase in our history in which we know that these questions *are* unanswerable. The first is: ‘What am I doing, anyway?’ And its trouble leads to the second: ‘Who am I, anyway?’ In *one* question: what can I truly believe about my fate?” Wolff means (and the reader agrees with him) that the answers provided by common sense and science are not totally satisfying, because they do not go beyond a certain limit. It follows that common sense and science, in the face of fundamental questions, are useless. “‘What is the meaning of what I’m doing? What is the meaning of my being the person that common sense and science can so well describe and explain?’ And in trying to answer, we may recall what tradition in religion, philosophy, art has to offer, and rest content”.

And the issue does not end here, as, traditionally, one problem opens up fresh ones, when no satisfactory answers are forthcoming. So, religion may be taken up, invented, reinvented, and exploited, performing a function similar to that enucleated by Niklas Luhmann in his systemic analysis of society (Luhmann 1977): “‘Invention’ comes from *in-venire*: as soon as I recall and affirm the meaning of this world, I have recalled and affirmed an element of tradition, gotten hold of a thread that connects this, until a moment ago, discontinuous time with a past time – and a past enormous. I have come upon this past, our past. Religion as the invention of the search for the invention: religion as that which has come upon the search, the search for the path that comes upon whatever it may be that allows us to come to terms with those unanswerable questions” (Wolff, 1976, p.38).

The quest for answers in religion is linked to the key-theme of Wolff’s sociology, which again takes up Mannheim’s concept of *labilizing*, that finds the relevance of reference points and values labile through reduction, so that the dearth created by labilization is tantamount to an absence of values (Wolff, 1976, p.49). At this point Wolff establishes a close connection between labilization and surrender (Wolff, 1976, p.50) in that thinking, feeling, and suffering ~~and groping~~ while looking for answers are all actions that connote both experiences and have the potential to find a concrete answer, at least at empirical level, in what has been defined as the “diffused religion of values” or the “religion of diffused values” (Cipriani, 2001; see also Cipriani, Foresta, 1996-1997; Cipriani, Del Re, 2010; Cipriani, Del Re, 2012).

Part II

by Emanuela C. Del Re

References

- BACKHAUS, G. (2003) Vindication of the Human and Social Science of Kurt H. Wolff. *Human Studies*. 28. p.309-335.
- BANKS, M. (2007) *Using Visual Data in Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- BATESON, G., MEAD M. (1942) *Balinese Character: A Photographic Analysis*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- BECKER, H. S. (1974) Photography and Sociology. *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication*. 1. p.3-26.
- BECKER, H. S. (1995) Visual Sociology, Documentary Photography, and Photojournalism: It's (almost) All a Matter of Context. *Visual Sociology*. 10 (1-2). p.5-14.
- BECKER, H. S., GEER, B., HUGHES, E., and STRAUSS, A. L. (1961) *Boys in White*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- BENNETT, J. W. (1992) Surrendering to Loma and to Sociology and Trying to Catch them: Some Recent Writings of Kurt H. Wolff. *Reviews in Anthropology*. 21(1). p.1-16.
- BOURGOIS, P., SCHONBERG, J. (2009) *Righteous Dopefiend*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- CIPRIANI, R. (2001) Religion as diffusion of values. 'Diffused religion' in the context of a dominant religious institution: the Italian case. In FENN, R. (edited by). *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion*. Oxford: Blackwell, Oxford. p.292-305.
- CIPRIANI, R., DEL RE, E. C. (2012) Imagination and Society: the Role of Visual Sociology. *Cognitive Processing. International Quarterly of Cognitive Science*. 13 (2). p.S455-S463.
- CIPRIANI, R., DEL RE, E. C. (2010) Visual Sociology and Religion. *Annual Review of the Sociology of Religion*. 1. p.403-420.
- CIPRIANI, R., FORESTA, O. (1996-1997) Dalla rappresentazione alla ripresentazione. Dal 'Cristo rosso' a 'Rossocontinuo'. *La critica sociologica*. 120. p.71-79.
- COMTE, A. (1853) *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte*. 2 volumes. London: J. Chapman, London; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- CORRADI, C. (1987) Surrender-Catch: The Contribution of Kurt H. Wolff to the Epistemology of Qualitative Analysis. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*. 12 (1). p.31-50.
- GLASER B., STRAUSS A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Hawthorne: Aldine de Gruyter.
- GRADY, J. (1996) The Scope of Visual Sociology. *Visual Sociology*. 11 (2). p.10-24.
- GRADY, J. (2007) Visual Methods. In RITZER, G. (ed.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. VI. p.2986-2989.
- HENNY, L. M. (1986) Theory and Practice of Visual Sociology. *Current Sociology*. 34 (3). p.1-76.
- GRIMSHAW, A. D. (1982) Sound-Image Data Records for Research on Social Interaction. Some Questions and Answers. *Sociological Methods and Research*. 11 (2). p.121-144.
- KISSMANN, U. T. (ed.) (2009) *Video Interaction Analysis. Methods and Methodology*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- KNOBLAUCH, H., SCHNETTLER, B., RAAB, J., SOEFFNER, H.-G. (eds.) (2009) *Video Analysis: Methodology and Methods. Qualitative Audiovisual Data Analysis in Sociology*. 2nd Ed. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- KONECKI K. T. (2011) Visual Grounded Theory: A Methodological Outline and Examples from Empirical Works. *Revija za Sociologiju*. 41 (2). p.131-160.
- LALLIER, C. (2011) L'observation filmante. Une catégorie de l'enquête ethnographique. *L'Homme*. 198-199. p.105-130.
- LUHMANN, N. (1977) *Funktion der Religion*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp; partial (pp. 72-181) English translation, *Religious Dogmatics and the Evolution of Societies*. New York/Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984.

- MARGOLIS, E., PAUWELS, L. (eds.) (2011) *The Sage Handbook of Visual Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- NATHANSON, R., ZUEV, D. (eds.) (2012) *Sociology of the Visual Sphere*. London and New York: Routledge.
- PAUWELS, L. (2010) Visual Sociology Reframed: An Analytical Synthesis and Discussion of Visual Methods in Social and Cultural Research. *Sociological Methods and Research*. 38 (4). p.545-581.
- PEIRCE, C. S. (1957) *Essays in the Philosophy of Science*. Indianapolis-New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- PINK, S. (ed.) (2012) *Advances in Visual Methodology*. London: Sage.
- RICHTER, P. Book reviews. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*. 27 (1). p.176-178.
- ROSE, G. (2011) *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials*. 3rd Ed. London: Sage.
- ROUCH, J. (1975) The Camera and Man. In HOCKINGS, P. (ed.). *Principles in Visual Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine. p.83-102.
- Sidewalk*. (2007) Film. By Mitchell Duneier and Barry Alexander Brown, with photographs by Ovie Carter. USA: National Science Foundation.
- SPENCER, S. (2011) *Visual Research Methods in the Social Sciences. Awakening Visions*. London, New York: Routledge.
- WOLFF, K. (1976) Surrender and Catch: Experience and Inquiry Today. In COHEN, R. S. & WARTOFSKY, M. W. (eds.). *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*. 51. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- WOLFF, K. (1984) Surrender-and-Catch and Phenomenology. *Human Studies*. 7 (2). p.191–210.
- WOLFF, K. (1994) Surrender and the Other. *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures*. 3 (2). p.155–178.

Film by Emanuela C. Del Re and Roberto Cipriani:

Haifa's answer. A film on coexistence in Israel, 2012, 86' (www.haifasanswer.it)

Filmography by Roberto Cipriani

- *Rossocontinuo*, 1990, LADIS and CATTID, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", in cooperation with T. Occhiello, 52 minutes.
- *Cerignola sullo schermo*, 1996, in cooperation with T. Occhiello, 76 minutes.
- *Las fiestas de San Luís Rey*, 1998, Centro Teatro Ateneo dell'Università di Roma "La Sapienza", in cooperation with T. Occhiello, 50 minutes.
- *Il viaggio*, 1998, Laboratorio Audiovisivo del Dipartimento di Sociologia dell'Università "La Sapienza" di Roma, with participation of C. Canta, 21 minutes.
- *I giorni di Camaldoli*, 2008, Università Roma Tre and LUMSA di Roma, in cooperation with F. Bocci, 36 minutes.
- *Semana Santa en Sevilla*, 2009, with participation of Isidoro Moreno, in cooperation with G. Bonavolontà and M. Pesce, 23 minutes.
- *Fuego en fiesta*, 2009, with participation of Xavier Costa, in cooperation with G. Bonavolontà and M. Pesce, 18 minutes.

Filmography by Emanuela C. Del Re

- *In the Name of the Elohim. The Raelian Movement: a UFO Cult*, 1993, C.A.T.T.I.D., University "La Sapienza" of Rome, 38 minutes.
- *The Mountains, the qiri and the Blessed Virgin. Rebirth of an Albanian Religious Festival*, 1993, C.A.T.T.I.D., University "La Sapienza" of Rome, in cooperation with F. Gustincich, 45 minutes.
- *Sangam. A River of Humanity at the Khumb Mela*, 1995, C.A.T.T.I.D., University "La Sapienza" of Rome, 45 minutes.