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1. THE LANGUAGE OF METHODOLOGY

- BUSINESS MODELS AND THEORIES DO NOT EXIST IN ISOLATION
  (Figure 1.1)
- METHODS
  (Figure 1.2)
  (Figure 1.3)
  (Figure 1.4)

TWO IMPORTANT CONDITIONS IN METHODOLOGY:

1. THERE ARE DIFFERENT GROUPS OF ULTIMATE PRESUMPTIONS, THAT IS, DIFFERENT METHODOLOGICAL VIEWS
2. THESE PRESUMPTIONS ARE IMPORTANT TO HOW METHODS ARE CONSTRUCTED
   A PARADIGM IS BRIDGING ULTIMATE PRESUMPTIONS AND THE METHODOLOGICAL VIEW CHOSEN
   (Figure 1.6)
   AN OPERATIVE PARADIGM IS BRIDGING THE METHODOLOGICAL VIEW AND THE STUDY AREA IN QUESTION
   (Figure 1.7)
A USEFUL CHARACTERIZATION OF PARADIGM WITHIN SOCIAL SCIENCES:

- **CONCEPTION OF REALITY (VIEW OF THE WORLD)** (PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAS ABOUT HOW REALITY IS CONSTRUCTED, WHETHER IT EXISTS IN ITSELF OR THROUGH OUR MEDIATION)
- **CONCEPTION OF SCIENCE** (KNOWLEDGE WE HAVE GAINED THROUGH EDUCATION, WHICH GIVES US OUR CONCEPTS OR BELIEFS ABOUT THE OBJECTS AND SUBJECTS WE STUDY, AND OUR KNOWLEDGE INTERESTS)
- **SCIENTIFIC IDEAL** (RELATE TO THE RESEARCHER AS A PERSON – AN EXPRESSION OF SOMETHING RELATED TO HIS/HER DESIRES)
- **ETHICAL AND AESTHETICAL ASPECTS** (HAVE TO WITH WHAT THE RESEARCHER CLAIMS TO BE MORALLY SUITABLE AND UNSUITABLE AND CLAIMS TO BE BEAUTIFUL OR UGLY)

PARADIGMS (ULTIMATE PRESUMPTIONS) CANNOT BE TESTED EMPIRICALLY OR LOGICALLY – THEY CANNOT BE VERIFIED OR FALSIFIED, ONLY BE REFLECTED UPON => WE CANNOT, IN ANY GENERAL SENSE, CLAIM THAT ONE METHODOLOGICAL VIEW IS BETTER THAN ANOTHER ONE!

OPERATIVE PARADIGMS CONSIST OF:

- **METHODICAL PROCEDURES**: THE WAY THE RESEARCHER INCORPORATES, DEVELOPS AND/OR MODIFIES SOME GIVEN TECHNIQUE IN A METHODOLOGICAL VIEW
- **METHODICS**: THE WAY A STUDY IS PLANNED AND CONDUCTED

(Figure 1.10)
2. THREE METHODOLOGICAL VIEWS

• THE ANALYTICAL VIEW
• THE SYSTEMS VIEW
• THE ACTORS VIEW

(Figure 3.1)

EXPLAINING AND UNDERSTANDING

• **EXPLAINING** = PROVIDING OBJECTIVE AND/OR SUBJECTIVE REASONS FOR PHENOMENA OR EVENTS, PRESUMED TO BE INDEPENDENT OF US AS RESEARCHERS; ASSOCIATED WITH THE ANALYTICAL VIEW AND THE SYSTEMS VIEW IN THE EXPLANATORY MODE

• **UNDERSTANDING** = PROVIDING KNOWLEDGE BASED ON THE RESEARCHER, ATTEMPTING TO GAIN A "DEEPER" KNOWLEDGE OF HIS/HER STUDY AREA, ASSOCIATED WITH THE SYSTEMS VIEW IN THE UNDERSTANDING MODE, OR KNOWLEDGE BASED ON THE MEANING THE ACTORS ATTACH TO THEIR LANGUAGE AND ACTION, ASSOCIATED WITH THE ACTORS VIEW.
WE CAN:

• EXPLAIN BY CAUSALITY ("BECAUSE OF" EXPLANATIONS)
• EXPLAIN BY FINALITY ("IN ORDER TO" EXPLANATIONS)

OR

• UNDERSTAND BY SIGNIFICANCE (HERMENEUTICS)
• UNDERSTAND BY INTENTIONALITY (PHENOMENOLOGY)

• EXPLAINERS COME UP WITH MODELS (DELIBERATELY SIMPLIFIED PICTURES OF REALITY – HISTORICAL, EXISTING OR WANTED)

• UNDERSTANDERS COME UP WITH INTERPRETATIONS (DELIBERATE ADDITION BY THE RESEARCHER TO FACTIVE REALITY, AS IN HERMENEUTICS, OR AS PARTLY CO-CREATED NEW SOCIALLY CONSTRUCTED REALITY BY THE RESEARCHER TOGETHER WITH ACTORS IN THE STUDY AREA, AS IN PHENOMENOLOGY)

HOWEVER, THE WHOLE TERMINOLOGY OF "MODELS" AND "INTERPRETATIONS" IS FAR FROM SETTLED AND CLEAR!
IMPORTANT! AS WE SEE IT, EXPLAINING AND UNDERSTANDING CANNOT BE DONE AT THE SAME TIME IN ONE AND THE SAME RESEARCH EFFORT! WE CANNOT, AT THE SAME TIME, PRESUME THAT REALITY IS FACTIVE (OBJECTIVE AND/OR SUBJECTIVE) AND FACTIFIED (TREATED AS IF IT WERE FACTIVE WITHOUT ACTUALLY BEING SO) OR, AT THE SAME TIME, BEING FACTIVE AND SOCIALY CONSTRUCTED.

SOME SAY THEY UNDERSTAND WHEN THEY KNOW THE BACKGROUND OR PEOPLE’S PERSONAL ATTITUDES OR A SITUATION INTO FURTHER DETAIL. THESE ARE, TO US, NOTHING MORE THAN MORE PRECISE EXPLANATIONS!

THE IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE TO US IS THAT EXPLAINING MEANS TO TREAT REALITY AS FACTIVE AND UNDERSTANDING TO TREAT REALITY AS CONSTRUCTED. THIS MEANS FOR US, FOR INSTANCE, THAT THE COMMON EXPRESSION "EMPHATIC UNDERSTANDING" IS A KIND OF EXPLANATION (BY KNOWING THE INTENTIONS BEHIND WHY PEOPLE BEHAVE THE WAY THEY DO!)

ALTERNATIVE WAYS IN WHICH REALITY IS PRESUMED TO BE BUILT UP:

(Figure 3.2)

(Figure 3.3)

(Figure 3.4)
MORE ABOUT REALITY, EXPLAINING, UNDERSTANDING AND RESULTS:

- ACCORDING TO THE ANALYTICAL VIEW, REALITY IS BUILT UP BY CAUSAL RELATIONS BETWEEN CAUSES X AND EFFECTS Y. THIS MEANS THAT THE FOLLOWING THREE REQUIREMENTS ARE MET IN A SPECIFIC CASE:

  1. THERE MUST BE A RELATION BETWEEN X AND Y
  2. Y MUST NOT PRECEDE X IN TIME (BUT X AND Y CAN BE CONTEMPORARY)
  3. RELATIONS OTHER THAN X -> Y ARE EXCLUDED, OR AT LEAST DO NOT GIVE A BETTER EXPLANATION

(Figure 3.5)  
(Figure 3.6)  
(Figure 3.7)

THE ANALYTICAL VIEW:

- CONCEPTION OF REALITY  A FACTIVE (OBJECTIVE AND/OR SUBJECTIVE) REALITY THAT CAN BE DESCRIBED AS CONSISTING OF SUMMATIVE COMPONENTS.
- KNOWLEDGE INDEPENDENT OF INDIVIDUAL OBSERVERS  DESCRIPTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS OF REALITY ARE GENERAL AND ABSOLUTE.
- EXPLANATIONS  THE ANALYTICAL RESEARCHER SEeks CAUSAL RELATIONS, THAT IS, NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT RELATIONS BETWEEN CAUSE AND EFFECTS (DETERMINISTIC RELATIONS) OR NECESSARY BUT NOT SUFFICIENT RELATIONS BETWEEN CAUSE AND EFFECT (STOCHASTIC RELATIONS).
- RESULTS  THE THEORY OF REALITY BECOMES EVER BETTER, CONSISTING OF MORE AND MORE VERIFIED HYPOTHESES (A HYPOTHESIS = A POSSIBLE CAUSAL EXPLANATION).
- PREREQUISITES FOR CONTINUING  WHEN STUDYING NEW PROBLEMS THE RESEARCHER CAN BUILD ON EXISTING THEORY FOR THE PROBLEM AREA IN QUESTION. HOWEVER, NEW RESULTS MAY FALSIFY EARLIER RESULTS.
• ACCORDING TO THE SYSTEM VIEW, COMPONENTS IN REALITY CANNOT BE EASILY SUMMED UP – THEY BRING ABOUT SYNERGISTIC RESULTS. IN ORDER TO STRESS THE FACT THAT FINALITY RELATIONS ARE NOT THE SAME AS CAUSAL RELATIONS, THE CONCEPT OF PRODUCER -> PRODUCT IS PREFERRED IN THE SYSTEMS VIEW INSTEAD OF THE CONCEPT OF CAUSE -> EFFECT, WHICH IS OF INTEREST IN THE ANALYTICAL VIEW. FURTHERMORE, IT IS POSSIBLE FOR A PRODUCER TO LEAD TO ALTERNATIVE PRODUCTS (MULTIFINALITY) OR FOR ALTERNATIVE PRODUCERS TO LEAD TO THE SAME PRODUCT (EQUIFINALITY)

(Figure 3.8)

(Figure 3.9)

(Figure 3.10)

Note the difference between Figure 3.6 and 3.10!

THE SYSTEMS VIEW:

• CONCEPTION OF REALITY A FACTIVE (OBJECTIVE AND/OR SUBJECTIVE) REALITY, CONSISTING OF WHOLES, THE OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS OF WHICH IS SYNERGY.

• KNOWLEDGE DEPENDENT ON SYSTEMS THE DESCRIPTION OF REALITY CONSISTS OF PICTURES OF SYSTEMS OR PARTS OF SUCH SYSTEMS. THESE PICTURES, HOWEVER, ARE NORMALLY NOT REGARDED AS GENERAL BUT AS VALID ONLY FOR SPECIFIC SYSTEMS CLASSES.

• EXPLANATION OR UNDERSTANDING THE RESEARCHER SEeks FINALITY RELATIONS (PRODUCER-PRODUCT RELATIONS), THAT IS, RELATIONS AMONG (SYSTEMS) FORCES AND THEIR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) RESULTS AS EXPLANATIONS, OR COMES UP WITH INTERPRETATIONS AS UNDERSTANDING.

• RESULTS THE THEORY OF REALITY BECOMES AN EVER BETTER EXPLANATION OR UNDERSTANDING OF THE BEHAVIOUR OF DIFFERENT CLASSES OF SYSTEMS. EVEN THE CLASSIFICATION ITSELF IS CHANGING AND IMPROVING.

• PREREQUISITES FOR CONTINUING WHEN STUDYING NEW PROBLEMS, THE RESEARCHER IS RELATIVELY FREE TO DRAW ANALOGIES OR COME UP WITH METAPHORS BEING INSPIRED BY THE RESULTS OF EARLIER (SIMILAR) STUDIES. THESE ANALOGIES, HOWEVER, MUST BE ADAPTED TO THE SPECIFIC CASE, WHICH COULD MEAN A RATHER UNIQUE (OR AT LEAST CONTINGENT) PICTURE OF A NEW SYSTEM.
ACCORDING TO THE ACTORS VIEW, REALITY IS SOCIOLOGICALLY CONSTRUCTED. THIS MEANS, THAT REALITY MEANS DIFFERENT THINGS TO DIFFERENT PEOPLE, EVEN WHEN THEY HAVE PART OF IT IN COMMON! FURTHERMORE, THIS SOCIOLOGICALLY CONSTRUCTED REALITY (THE LIFE-WORLD FOR INDIVIDUAL PEOPLE) IS DEVELOPING DIALETTICALLY. ONLY BY UNDERSTANDING THIS DIALETTICS, WE CAN UNDERSTAND HOW ACTORS FINITE PROVINCES OF MEANING CHANGE AND THE MEANING THEY ATTACH TO THEIR ACTS. THE ACTORS RESEARCHER AIMS TO COME UP WITH DIFFERENT DESCRIPTIVE AND IDEAL-TYPIFIED LANGUAGE SCHEMES FOR SOCIOLOGICALLY CONSTRUCTED REALITY. WE CALL THEM "MODELS", EVEN IF THEY DO MEAN THE SAME THING AS MODELS OF FACTIVE REALITY.

(Figure 3.11)
(Figure 3.12)
(Figure 3.13)
(Figure 3.14)

THE ACTORS VIEW:

- **CONCEPTION OF REALITY**: A SOCIOLOGICALLY CONSTRUCTED REALITY THAT CONSISTS OF DIFFERENT LEVELS OF MEANING STRUCTURES. HUMAN BEING (THE GENERATING ACTORS) AND REALITY (WHAT IS GENERATED) STAND IN A MUTUAL DIALETTIC RELATION TO EACH OTHER (WE CREATE REALITY AT THE SAME TIME AS REALITY CREATES US).
- **KNOWLEDGE DEPENDENT ON INDIVIDUALS, INCLUDING THE RESEARCHER**: REALITY IS DESCRIBED AT VARIOUS STRUCTURAL LEVELS, WHICH IS BASED ON HOW DIFFERENT ACTORS (INDIVIDUALS) PERCEIVE, INTERPRET AND ACT IN REALITY (THEIR ECOLOGICAL SPHERE).
- **UNDERSTANDING**: THE RESEARCHER ATTEMPTS TO UNDERSTAND AND DESCRIE DIALETTIC RELATIONS, THAT IS, AMBIGUOUS RELATIONS THAT ARE CONTINUOUSLY REINTERPRETED AND GIVEN DIFFERENT MEANING.
- **RESULTS**: THROUGH THE UNDERSTANDING SOUGHT FOR, OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THOSE PROCESSES THAT SOCIOLOGICALLY CONSTRUCT REALITY WILL GROW. THE RESULT IS PRESENTED IN VARIOUS FORMS OF DESCRIPTIVE LANGUAGE AND IDEAL-TYPIFIED LANGUAGE AND BY EMANCIPATORY INTERACTIVE ACTION OUT IN THE FIELD.
PREREQUISITES FOR CONTINUING USE OF THE ACTORS VIEW IS VERY MUCH BASED ON A PERSONAL AND CONCIOUS DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE RESEARCHER HIM/HERSELF. THE ACTORS RESEARCHER WILL OVER TIME DEVELOP SOMETHING WE MIGHT CALL CRAFTSMANSHIP IN CREATING KNOWLEDGE (CRAFT AS CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND NOT AS A REPETITION OF ROUTINES). THIS WILL BE OF HELP IN ATTACKING NEW PROBLEMS. RESEARCHERS ALSO HAVE METATHEORIES AT THEIR DISPOSAL THAT PROVIDE ESSENTIAL STARTING POINTS FOR A "GENERAL" UNDERSTANDING OF THE FUNCTION OF HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL REALITY. FURTHERMORE, THESE METATHEORIES GIVE GUIDELINES FOR CONSTITUTIVE INTERPRETIVE PROCEDURES TO BE APPLIED BY THE RESEARCHER TO HIM/HERSELF AND TO OTHERS. THE "GENERAL" CONTRIBUTION PROVIDED BY PREVIOUS RESEARCH AS CONSTITUTIONAL FACTORS ALSO GIVE STARTING POINTS A PRIORI. OTHER "GENERAL" CONTRIBUTIONS, THAT IS, TYPIFIED CASES, ARE ONLY A GUIDE FOR THINKING IN ANALOGIES. EXPERIENCES FROM EMANCIPATORY INTERACTIVE ACTIONS OUT IN THE FIELD RAISE THE QUALITY OF "CRAFTSMANSHIP" RESOURCES AS WELL, OF COURSE, IN ORDER TO CONTINUE TO CREATE KNOWLEDGE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE ACTORS VIEW.

A RECAPITULATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Analytical view</th>
<th>Systems view</th>
<th>Actors view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Prerequisites**    | • Existing analytical theory  
                      | • Verified/falsified hypotheses | • Existing systems theory  
                      |                                      | • Analogies (Homologies) | • Metatheories  
                      |                            | | • Constitutional factors  
                      |                            | | • General pre-understanding  
                      |                            | | • Interactive developing of understanding |
| **Explaining/Understanding** | Explanations in terms of causality | Explanations or understanding in terms of finality | Understanding in terms of dialectics |
| **Results**          | • Cause-effect relations  
                      | • Logical models  
                      | • Representative cases | • Classifications  
                      | |                                      | • Classification mechanisms  
                      | |                                      | • Typical cases  
                      | |                                      | • Partly unique cases  
                      | |                                      | • Representative interpretations | • Descriptive languages  
                      | |                                      | • Ideal-typed languages  
                      | |                                      | • Emancipatory interactive action |
MORE ABOUT THE ANALYTICAL VIEW:

• TWO QUESTIONS ARE PRIMARY FOR THE ANALYTICAL RESEARCHER:
  1. WHICH ARE THE FACTS?
  2. HOW CAN WE EXPLAIN THESE FACTS?

• A VERY IMPORTANT CONCEPT HERE IS HYPOTHESES, THAT IS, SUGGESTED CAUSAL EXPLANATIONS.

(Figure 4.1)

(Figure 4.2)

(cont.)

(cont.)

• INDUCTION, DEDUCTION, VERIFICATION - AND ABDUCTION

(Figure 4.3)

• ANALYTICAL RESEARCHERS TEND TO VERY QUANTITATIVE.

• THE ANALYTICAL VIEW IS ALSO IN FAVOUR OF OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING PARTS:
  — A STATEMENT OF WHICH OBJECT(S) OR SUBJECT(S) ARE TO BE OBSERVED OR QUESTIONED.
  — A DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION IN WHICH THE OBSERVATION OR QUESTIONING IS TO TAKE PLACE.
  — A DETERMINATION OF THE TYPE OF MEASURING SCALE TO BE APPLIED TO THE OBSERVATIONS MADE OR ANSWERS PROVIDED.
  — RULES FOR HOW TO HANDLE THE DATA OBTAINED THROUGH THE OBSERVATION OR QUESTIONING.

• THE ANALYTICAL RESEARCHER THINKS "CETERIS PARIBUS" ("OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL")
MORE ABOUT THE SYSTEMS VIEW:

- THE ROOTS OF THE SYSTEMS VIEW
  - SYSTEMS THEORY
  - HOLISM
  - STRUCTURALISM

- EXPLANATION OR UNDERSTANDING?

(Figure 5.1)

EXAMPLES OF (CLASSIC) SYSTEMS MODELS:
- Burns & Stalker (1961): mechanistic or organic organization structures
- Thorsrud & Emery (1964): sociotechnical systems
- Thompson (1967): the law of prerequisite variety and the need for buffering systems
- Lawrence & Lorch (1969): the different importance of differentiation and integration in different organizations
- Several consultant schemes, for instance, McKinsey's 7S (Figure 5.2) (cont.)

EXAMPLES OF SYSTEMS INTERPRETATIONS (MORE AND MORE PREVALENT)
- To understand organizations as living mechanisms (Miller, 1977), as cultures, conceptions and psyches (Kilmann, 1984), as jingles (Pfeffer, 1992), as music (DePree, 1992), as factories (Hammer & Champy, 1993), as theatres (Jeffcutt et al., 1996), as jamming (Kao, 1997), as having souls (Salzer-Mjörling, 1998) or as cognitive fields (Morgan, 1998)
- THE DETERMINANTS OF COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE AND PROGRESSIVE CLUSTERS (Figure 5.3)
- THE ITALIAN VILLAGE BUSINESS CIRCLE (Figure 5.4)

SYSTEMS VIEW IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY
- PROCESSES MORE THAN STRUCTURE
- GOOD RELATIONS TO CUSTOMERS
- TEAM-BUILDING
- TEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS/PROJECT ORGANIZATIONS
- ENTREPRENEURIAL ORGANIZATIONS/ORGANIZED CHAOS
- THE NETWORK PERSPECTIVE
- THE INNOVATIVE SYSTEM
- THE VIRTUAL SYSTEM
- DEEP STRUCTURES (cont.)
(cont.)
• ALL ALONG, SYSTEMS RESEARCH IS BASED ON THREE PRINCIPLES
  (Figure 5.5)

• SOME COMMON SYSTEMS TERMS:
  – SYSTEMS, OPEN OR CLOSED (Figure 5.6 and 5.7)
  – MAGNIFYING LEVEL (Figure 5.8)
  – SYSTEMS RELATIONS (Figure 5.9 and 5.10)

MORE ABOUT THE ACTORS VIEW:

• ONE IMPORTANT TERM IS ACTION – NOT BEHAVIOUR.

• INTENTIONALITY = THE STRUCTURE THAT GIVES A PURPOSE TO EXPERIENCE. IT IS NOT THE SAME AS INTENTIONS, IT IS THE DIMENSION BEHIND INTENTIONS.

• ULTIMATE KNOWLEDGE AIM OF THE ACTORS VIEW IS EMANCIPATION.

• THE KNOWLEDGE-CREATING FOUNDATION OF THE ACTORS VIEW IS DIALOGUES.

• REALITY IS SOCIALLY CONSTRUCTED BY FOUR DIALOGICAL PROCESSES.
  (Figure 6.5)

• IN THIS REALITY, WE BUILD UP OUR EVERYDAY REALITY
  (Figure 6.6)
THE KNOWLEDGE AMBITIONS OF THE ACTORS RESEARCHER ARE SEVERAL

(Figure 6.11)

3. METHODICAL PROCEDURES

• THE WAY IN WHICH RESEARCHERS ARRANGE, DEVELOP AND/OR MODIFY ANY TECHNIQUE, THEORY OR PREVIOUS RESULT IN A METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (VIEW IN ACTION) OR, ALTERNATIVELY, DEVELOP A NEW TECHNIQUE.

• ARE DETERMINED BY
  – THE METHODOLOGICAL VIEW CHOSEN
  – THE CHARACTER OF THE STUDY AREA
• THERE ARE SOME “COMMON” GROUPS OF TECHNIQUES:
  – SELECTION TECHNIQUES (FOR UNITS TO STUDY)
  – TRADITIONAL DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES
  – MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES
  – RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY TECHNIQUES

• THERE ARE ALSO SOME TECHNIQUES WHICH ARE MORE ASSOCIATED WITH ONE
  METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH THAN THE OTHER TWO:
  – FOR THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH:
    • SAMPLING AND SURVEYS
    • VALIDATION TECHNIQUES
  – FOR THE SYSTEMS APPROACH:
    • HISTORICAL STUDIES
    • CASE STUDIES
  – FOR THE ACTORS APPROACH:
    • DIALOGUE
    • LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

"COMMON" GROUPS OF TECHNIQUES:

TECHNIQUES FOR SELECTING UNITS TO STUDY:

• FOR THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH, REPRESENTATIVITY IS CRUCIAL – AND AVERAGES AND
  SPREAD AROUND AVERAGES ARE POSSIBLE TO CALCULATE DUE TO ITS PRESUMPTIONS OF
  INDEPENDENT UNITS IN THE STUDY AREA.

• FOR THE SYSTEMS APPROACH, UNITS ARE DEPENDENT AND MIGHT EVEN BE PARTLY
  UNIQUE. REPRESENTATIVITY IS NOT POSSIBLE IN A GENERAL SENSE. UNITS TO STUDY ARE
  THEREFORE SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF WHETHER THEY ARE VERSATILE AND/OR
  INTERESTING.

• FOR THE ACTORS APPROACH, REPRESENTATIVITY MIGHT ALSO BE SEEN AS INVALID.
  MEANING AND CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL PHENOMENA ARE NOT STATISTICALLY
  GENERALIZABLE. UNITS TO STUDY MIGHT BE SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF WHETHER THEY
  ARE RECOMMENDED, THEY PROVIDE AN UNDERSTANDING OF A SPECIFIC PHENOMENON
  OR WHETHER THEY ARE PROBLEM-ORIENTED.
TRADITIONAL TECHNIQUES FOR COLLECTING DATA:

- THERE ARE TWO MAIN CATEGORIES OF TRADITIONAL TECHNIQUES FOR COLLECTING DATA:
  - USING MATERIAL ALREADY COLLECTED, SO-CALLED SECONDARY INFORMATION
  - COLLECTING NEW DATA, SO-CALLED PRIMARY INFORMATION

- PRIMARY INFORMATION CAN BE COLLECTED IN THREE WAYS:
  - DIRECT OBSERVATION
  - INTERVIEWS
  - EXPERIMENTS

THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH AND TECHNIQUES FOR COLLECTING DATA: THIS APPROACH IS BASED ON THE INFORMATION THAT ALL RESEARCH SHOULD BE CUMULATIVE. IT THEREFORE USES SECONDARY INFORMATION EXTENSIVELY. IT ALSO USES ALL THE TECHNIQUES FOR COLLECTING PRIMARY DATA WHEN POSSIBLE, FOR INSTANCE, IS HAPPY TO SET UP LARGE SURVEYS TO COLLECT INFORMATION BY MAIL. FINALLY, WHEN PRESENTING RESULTS, THE APPROACH PLACES GREAT IMPORTANCE TO DISCLOSING THE WAY IN WHICH DATA COLLECTION WAS MADE.

THE SYSTEMS APPROACH AND TECHNIQUES FOR COLLECTING DATA: THIS APPROACH CANNOT PUT UP EXPERIMENTS (THESE ARE MADE TO REVEAL CAUSAL RELATIONS). OTHERWISE, THIS TECHNIQUE USES ALL THE OTHER TECHNIQUES FOR COLLECTING DATA. HOWEVER, SECONDARY DATA ARE USED WITH GREAT CARE, AS THE APPROACH BELIEVES THAT SITUATIONS MAY CONTAIN UNIQUE ELEMENTS. FOR THE SAME REASON, THIS APPROACH RARELY USES SURVEYS.

THE ACTORS APPROACH BASES ALL COLLECTIONS OF DATA IN THE ANALOGICAL SITUATION AND ON THE BELIEF THAT UNDERSTAND MEANING AMONG ACTORS IS BASIC. THEREFORE, DATA COLLECTION FACE-TO-FACE IS RARELY PRE-STRUCTURED AND HARDLY EVER MADE BY TRADITIONAL SURVEYING. FURTHERMORE, EXPERIMENTS, IN THE ANALYTICAL SENSE OF IT, ARE OF NO USE TO THE ACTORS APPROACH.
MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES:

- THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH: TO THIS APPROACH, PRECISION IS IMPORTANT. MORE EXACT, THAT IS, MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICAL, MEASUREMENTS ARE THEREFORE OF INTEREST TO THIS APPROACH.

- THE SYSTEMS APPROACH: TO THIS APPROACH, QUANTIFICATION IS OF LESS INTEREST. IT LOOKS MORE FOR PRAGMATIC THAN PRECISE RESULTS.

- THE ACTORS APPROACH: AS MEANING CANNOT BE QUANTIFIED, MEASUREMENT SCALES IN A PRECISION MEANING OF THE TERM, ARE NOT USED. SOMETHING SUMMATIVE OR CAUSAL OR PRAGMATIC IS NOT REQUIRED ACCORDING TO THIS APPROACH.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY TECHNIQUES:

- THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH: MAKES A STRICT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RELIABILITY (CONSISTENCY IN MEASUREMENT AND RESULT) AND VALIDITY (CORRESPONDENCE TO A DEFINITION OR TRUTHFULNESS). THIS APPROACH RECOMMENDS RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY TESTS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.

- THE SYSTEMS APPROACH: THE DECISIVE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESULTS IN THE SYSTEMS APPROACH LIE IN THE EFFECTS THAT CAN BE ACHIEVED BY APPLYING THEM (PRAGMATISM).

- THE ACTORS APPROACH: "RELIABILITY" AND "VALIDITY" HAS ANOTHER MEANING IN THIS APPROACH. IT HAS MORE TO WITH "CREDIBILITY" AND "SINCERITY" THAN WITH ANYTHING ELSE.
MORE "SPECIFIC" TECHNIQUES FOR THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH; SAMPLING (AS A BACKGROUND FOR SURVEYS):

- SAMPLING FITS WELL THE PRESUMPTIONS ON WHICH THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH IS BASED, THAT IS, INDEPENDENT UNITS IN THE STUDY AREA, WHICH MAKES REPRESENTATIVITY POSSIBLE.

- THERE ARE MANY TYPES OF SAMPLING TECHNIQUES, FOR INSTANCE:
  - RANDOM SAMPLING
  - SUBJECTIVE SAMPLING

MORE "SPECIFIC" TECHNIQUES FOR THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH; VALIDATION:

- THE ANALYTICAL APPROACH WANTS TO CHART AND MEASURE FACTIVE REALITY – AND ASSES WHETHER IT IS DOING IT WELL, THAT IS, TO WHAT EXTENT IT HAS BEEN ABLE TO CATCH THE TRUTH.

- THERE ARE THREE BASIC KINDS OF VALIDITY:
  - FACE VALIDITY
  - INTERNAL VALIDITY (LOGICAL OR THEORETICAL VALIDITY)
  - EXTERNAL VALIDITY (EMPIRICAL VALIDITY)
MORE "SPECIFIC" TECHNIQUES FOR THE SYSTEMS APPROACH;
HISTORICAL STUDIES:

• SYSTEMS APPROACH BELIEVES IN A REALITY, WHICH IS BUILT UP BY RELATIVE WHOLES. THESE WHOLES HAVE A "LIFE" OF THEIR OWN AND EXIST OVER TIME. TO EXPLAIN OR UNDERSTAND PRESENT SITUATIONS OF WHOLES (SYSTEMS), IT IS COMMON TO STUDY THEIR HISTORY – AS FAR AS THE FOOTPRINTS OF IT ARE STILL OF INTEREST.

• DOCUMENTARY STUDIES AND INTERVIEWS WITH PEOPLE HAVING EXPERIENCED THE PAST ARE THEREFORE VERY COMMON HERE.

MORE "SPECIFIC" TECHNIQUES FOR THE SYSTEMS APPROACH;
CASE STUDIES:

• THIS IS A LOGICAL CONSEQUENCE OF THE BELIEF THAT REALITY IS COMPLEX AND CAN ONLY BE EXPLAINED OR UNDERSTOOD AS SUCH. CONCENTRATING DATA COLLECTION TO ONE OR A FEW "CASES" THEN BECOMES NATURAL.

• "CASE STUDIES" IS NOT REALITY A METHOD, BUT AN ORIENTATION TO HOW THE STUDY AREA IS ARRANGED. CASE STUDIES CAN BE DONE IN AN EXPLAINING MODE AS WELL AS IN AN UNDERSTANDING MODE.
MORE "SPECIFIC" TECHNIQUES FOR THE ACTORS APPROACH;

DIALOGUE:

- INTERVIEWS AND REGULAR CONSERVATIONS ARE NOT ENOUGH AS A RESEARCH INTRUMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN GENERATING NEW VERSIONS OF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTED REALITY, BASED ON THE ACTORS IMAGES OUT IN THE STUDY AREA.

- DIALOGUES MEANS "THROUGH WORDS" AND MEANS HONEST QUESTIONING, ANSWERING AND LISTENING, WHERE ALL PARTICIPANTS LEARN NEW ASPECTS.

MORE "SPECIFIC" TECHNIQUES FOR THE ACTORS APPROACH;

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT:

- ACCORDING TO THE ACTORS APPROACH, REALITY IS BUILT UP BY LANGUAGE AND CAN ONLY BE UNDERSTOOD BY LANGUAGE.

- TO UNDERSTAND REALITY IN A NEW WAY OR TO UNDERSTAND NEW REALITY, LANGUAGE HAS TO BE DEVELOPED.
4. Methodics

- The way in which the researcher relates to and incorporates techniques-made-into-methods into his/her study process, and the way the study is planned and conducted.

- This differs from one methodological approach to another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modelling</th>
<th>Interpreting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factive Reality</td>
<td>Socially Constructed Reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain by Causality</td>
<td>Understand by Intentionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Approach</td>
<td>Systems Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Positivism; Atomism)</td>
<td>(Holism; Structuralism; Functionalism)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concepts:**
- Hypotheses
- Induction, deduction, abduction
- Operational definitions
- Ceteris paribus

**Methods:**
- Statistical sampling (surveys)
- Validity testing

**Analytics:**
- Totality
- Complexity
- Relativity
- Structure

**Systems:**
- Case studies
- Historical studies

**Actors:**
- Dialogues
- Language development
METHODICS: ANALYTICAL VIEW

MAP THE PROBLEM ANALYTICALLY → EXPLAIN ANALYTICALLY AS HYPOTHESES

PROBLEM → TESTING

METHODICS: TRADITIONALLY SYSTEMS VIEW

MAP THE SYSTEM → COME UP WITH SYSTEMS EXPLANATIONS, FOR INSTANCE, AS INAPPROPRIATE SYSTEMS STRUCTURE OR LACK OF FITNESS

PROBLEM → TESTING
METHODICS: HERMENEUTICS

THE RESEARCHER'S INTERPRETATION

THE GENERAL

THE GENERAL

(F THE HERMENEUTIC CIRCLE)

FUSION OF HORIZONS

THE PARTICULAR

THE PARTICULAR

THE INTERPRETATION IN THE STUDY AREA

ACTORS

INTERNALIZATION

ACTOR A

ACTOR B

ACTOR C

ACTOR D

= CONTAIN FOUR INEVITABLE SIMULTANEOUS DIALOGICAL PROCESSES:

* SUBJECTIFICATION
* EXTERNALIZATION
* OBJECTIFICATION

TYPIFICATIONS
METHODICS: ANOTHER VERSION

- (Figure 9.1)
- (Figure 9.2)
- (Figure 9.3)
- (Figure 9.4)

OF COURSE, RESEARCH IS NEVER STRAIGHTFORWARD OR LINEAR! YOU OFTEN HAVE TO GO BACK ONE OR A FEW STEPS, TRY AND TRY AGAIN, ETC.

5. METHODOLOGY OF COMPLEMENTARITY

IS IT NOT POSSIBLE TO COMBINE THE DIFFERENT METHODOLOGICAL VIEWS TO COME UP WITH BETTER RESEARCH IN ONE UNIFIED METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH?

NOT DIRECTLY! IT IS, HOWEVER, POSSIBLE TO USE ONE OF THE THREE METHODOLOGICAL VIEWS AS A BASE APPROACH, AN OPERATOR FOR TRANSFORMING RESULTS (LIKE DATA, CONCEPTS AND THEORIES) FROM OTHER VIEWS. THIS IS DONE BY ADDING COMPLEMENTARY METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES TO THOSE PRIMARY METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES ALREADY IN THAT METHODOLOGICAL BASE APPROACH!

(Figure 13.2)

IT IS NECESSARY TO BE EXTRA CAREFUL AND CREATIVE (WHAT WE CALL TO BE CREALIABLE) USING A METHODOLOGY OF COMPLEMENTARY, HOWEVER, THE PRECISE MEANING OF THIS TERM DIFFERS BETWEEN THE METHODOLOGICAL VIEWS.

(Figure 13.3)