

CHAPTER 4

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the research methodology employed by the thesis, or more specifically, how the Coxian method translates into a practical research strategy, by analysing its four key stages. These include the collecting of documentary evidence, interviews, textual analysis, and the synthesis of these within the context of the post-war historical structures.

THE RESEARCH STRATEGY

The research strategy comprises four key stages. The aim of the *first stage* is to identify the synchronic dimension by collecting documentary evidence to reveal the European policies of the British Left at particular points in time. This stage particularly focuses on institutional factors and corresponds with stage one of the historical method.

The aim of the *second stage* is to identify the diachronic dimension by conducting interviews with key actors and commentators to reveal the intra- and inter-institutional conflicts relating to European policy. This stage particularly focuses on discursive factors and corresponds with stage two of the historical method.

The *third stage* involves textual analysis of the documentary evidence and the interview transcripts. This stage aims to identify, for each institution, the nature of the policy process, including the main actors involved, the influence of external factors, the major themes of the European debate and the outcomes of the policy process. Textual analysis is supplemented by the comparative method: comparison between institutions and over time. This stage is augmented by the technique of triangulation (discussed below).

The aim of the *fourth stage* is to contextualise the analysis produced by stage three within post-war historical structures. The aim of this stage, which particularly focuses on political economy factors, is to ascertain whether the European policies of the British Left are a product of, and/or contribute to shaping, the dominant historical structure, or whether they challenge the dominant historical structure. The four hypotheses of the thesis can then be tested, and the central research question answered.

Stage One: Documents

Details of the left-wing institutions that were studied, the documents that were collected, and the sources of these documents are listed in Figures 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

Figure 2: Institutions Studied

<p>Political Parties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Alliance for Green Socialism▪ The Alliance for Workers' Liberty▪ The Class War Federation▪ The Communist Party of Britain▪ The Communist Party of Great Britain (original and post-1991)▪ The Communist Party of Scotland▪ The Co-operative Party▪ Cymru Goch▪ The Democratic Left▪ The Ecology Party/The Green Party▪ The Independent Labour Party▪ The International Marxist Group/The International Socialist Group▪ The International Socialists/The Socialist Workers Party▪ The Labour Party▪ The Militant Tendency/Militant Labour/The Socialist Party▪ The New Communist Party▪ Plaid Cymru▪ The Revolutionary Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)▪ The Scottish Green Party▪ The Scottish National Party▪ The Scottish Socialist Party▪ The Social Democratic Party▪ The Socialist Alliance▪ The Socialist Labour Party▪ The Socialist Party of Great Britain▪ Solidarity Federation▪ The Welsh Socialist Alliance
<p>Trade Unions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The engineers' union▪ The National Union of Miners▪ The municipal workers' union▪ The Trades Union Congress▪ The Transport and General Workers' Union▪ UNISON
<p>Pressure Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Campaign Against Euro-Federalism▪ Communists for Europe▪ Labour Against the Euro▪ Labour Against a Superstate▪ The Labour Committee for Europe▪ The Labour Committee for the Five Safeguards on the Common Market/The Labour Common Market Committee/The Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign▪ The Labour Movement for Europe▪ The People's Europe Campaign

Pressure Groups [continued]

- Trade Unions Against the Common Market
- Trade Unionists Against the EU Constitution
- Trade Unionists Against the Single Currency
- Trade Unionists for Europe
- The Trade Union Committee for Europe

Think Tanks

- The Centre for Democratic Policy-making
- The Centre for a Social Europe
- Compass
- Demos
- The Fabian Society
- The Foreign Policy Centre
- The Institute for Public Policy Research
- The Labour Research Department
- The New Politics Network (Citizens for Europe Project)

Figure 3: Documents Surveyed

Autobiographies and biographies
Cabinet and Foreign Office papers
Annual conference reports, including agenda and executive reports
Hansard Parliamentary Debates
In-house journals
Manifestos
Memoranda
Newspaper articles
Policy documents
Political diaries
Private correspondence
Publications, including pamphlets

Figure 4: Sources of Documents

Gaitskell Papers Archive (University College London)
Green Party Archive (University of Teeside)
Labour History Museum Archive (Manchester)
Marx Memorial Library (London)
Plaid Cymru Archive (National Library of Wales)
Public Records Office
Social Democratic Party Archive (University of Essex)
Scottish National Party Archive (National Library of Scotland)
Trades Union Congress Archive (University of North London)

Documents are a valuable source of data for analysing institutions and the policy process because they constitute a record of ‘the development and implementation of decisions and activities that are central to [institutional] functions’ (Hakim, 2000, p.46). However, there are a number of methodological and practical problems associated with using data of this kind.

Scott (1990) identified four criteria to solve the methodological problems associated with using documentary data. *Authenticity* refers to authorship, whether the author can be identified and verified, plus soundness, whether a document is an original or technically sound copy. *Credibility* is concerned with accuracy, whether a document is free from error and distortion, plus sincerity, whether the author actually believed what they recorded and why they chose to produce the document. *Representation* relates to availability, whether complete records have been maintained, plus sampling, whether the documents consulted are representative of the totality of relevant documents. *Meaning* is concerned with the literal and interpretative dimensions of understanding. The former refers to the ability of researchers to actually read the documents and understand its linguistic forms. The latter concerns the ‘hermeneutic process in which the researcher relates the literal meanings to the contexts in which they were produced in order to assess the meaning of the text as a whole’ (Scott, 1990, p.30).

There are three practical problems associated with using documentary data: access, cost and utility. In terms of *access*, documents may be missing, may not exist, or if they do exist, may be confidential (subject to the 30, 50 or 75-year rule, for example). Even where access is granted, there may be restrictions on using or publishing the data. In terms of *cost*, obtaining and analysing documents may be costly, both financially and in terms of time. In terms of *utility*, documents may not have been compiled in a clear and consistent manner, or may have been kept for internal rather than public use, with implications for clarity and quality. Furthermore, ‘formal organisational rules are often supplemented, sometimes even overwritten, by informal rules, and such practices may affect’ consistency ‘over a period of time, over and above any changes to the formal rules about documents they are kept or the activities to which they relate’ (Hakim, 2000, p.52).

Scott (1990) generated a typology of modern documents used in social science research, identifying 12 different types of document. These were classified according to authorship (personal, official private and official state documents) and access (closed, restricted, archival and published documents). The vast majority of documents analysed in this thesis were official private documents, deposited in archives and/or published by political parties, trade unions, pressure groups and think tanks. These documents include

executive reports, conference agenda, conference reports, policy statements, manifestos and private correspondence. They also include the autobiographies and biographies published by key politicians and trade unionists, plus the political diaries of Tony Benn, Barbara Castle, Richard Crossman, Robin Cook and others. Relevant Cabinet and Foreign Office papers were also surveyed.

Methodologically, these documents fulfilled the authenticity and credibility criteria because, with the exception of private correspondence, they were official publications. They met the representation criterion, being published on a regular, usually annual, basis, and they passed the literal part of the meaning criterion, being written with the membership, and wider public, in mind. Practically, most of the documents required were publicly available.

Stage Two: Interviews

A number of interviews were conducted with key actors on the British Left. These included academics that played an important role in shaping the European policies of left-wing political parties, current and retired politicians, and current and retired trade union leaders and officials. Interviews were also conducted with campaigners, lobbyists and researchers working in the media, pressure groups and think tanks. Figures 5 and 6 list the interviews that were conducted and the questions that were posed.

Figure 5: Interview Participants

<p>Academics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Michael Barratt Brown ▪ Noam Chomsky* ▪ John Eatwell (former policy advisor to Neil Kinnock)* ▪ Stuart Holland (former Labour MP and advisor to Harold Wilson) ▪ Bernie Moss ▪ Tom Nairn*
<p>Politicians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tony Benn (former Labour MP and Cabinet Minister) ▪ Alex Callinicos (Central Committee member of the Socialist Workers Party) ▪ Ken Coates (former Labour MEP) ▪ Dafydd Elis-Thomas (former Plaid Cymru MP)* ▪ Mark Fischer (National Organiser of the post-1991 Communist Party of Great Britain) ▪ Bryan Gould (former Labour MP and Shadow Cabinet member) ▪ Robert Griffiths (General Secretary of the Communist Party of Britain) ▪ Kelvin Hopkins (Labour MP) ▪ Marc Jones (Cymru Goch member)* ▪ Hugh Kerr (former Labour MEP)* ▪ Neil Kinnock (former Labour Party Leader)* ▪ Jean Lambert (Green MEP) ▪ Caroline Lucas (Green MEP)* ▪ Paul Marsh (Class War Federation member)* ▪ Craig Milroy (Policy Officer for the Scottish National Party)

<p>Politicians [continued]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Austin Mitchell (Labour MP) ▪ Susan Murray (Alliance for Green Socialism member)* ▪ National Secretary (Solidarity Federation member)* ▪ David Owen (former Labour MP and Cabinet Minister) ▪ Ken Smith (National Organiser for the Socialist Party) ▪ David Stoddart (Labour Member of the House of Lords) ▪ Shirley Williams (former Labour MP and Cabinet Minister)
<p>Trade Unionists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dick Barry (Policy Officer for Unison) ▪ John Edmonds (former General Secretary of the GMB – Britain’s general union) ▪ John Fisher (Director of Education for the Transport and General Workers’ Union) ▪ Paul Hardiman (Chief Executive Officer of the National Union of Miners and National Executive Committee Member of the Socialist Labour Party) ▪ Jack Jones (former General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers’ Union) ▪ John Monks (former General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress) ▪ Regan Scott (former European Co-ordinator and Research Director for the Transport and General Workers’ Union)
<p>Campaigners, Lobbyists and Researchers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Boyd (Secretary of the Campaign Against Euro-Federalism)* ▪ Larry Elliott (Economics Editor of <i>The Guardian</i>) ▪ John Mills (Secretary of the Labour Euro-Safeguards Committee) ▪ Robin Ramsay (Editor of <i>Lobster</i> and Hull Labour Party Member) ▪ Peter Robinson (Senior Economist at the Institute for Public Policy Research) ▪ Mark Seddon (Editor of <i>Tribune</i>) ▪ Hilary Wainwright (Editor of <i>Red Pepper</i>) ▪ John Williams (Centre for Democratic Policy-making member)* ▪ Ernest Wistrich (former Director, now Vice-President, of the European Movement) ▪ Robert Worcester (Director of MORI)

Note: * = Interviews that were conducted by email, post or telephone – rather than face-to-face.

Figure 6: Research Questions

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What European policies has the [institution] adopted from 1945 to the present? 2. Has European policy changed over this period, and if so, how? 3. What is your view of the wider debate on the British Left about European integration, from 1945 to the present? 4. Has the debate changed over this period, and if so, how? 5. What is your view of the state of the debate at present? 6. Have the foreign policies and intelligence agencies of the Soviet Union and United States played a role in shaping the European policies of the British Left? 7. Has propaganda, the manipulation of public opinion, played a role in shaping the European policies of the British Left? 8. How do you think the debate on the British Left about European integration will develop in the future? 9. Is the subject of European integration a contentious one for the British Left, and if so, why?

The work of Davies (2001) and Lilleker (2003) on interviewing the political elite is of particularly relevance to this thesis. Lilleker argued that such interviews provide valuable insights into the political process, helping to compensate for the lack of information in official published documents or contemporary media accounts.

There are four types of interviews. Structured interviews are controlled interactions where questions are determined beforehand, thus limiting the parameters of participant response. Semi-structured interviews are also controlled interactions. However, this model enables the researcher to ask supplementary questions, for clarification and elaboration, whilst the use of open questions grants the participant greater freedom to discuss their experience. Unstructured interviews are relatively uncontrolled interactions where, once the question has been put, the researcher listens and does not prompt. This offers the participant the opportunity to discuss the subject using their frames of reference. Group interviews, usually of 8 to 12 people, focus on participant interaction and debate, and are less concerned with control. However, they can be structured, semi-structured or unstructured.

A number of methodological problems arise when using interviews as a research method. Briggs (1986) conducted a review of the sociological literature on interviews and noted the predominance of bias theory in the literature, that is the concept that the characteristics of the researcher and participant can bias the response to the questions. He further noted the concomitant assumption that if this bias could be eliminated, then the real or true response would emerge. Epistemologically, the orthodox approach is rooted in the belief that the researcher can directly access the thoughts of the participant by eradicating bias, and the belief that social facts exist independently and can be perceived as such. Briggs concluded his critique by arguing that researchers' lack of attention to the interview situation precluded any examination of their role in the research process. Like Briggs, Mishler (1986) diverged from the orthodox view, arguing that there is a fundamental difference between a formal interview and everyday speech, that these represented two different discourses and that the gap between these two modes of speech is a problematic issue that has not received sufficient attention. Mishler criticised the stimulus-response model underpinning orthodox work and advocated an alternative approach based upon the analysis and interpretation of interviews as discourse.

Several practical problems also arise. These emerge in the research design process, preparation stage, when conducting the interview, undertaking transcription and during analysis. In terms of *research design*, the type of interview model chosen obviously shapes the data and how it can be analysed.

In terms of *preparation*, the researcher needs to be knowledgeable about the subject, should possess questions that will elicit the information required, and needs to know how and when to prompt. How you present yourself and your thesis is important. First impressions matter because they may affect the participant's willingness to be interviewed and the responses they offer. The researcher needs to decide whether to seek permission to record the interview, or to take notes. Using a tape recorder makes it easier to extract quotes, whilst other researchers can check the tape and transcript for validity. However, participants may find a tape recorder inhibiting or intimidating, while a one-hour tape can take hours to transcribe. Taking notes may be less inhibiting and intimidating for the participant. However, it can be distracting for the participants, important data may be forgotten and it may be difficult to extract quotes.

In terms of *conducting the interview*, a key concern is the role of the researcher during the interview. May (1997), for example, noted the contradiction between the need to establish intersubjective understanding whilst seeking objectivity during an interview. Another concern is the researcher's characteristics, age, class, ethnicity, and gender *vis-à-vis* the participant. The orthodox view is that such characteristics exert an influence over the nature and type of information elicited, and that, where appropriate and practical, characteristics should match. Moser and Kalton (1983) suggested that the success of an interview was dependent upon access, cognition and motivation. Spradley (1979) noted a fourth condition: rapport. In terms of access, the participant needs to possess the information and knowledge that the researcher seeks. In terms of cognition, the participant should enjoy a full understanding of their role. In terms of motivation, the participant must feel that their contribution is valuable, and in terms of rapport, the researcher needs to establish openness and trust.

In terms of *transcription*, further scope exists for shaping when interview accounts are transcribed; for example, how the interview is interpreted and what is actually recorded. In terms of analysis, data can be manipulated in a variety of ways, each of which places a different emphasis on the account. For example, it can be coded and analysed using statistical techniques (content analysis), it can be used to develop theory (grounded theory), or the themes and context of the account can be identified (discourse analysis or qualitative content analysis).

This thesis employed the semi-structured interview model, which enabled different accounts to be compared, whilst its flexibility facilitated a greater understanding of the subject. The 45 interview participants were not chosen at random; they were selected on the basis of their experience, knowledge of the subject and willingness to participate.

The purpose of the interviews was twofold. First, to explore the policy processes within left-wing political institutions, specifically how European policy was formulated and by whom. Second, to discover how these actors, together with the institutions to which they belong, interpreted the British Left's response to European integration.

In terms of *analysis*, several methodological problems were encountered. Participants had different perceptions of events, raising the possibility of exaggeration or even falsehood as they sought to rewrite history in their favour. Participants were sometimes reluctant to discuss certain topics, particularly those that were contemporary and/or sensitive. Their accounts were occasionally personal and partisan, neglecting to acknowledge the existence of other views within their particular institution. Those aware of the work of my supervisor, a prominent left-wing critic of the EU, may have used the interview as an opportunity to counter or to simply reinforce left-wing Eurosceptic arguments, rather than focusing on the European policy of their particular institution. The solution to these problems was careful abstraction, interpretation and the use of triangulation.

The technique of triangulation was devised by Webb et al. (1966), developed by Denzin (1970) and endorsed by Davies (2001) and Lilleker (2003). Triangulation involves the use of multiple observers, theoretical perspectives, and sources of data and/or methodologies, so that data can be cross-checked and researchers confident of their findings. For the purposes of this thesis, triangulation meant cross-referencing the data I collected from interviews, first with the data obtained from the documentary evidence, and second, with published material such as autobiographies, biographies and political diaries.

Stage Three: Textual Analysis

There are three main approaches to the textual analysis of documentary and interview transcript data. The first is the positivist approach, including grounded theory (Strauss et. al. 1967, 1990) and content analysis (Berelson, 1952). The aim of the former is to generate theory out of qualitative data, whilst the aim of the latter is to quantify the content of textual data, using predetermined categories, in a systematic and replicable manner. However, positivist approaches are not appropriate for this thesis, for four principal reasons. First, the quest for universally valid laws is not compatible with the historicism of the Coxian approach. Second, Coxian historicism incorporates an analysis of processes and structures that are unobservable. However, for positivists, that which cannot be observed does not exist. Third, there is no scope for interpretation, a key feature of the Coxian approach. Fourth, the aim of the thesis is not to generate a theory, but to apply and verify the conceptual framework devised by Cox. This specifically rules out the grounded theory approach.

The second is an interpretive approach, including discourse analysis (van Dijk, 1985), semiotics (Saussure, 1916/1959; Barthes, 1967, 1976) and hermeneutics (Phillips and Brown, 1993; Forster, 1994). The aim of discourse analysis is to identify how language shapes social reality. Semiotics aims to identify the process of meaning through signs and symbols, whilst hermeneutics aims to interpret human action from the perspective of the social actor. The interpretive approach is also not appropriate for this thesis, for one practical reason. It is not possible to apply discourse analysis, semiotics, hermeneutics, or a combination thereof, to the textual data collected, because of its sheer volume.

Instead, this thesis employs an approach that attempts to combine the respective strengths of the positivist and interpretive approaches. Qualitative content analysis places a greater emphasis on the role of the researcher in the construction of meaning, both the meaning of the text and meaning within the text. It also allows categories to emerge from the data and recognises the importance of context when analysing these. As such, qualitative content analysis is more compatible with Coxian historicism, which is based on the need for empirical evidence, the interpretation of intersubjective meanings and collective images, and the contextualisation of data within historical structures.

Qualitative Content Analysis

This thesis will use the method of qualitative content analysis (QCA) developed by Altheide (1996). Like quantitative content analysis, QCA is also concerned with understanding and explaining the communication of meaning and the verification of theoretical relationships. However, the major difference is the reflexive and interactive nature of QCA, which involves a recursive and reflexive movement between concept development, data collection, coding, and analysis and interpretation. The aim is to follow a systematic analytical process, but one that is not rigid. Categories and variables initially guide the thesis, but others are allowed and expected to emerge. The emphasis rests upon constant discovery and comparison rather than trying to force the data into predetermined categories as with conventional content analysis.

Altheide set out a six-stage method of QCA. The *first stage* involves the construction of a protocol. This consists of a set of questions that guide data collection. Its aim is to differentiate between types of data and to capture definitions and meanings, rather than simply record data frequencies. The latter point is crucial because a word that appears once in the text can have far more meaning than a word that appears fifty times. The protocol will include some predetermined categories, but most will be refined during data collection and analysis.

The *second stage* is to identify the format, frame, themes and discourse within the text. Format refers to the way in which information is selected, organised and presented as an act of communication. Frames refer to the focus, or parameter and boundary, of how a particular event will be discussed. Themes refer to the recurring theses that run through the text, whilst discourse refers to the parameters of relevant meaning.

The *third stage* is sampling, which involves both theoretical and random stratified sampling. The former refers to the selection of material, for conceptual or theoretically relevant reasons, based on an emerging understanding of the subject under investigation. This process continues until all the categories have been saturated by the data, that is, where all data have been assigned into categories. The latter refers to the selection of cases within certain categories or strata, where the strata are selected for conceptual reasons. With QCA, the aim is conceptual adequacy rather than frequency and representation. A random sample of between 5 and 10 per cent of the complete set of texts is enough to ensure that all of the data have been assigned to the categories listed in the protocols.

The *fourth stage* is data collection where the data are collected by providing codes and descriptions to the protocol categories. The researcher's interpretation of meaning within the text and subsequent assignment of data to categories is central here.

The *fifth stage* is data analysis. This consists of extensive reading, sorting of materials, comparison, coding and description. Extensive reading allows the researcher to become familiar with the data. The sorting of materials facilitates the further refinement of categories and the construction of more sophisticated protocols. Data analysis involves comparison between and within categories to identify typical cases that have certain thematic characteristics. These categories are then coded, perhaps numerically but more often by description. The quantification of codes can be applied here.

The *sixth stage* is integration, whereby each category from the protocol is expanded to include a description of the category, an explanation of its meaning, and illustrative quotations. This stage will identify the variety of themes running through the complete set of documents and interview transcripts.

The purpose of textual analysis, using QCA, is to identify the range of European policies and analyses found on the British Left from 1945 to 2004, and to test the four hypotheses regarding changes to them. Quantitative content analysis would have provided information about the frequency of particular policies and their change over time. It would not, however, provide information about how and why these policies were adopted and/or changed.

QCA, with its attention to meaning and the interaction between researcher and data, is more suited to this purpose. However, a number of problems were anticipated regarding the interpretation of meaning. Policy statements and interview transcripts may not contain enough contextual detail. There may be little detail about how the policy was arrived at (the policy process), its rationale (the analysis underpinning the policy) and the different policy positions held within a particular institution by different factions (the distribution of power resources within an institution). Furthermore, policy outputs may result from a leadership 'fix' or 'fudge' which effectively subverts the will of the membership. Alternatively, the policy may reflect the position of the membership, but the leadership may be actively working against an adopted policy, either covertly or overtly. The distribution of power resources will, to a large extent, reflect the extent of internal democracy and grassroots participation within a particular institution. This is an important point because the policy on paper may not accord with the policy in practice. It was anticipated that the process of triangulation would minimise these problems.

Stage Three: Comparative Analysis

Comparison is intrinsic to the social sciences because it provides a basis for identifying empirical regularities, and for evaluating and interpreting particular cases. However, there is no unified understanding of comparative method. Hantrais and Mangen (1996) and Ragin (1987) identified several different types: cross-cultural, cross-institutional, cross-national, cross-societal and cross-systemic comparison. These involve the use of comparable data from at least two societies, at two levels simultaneously, at the level of systems and at the within-system level, identifying the similarities and differences among macro-social units, and/or the identification of different combinations of conditions associated with specific outcomes or processes. Despite this lack of clarity, whichever approach is adopted, the unit of analysis is central to comparative method.

Ragin (1987) argued that any data unit can be used in comparative research, but essentially, units of analysis refer to either data categories or theory categories. An example of the former is national economic data, and the latter, the conceptualisation of social class. Ragin proposed an additional typology: units of analysis developed for observation or explanation. Those developed for observation are used in data collection and analysis, whereas those developed for explanation are employed to account for the pattern of results obtained. Units of analysis can be applied at the individual or collective level.

The comparative method, whether based on data or theory categories, observational or explanatory units, or at the individual or collective level, employs one of two broad research strategies: the case-oriented or variable-oriented strategy. The former approach is evidence-based and aims to compare cases, whether these are examined as a whole or as a combination of characteristics. This approach is historically interpretative and casually analytic, with precedence given to complexity over generality. The latter approach is theory-based, dedicated to producing generalisations about the relationships between variables and testing hypotheses.

The comparative method used in this thesis aims to identify the similarities and differences in European policy, within and between left political institutions over time. The basic unit of analysis, therefore, is institutional. As such, this thesis uses data and theory categories, for observation and explanation, and will employ both a case-oriented and variable-oriented strategy. The former will aid historical interpretation and the identification of important causal factors, whilst the latter will enable the testing of hypotheses.

However, there are a number of methodological and practical problems associated with using the comparative method in this thesis. Different political institutions possess different cultures, histories and modes of operating. They also exhibit different policy processes in that they have formulated, presented and changed their European policies at different times and in different ways. Therefore, careful abstraction and interpretation was required to overcome these problems.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has detailed how Coxian historicism, with its three-stage method of historical structures, translates into a practical research strategy. This can now be applied to the study of the British Left's European policies. The data generated by stages one, two and three of the research strategy are presented in Chapter 6 to 9. Stage four, which includes the testing of the four hypotheses of this thesis, so as to be able to answer the central research question, is presented in Chapter 10.