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Introduction

Focus groups are often seen as a means of eliciting consumer preference. The historical development of this technique is attributed to two social scientists, Robert Merton and Paul Lazarsfeld, who developed the technique to assess war-related communications conducted by radio (Merton, 1987). The work was first reported by Merton and Kendall (1946). An up-to-date account is given in Merton et al. (1990). The technique was originally labelled “focus research”. Bagozzi (1994, p. 51) reports on the growth in use of focus groups as a process of intellectual continuity and as obliteration by incorporation, meaning that the technique was adapted and adopted by someone to conduct marketing research and that later users simply replicated the technique without knowing its original use. There are a number of different types of focus group that are considered below together with relative merits.

Cognitive mapping is a qualitative technique designed to identify cause and effect as well as to explain causal links (Eden, 1990; Eden and Ackerman, 1992). It is used to structure, analyse and make sense of problems (Ackerman et al., 1993). There are a small number of computer programs that can be used to conduct this type of work. One of those is COPE developed by Colin Eden and now renamed as Decision Explorer. This particular computer program was used in combination with the focus groups to explore the decision-making processes adopted by key figures in the two small organisations examined that are reported here.

It is important for all researchers to have a clear understanding of the most appropriate philosophical position from which to derive a suitable research method. Easterby-Smith et al. (1994) report a long-standing debate within the social sciences about the most appropriate philosophical stance to take, from which the research methods should be derived. There is an absence of consensus about which position is best to help a novice researcher make simple choices in deriving methods to conduct the work. Nevertheless, it is essential to have a clear understanding of the philosophical basis for the research strategy selected and this helps to provide the researcher with clarification, focus and consistency of research design. More
specifically, it helps the researcher in a number of ways:

- to determine whether or not their own research design is appropriate to the questions being asked,
- to create designs beyond past experience (Easterby-Smith et al., 1994); and
- to provide grounding in research methods located within an accepted epistemological paradigm. Houlsdworth (1995) remarks that this distinguishes academic work from lay knowledge.

Researchers often take two diametrically opposing philosophical stances (positivism and phenomenology) and they may be regarded as two poles on a methodological continuum. Each one is discussed briefly before justifying the stance taken by this research. The ontological implications for both positions are often seen as being mutually exclusive by researchers and this requires some further explanation. Ontology is concerned with reality and being. Deciding whether or not the object of investigation is the product of consciousness (nominalism) or whether it exists independently (realism) has a bearing on the research approach, the methods, the tools and the tactics employed. Epistemology is concerned with our grounds for knowledge and this will be dependent on the research design and the types of evidence we collect (Remenyi et al., 1998, p. 103).

**Positivism**

Positivism follows the traditional scientific approaches to developing knowledge, research strategies, methods and interpreting results. This manifests itself in terms of the structure of research design reminiscent of experiments conducted in the science laboratory at school. The processes follow a number of steps. It begins with aims usually in the form of a hypothesis to be proven or disproven. Second, a method to achieve the aims, usually a quantitative approach, is adopted to measure variables in the data. The data are collected or generated through means of a survey, an experiment or observation and results are then declared and a conclusion is drawn that accepts or rejects the hypothesis being tested. It is through deductive reasoning in this way that results are derived. The researcher is external to the events being examined such that measures taken are objective. Researchers focus on facts and search for cause and effect.

**Phenomenology**

Phenomenologists recognise that the world in which we live is socially constructed (Berger and Luckman, 1967). Observations are prima facie subjective and the observer is a part of what is being observed. Research focus is on understanding meaning, context and complexity. Ideas are developed through inductive reasoning. The task of social scientists is "to appreciate different constructions and meanings that people place upon their experience" (Easterby-Smith et al., 1994). Easterby-Smith et al. (1994, p. 27) provide a useful summary description of the two paradigms and this is shown in Table I.

**Access**

The nature of the research questions and the research strategy chosen will determine the type of research site and the sources of evidence to which access is required (Remenyi et al., 1998, p. 109). It often appears to be rather straightforward in many research texts and papers that access will be obtained if the researcher plans well and is orderly in approach. However, the reality may be as reported by Buchanan et al. (1988) whereby "... members of organisations block access to information, constrain time allowed for interviews, lose questionnaires, go on holiday and join other organisations in the middle of your study". Gummesson (1991, p. 21) describes access as the researcher's biggest problem. This is particularly the case when it is a one-off study for academic purposes that needs to be completed within a short time-frame. The nature of the research and the questions being addressed will determine the types of access required. Remenyi et al. (1998, p. 109) list criteria for what constitutes a good research site:

- Entry should be possible.
- There is the possibility of gathering appropriate evidence.
- Trust can be established with the respondents.
- Evidence quality and credibility of the research can be assured.
Table 1 The positivist and phenomenological paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positivist paradigm</th>
<th>Phenomenological paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic beliefs</td>
<td>The world is socially constructed and subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer is independent</td>
<td>Observer is part of what is being observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science is value free</td>
<td>Science is driven by human interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on facts</td>
<td>Focus on meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for causality and fundamental</td>
<td>Try to understand what is happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce phenomenon to simplest</td>
<td>Look at the totality of each situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate hypotheses and test them</td>
<td>Develop ideas through induction from data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(deductive reasoning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred methods</td>
<td>Using multiple methods to establish different views of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include:</td>
<td>phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationalising concepts so they can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use large samples</td>
<td>Small samples investigated in depth or over time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Easterby-Smith et al. (1994)

In the context of this study access was achieved through personal contacts known to the researcher. In both cases during discussions in a social context potential benefits for both parties (researcher and researched) were explored. Agreement was reached following the discussions and access was secured to the owner-managers in each of the two firms. Follow-up after the initial discussions was by letter, telephone, facsimile and e-mail to confirm the agreements and to agree specific details regarding the protocols and dates. It was important to keep the project live through regular contact with each company until the research was completed. People need to be reminded of agreements and benefits but should not feel pressured to such an extent that they become annoyed and access is subsequently denied. All four criteria listed by Remenyi et al. (1998, p. 109) were met.

The study

The particular work conducted was trying to establish how owner-managers in the two small firms being examined made decisions relating to organisational strategies.

Context

One firm was a small clothing manufacturer based in the north-west of England. The firm had been bought out by the management team from a larger company that had at one time been a listed company on the London Stock Exchange. In effect this was a firm in a declining industry that had become a small firm as a result of the management buy-out. There were three owner-managers who looked after functional areas for sales and marketing; production and sourcing; and finance and information systems. These managers were selected as the subjects of the study. Although classified as a small firm, it is typical of the majority (99 per cent) of all clothing manufacturing firms in the UK. Their customers are large retailing groups with multiple stores. In contrast, a second small firm was selected from a different industry – publishing. This firm also had three owner-managers who were responsible for sales and marketing, production and print, and editorial. In addition each firm had a managing director with overarching responsibility. Despite a growing concentration of large publishing groups in the UK, this firm is typical of the many smaller publishing firms that comprise 97 per cent of the industry. It operates in specialist educational markets and is located in the north of England. The company was founded 20 years ago by two of the current management team who themselves had been lecturers. The third member of the company joined later, as the company grew, and he had experience in publishing and distribution.
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The work is essentially pragmatic and it needed to be carried out expeditiously, in small time-frames, at infrequent visits. Inhabitants who operate in that environment, although influenced by externalities, nevertheless internalise them in shaping their own views of the world which they socially construct. The academic interest in the decision-making processes is concerned with human behaviours. In this context, to understand what is happening, it is important to focus on meanings (Gergen, 1988). Focus groups were chosen as being an appropriate method of eliciting meanings. The method is also efficient, being capable of obtaining a number of points of view in a short period of time. Inductive approaches were preferred to ensure that the views obtained were those of the entrepreneurs and not determined by the prescriptive approaches that are so often observed in positivist research. Having previously used cognitive mapping techniques in one-to-one interviews, to explore management decisions, I was aware of how useful the technique might be in relation to this work. The work could have been conducted in other ways using flip charts or alternative recording devices. However, it is important not simply to record but also to analyse the meanings and it seemed appropriate, therefore, to use a cognitive mapping program to record and analyse evidence in relation to their meanings. Furthermore, it is important not to overlook the power of the “gizmo”. The cognitive maps were drawn in the presence of managers who could revise the maps as the discussions progressed. Maps were projected on to a large screen as discussions progressed. The participants were also able to take away copies of the maps and analysis in the form of print-outs. The “gizmo” effect seemed definitely to encourage participation and commitment.

Nature of the problem

The research issue in both cases was to determine the major factors that have a bearing on strategy decisions in small firms. The purpose was to find out the views and experiences of the management teams in each case. Interpretation of the focus group interviews and the maps is discussed later.

Research questions

The research was designed to find out how managers made decisions together in their own organisations and to provide explanations of why they regarded particular issues important in the context of their own small firms and in relation to industry-wide influences.

Traditional use of focus group interviews

A number of important approaches can be observed in the marketing research literature in relation to “focus group” research. As Bagozzi (1994, p. 53) observes, the manager who says, “Let’s conduct some focus groups”, is likely to get inappropriate evidence. Researchers need to be rigorous in their approach. Researchers need to be very clear about the nature of the evidence required, which in turn will depend on the purpose of the research and the philosophical stance taken. Therefore, the researcher’s notion of what a focus group is will influence the quality and therefore the utility of responses received. Focus groups have traditionally been used in marketing research as follows:

- Phenomenological interaction-centred focus groups
- Clinical focus groups
- Exploratory research.

The types of focus group explained

The phenomenological focus group is designed to share the experience of a group of people and to participate in that shared understanding. The researcher therefore attempts to experience the view of the world from the point of view of the managers or entrepreneurs being observed. It is a way of experiencing their experiences through discussion. In discussing decision-making approaches the researcher gains some understanding of the issues, processes and experiences of the people involved. This is essentially the type of focus group that this research focused upon. Interaction between the participants is an essential feature of the interview to identify and report the “true feelings” of the group.

The other two reported types have been used more often in a marketing research context, exploratory research being most common to examine a topic quickly and at low cost before conducting follow-up survey work. Clinical focus groups are used to obtain a deeper understanding of individual
behaviours. It is often a means of going beyond the individual’s own experience to find out things that participants cannot articulate fully. For example, research into beliefs, behaviour and the unconscious mind. Psychotherapists typically adopt this approach.

The focus group interview has the following advantages and disadvantages listed in Table II. Group research is useful if it is the opinion of the group under investigation that is of paramount importance. For example, in the case of this research it was important to establish the views of the management team determining the strategy of the organisation. In this respect some of the disadvantages listed in the Table were less important. For example, dominant personalities often listed as a disadvantage of conducting this type of work may simply reflect the decision-making process in the organisation. This could mean that a particular member of the management team or an owner of the firm may have more say in the group and in the reality of a decision-making process. Therefore, the experience being reported and observed, rather than obscuring realities, may reveal them. Similarly the weakness of conducting research into sensitive issues is not as important if the team being interviewed agree confidentiality and are the people who need to work together to set the agenda for the whole business.

Cognitive maps

There are many ways in which researchers could approach the use of cognitive mapping; some are reported in Miles and Huberman, (1994, p. 32). One useful example is that reported by Novak and Gowan (1984) who used the techniques after first conducting pre-mapping interviews to obtain concept definition. When the mapping interview takes place the researcher presents the interviewee with the concepts and is then asked to arrange them searching for cause and effect. It is also possible to use cognitive maps for the purpose of identifying a conceptual framework or to apply it to an interview transcription. However, it was not concept definition but rather construct definition that was important to this research and, therefore, this approach was not appropriate (Kelly, 1955). There were three specific reasons for rejecting this type of approach in the current research; these were:

1. The time required conducting individual interviews before mapping and during mapping. Group interviews and interactive development of maps were preferred to individual interviews and any preliminary shaping. The preliminary shaping may have destroyed the spontaneity and creative development of the cognitive maps.

Mapping is an iterative process and preliminary interviewing may inhibit this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively inexpensive to conduct research</td>
<td>Dependent on the skills of the interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-rich</td>
<td>Can deteriorate into an unfocused group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>with poor interviewer, poor planning or dominance of strong individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating to respondents</td>
<td>It may be difficult to research sensitive issues in a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids recall</td>
<td>Group think may mislead individuals in the group and the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows accumulation of responses from all participants</td>
<td>Access to appropriate people denied in an organisational setting, e.g. on holiday, off sick, too busy, away on business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) It would not have been possible to gain unlimited access to the groups for the purpose of preliminary interviews nor was it considered appropriate to the phenomenological stance taken by this research. The group dynamics were more important to the development of the maps. However, each member of the focus group had been briefed verbally by telephone and supported by email documentation as to the purpose and protocols.

(3) Perhaps most importantly, the purpose of the mapping in this research was to allow owner-managers the opportunity to construct a map of their collective decision-making processes. In this context it was constructs rather than concepts that were important to the process of decision making in these small firms. In particular the personal constructs of the owner-managers. This was achieved by reporting the issues during a focus group interview to reveal how and why the managers did what they did.

Cognitive mapping as a personal construct approach
Cognitive mapping is based on personal construct theory developed by Kelly (1955). The theory suggests that people make sense of their world in order to predict how that world will be in the future. It is also regarded as more than a theory by some and they refer to it as an approach to conducting research work (Jahoda, 1988, p. 2). Therefore, its place in the current work is as an approach using the computer program as a tool and cognitive mapping as a method. It enables actors involved to shape their world through intervention. It is suggested that researchers begin their work not with theories but with involvement in the life situation of the people they have chosen to study (Kelly, 1986, p. 1). “Only when man [sic] attunes his ear to recurrent themes in the monotonous flow does his universe begin to make sense to him” (Kelly, 1955, p. 53). Personal constructs, as Kelly refers to our personal frameworks, are made up of a large number of similarity-difference dimensions or bi-polar constructs. Each individual construes the world in which they live both systematically and uniquely to the individual. There are constructs that are central to our existence and they are core constructs that impose a personal order on our life. Other constructs are subordinate to the core constructs. Fransella and Dalton (1990) referred to personal constructs as being capable of anticipating future actions but raise concerns that in so doing individuals become prisoners of the biography that they construe. This concern, although important in a wider context, is not so important to the current work, where an examination of how and why decisions are being made rather than any investigation of specific problems or constraints applied to those individuals making the decision.

Ackerman et al. (1993, p. 2) suggest that cognitive mapping can be used for note-taking at interviews with the problem owner. It may also be used to record transcripts of interviews or other documentary evidence in a way that promotes analysis, questioning and understanding. In addition I have used cognitive maps on other occasions to interrogate transcripts of individual interviews with the aim of analysing and mapping causal relationships.

Describing the detail
The mapping meetings lasted approximately two hours for each firm. Diary dates for the meeting were fixed well in advance, as it was essential that the participants could all attend. The managing directors of each organisation recognised the importance of the meeting in helping them to formulate their new strategies. The meetings were therefore given sufficient priority to ensure attendance. Furthermore, because the mapping meetings were seen as an important senior management development process, individuals were keen to take part. This is an important point that relates back to access discussed earlier. Research is important to participants when they can see personal benefit. Often researchers are the only people who think the research is important and they fail to sell the benefits to the participants.

During the interviews, the focus groups were guided by the researcher and invited to discuss freely issues relating to the small firm’s strategy. The discussion points were recorded on the computer and projected onto a large screen for all participants to see. As discussions developed, so too did the map. The combination of the focus group interview in conjunction with the cognitive mapping allowed individuals in the groups to reflect
and moderate their views as the discussion progressed. Probing was also possible to clarify meanings and interpretations of the owner-manager comments. It was also possible to record different maps by saving versions at different stages of the interview. One advantage of this is that key changes can be examined later after the meeting. This can give the researcher further insight into the dynamic nature of decision-making processes.

After the meetings, the researcher is able to analyse the map and explore the relationship between different aspects of it. This can be done using the analysis clustering tools in the program. It is possible to identify some further relationships that may have been overlooked during the meeting. These items can then be further examined in a new meeting or they can be discussed with individuals who made specific contributions to check meanings and the researcher's interpretations. In both these cases this process was followed.

Figure 1 illustrates a cognitive map produced during a focus group interview with a group of five managers (the three owner managers previously mentioned, the managing director and a factory manager), running a clothing manufacturing company in North West England. Themes emerged that the group was able to explore more thoroughly during a meeting to determine their future corporate strategy. The arrowheads in the map show a causal link. For example, the managers decided that Number 10—"Good people"—led to Number 5—"Quality of the product and service". Number 10—"Good people"—also leads to Number 7—"The customer's perceived view of the organisation".

Figure 2 shows the influences on decisions taken by the management team in a small educational publishing company. Once again, the group of four managers began their discussions by identifying key influences on their strategy formulations. For example, Number 3—"The demise of the net book agreement"—had the effect of reducing the publisher's profit margin. Larger book retailing groups became more demanding regarding trade discounts for shelf space, while at the same time they raised the prices charged in the stores. To get the same volumes through the supply chain to retailers it became necessary to increase the trade discounts. Order sizes tended to diminish after the net book agreement was abandoned, according to the management team. Smaller order quantities increased the cost of distributing orders. This led the team to consider missing out the booksellers by attempting to get directly to their customers using new technologies in the form of Internet Web pages. This is shown as Number 9. The cognitive maps presented the team with a visual display of the key issues, which they could then discuss further. They were able to change the maps in the light of the discussions, but only after group agreement.

**Discovery and discussion**

In effect, a grounded theory approach was adopted for the interpretation of the maps.

Figure 2 Future strategy map produced by owner-managers at a small book publishing company.
(Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This was so that the views given remain those experienced by the managers themselves without too much interference from the researcher who was bringing different knowledge and experiential influences to the scenario. Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 17) provide a useful definition of the term “qualitative research” as any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification. They go on to explain that this could be research about people’s lives, stories, behaviour, organisational functioning, social movements and, most interestingly, interactional relationships. The type of research being explained here is just that – interactional relationships related to future strategy decisions. Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 18) list the skills for doing qualitative research as:

- An ability to step back and critically analyse situations.
- To recognise and avoid bias.
- To obtain valid and reliable data.
- To think abstractly.

The authors go on to explain that to do this a researcher needs to have: “theoretical and social sensitivity, the ability to maintain analytical distance while at the same time being able to draw on past experience and theoretical knowledge to interpret what is seen; astute powers of observation and good interactional skills”.

The skills of the researcher are therefore essential to the successful implementation of this type of work. It may be important to practise some of these skills before entering the field. A useful way is to work with fellow researchers and research students to refine your skills before subjecting unsuspecting managers to your inadequacies. This will save time in the conduct of the real research and help avoid any pitfalls with the tools and techniques that can be “ironed out” through preliminary practice.

Construct validity is achieved by participants being able to contribute as individuals in a team context through the focus group interviews. Participants are also able to modify and remodel constructs and concepts as the discussion progresses. Internal validity is achieved through the identification and confirmation of causal relationships in the group discussions. Rival explanations for cause and effect relating to the decision-making processes can be examined with the aim of either eliminating them or alternatively modifying the cognitive maps. External validity is achieved by pursuing a general analytic strategy that rules out alternative interpretations (Yin, 1994, p. 103).

Developing theories from this type of research

Theoretical frameworks, developed from qualitative work adopting a phenomenological, social constructive perspective employing multiple methods, recognise that there are different versions of the world (Goodman, 1978), where there are continuous revision and reconstruction. The combination of focus group interviews and cognitive mapping allows these different perspectives to emerge and fit well with a grounded theoretical approach. The interactive approach of focus group interviews together with the dynamic process of cognitive mapping is in stark contrast to the static approaches that many quantitative researchers adopt to investigate decision making by examining data relating to the consequences of decision making rather than the processes (Bagozzi, 1994).

Summary

In summary, the work set out to explain the utility of mixed method research using two particular techniques in a qualitative study. A phenomenological use of focus group interviews was explained combined with cognitive mapping to reveal the key concepts that managers hold in their heads when exploring decisions relating to an organisation’s future strategy. The work was interpreted using a social constructionist perspective.

Conclusions

The two methods combined seemed to offer a way of making science through the participation of managers in a research process. This is not simply passive observation, recording, analysis and interpretation but enables the whole research process to be live. It is most appropriate to conducting management research where, unlike deductive approaches to scientific
research, replication of the conditions is not the aim. However, it is suggested that replication of the research process could be achieved. The methods are usefully combined when investigating small firm owner-manager decision-making processes. The steps involved are: agree access to the owner-managers in the small firms you want to investigate; agree protocols; specify benefits for those participants being researched; agree dates for interviews; ensure that all owner-managers you want to interview will be present; use interactive focus group interview techniques and map the responses during the discussion; probe and clarify any ambiguities during the interview; finally, analyse the evidence using the cognitive mapping program beyond the interviews. Furthermore, it may be possible to extend the multiple methods combined. Indeed, further work currently being undertaken has taken this process a stage further, by combining the two techniques reported with repertory grid interviewing, to explore further the personal constructs of the participants (Kelly, 1955).

Limitations of the research approach
It is important to recognise and reiterate the limitations of the research methods used. In particular, the group approach may encourage a group response whereas key individuals may hold their own beliefs and views about the future strategies decided in the group, even though they appear to go along with them when they discuss matters with their peers. A number of explanations are possible for this. One possibility is that they are dominated by a member, or other members collectively. Another is that they want to be seen as part of the management team and do not, therefore, want to be seen to disagree. This is especially the case when managers are new to their role or to an organisation. There may be further explanations of this. Another limitation is that it is not always possible to get all the key team members together at one time and therefore at the time the group interview takes place a key member is missing and their views are omitted from the maps drawn and analysed. This could be a serious flaw. It is essential that interview dates be rescheduled where it is known in advance that key personnel may be absent. It is possible that the computer mapping process is itself inhibiting to participants. This can especially be the case if the researcher is new to mapping and slow in doing it such that it detracts from the discussion or that technical failures occur. On one occasion I experienced a technical problem with a projector that my laptop computer was connected to and had to abandon the computer map for a paper version. It is, therefore, essential for the researchers to be flexible and knowledgeable enough to adopt an alternative strategy on the spot. You may not get a second chance.

Utility of the research approach
However, drawbacks considered, there are a number of very important positive reasons for adopting the combined approaches reported. First, if you want to conduct a qualitative piece of research work that is attempting to understand particular phenomena in particular organisations, then it is necessary to choose methods that can achieve those aims. Focus group interviews combined with cognitive maps to display and then analyse and interpret the evidence in the context used here, examining management decision-making processes, were both lively and living examples of how and why decisions were taken. I have also recently combined these techniques with Planagan's (1954) critical incident technique, to explore historical decisions taken that were crucial to gaining a particular customer in one case and, in another case, to the initial survival and subsequent failure of the organisation. For those readers who want to examine further combinations, a very good demonstration of the usefulness of the technique is given by Chell (1998) in a small firm context. Further combinations of research methods may help strengthen evidence and argument through triangulation.

There are many possible areas within marketing research and management where it is necessary to gain insight and understanding of particular phenomena and it is in this context that a qualitative approach to conducting research could benefit from applying the research methods discussed. Analytic rather than statistical justification for conducting the research is of more importance in such cases. A problem of some kind, or a process such as decision making or strategy formulation, as in the cases reported here, may provide the focus for investigation using these combined methods. It is
suggested that multiple methods provide construct validity, internal and external validity. Furthermore, the methods allow complex issues to be examined using the language of those involved. Interpretations can be made with the help of those who have influenced or socially constructed their actions. This reduces researcher bias in attempting to understand the world in which participants are engaged. Meanings can be examined through the group interviews, recorded and analysed using the cognitive mapping program, while participants are present.
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