УДК: 303.01
Оригинални научни рад

Српска политичка мисао
број 4/2011.
год. 18. vol. 34.
стр. 395-420.

Uros Suvakovic
University in Pristina with temporary
Head Office in Kosovska Mitrovica,
Faculty of Philosophy/Departmen on Sociology

ON EXCEEDING OF DIVISION FOR QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCHES IN CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY*

I always believed in the interdependence
of quantitative and qualitative work[1)]
Paul F. Lazarsfeld

Summary

Argumentation in favor of the attitude on exceeding the long ago established division of scientific researches to qualitative and quantitative is discussed in the work. Considering the attitude of materialistic dialecticians that every scientific research must deal with a subject, the attitude is represented according to which it is impossible to perform any quantitative research without prior establishing the quality that is being investigated. Since nothing cannot be investigated, but always only something, it means that it is necessary to establish precisely (to

* The work is the result ot the author's participation in the scientific research III 47023 "Kosovo and Metohija between national identity and Euro-integrations" financed by the Ministry for education and science of the Republic of Serbia

1) Paul. F. Lazarsfeld, *Qualitative Analysis: Historical and Critical Essays*, Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Boston, 1972, p. xvii.

define) the quality that is being researched and to do this it is necessary to perform an adequate research.

This is valid for all researches, including measuring, for which it is considered in the literature that these are only quantitative researches. It is shown on the example of designing two instruments for measuring successfulness of political parties – the scale and the quotient of party successfulness and the Bogardus`s scale of social distance On the other hand, even the expressively qualitative research methods (e.g. qualitative content analysis, case study, method of biography, etc.) as the rule comprehend certain quantifications.

Aiming to methodological correctness, it would be the most accurately to consider as surpassed the existing dichotomy to qualitative and quantitative research, and to establish typology of scientific researches to qualitative-quantitative (prevailing element is qualitative) and quantitative-qualitative (prevailing element is quantitative) researches, depending on which element in the research is more dominant, with clear establishment of their interconnection.

Key words: qualitative and quantitative researches, exceeding of division, interconnection, new typology.

ON DIVISION OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ON THE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE AND BASIC NOTIONS

Conventional qualification of methods to qualitative and quantitative is traditional in the methodology of social sciences. Unlike the referred Lazarsfeld's attitude, researchers point out that in the contemporary theory there is a continuous insisting on "paradigmatic differences" between "qualitative and quantitative methodology"[2)].

This qualification is actually the result of another idea – the idea originating since Descartes – on universal usability of mathematics. Economic Table that Francois Quesnay made in 1758 belongs among the first attempts of social phenomena quantification. Condorcet also in 18th century developed theory on "social mathematics". Apart of these, the need for performing certain quantifications appears and develops from the ideas originating from the sphere of science regarding the quantification of social phenomena and also in the state sphere. The need of state for establishing certain statistical data appears and devel-

2) Slavica Ševkušić, „Kombinovanje kvantitativnih i kvalitativnih metoda u proučavanju obrazovanja i vaspitanja“, *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, Institut za pedagoške studije, Beograd, br. 1/2009, str. 48.

ops even in the Middle Ages and onward. That need of the states of that period was motivated, primarily, by the need to establish the number of taxpayers. Turkish Sultan Mehmed II, the Conqueror, just after the fall of Constantinople under the power of Turks, issued declaration on registration of all the properties of the growing Ottoman Empire. That registration contained in the Turkish so called *defters* comprises also the data on income from land, number of cattle, number and names of household members and number of houses in a village, etc.[3)] Later, other date started to be collected, leading to the first studies dedicated to demographic issues[4)]. Positivism and it's spreading, firstly in philosophy and then in sociology, contributes to strengthening of the idea on quantifying social phenomena. Scientist of Positivism had as their ideal the implementation, transfer of natural methods into the social sciences. As one of the leading contemporary Serbian methodologists M. Bogdanovic correctly concludes, "quantitative research of social phenomena gradually has been growing from the two basic streams of facts, interconnected. On one hand, these are practical social needs, especially intensified from the second third of 19th century for more precise data on narrower but also on the widest social frame… The other stream of facts is trying to include this tendency for quantification of social phenomena to scientific research of society"[5)].

This "soar" of mathematical methods and requirement for their application also in social sciences was the result of the fact that their application in natural sciences has given undreamed results. What should be noticed is that the studies of the oldest authors, which appeared far before thinking on application of quantification in researches of social phenomena, contained certain quantifications, like the one of Hippodamus of Miletus (5th century B.C.) on optimal number of polis inhabitants. However, regardless the quantifications in the area of study society and its organization, the idea of application of mathematics in the area of the one that belonged to the study of science still did not exist.

3) In Serbia, one of the most important studies based on registration statistics is based just on this Turkish registration from 1455. it is the study of the academic Milos Macura (2001) "Colonies and Population in the area of Brankovic in 1455". That Turkish area covered greatest part of today's Autonomous Province Kosovo and Metohija. This study, on basis of Turkish sources, has shown that in that period – in the middle of the 15th century – in that area lived approximately 95% of people with Serbian i.e. Slavic names, "while the influence of Muslim names was imperceptible" (Macura 2001, p. 21).

4) John Graunt according to Marija Bogdanović *Kvantitativni pristup u sociologiji: razvoj, dometi i formalističke jednostranosti*, Službeni listi SFRJ, Beograd, 1981, str. 14.

5) Marija Bogdanović, *Ibid*, str. 43.

After this short historical survey of introduction to quantification of research of social phenomena, we would like to point out our understanding of the basic ideas: the quantity and the quality.

Quantity indicates the number of something. The quantity is always connected to this something.

Something represents a certain idea, a quality that is possible to distinct clearly in the reality. Only in case of existence, regarding the other reality, of clearly distinct quality, we may discuss its quantification. Nothing can be quantified; only something, some idea is always quantified. Karl Marx was just the one who comprehended just in such the dialectical way the relationship between the quality and the quantity – as two faces of the same thing. It is clearly seen already in the First chapter of the First book of his "Capital", the chapter speaking on the relationship between the goods and the money: "Classical political economy neither explicitly nor with clear consciousness distinct work as represented in the value of the work as represented in the usable value of the product. Of course, it makes in fact this distinction, since it observes the work now quantitatively, now qualitatively. But it rises not in its mind that purely quantitative distinction between works has a presumption of their qualitative unity or equity, therefore their reduction to humane work taken abstractly"[6)]. Therefore, quantification represents "a special procedure of formalization as interpretation of qualitative characteristics and relations, according to certain rules, while a concrete social content gets a numerical form and analysis is further conducted by statistical and mathematical procedures"[7)]. Regarding such the definition, there are several questions to which we shall try to give answers in the work. Firstly, what is considered the "concrete social content"? May the contents that are not concrete be quantified, in sense that they represent things, objects, but these are qualities that can be clearly distinct from other parts of reality (not only material, but also spiritual), e.g. a value like the marital fidelity. Another question is if the quantification necessarily means interpretation of social content to "numerical form", or it means only by the rule, but quantification is possible even without using figures, by using relational opinions, e.g. bigger-smaller, higher-lower, closer-further, etc. This question is especially important when social sciences are in question. Finally, the third question asked is if the method of analysis is the only one that follows performed quantification, or synthesis may also be used after performed quantification.

6) Karl Marx, *Kapital*, prvi tom, Kultura, Beograd, 1947, str. 44.

7) Marija Bogdanović, *Ibid*, str. 8.

Rather if further are implemented statistical procedures of inductive character, and induction itself is synthetic method.

With the goal to answer to the asked questions, we shall firstly consider some of the methods applied in social sciences and which are traditionally classified among quantitative, i.e. among qualitative methods.

IS MEASURING METHOD IN SOCIAL SCIENCES A QUANTITATIVE METHOD?

Measuring means establishing presence and expressing quantity of presence of a certain quality.

Both natural sciences and social sciences apply three types of measuring: exact, conventional and intuitive[8)]. However, the third one is much more present in social sciences, and we shall see why it is so.

Exact measuring have in their basis the absolute zero (complete absence of the quality that is measured), and measuring units are natural entities that might be considered as concrete realities[9)]. The main method of such measuring is – counting, e.g. 2,000 – 3,000 pandas live in nature[10)] (Briggs, 2006). In this case, we have the situation with existence of concrete reality, clearly defined, the quantity of which would be established by simple counting. Already here we can answer your question on quantifying qualities that are not things, but which are defined as phenomenon. If we exclude fantastic phenomena that we can imagine, but cannot count them since they do not represent natural entities, we can also exactly define certain phenomena based on values, e.g. number of divorced marriages due to marital infidelity. Of course, precondition for that is that spouses admit infidelity in the court, so that the presence of the "quality" of infidelity is established in the court. Without such basically normative definition, we would not be able to measure the presence of the quality of "infidelity" as the reason for divorce. And also for the one that we perform on such based quality we know in advance that it does not correspond to the real conditions since the great number of spouses will claim in court that the reason for

8) Slavomir Milosavljević, Ivan Radosavljević, *Osnovi metodologije političkih nauka*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd, 2000, str. 582.

9) Although this statement is not completely correct. Due to anthropomorphic comprehension of the Greek and Roman gods, the number of these gods might be established exactly, even their individual list.

10) Helen Briggs, "Hope for future of giant panda". *BBC News*, June 20th 2006. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/5085006.stm

divorce is “incompatibility in marriage”, rather than infidelity. All this mentioned, as an example is valid only for Christian culture based on monogamy and marital legislation dominant for Christian states. On the other hand, some other cultures that accept polygamy (like Islam) will allow to a man to be married with four women simultaneously and it is not considered to be infidelity, while in states of Christian culture it would represent even the crime.

Conventional measuring have in their basis a conventional zero, therefore they allow measuring also of values that are negative, bellow zero (e.g. we establish by thermometer temperature of -2 degrees Celsius). These measuring are based on international units established by benchmarks and standards. In this way, Christian civilization measures time before and the birth of Christ, while Islamic community do the same from Hijra, i.e. emigration of Muhammad from Mecca to Medina which happened on 16 July 622 according to the Julian calendar. Since this is a completely lunar calendar and therefore is late regarding our calendar complete 11 days per year, the difference is increasing, so that now is 1432 year according ho Hijra. Not to mention that even French revolutionaries also had their own calculation of time, applied in France from 1793-1805 and the basis was the date of proclamation the first French republic. Therefore, with conventional measuring there is a generally accepted agreement that a certain event that happened in some moment (or it is considered to happen at that moment) or a natural phenomenon with which human has empirical experience (freezing of water at 0 degrees Celsius) taken as start of measuring something (time, outside temperature and similar). That acceptance of convention must not be simultaneous in the world, which produces different measuring systems, but today, in the global period, there are generally accepted standards.

Intuitive measuring requires rating or estimation of a subject of research, i.e. differences that appear between certain phenomena (things, objects, values) or their characteristics. With intuitive measuring it is especially important to correctly and precisely define the phenomenon for which presence or absence of certain qualities is being established (for example certain characteristics), as well as precise definition of those qualities themselves.

All three types of measuring are applied in social sciences. Therefore, it is possible to establish the number of members of a party or the number of demonstrators by exact measuring (counting), it is possible to measure the length of column (in meters or kilometers) of trade union activists protesting against government measures by conventional measuring, while with intuitive measuring scaling is the procedure that is applied the most frequently. Scaling as the procedure is based on continual concept, therefore due to it scales "appear as internal classifications of certain continua by which quantitative i.e. qualitative-quantitative differences within a whole are established"[11]. "Whenever we classify certain number of units we shall talk about measuring"[12]. Or, as specified by Serbian methodologist Vojin Milic "Measuring is, actually, only improvement and specifying of classification"[13]. In order to avoid confusion, we specify that equalization of classification and measuring methods is possible only in social sciences, when intuitive measuring is in question.

In the example of designing the Scale of successfulness of political parties and quotient of successfulness of political parties derived from it[14], we shall demonstrate the conditionality of measuring depending on what is the defined quality that is being measured.

First of all, it is necessary to define what is comprehended under the phenomenon political party. It may be discussed, depending on the element that is being stressed, on comprehension of political parties as: *a*) ideological organizations, *b*) class organizations, *c*) mean for achieving national interest, *d*) organization for gaining and performing power. Of course, there are also numerous attempts of e) giving one synthetic definition of the phenomenon of political parties[15]. From such a variety of insisting on different elements of the content of the phenomenon of political party, it is possible to perform different measuring of their "successfulness" based on different qualities, e.g. on diffusion of ideology propagated by the party, on protection of class interests and similar. However, under the phenomenon of political party we comprehend "political organization of ideologically-politically like-minded persons who associate on relatively permanent basis and promote certain program orientations with basic goal of gaining, i.e. remaining in power or participation in power, by which they realize and assert interests, values and goals of those social groups which they tend to represent, as the rule trying to present those interests, values and goals as much as possible to

11) Slavomir Milosavljević, Ivan Radosavljević, *Ibid*, str. 583-584.

12) Paul. F. Lazarsfeld, *Main Trends in Sociology*, George Allen and Unwin, London, p. 12.

13) Vojin Milić, *Sociološki metod*, treće izdanje, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1996, str. 566.

14) Uroš Šuvaković, „Instrumenti merenja uspešnosti političkih partija", *Zbornik Matice srpske za društvene nauke,* Matica srpska, Novi Sad, br. 118-119/2005, str. 395-403.

15) Uroš Šuvaković, *Političke partije i globalni društveni ciljevi*, Treći milenijum, Beograd, 2004, str. 165-177.

be general, i.e. global"[16]. From such the definition of the phenomenon of political party, it is clear that its basic goal is gaining, i.e. remaining or at least participation in power. If we define political parties like this, it is clear that the quality of successfulness means participation in power, while the quality of unsuccessfulness means absence from power. The presence, i.e. the absence, of this quality is therefore the precondition for the possibility of measuring successfulness. Here already comprehensions on measuring as classifications are confirmed, for now as dichotomy. However, we can further measure how much a party is unsuccessful, i.e. how much it is successful. However, before that, we must define what "participation in power" means.

In his considerations, Sartori uses, instead of successfulness, another phenomenon – relevancy of political party and establishes criteria for its measuring. "A party is relevant for the power only when it really rules, enters into government or supports it by voting on its trust, by which it insures the majority necessary for gaining the power"[17]. Regarding parties with blackmailing potentials and their relevancy which, according to Sartori himself, is subsidiary, he points out that these are anti-system parties which become relevant if their "existence or performance is reflected to tactics of party competition", and if a parliamentary party is in question, then there is a "veto power of parliamentary party in legislature"[18]. On basis of such presumptions, Sartori further made his calculations of relevancy of political parties, while he takes the mandatory period of the legislative body as the time unit for calculation.

Successfulness and relevancy are not the same. The relevancy is narrower phenomenon, since it refers only to the quality of importance of party for establishing executive power, while the successfulness starts from the quality of participation both in legislative and executive power. Therefore, we consider as successful all parliamentary parties, while we consider as unsuccessful all non-parliamentary parties. It is a consistent implementation of our definition of parties as organizations that have for the goal gaining power, performance of power or participation in power, since legislative power is also – the power. When the fact is added to this that parliament performs also monitoring power, is completely clear that successfulness of parliamentary parties may not be denied only because they do not participate in executive power.

16) Uroš Šuvaković, *Ibid,* str. 177-178.

17) Giovani Sartori, *Stranke i stranački sustavi: analitički okvir*, prvi svezak. Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2002, str. 260.

18) Giovani Sartori, *Ibid,* str. 113.

Therefore, the criterion – quality of successfulness is measured with relevance to the presence in parliament, and not with relevance to the presence in government. However, it is also possible to measure successfulness among successes, as well as unsuccessfulness among failures. By establishing the notorious fact that parliamentary parties may be considered as successful, and non-parliamentary parties as unsuccessful, we still have not perform measurement. We have not answered the question on how much the former are successful and how much the latter are unsuccessful. In both categories, some are more successful, and some are less successful. We answer to the question how much are they (un)successful by designing appropriate instruments that help us to measure (un)successfulness of political parties. These instruments, of course, are based on classification since the "logic of gradation leads to complete unawareness if classificatory approach is not assumed"[19].

Considering the criteria that we have established, then a ten-member graphic interval scale of successfulness of political parties may present the successfulness of political parties. In its left end there are unsuccessful, non-parliamentary parties, which have just fulfilled legislative conditions for registration, they have national leadership constituted that meets at least twice a year and at least five local boards formed, while on the right end there are successful, parliamentary parties that independently perform executive power. Between these two ends, there are eight positions with different marks on basis of which we make conclusions about successfulness of political parties. The interval between position 5 and 6 is graphically twice as big as any other interval, in order to point out the fact in an obvious visual manner that transition of a party from the status of non-parliamentary to the status of parliamentary party represents a substantial change, transition from one class to another.

Unsuccessful Successful
Non-parliamentary Parliamentary

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Figure 1: *Scale of successfulness of political parties*

At the fist level (1) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfilled legislative conditions for registration, with constituted national leadership that meets at least twice a year and at least five local boards formed;

At the second level (2) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfilled conditions for registration, with constituted leadership that

19) Giovani Sartori, *Ibid,* str. 257.

meets at least four times a year and has local boards formed in at least 10% of local administrative units at the level of municipality;

At the third level (3) there is a non-parliamentary party with constituted national leadership that meets on regular basis, has local boards formed in at least 10% of local administrative units at the level of municipality, fulfills legislative conditions for independent candidacy of own list of representatives at parliamentary elections and which has publicly recognizable symbols;

At the fourth level (4) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfills the above mentioned conditions and whose list of representatives has managed to get support of more than 2% of voters that went out to parliamentary elections and less than legally established census for entering the parliament;

At the fifth level (5) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfills conditions required for the levels 1-3 and whose list of representatives has managed to get support from more than 3% of the voters that went out to parliamentary elections and less than legally established census for entering the parliament, i.e. the party that has managed to candidate at least 10% of the total number of possible candidates for representatives at local levels. The following should be kept in mind here: as the rule, local and parliamentary elections are not organized simultaneously, but in different years. Therefore, in the year when parliamentary elections are organized, the percentage of gained votes should be used as the parameter, and in the year when local elections are organized, then the percentage of candidates should be used. However, if parliamentary and local elections are still organized in the same year, then better result for the party should be used for determination of the position;

At the sixth level (6) there is a parliamentary party;

At the seventh level (7) there is a parliamentary party – participant in government or a parliamentary party by whose support a minority government has been elected;

At the eight level (8) there is a leading parliamentary oppositional party, with the greatest number of mandates among oppositional parties, on condition that it has enough representatives by itself that it can start at any moment the voting about the distrust to the government;

At the ninth level (9) there is a parliamentary party – participant in government with the greatest number of mandates'

At the tenth level (10) there is a parliamentary party that independently performs executive power.

From the conditions required in order that certain party takes the appropriate position in the scale, it is clear that criteria are more explicit regarding the parliamentary parties in comparison to non-parliamentary parties. The only additional explanation that is necessary to be given regarding the positioning of parliamentary parties is related to the position of the leading opposition party (8), which is higher positioned in the scale then the established position of the parliamentary party – participant in the government, i.e. parliamentary party by whose support the minority government was elected (7). An impression might be acquired that such a positioning of the leading opposition party is a significant discrepancy from the basic criterion about successfulness of any party – gaining, remaining or participation in the power. However, it is not like that. In the greatest number of situations, in the countries with the developed parliamentary, the leading opposition party may – by using its political power – influence even the most important projects of the government, especially if it fulfills presumed additional criterion – that it can start at any moment the voting about the distrust to the government. That is the reason for such positioning in the scale. On the other hand, the party that supports minority government or which participates as minority in the government must, as the rule in most of the cases, indulge in practice the party that is the oldest participant in the government. Otherwise, it would risk elections at the moment when it is the least convenient for it. Because of everything mentioned, it usually retires from own goals and interests, jeopardizing also the purpose of own participation in the power. Except, of course, if we would assume that participation in the power is the goal for itself, which no party would ever admit and which is contrary to the very phenomenon of political party, as we have defined it. Besides, such behavior would surely lead to the elective debacle of that party in the first next elections. Since there is no need for additional explanations of criteria regarding the other positions in the scale of successful, parliamentary parties, we shall give them only for criteria defining the positions of unsuccessful, non-parliamentary parties.

When establishing the criteria for differentiation of successfulness of non-parliamentary parties, we were also trying to make these criteria such that they can be established empirically relatively easily; therefore these are not the matter of rating or estimation of the researcher, but simple registering the facts. In this regard, we were using as criteria the following combinations of indicators: A) fulfillment of legislative conditions for registration; B) party organization development level that reflects through B1) existence of local party leaderships in a number of local selfmanagement units at the level of municipality that grows with the rise of the party position in the scale, B2) existence of constituted national leadership that meets regularly, provided that the party position in the scale grows with regularity of the national leadership meetings, B3) ability to fulfill legislative conditions for candidacies of the national representatives list, i.e. ability to candidate certain number of representatives at local elections; C) recognition of party symbols in public is the indicator that the party is "noticed", "determined" in the body of electors; D) support percentage of electors that went out to elections. Regarding this last criterion, the percentage of gained votes of electors that went out to elections and which influence the positioning of a party to the place 4 or 5 is not chosen incidentally. We have chosen them on basis of the comparative analysis of legislative solution in certain East European countries regarding the percentage of votes that parties should gain at parliamentary elections in order to be financed from budgets. Namely, such legislative solution show that parties are relevant when they gain a certain percentage of votes, regardless the fact that they could not manage to enter the parliament and then they are financed from sources of public income. In Poland that percentage for independent appearance of a party is 3% and 6% for a coalition, in Czech it is 1.5%, Slovakia 3%, Bulgaria 2%, Estonia 5%, Russia 3% or 12 seats in the parliament, Slovenia 1.2% independently and 1.5% in coalition, in Croatia 5%, in Macedonia at least 1 mandate in the Sobranie[20)].

We can establish the successfulness of parties for each year individually by classification of political parties on this scale. However, the importance of this scale is much greater since it enables us to monitor and compare successfulness of political parties on the political scene of a state for a longer period. We consider that optimal period for that is 10 years. It is the period when at least two regular elections for national parliament are organized, at least the same number of local election cycles and on basis of this entire one can with relatively high precision rate the successfulness of each political party that was the subject of our interest.

If again we ascribe to each of the referred positions on the Scale of successfulness a certain number of points in the value equal to the number of the position (for example, for level six we ascribe 6 points), then it is possible to design the *Successfulness quotient of political parties*. The successfulness quotient (SQ) of political parties is calculated for the period of 10 years by rating each monitored party according to the scale of successfulness for each moni-

20) Milan Jovanović, *Izborni sistemi postkomunističkih država*, Službeni list SCG, Fakultet političkih nauka, Intitut za političke studije, Beograd, 2004, str. 466.

tored year individually, according to its best position in that year. In this way, we gather the sum of points for each political party for the period of ten years, and in order to get successfulness quotient for the ten-year period, we divide with 10 the obtained result.

$$SQ = \frac{x1+x2+x3+x4+x5+x6+x7+x8+x9+x10}{10}$$

At the example of Serbia, for the period 2001-2010, establishing of successfulness quotient for several political parties would look like this:

In the year **2001**, SPS holds the possition number 8 on the Scale of successfulness, so we assign to it 8 points[21)], SRS – 6, ND – 7, DS – 9, DSS – 7, SPO – 5[22)].

In the year **2002**, SPS – 6, SRS – 6, ND – 7, DS – 9, DSS – 823), SPO – 5.

In the year **2003**, SPS – 6, SRS – 6, ND – 7, DS – 9, DSS – 8, SPO - 6[24)]

In the year **2004**, SPS – 7, SRS – 8, ND[25)] – 3, DS – 6, DSS – 9, SPO – 7

In the year **2005**, SPS – 7, SRS – 8, ND/LS – 2, DS – 6, DSS – 9, SPO – 7

In the year **2006**, SPS – 7, SRS – 8, ND/LS – 2, DS – 6, DSS – 9, SPO – 7

In the year **2007**, SPS – 6, SRS – 8, ND/LS – 2, DS – 9, DSS – 7, SPO – 5

In the year **2008**, SPS – 7, SRS – 8, ND/LS – 2, DS – 9, DSS – 6, SPO – 7

In the year **2009**, SPS – 7, SRS – 6, ND/LS – 2, DS – 9, DSS – 6, SPO – 7

In the year **2010**, SPS – 7, SRS – 6, ND/LS – 2, DS – 9, DSS – 6, SPO – 7[26)]

---

21) The Article 93 of the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia from 1990 predicted that 20 commoners have the right to submit a request for voting on distrust to the Government of the Republic of Serbia, which SPS fulfills as a leading parliamentary party with 37 mandates.

22) This party is an example how easy it is to loose parliamentary status due to one wrong political decision. Vuk Draskovic, the leader of the party, would not accept not to be the candidate for president of DOS coalition at presidential elections held simultaneously with parliamentary elections, therefore his party appeared individually also on parliamentary elections. The consequence was absence from the Parliament.

23) In the meantime, DSS fell out from the Government of the Republic of Serbia. After that, DOS tried to take away mandates from their members. By the decision of the Federal Constitutional Court such decision of the Administrative Board of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia was dismissed ("Official Gazette of FRY" No. 57/2002, but they have become the leading opposing party.

24) Transition of this party from non-parliamentary to parliamentary was not the result of elections, but the transfer of one commoner to membership of SPO, which was ranked as permissible by the Constitutional Court of Serbia, regarding that commoners and not parties are owners of mandates. Such gaining of parliamentary status we consider to be a political deviance. Unfortunately, it was not the only case in the ten-year practice of parliamentarism in Serbia after the 5th October.

25) This party changes its name to Liberals of Serbia.

26) Regarding the parliamentary parties and parties whose representatives participated in governments of the Republic of Serbia, we have taken the data from the book of Zoran Radonjic m.a. and Verica Mihajlovic *Two Decades of Multipartism in the Republic of Serbia*, which

Successfulness quotient for each of the referred parties, for the period 2001 – 2010, would look like this:

$$SQsps=\frac{6+6+6+7+7+7+6+7+7+7}{10}=6,6$$

$$SQsrs=\frac{6+6+6+8+8+8+8+8+6+6}{10}=7,0$$

$$SQnd/ls=\frac{7+7+7+3+2+2+2+2+2+2}{10}=3,6$$

$$SQds=\frac{9+9+9+6+6+6+9+9+9+9}{10}=8,1$$

$$SQdss=\frac{7+8+8+9+9+9+7+6+6+6}{10}=7,5$$

$$SQspo=\frac{5+5+6+7+7+7+5+7+7+7}{10}=6,3$$

As it is visible from the referred, measurement of successfulness of political parties actually depends on several qualities that must be defined in advance: a) content of the political party phenomenon; b) content of the successfulness of political party phenomenon; c) classification of political parties according to as objective, really obvious criteria as possible; d) determination of a time period in advance in which measurement is performed. All this that we mentioned represent certain qualities, to which we assign certain numeric values, on basis of which we perform measurement of successfulness. If we have defined these qualities in a different manner then we have, it is sure that the result of the measurement of successfulness would be different. We could simply say that party that is more successful is the party that gains more votes at elections, which is also an objective criterion, but it is not of essential importance. Since a small party also, if it has passed the census for a half of the required percentage, may participate in the government or the government may depend on it and therefore it will be more important than the party with half percent more votes, but has remained outside the executive power and in the system of parliamentary democracy it will be able only through the parliamentary procedure

should be published soon. We thank to the authors who made us available the systemized data before their book is published. Regarding the gained votes of non-parliamentary parties, we have used the data of the Republic Electoral Commission, according to the Report on parliamentary elections held on 28 December 2003 at http://www.rik.parlament.gov.rs/cirilica/propisi_frames.htm [approached on 14 March 2011] and the Report on parliamentary election held on 21 January 2007 at http://www.rik.parlament.gov.rs/cirilica/propisi_frames.htm [approached on 14 March 2011].

to influence on bringing political decisions and creation of global social goals. It is more successful then the parties that have remained outside the parliament, but it is less successful then the parties with smaller number of gained votes, but which managed to become a part of the coalition in power.

We can also use another scale, more famous, by which we measure social distance – *the Bogardus Social Distance Scale*, in order to illustrate that it is necessary to establish what is measured (the quality) with any measuring. When designing his scale, E. S. Bogardus has started from certain possible relations that exist in everyday life (that a member of a social group – nation, religion and similar – may visit my country, live in it, get citizenship of the examinee's country, examinee to work with a member of that group, to be his neighbor, to be in the same club, to marry him). Examinees respond which of the referred relations they would accept, in order to make conclusion on social distance of the certain group of examinees to the certain social group, which may be expressed numerically, but also equivalently to numerical statement – descriptively (without distance, small distance, moderate distance, great distance). Conclusion is inductive, based on statistic method of average value, therefore on synthesis. However, it should be noticed also: in order to reach the conclusion, an analysis of criteria-qualities that were of significant importance as indicators for relations of closeness (distance) between individuals as members of certain social groups had to be performed previously, so that even this example confirms dialectic comprehension of the unique analytic-synthetic method. Exactly this fact enables modification of this scale, according to who examinees are[27)] and what is being examined (e.g. ethnic or religious distance).

Answering the question from this subheading, and taking as the subject of our discussion the scientific method that is the most quantitative regarding its nature – the method of measurement, we have to agree that it is not viable without necessary relying on certain qualities that represent at least the subject of measurement and criteria on basis of which the measurement is performed. The most that we can establish is that the measurement is a quantitative-qualitative method.

27) Uroš Šuvaković, Jasmina Petrović, „Etnička udaljenost studenata Univerziteta u Beogradu i Univerziteta u Prištini sa privremenim sedištem u Kosovskoj Mitrovici“, *Sociološki godišnjak*, Sociološko društvo Republike Srpske, Pale, br. 5/2010, str. 216.

ON OBSOLESCENCE OF DISTINGUISHING QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSES

It is conventional in the methodological literature to consider methods of content analysis through the two techniques: quantitative and qualitative content analysis.

As determinations of the qualitative analysis, it is indicated that it is intuitive, with impressionistic basis, that hypotheses might be checked by it, that no special instruments are required for implementation, which contributes to its elasticity. On the contrary, penetrability, systematicness, necessity for making instruments and possibility of checking hypotheses are assigned to the quantitative analysis[28)]. The origination itself of the content analysis method is connected actually for the origination of content analysis method and Berelson's researches, where he determine it as the "research technique for objective, systematic and quantitative description of obvious content of symbolic communication"[29)]. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that content analysis of documents has been developing practically throughout the whole history of science. Aristotle has made his classification of regimes just on the basis of content analysis of documents – 158 constitutions of Antique Greek states. Historians ever since apply content analysis do documents that is prevailingly qualitative, but certain quantifications were also performed (e.g. numeration of book parts, ordinary numbers of literature and similar). Quantification is also performed by logicians in defining a phenomenon, in addition to its content, by extent of the phenomenon (all, some, these are also quantifications).

If we would like to establish in short the differences between these two techniques of content analysis technique, and not to enter into the details with which numerous studies before ours have been dealing, then it would be the following: qualitative analysis answers to questions what and how something was told, and quantitative also to the question how mush is told (repeated). Qualitative content analysis is focused to the meaning of something that was meant to be told, where the context of the told is specially taken into consideration. The context of a statement is very important for recognition of its truthful meaning. It is completely possible to imagine content analysis of a document without performing any quantification. Such a thing is possible, but insufficient, since it is important to take into consideration how many times an atti-

28) Dževad Termiz, Slavomir Milosavljević, *Analitika*, prvi tom, Grafit, Lukavac, 2008, str. 28.

29) Bernard Berelson, *Content Analysis in Communication Research,* Free Press, Glencoe (ILI), p. 18.

tude or a value that is the subject of analysis is being repeated, from the standpoint of insisting on an attitude of a value. Finally, it is important to establish e.g. if in a political document the value "freedom" is treated as one of values or as one of basic values or as the most important value. In this case also we have a gradation (and classification) of values according to their importance, which also represents a certain quantification. Regarding the study of social phenomena, "quantitative content analysis may not be applied without, at least limited, cooperation with qualitative analysis"[30)]. Simply because it is impossible to count – nothing! Therefore, in order to perform quantification, it is necessary to establish in advance the presence or the absence of a certain quality, which was previously clearly defined, in order to establish the quantity of its presence-absence.

In the work dedicated to the relation between qualitative and quantitative approach to content analysis of schoolbooks, Z. Avramovic and M. Vujacic demonstrate exactly the need for exceeding limitations of each of these approaches by necessity for "methodological cooperation"[31)]. Unfortunately, they also fall under the influence of positivists by recognizing to the qualitative content analysis the status of "addition to quantitative method"[32)]. Such an attitude is not acceptable, since these are two different concepts of one method – content analysis, while it is possible, as we have already shown, to imagine a qualitative analysis without any quantification, but quantitative analysis is impossible without previously established qualities that are being quantified. Unlike the attitude on qualitative as "additional method", R. Kulic just in the area of pedagogy indicates attitudes of numerous authors on "various aspects of qualitative and quantitative strategy permeation"[33)]. The similar conclusion, but in the area of studying tourism and its constituting as the scientific discipline, have reached I. D. Volic and I. I. Nadj[34)].

Here we would like to indicate a terrific study based just on application of quantitative (frequency) content analysis. It is the book by E. S. Herman and D. Peterson "The Politics of Genocide"[35)] (2010). It

30) Uroš Šuvaković, *Metodološke studije o pitanjima sociološkog proučavanja političkih partija*, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Prištini, Kosovska Mitrovica, 2011, str. 77.

31) Zoran Avramović, Milja Vujačić, „Odnos kvantitativne i kvalitativne metode istraživanja školskih udžbenika", *Teme*, Univerzitet u Nišu, br. 2/2010.

32) Zoran Avramović, Milja Vujačić, *Ibid,* str. 460.

33) Radivoje Kulić, „Neki problemi i protivrečnosti u komparativnim istraživanjima vaspitanja i obrazovanja", *Pedagogija*, Forum pedagoga Srbije i Crne Gore, Beograd, br. 4/2010, str. 571.

34) Ivana D. Volić, Imre I. Nađ, „Kvalitativne metode u turizmu – put ka konstituisanju teorijske osnove za buduću nauku", *Teme*, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, br. 1/2011.

35) Edward S. Herman, David Peterson, *Politika genocida*, Vesna Info, Beograd, 2010.

is based a) on establishing the number of repetitions of the word "genocide" in American press regarding war crimes conducted in various parts of the world[36] and putting in relation that number with estimated number of victims, and b) differentiated use of the words "massacre" and "genocide" in different parts of the world[37] depending on the relation between crime committers and American government and putting in relation the number of dead and frequency of use of both these words in order to qualify the crime. However, this quantitative analysis given by Herman and Peterson would remain incomplete if they had not performed also the qualitative content analysis of texts in American press, but also declarations of American officials, on basis of which the authors have established an original typology of crimes, based on criterion of relation of American authorities to them[38], which is, needless to say, caused by the American interests and the role of America in committed crime.

When discussing the differences between qualitative and quantitative analysis regarding the absence of methodological instrument with the former, such a claim is untrue. Instruments of content analysis of documents are: evidence list, professional dictionary and codex of words and codes.

Evidence list undobtful exist both with qualitative and with quantitative analysis, of course adapted to specificities of these techniques.

Professional-political dictionary[39] is undobtful an instrument that is used by both techniques of content analysis. Political phenomena and political terms are specific and require determination of the meaning in which these are used. Those meanings are not only linguistic, but also ideological and cultural: democracy is comprehended completely differently in liberal-democratic and in Marxist, proletarian sense. Coup d'etat is considered to be political violence and anti-democratic act everywhere in Europe, but if the army in Turkey performs it then it is, since the period of Kemal Ataturk, an act based on the Constitution in order to prevent re-Islamization of the state and preserve laical republic! Therefore, when studying political situation in Turkey, this

36) Over Iraqi people after establishment of economic sanctions, over Iraqi people after American-British invasion and occupation, over Bosnian Muslims, over Kosovo Albanians, in Ruanda, Democratic Republic of Kongo and Darfur

37) El Mozote, Rio Negro, Sabra and Shatila, Halabja, two attacks on Sarajevo markets (Markale 1 and 2), Srebrenica, Serbian Krajina – operation Storm, Racak, Likisa, Dasht-i-Leili, Fallujah and Gaza strip.

38) Authors distinguish: constructive genocide, criminal genocide, benign bloodsheds and mythical bloodsheds

39) For distinction between this instrument and codex and codebook, see Dževad Termiz, Slavomir Milosavljević, *Ibid,* str. 32-33.

specificity must be known when analyzing requests for preservation of democracy in that state.

Codex of words and book code represents the "system of strictly defined basic categories and codes… Codex is, basically, a system of classifications and definitions of words for which it is, more or less reasonably, presumed to appear in the documents submitted to the analysis"[40)]. It is conventional in literature to distinguish static, successive and continual codex[41)]. Regarding the standpoint of distinguishing techniques of content analysis of documents, we might say that all the three codices are usable in application of both techniques.

All this leads us to the conclusion that both techniques of content analysis are using the same methodological instruments, from which follows a conclusion on senselessness of the statement that a qualitative content analysis has no methodological instruments. Another thing is that with application of qualitative content analysis, in certain cases, it is not necessary to use these instruments in more developed form. "Contemporary qualitative analysis is not based only on impression and it is more oriented to the so called thematic analysis that implies certain codification (defining and classifying themes) and suitable recording"[42)].

Regarding our attitude, scientific research is not possible without previously established project of the research[43)]. It implies existence of hypotheses, for which indicators may be statements of certain content and type, which everything may be the basis for making scientific conclusions in the sense of confirming or rejecting the hypotheses. All this is possible even without performing any quantification, therefore the statement that it is not possible to check hypotheses by qualitative analysis is not true, by which its cognitive penetrability is actually denied. Conclusions on "impressionistic character" of qualitative content analysis are equally impressionistic and unviable, as well as the statements that check of hypotheses can be performed only by quantitative analysis.

All this leads us to conclusion on obsolescent of distinguishing qualitative and quantitative content analysis and necessity of pleading

40) Neđo Danilović, *Specifičnosti izrade kodeksa pojmova i cifara u politikološkim istraživanjima*, doktorska disertacija odbranjena na Fakultetu političkih nauka Univerziteta u Beogradu pod mentorstvom prof. dr Ivana Radosavljevića, Beograd, 2004, str. 80, 85.

41) Neđo Danilović, op. cit.

42) Slavomir Milosavljević, Ivan Radosavljević, *Ibid,* str. 552.

43) Dragan Subotić, „Istraživanje i naučno-istraživački rad u društvenim naukama", *Politička revija*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2009, str. 352.

for the unique, integral content analysis as a scientific method in social sciences.

ARE BIOGRAPHIC METHOD AND METHOD OF CASE STUDY QUALITATIVE METHODS?

The methods that we discuss in this section are usually indicated in the literature as the examples of qualitative methods. Is it so?

Using of personal documents in order to obtain appropriate data that enable the scientific conclusion is the characteristic of biographic method. "It is implied that the procedure, on basis of personal documents as adequate experience, should the acknowledgement regarding the subjective experience of participants in certain events and situations, and from their point of view, their "definition of situation", to understand also the motives of their acting and performance"[44]. However, it should be noticed that the "essence of the idea of biographic method is not in the choice of sources, *but in the acknowledgement of individual biographies and through them acquiring acknowledgements on social groups, organizations, etc.* (emphasized by U.S.), i.e. on social relations, movements, characteristics, positions, etc."[45].

One of the problems with which this method confronts is the problem of objectivity. It tends to acknowledge objectively (social group, situation and similar), on basis of objective conditions and experience of its members. "The idea of repeating the patterns of behavior, in autobiographies, diaries, letters of researched individuals – members of the same group, is the important idea of this method, and by reaching the 'saturation threshold' – the objection regarding lack of representation and experience basis are being renounced"[46]. That is the reason why the founders of this method – W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, writing the monography on the position of Polish peasant in Europe and America[47], bought 15,000 letters, selecting among them according to certain criteria, 754 letters for publishing. They performed certain classifications, reaching the typology "which in its essence has as criterion their role [of letters, author's remark] in functioning of one type

44) Marija Bogdanović, „Biografski metod u sociologiji", *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta. Serija B, društvene nauke*, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Beograd, br. 16/1993, str. 73.

45) Slavomir Milosavljević, Ivan Radosavljević, *Ibid,* 571.

46) Uroš Šuvaković, *Ibid,* str. 159.

47) William I. Thomas, Florian W. Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 3th edition, Dover Publications, Inc, New York, 1958.

of culture, in this case peasant culture of one European nation"[48] (M. Bogdanovic, 1993, p. 80). The authors have made certain quantifications, processing such a great number of letters, on basis of which the referred typology originated. This invalidates the thesis that biographic method is purely quantitative. Of course, we could indicate also some other examples that show that biographic method have, in certain areas of its implementation, quantitative characteristics, too. Which are these areas? When it is implemented as the method of macro-research and on great sample, which surely was the case with the referred research of its founders.

Another important principle of this method, the principle of complementarity, which requires collecting material from different sources and comparing with private documents, also enables certain quantifications.

All this speaks in favor of the fact that biographic method may be justifiably considered as a qualitative-quantitative method.

Regarding the method of case study, usually classified among "qualitative" ones, the object of the research must be *one case*. It means that the object is a social reality that represents a totality, and as such may be clearly distinguished in time and space. These totalities may be greater or smaller in their extent, more or less complex regarding their complexity, but they always must be totalities clearly distinguished from the environment, while the ties with the environment are not disconnected, but they are taken into account when making conclusions. The case always represents a social totality: micro, medium extent or macro. Integral processes are not, as a rule, monolithic, but they are diverse. As a consequence, the case study uses different sources of data and accordingly different techniques of collecting data. It uses any technique of collecting data that is appropriate for the object of research. When we say that the method of case study comprises a totality of one phenomenon that is the object of the research – "the case", it is important to understand this refers to its complexity in its own historicity: origin, development, culmination, disappearance, therefore to all phases of its development, of course during the period defined by the research. In this way understanding of development process of a social appearance is achieved, which is, regarding social sciences, of vital importance for scientific conclusion.

Although social processes and phenomena are of non-repetitious character, there are social processes that repeat periodically, e.g. elections. Any elections may be the object of a special case study. Here also

48) Marija Bogdanović, *Ibid,* str. 80.

a question is asked – what is the most important for any elections? The result, who gained most of the votes. When the case study would be only a qualitative method, then it could not use statistical data on the number of gained votes of each party at elections. It uses also the statistic method and sample method when researching public opinion etc. which all give to it quantitative characteristics. Finally, when making a case study on acting of a political party within the certain period and certain area, it is obligatory to use statistical data (e.g. on number of members, on number of gained votes), which are all quantifications, as it is impossible to avoid measuring of successfulness of that party, and all that together determine the case study not as the qualitative, but the qualitative-quantitative method[49].

TO ESTABLISH A DIALECTICAL TYPOLOGY TO QUALITATIVE-QUANTITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE-QUALITATIVE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Establishing basic characteristics of the two methods that are traditionally rated among quantitative methods in social sciences (method of measurement and method of quantitative content analysis), and the two methods that are traditionally rated among qualitative methods in social sciences (biographic and method of case study), we have established that the division of methods to quantitative and qualitative is unviable. The main objection that might be directed is the one that strikes to the very foundation of establishing quantitative methods – one cannot measure (count) nothing; one always measure – something. That something, in social sciences, must represent a clearly defined quality, where any distinguish ability in establishing the quality that is measured (and which measure it) also produces differences in the results of measurement.

On the other hand, even the methods that are considered expressively qualitative (qualitative content analysis, biographical method, case studies) most usually operate with certain quantifications, since the results of their implementation remain incomplete in case of avoiding quantifications (which theoretically can be imagined). Using of statisti-

49) Even when the object of a case study is an individual, when it gets close to the biographic method, in some situations it is difficult to avoid quantifications, e.g. how many times that individual was sentenced to jail and for how many years, or how many times he was elected for the head of the state and how many votes ha was gaining. If a distribution according to municipalities is added to this, which would serve for further analyses, it is completely clear that here also we are dealing with quantifications.

cal procedures in implementation of so called quantitative methods, and statistical method is based on induction, necessary leads to conclusion that not only analysis, but also synthesis, is applied on the process of concluding, i.e. unique dialectic analitical-synthetical method is implemented[50].

Therefore, with the aim to be methodologically correct, it would be the most accurately to consider the existing dichotomy to qualitative and quantitative researches as obsolete, and to establish a typology of scientific researches to qualitative-quantitative (prevailing element is qualitative) and quantitative-qualitative (prevailing element is quantitative) researches, depending on which element in the research is more dominant, with clear establishment of their interconnection.

Урош Шуваковић

О ПРЕВАЗИЂЕНОСТИ ПОДЕЛЕ НА КВАЛИТАТИВНА И КВАНТИТАТИВНА ИСТРАЖИВАЊА У САВРЕМЕНОЈ НАУЧНОЈ МЕТОДОЛОГИЈИ

Сажетак

У раду са износи аргументација у прилог ставу о превазиђености давно успостављене поделе научних истраживања на квалитативна и квантитативна. Имајући у виду став материјалистичких дијалектичара да свако научно истраживање мора бити предметно, заступа се становиште да је немогуће извести било какво квантитативно истраживање коме не би макар претходило утврђивање квалитета који се истражује. Пошто не може да се истражује ништа, већ увек само нешто, то значи да је најпре неопходно прецизно утврдити (дефинисати) квалитет који се истражује, а и да би се то учинило неопходно је одговарајуће истраживање.

Ово важи за сва истраживања, укључујући и мерења, за које се у литератури сматра како су искључиво квантитативна истраживања. То се показују на примеру конструисања два инструмента за мерење успешности политичких партија – скале и количника успешности партија, као и Богардусове скале социјалне дистанце. С друге стране, чак и изразито квалитативне методе истраживања (нпр. квалитативна анализа садржаја, студија случаја, биографски метод, итд.) по правилу садрже одређене квантификације.

У циљу методолошке коректности стога би било најисправније постојећу дихотомију на квалитативна и квантитативна ис-

50) Bogdan Šešić, *Opšta metodologija*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd, 1980, str. 62-65.

траживања превазиђеном, и успоставити типологију научних истраживања на квалитативно-квантитативна (претежући елемент квалитативни) и квантитативно-квалитативна (претежући елемент квантитативни) истраживања, у зависности од тога који је елемент у истраживању доминантнији, уз јасно констатовање чињенице о њиховој међузависности.

Кључне речи: квалитативна и квантитативна истраживања, превазиђеност поделе, међузависност, нова типологија.

REFERENCES

Avramović, Zoran, Vujačić, Milja: „Odnos kvantitativne i kvalitativne metode istraživanja školskih udžbenika“, *Teme,* Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, br. 2/2010.

Berelson, R. Bernard: *Content Analysis in Communication Research,* Free Press, Glencoe (ILI), 1952.

Bogdanović, Marija: *Kvantitativni pristup u sociologiji: razvoj, dometi i formalističke jednostranosti*, Službeni list SFRJ, Beograd, 1981.

Bogdanović, Marija: „Biografski metod u sociologiji“, *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta. Serija B, društvene nauke,* Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Beograd, br. 16/1993.

Briggs, Helen: “Hope for future of giant panda”, *BBC News,* June 20th 2006, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/5085006.stm

Danilovic, Neđo: *Specifičnosti izrade kodeksa pojmova i cifara u politikološkim istraživanjima,* PhD defended at the Faculty of Political Sciences of Belgrade University under mentorship of Prof. Dr. Ivan Radosavljevic, Beograd, 2004.

Herman, S. Edward, Peterson, David: *Politika genocida*, Vesna Info, Beograd, 2010.

Jovanovic, Milan: *Izborni sistemi postkomunističkih država,* Službeni list SCG, Fakultet političkih nauka, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, 2004.

Kulić, Radivoje: „Neki problemi i protivrečnosti u komparativnim istraživanjima vaspitanja i obrazovanja“, *Pedagogija,* Forum pedagoga Srbije I Crne Gore, br. 4/2010.

Lazarsfeld, F. Paul: *Qualitative Analysis: Historical and Critical Essays*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc, Boston, 1972.

Lazarsfeld, F. Paul: *Main Trends in Sociology*. George Allen and Unwin, London, 1973.

Marx, Karl: *Kapital,* prvi tom. Kultura, Beograd, 1947.

Macura, Miloš: *Naselja i stanovništvo oblasti Brankovića 1455. godine*, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Službeni glasnik, Beograd, 2001.

Milic, Vojin: *Sociološki metod,* treće izdanje, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1996.

Milosavljevic, Slavomir, Radosavljevic, Ivan: *Osnovi metodologije političkih nauka*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd, 2000.

Sartori, Giovani: *Stranke i stranački sustavi: analitički okvir,* Vol. 1, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2002.

Šešić, Bogdan: *Opšta metodologija*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd, 1980.

Ševkušić, Slavica: „Kombinovanje kvantitativnih i kvalitativnih metoda u proučavanju obrazovanja i vaspitanja", *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, Institut za pedagoška istraživanja, Beograd, br. 1/2009, DOI: 10.2298/ZIPI0901045S

Subotić, Dragan: „Istraživanje i naučno-istraživački rad u društvenim naukama", *Politička revija,* Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2009.

Šuvaković, Uroš: *Političke partije i globalni društveni ciljevi,* Treci milenijum, Beograd, 2004.

Šuvaković, Uroš: „Instrumenti merenja uspešnosti političkih partija", *Zbornik Matice srpske za društvene nauke,* Matica srpska, Novi Sad, br. 118-119/2005

Šuvaković, Uroš, Petrovic, Jasmina: „Etnička udaljenostost studenata Univerziteta u Beogradu i Univerzitetau Prištini sa privremenim sedištem u Kosovskoj Mitrovici", *Sociološki godišnjak,* Sociološko društvo Republike Srpske, br. 5/2010.

Šuvaković, Uroš: *Metodološke studije o pitanjima sociološkog proučavanja političkih partija,* Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Prištini, Kosovska Mitrovica, 2011.

Termiz, Dževad, Milosavljevic, Slavomir: *Analitika* tom prvi, Grafit, Lukavac, 2008.

Volic, D. Ivana Nadj, I. Imre: „Kvalitativne metode u turizmu – put ka konstituisanju teorijske osnove za buduću nauku", *Teme, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš,* br. 1/2011.

Резиме

У раду са износи аргументација у прилог ставу о превазиђености давно успостављене дихотомије научних истраживања на квалитативна и квантитативна. Имајући у виду став материјалистичких дијалектичара да свако научно истраживање мора бити предметно, заступа се становиште да је немогуће извести било какво квантитативно истраживање коме не би макар претходило утврђивање квалитета који се истражује. Пошто не може да се истражује ништа, већ увек само нешто, то значи да је најпре неопходно прецизно утврдити (дефинисати) квалитет који се истражује, а и да би се то учинило неопходно је одговарајуће истраживање.

Ово важи за сва истраживања, укључујући и мерења, за које се у литератури сматра како су искључиво квантитативна истраживања. То се показују на примеру конструисања два инструмента за мерење успешности политичких партија – скале и количника успешности партија. Ови инструменти не служе утврђивању релевантности партија, којом се бавио Сартори, већ анализирању и поређењу њихове успешности на основу објективних критеријума. Да би их конструисао, аутор је морао: 1) да дефинише партије у односу на њихов основни циљ – освајање и вршење власти; 2) да одреди шта значи квалитет успешност. Успешност партије могуће је утврђивати само у односу на циљ коме све оне теже – вршење власти.

Имајући вршење власти као квалитет у виду, могуће је направити поделу на неуспешне (ванпарламентарне) и успешне (парламентарне) партије, на основу чега и одређених допунских квалитативних и квантитавних критеријума је могуће конструисати скалу и индекс успешности партија; 3) Ови инструменти мерења, засновани на претходном квалитативном истраживању, имају и ограничења у погледу врсте политичких и изборних система у којима их је могуће примењивати, која су опет квалитативне природе. У прилог нужности претходног јасног одређивања квалитета који се мере иде и конструисање Богардусове скале социјалне дистанце, коју смо у раду такође користили како бисмо демонстрирали превазиђеност поделе на квантитативна и квалитативна истраживања. Херман и Питерсон су у својој књизи „Политика геноцида“ јасно показали да није могућа квантитативна нализа садржаја, а да се претходно јасно не утврде квалитети који се квантификују.

С друге стране, чак и изразито квалитативне методе истраживања (нпр. анализа садржаја, студија случаја, биографски метод, итд.) по правилу садрже одређене квантификације. Тако су, на пример, оснивачи биографске методе W. I. Thomas и F. Znaniecki на основу анализе 15000 писама и селекције њих 754 извели своју типологију. Чињеница да је закључивање изведено на статистичкој методи узорка, говори у прилог постојања одређених квантификација, на основу којих је типологија заснована.

У циљу методолошке коректности стога би било најисправније постојећу поделу на квалитативна и квантитативна истраживања сматрати превазиђеном, и успоставити типологију научних истраживања на квалитативно-квантитативна (претежни елемент квалитативни) и квантитативно-квалитативна (претежни елемент квантитативни) истраживања, уз сталну присутност свести о томе да је реч о њиховој међусависности.

Кључне речи: квалитативна и квантитативна истраживања, превазиђеност поделе, међузависност, нова типологија

* Овај рад је примљен 12. септембра 2011. године а прихваћен за штампу на састанку Редакције 16. новембра 2011. године.