ON THE DICHOTOMY OF QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITAIVE RESEARCHES IN CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY

U.V. Suvakovic

Department of Sociology
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Pristina
Temporary Head Office in Kosovska Mitrovica
Ul. Filipa Vishn'icha, 66, Kosovska Mitrovica, 38220, Serbia

Argumentation in favor of overcoming the long-ago-established dichotomy of qualitative and quantitative scientific research is presented in the article. Proceeding from the view of materialistic dialecticians that every scientific research must deal with a subject, the author assumes that it is impossible to conduct a quantitative research without first establishing the quality to be studied. This also concerns measuring, which is referred only to quantitative procedures in literature. By way of illustration, the author designs two instruments for measuring the successfulness of political parties — the scale and the quotient of party successfulness. On the other hand, even the qualitative analysis usually involves certain quantifications. The author concludes that to achieve methodological correctness the existing dichotomy of qualitative and quantitative research should be considered as overcome and a typology of scientific research including "predominantly qualitative" and "predominantly quantitative" studies, depending on the methodological components prevailing in them, should be used.

Key words: qualitative research, quantitative research, dichotomy, measuring instruments, successfulness of political parties, content analysis

> I always believed in the interdependence
> of quantitative and qualitative work.
> *P.F. Lazarsfeld* [8. P. XVII]

The conventional subdivision of methods into qualitative and quantitative ones is traditional in the methodology of social sciences. This subdivision is the result of another idea dating back to the times of Descartes — of universal usability of mathematics. The Economic Table introduced by Quesnay in 1758 is among the first attempts to quantify social phenomena. In the 18th century, Condorcet developed his theory of "social mathematics". Apart from these, the need for using quantifications appears and develops from the ideas related to the state sphere. The need of the state to establish certain statistical data emerged as early as in the Middle Ages. At that time that need was motivated, primarily, by the necessity to evaluate the number of taxpayers. Turkish Sultan Mehmed II, the Conqueror, just after the fall of Constantinople under the power of Turks, issued a declaration on registering all the properties of the growing Ottoman Empire. The registration, which the Turks called *defters,* comprised the data on income from land, number of cattle, number and names of household members, number of houses in a village, etc. (2). Later, other data started to be collected, leading to the first studies of demographic issues [2. P. 14]. Positivism, firstly in philosophy and then in sociology, contributes to strengthening the idea of quantifying social phenomena. The sci-

entist-positivist had as his ideal the application of natural scientific methods in social sciences: "Quantitative research of social phenomena has been gradually growing from the two basic streams of facts, interconnected. On the one hand, these are practical social needs, especially intensified in the middle of the 19th century, for more precise data on a narrower, as well as on a wider social scale... On the other hand, the quantification of social phenomena inevitably became part of any social scientific research" [2. P. 43]. The rapidly growing application of mathematical methods and the requirement for their use in social sciences was the result of the fact that their application in natural sciences produced undreamed results. What should be noted is that the studies of the early authors, which appeared much earlier than the ideas on applying quantification to the research of social phenomena, already contained certain quantifications, like the one by Hippodamus of Miletus (5th century B.C.) on the optimal number of polis inhabitants. However, regardless of the quantifications in the studies of society and its organization, the idea of applying mathematics in scientific studies still did not exist.

After this short historical review, we will clarify our understanding of the basic notions — quantity and quality.

Quantity indicates the number of 'something' and is always connected with it. This 'something' represents a certain idea, a quality that is possible to identify clearly in the real world. Only when a clearly distinct quality exists, we may discuss its quantification. 'Nothing' cannot be quantified — only 'something', some idea. Marx was the one who defined the relationship between quality and quantity in the following dialectical way — as two facets of the same thing. It is clearly seen already in the First book of his "Capital", in the chapter devoted to the relationship between the goods and money: "Classical political economy neither explicitly nor with clear consciousness considers work as represented in the value of the work and in the usable value of the product. Of course, it makes, in fact, this distinction, since it considers the work quantitatively or qualitatively. But it makes that purely quantitative distinction between works not only mentally, but has a presumption of their qualitative unity or equity; therefore, their reduction to human work is taken abstractly" [10. P. 44]. Thus, quantification represents "a special procedure of formalizing the interpretation of qualitative characteristics and relations according to certain rules, when some social content gets a numerical form and analysis is further conducted by statistical and mathematical methods" [2. P. 8].

As regards this definition, there are several questions we will try to answer. Firstly, what is understood by "some social content"? May the content that is not concrete be quantified, in the sense that it represents things, objects? But these are qualities that can be clearly distinct from other parts of reality (not only material, but also spiritual, e.g. the value of marital fidelity). Another question is whether quantification necessarily means an interpretation of social content in "numerical form" or it is possible without figures, by using relational opinions (e.g. bigger-smaller, higher-lower, closer-further, etc.). This question is especially important when social sciences are concerned. Finally, is the quantification method of analysis the only one or may synthesis also be applied (statistical procedures of inductive character representing the synthetic method)? In order to answer these questions we will first consider some methods applied in social sciences, which are traditionally classified as quantitative or qualitative.

The measuring method in social sciences is considered as quantitative. Measuring means establishing the presence and expressing the quantity of the presence of a certain quality. Both natural and social sciences apply three types of measuring: exact, conventional and intuitive [12. P. 582]. However, the third one is much more often used in social sciences, and we will see why it is so. Exact measuring has in its basis the absolute zero (complete absence of the quality that is measured), the measuring units are natural entities that might be considered as concrete realities. The main method of such measuring is counting, e.g. 2,000 — 3,000 pandas live in nature [3]. In this case we have the situation of existence of a concrete reality, clearly defined, the quantity of which would be established by simple counting. Here we can answer the question on quantifying qualities that are not things, but which are defined as phenomena. If we exclude fantastic phenomena that we can imagine but cannot count, for they do not represent natural entities, we can also define certain phenomena based on values, e.g. the number of divorced marriages due to marital infidelity. Of course, a precondition for this would be that spouses admit infidelity in court, so that the presence of the "quality" of infidelity is established. Without this normative definition we are not able to measure the presence of the quality of "infidelity" as the reason for divorce. And we know in advance that it does not correspond to the real conditions, since a great number of spouses will claim in court that the reason for divorce is "incompatibility in marriage", rather than infidelity. All said above is an example valid only for the Christian culture based on monogamy and the marital legislation dominant in Christian states. On the other hand, some other cultures that accept polygamy (like Islam) will allow a man to be married to four women simultaneously and this is not considered to be infidelity, while in the states of Christian culture it would even represent a crime.

Conventional measuring has in its basis a conventional zero, therefore, it allows measuring values that are negative, below zero (e.g., we establish the thermometer temperature as –2 degrees Celsius). This measuring is based on international units established by benchmarks and standards: the Christian civilization measures time since the birth of Christ, while the Islamic community does the same from Hijra, i.e. emigration of Muhammad from Mecca to Medina which happened on the 16th of July 622 according to the Julian calendar. Since this is a lunar calendar and therefore falls behind our calendar by 11 days per year, the difference is increasing, so that now it is 1432 year according ho Hijra. Not to mention the French revolutionaries who had their own calculation of time, applied in France in 1793—1805 and based on the date of proclamation of the first French republic. Therefore, with the conventional measuring there is a generally accepted agreement that a certain event that happened at a certain moment (or considered to have happened at that moment), or a natural phenomenon in relation to which man has empirical experience (freezing of water at 0 degrees Celsius) is taken as the starting point of measuring something (time, temperature, etc.). That acceptance of convention cannot coincide in the world which produces different measuring systems, but today, in the global period, there are generally accepted standards.

Intuitive measuring requires a rating or an estimation of the 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 the presence or absence of certain qualities is established and a precise definition of those qualities is made.

All the three types of measuring are applied in social sciences: we can identify the number of party members or demonstrators by exact measuring (counting), or measuring the length of a column (in meters or kilometers) of trade union activists protesting against government measures by conventional measuring, while the intuitive measuring scaling is applied most frequently. Scaling is based on the continual concept, therefore, it "appears as internal classifications of certain continua by which quantitative, i.e. qualitative-quantitative, differences within a whole are established" [12. P. 583—584]. "Whenever we classify a certain number of units, we talk about measuring" [7. P. 12]. Or, "measuring is only an improvement and specification of classification" [11. P. 599]. In order to avoid confusion, we assume that equalization of classification and measuring methods is possible only in social sciences, when intuitive measuring is doubtful.

In designing the Scale of successfulness of political parties and the rate of such successfulness derived from it, we will demonstrate the conditionality of measuring depending on what the defined quality being measured is. First, it is necessary to define what is understood as a political party: *a*) an ideological organization, *b*) a class organization, *c*) a means to achieve national interests, *d*) an organization for gaining and exercising power. Of course, there are numerous attempts to e) give a synthetic definition of political parties [17. P. 165—177]. With a variety of definitions of a political party, we can use different kinds of measuring their "successfulness" based on different qualities, e.g. on the popularity of its ideology, on protection of class interests, etc. Thus, we identify a political party as a "political organization of ideologically and politically like-minded persons who associate on a relatively permanent basis and promote certain orientations with the basic goal of gaining or keeping power, by which they achieve the values and goals of those social groups whose interests they tend to represent as much as possible as general, i.e. global" [17. P. 177—178]. So, it is clear that a party's basic goal is to gain or keep power. If we define political parties like this, the quality of successfulness means participation in power, while the quality of unsuccessfulness stands for absence of power. Consequently, the presence or absence of this quality is a precondition for measuring successfulness. Here understanding of measuring for classification is confirmed as a dichotomy. We can further measure 'how much' a party is unsuccessful or successful. But to do that we at first must define what "participation in power" means.

Sartori uses, instead of successfulness, another phenomenon — the relevancy of a political party — and establishes criteria for its measuring: "A party is relevant only when it really rules, enters the government or supports it by voting on its trust, by which it insures the majority necessary for gaining power" [13. P. 260]. Parties with blackmailing potentials and subsidiary relevancy are anti-system parties which become relevant if their "existence or performance is reflected in parties' competition", and if a parliamentary party is questionable, there is a "veto power in legislature" [13. P. 113]. On these presumptions, Sartori made calculations of political parties' relevancy, taking the mandatory period of the legislative body as the unit for calculation.

Successfulness and relevancy are not the same terms. Relevancy is narrower, since it refers only to the quality of a party's importance for establishing executive power, while its successfulness starts from the quality of participation both in legislative and executive powers. This is why we consider all parliamentary parties as successful and all non-parliamentary parties as unsuccessful. It is a consistent implementation of our definition of parties as organizations that have the goal of obtaining power, exercising power or participating in power. As the parliament also performs the monitoring power, it is clear that successfulness of parliamentary parties may not be denied just because they do not participate in the executive power. Therefore, the quality of successfulness is measured with relevance to the presence in the parliament, not in the government. However, it is also possible to measure successfulness among successes, as well as unsuccessfulness among failures. Parliamentary parties may be considered as successful and non-parliamentary as unsuccessful, but we have not answered the question 'to what extent' they are successful or unsuccessful. In both categories some are more successful, others — less. We can answer this question by designing appropriate instruments to measure the (un-)successfulness of political parties. These have to be based on the classification, because the "logic of gradation leads to complete unawareness if the classificatory approach is not assumed" [13. P. 257]. A ten-division graphic interval scale was designed to represent the successfulness of political parties (Fig.). On its left end there are unsuccessful non-parliamentary parties, which have just fulfilled the legislative requirements for registration, have a national leadership that meets at least twice a year and at least five local boards. On the right end there are successful parliamentary parties that independently exercise the executive power. Between these two ends there are eight other positions with different marks: the interval between position 5 and 6 is graphically twice as big as any other to point out in an obvious visual manner that transition of a party from the non-parliamentary to the parliamentary status represents a substantial change.

| Unsuccessful | | | | | | | | Successful | |
Non-parliamentary								Parliamentary	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Fig. The scale of successfulness of political parties

At the first mark (1) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfilled the legislative conditions for registration, constituted a national leadership that meets at least twice a year and formed at least five local boards. At the second mark (2) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfilled conditions for registration, constituted a leadership that 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 mark (3) there is a non-parliamentary party with a constituted national leadership that meets on a regular basis, has local boards formed in at least 10% of local administrative units at the level of municipality, fulfills the legislative conditions for independent candidate nomination with its own list of representatives at parliamentary elections and has publicly recognizable

symbols. At the fourth mark (4) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfills the above mentioned conditions and whose list of representatives manages to get the support of more than 2% of voters who participated in parliamentary elections and less than the legally established census for entering the parliament. At the fifth mark (5) there is a non-parliamentary party that fulfills the conditions required for levels 1—3 and whose list of representatives manages to get the support from more than 3% of the voters in parliamentary elections and less than the legally established census for entering the parliament, i.e. the party managed to nominate at least 10% of the total number of possible candidates for representatives at local levels. The following should be kept in mind: as a rule, local and parliamentary elections are not organized simultaneously, but in different years. So, in the year when parliamentary elections take place the percentage of gained votes should be used as a parameter, and in the year when local elections take place the percentage of candidates should be used. However, if parliamentary and local elections are organized in the same year, the better result for the party should be used to determine its position.

At the sixth mark (6) there is a parliamentary party. At the seventh mark (7) there is a parliamentary party — participant of the government or a parliamentary party with whose support the government minority has been elected. At the eighth mark (8) there is the leading parliamentary opposition party with the greatest number of mandates among the opposition on condition that it has enough representatives to start at any moment the vote of distrust in the government. At the ninth mark (9) there is a parliamentary party — a participant in the government with the greatest number of mandates. At the tenth mark (10) there is a parliamentary party that independently exercises executive power.

It is clear that the criteria are more explicit regarding the parliamentary parties in comparison to the non-parliamentary ones. The additional explanation that needs to be given concerning the parliamentary parties is the position of the leading opposition party (8), which is placed higher on the scale than the party-participant in the government, i.e. the parliamentary party with whose support the government minority was elected (7). One may get the impression that such a position of the leading opposition party is a significant discrepancy from the basic criterion of successfulness of any party — gaining, remaining or participating in power. However, it is not like that. In countries with a developed parliamentary system the leading opposition party may — by using its political power — influence even the most important projects of the government, especially if it fulfills the presumed additional criterion — to start at any moment the vote of distrust in the government. That is the reason for its position on the scale. On the other hand, the party that supports the government minority or participates as a minority in the government, must, as a rule, indulge the party that is the oldest participant in the government. Otherwise it would risk elections at a moment least convenient for it. So such a party usually retires from its own goals and interests, jeopardizing the purpose of its participation in power, except for the situation when the goal itself is participation in power, which no party would ever admit and which contradicts the very phenomenon of political party as we have defined it. Besides, such behavior would surely lead to the elective debacle of the party in the next elections. Since there

is no need in additional explanations of other positions on the scale of successful parliamentary parties, we will explain the criteria defining the positions of unsuccessful non-parliamentary parties.

When establishing criteria for the differentiation of successfulness of non-parliamentary parties we tried to make them empirically relatively easily grasped. So we used the following combinations of indicators: A) fulfillment of the legislative conditions for registration; B) an organization development level that manifests itself in: B1) the existence of local party leaderships in a number of local government units that grow with the rise of the party position on the scale, B2) the existence of a constituted national leadership that meets regularly, provided that the party position on the scale grows with the regularity of national leadership meetings, B3) its ability to fulfill the legislative conditions for candidacies for the national representatives' list, i.e. the ability to nominate a certain number of representatives at local elections; C) public recognition of party symbols as an indicator that the party is "noticed", "identified" among the electors; D) the support percentage of electors who participated in the elections. The percentage of gained votes of those who came to the elections and influenced the transfer of the party from place 4 or 5 was not chosen incidentally — on the contrary, it was chosen on the basis of a comparative analysis of the legislative situation in a number of East European countries regarding the percentage of votes that parties should gain at parliamentary elections to be financed from budgets. Such legislative solutions show that parties are relevant when they gain a certain percentage of votes, regardless of the fact that they failed to enter the parliament and are financed from the public income. In Poland, the percentage for independent appearance of a party is 3% and 6% for a coalition, in Czechia — 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, Croatia — 5%, Macedonia — at least 1 mandate in the Sobranie [6. P. 466].

We can evaluate the successfulness of parties for each year by their location on this scale. However, the importance of the scale is much greater, as it enables us to monitor and compare the successfulness of parties on the political scene for a longer period: the optimal one is ten years — at least two regular elections to the national parliament and local election cycles take place, and we can quite precisely rate the successfulness of each political party under study [15. P. 400]. If we ascribe to each of the scale positions a certain number of points (for example, to level six we ascribe six points), it is possible to design the *Successfulness quotient of political parties* (*SQ*). It is calculated for the period of ten years by rating each monitored party according to the scale of successfulness in each monitored year according to its best position in that year. In this way, we get a sum of points for each party for the period of ten years and divide it by ten:

$$SQ = \frac{x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_7 + x_8 + x_9 + x_{10}}{10}.$$

Thus, measurement of the successfulness of political parties depends on several qualities that must be defined in advance: a) the content of the political party phenomenon; b) the content of the successfulness phenomenon; c) a classification of political parties according to some obvious criteria; d) determination of the time period for which

measurement is performed. All these points represent certain qualities to which we assign certain numeric values to perform measurement of successfulness. If we define these qualities in a different manner, then the result of measurement will be different. We could simply say that the most successful party is the one that gets most of the votes at the elections — this is an objective criterion, but not of essential importance. A small party that has passed the census of 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 more votes that remains beyond executive power, and in a parliamentary democracy it will be able to influence political decisions and global social goals only through the parliamentary procedure. It is more successful than the parties that remain outside the parliament, but less successful than the parties with a smaller number of gained votes which managed to become a part of the coalition in power.

Considering the scientific method that is the most quantitative in nature — measurement — we have to agree that it is not viable without relying on certain qualities that represent the subject of measurement and criteria of its conducting. We suggest viewing measurement as a quantitative-qualitative method. For instance, it is conventional for methodological literature to consider content analysis as being quantitative or qualitative. The latter is identified as intuitive, with an impressionistic basis; its hypotheses might be checked without any special instruments. On the contrary, objectivity, a system-based approach and the necessity to construct valid instruments to check hypotheses are all assigned to the quantitative content analysis [18. P. 28]. The emergence of the content analysis method is usually associated with Berelson's studies, where he determines it as "a research technique for objective, systematic and quantitative description of the obvious content of symbolic communication" [1. P. 18]. It should be mentioned, however, that content analysis of documents has been developing throughout the whole history of science: Aristotle made his classification of regimes on the basis of content analysis of 158 constitutions of Antique Greek states. Ever since historians have been applying content analysis which is predominantly qualitative, but certain quantifications are also used. Quantification is applied by logicians to define a phenomenon, in addition to its content, by its extent (all, some — these are also quantifications).

To briefly define the basic differences between the two techniques of content analysis without entering into the details that numerous studies have already dealt with we have to say the following: the qualitative analysis identifies *what* and *how* something was told; the quantitative study also answers the question *how often* it was told (repeated). The qualitative content analysis is focused on the meaning of what was meant to be told and the context is specially taken into account to recognize the truthfulness of meaning. But it is hard to imagine content analysis of any document without any quantification: it is possible but insufficient, as it is important to take into consideration how many times an attitude or a value under study was repeated (e.g., in a political document "freedom" is treated as one of the values, as one of the basic values or as the most important value). We can also construct a scale (or classification) of values according to their importance, which also represents quantification. In the studies of social phenomena "the quantitative content analysis may not be applied without qualitative analysis, at least on a limited scale." [16. P. 77]. In order to perform quantification we have to establish the

presence or absence of a certain quality previously clearly defined. For instance, the book of E.S. Herman and D. Peterson "The Politics of Genocide" [5] is based on a) counting the number of the word "genocide" in the American press regarding war crimes in various parts of the world (3) and comparing that number with the estimated number of victims; b) the differentiated use of words "massacre" and "genocide" in different parts of the world depending on the relationships of crime committers and the American government and comparing the number of the dead and the frequency of usage of both words in order to qualify the crime. This quantitative analysis would be incomplete, if the authors had not performed the qualitative content analysis of the American press and American officials' statements to create a typology of crimes based on the criterion of American authorities' definitions (constructive genocide, criminal genocide, benign bloodsheds and mythical bloodsheds).

When discussing the differences between qualitative and quantitative analysis the absence of the methodological instrument in the former is usually stressed, but such a claim is untrue. There exist the following instruments of content analysis regardless of its type: a registration list, a dictionary and a codex of codes (words). The registration list is part of both qualitative and quantitative analysis and is simply adapted to the characteristics of the technique. The dictionary [18. P. 32—33] is an instrument that is used in both techniques too. For instance, political phenomena and terms always require a precise definition of their meaning in the context under study. Such meanings can be linguistic, ideological and cultural: democracy is comprehended differently in liberal-democratic and Marxist proletarian senses; a coup d'etat is considered to be political violence and anti-democratic everywhere in Europe, but in Turkey, since Kemal Ataturk, it is pronounced by the Constitution as a way to prevent re-Islamization of the state and preserve the laical republic (when studying the political situation in Turkey this feature must be crucial in studying requests for the preservation of democracy in the country). The codex (book) of codes (words) represents "a system of strictly defined basic categories and codes... The 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" [4. P. 80, 85]. It is conventional in literature to distinguish a static, successive and continual codex, but all the three can be used in both techniques.

Thus, both techniques of content analysis use the same methodological instruments, i.e. the qualitative content analysis does have such. The point is that the latter in some cases does without any developed instruments: "the contemporary qualitative analysis is not based only on impression and it is more oriented to the so- called thematic analysis that implies a certain codification (defining and classifying themes) and suitable recording" [12. P. 552]. Scientific research is not possible without a previously established project that implies some hypotheses with due indicators (statements of certain content and type) to be confirmed or rejected. All this is necessary even without any quantification; therefore the statement that it is not possible to check hypotheses in qualitative analysis is not true. Statements about the "impressionistic character" of the qualitative content analysis are equally impressionistic and unviable, as well as the statements that hypotheses can be checked only quantitatively.

Discussing the basic characteristics of the two methods that are traditionally described as quantitative (measurement and content analysis) we have come to the conclusion that the division of methods into quantitative and qualitative is unviable. Our main objection is that one cannot measure (count) 'nothing', one always measures 'something', and that 'something' in social sciences must represent a clearly defined quality — its features determine the differences in the instruments and the results of measurement. Moreover, the methods that are widely regarded as qualitative (the biographical method, case studies, etc.) usually imply certain quantifications — otherwise the results of their implementation remain incomplete. Quantitative methods imply statistical procedures that are based on induction — this leads us to the conclusion that not only analysis but also synthesis is applied in the process of concluding, i.e. the unique dialectic analysis-synthesis method is implemented [14. P. 62—65]. Therefore, to be methodologically correct, we have to consider the dichotomy of qualitative and quantitative researches as overcome and rely on a typology of scientific researches as 'predominantly qualitative' and 'predominantly quantitative', depending on their dominant elements.

NOTES

(1) This article is the result of 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.

(2) In Serbia one of the most important statistical data is based on the Turkish census of 1455. It is the study of M. Macura "Colonies and Population in the Area of Brankovic in 1455". That Turkish area covered the greatest part of today's Autonomous Province Kosovo and Metohija. This study has shown that in the middle of the 15th century in that area there lived approximately 95% of people with Serbian, i.e. Slavic names, "while the influence of Muslim names was imperceptible" [9. P. 21].

(3) Iraqi people after establishing economic sanctions, Iraqi people after American-British invasion and occupation, Bosnian Muslims, Kosovo Albanians, Ruanda, Democratic Republic of Kongo and Darfur, etc.

REFERENCES

[1] *Berelson B*. Content Analysis in Communication Research. Glencoe (ILI): Free Press, 1952.

[2] *Bogdanovic M.* Kvantitativni pristup u sociologiji: razvoj, dometi i formalističke jednostranosti. Beograd: Službeni list SFRJ, 1981.

[3] *Briggs H*. Hope for Future of Giant Panda. BBC News, 20 June 2006.

[4] *Danilovic N.* Specifičnosti izrade kodeksa pojmova i cifara u politikološkim istraživanjima: Doctoral dissertation defended at the Faculty of Political Sciences of Belgrade University under mentorship of Prof. Dr. I. Radosavljevic, 2004.

[5] *Herman E., Peterson D*. Politika genocida. Beograd: Vesna Info, 2010.

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

[7] *Lazarsfeld P*. Main Trends in Sociology. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1973.

[8] *Lazarsfeld P*. Qualitative Analysis: Historical and Critical Essays. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc, 1972.

[9] *Macura M.* Naselja i stanovnistvo oblasti Brankovica 1455 godine. Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, Službeni glasnik, 2001.

[10] *Marx K.* Kapital. Vol.I. Beograd: Kultura, 1947.

[11] *Milic V.* Sociološki metod. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 1996.

[12] *Milosavljevic S., Radosavljevic I.* Osnovi metodologije političkih nauka. Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2000.

[13] *Sartori G.* Stranke i stranački sustavi: analitički okvir. Vol.1. Zagreb: Politička kultura, 2002.

[14] *Sesic B.* Opšta metodologija. Beograd: Naučna knjiga, 1980.

[15] *Suvakovic U.* Instrumenti merenja uspesnosti politickih partija // Zbornik Matice srpske za drustvene nauke. — 2005. — N.118—119. — Pp. 395—403

[16] *Suvakovic U.* Metodološke studije o pitanjima sociološkog proučavanja političkih partija. Kosovska Mitrovica: Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Pristina, 2011.

[17] *Suvakovic U.* Političke partije i globalni društveni ciljevi. Beograd: Treci milenijum, 2004.

[18] *Termiz Dz., Milosavljevic S.* Analitika. Vol.1. Lukavac: Grafit, 2008.

О ДИХОТОМИИ «КАЧЕСТВЕННОЕ—КОЛИЧЕСТВЕННОЕ» В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ НАУЧНОЙ МЕТОДОЛОГИИ

У.В. Шувакович

Кафедра социологии
Философский факультет
Университет Приштины
Ул. Филипа Виньича, д. 66, Косовска Митровица, 38220, Сербия

В статье приведены доводы в пользу преодоления давно установленного разделения научных исследований на качественные и количественные. Исходя из мнения материалистических диалектиков о том, что любое научное исследование обязательно должно быть предметным, автор полагает, что невозможно провести количественное исследование без предварительного установления качества, подлежащего изучению. Это касается и измерения, которое в литературе относят исключительно к количественным процедурам. В качестве иллюстрации приводится разработка двух инструментов измерения успешности политических партий — шкалы и коэффициента успешности. С другой стороны, даже качественный анализ, как правило, включает в себя некие квантификации. Автор делает вывод, что в целях методологической корректности следует считать дихотомию качественного и количественного преодоленной и использовать типологию научных исследований, включающую в себя «преимущественно качественные» и «преимущественно количественные» в зависимости от преобладающих в них методических и аналитических компонентов.

Ключевые слова: качественное исследование, количественное исследование, дихотомия, инструменты измерения, успешность политических партий, контент-анализ.