An Ethnographic Approach to the Study of Institutional Change:

Home Language in the Swedish School

Ingegerd Municio

"Primum scribere, deinde philosophari ..."
(Friedrich Nietzsche 1886)[1]

This paper makes an effort to explicate theoretical conclusions, following from the mainly empirical studies of institutional change in which I have been involved during the last decade. It is also a description of participant observation, one of the methods used in these studies. In my previous writing I have described research procedures without making the pros and cons of methodological choices explicit. The present paper represents an effort to fill this void by raising questions which follow from the choice of methods which are new to the discipline of political science. It also seeks to provide answers to these questions.

"Vad betyder F?"
(Johan Asplund 1970)

The application of theories and methods of ethnography to the study of institutions constitutes another sign of the anthropological influence on theories of sociology and political science, an influence which has been documented in recent publications (i.e. Douglas & Wildavsky 1982). The fact that scholars of these disciplines turn to outside sources for renewal seems to be a response to the sterility of that which might be denominated "normal science" in Kuhnean terminology. What is the contribution, then, of ethnography to the study of institutional change? What will be the result of an interplay of ethnographic methods and organizational theories?

An ethnographic approach brings institutional culture into the foreground. Emphasis is shifted from the structural phenomena of the institution to the meaning given these phenomena by people. Studying institutional culture involves learning the interpretive patterns, shared by people in and outside the

Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift 1992, årg 95 nr 2, s 113-138

institution, which are used to interpret experience and generate action. An institution is, thereby, conceived as an ongoing series of activities, mainly performed by people on the inside. The influence of outsiders who are touched by these activities is also taken into account. So, for example, the institution referred to in this paper, the Swedish school, is conceived as constituted not only by the activities of teachers, administrators and politicians, but also by pupils and parents. In the case of immigrants the choice of language in the family, i.e. whether to speak the mother tongue or Swedish, constitutes a powerful influence on school activities.

Recent publications show that there is a growing interest in studies of institutional culture and in the possibility of using ethnographic method in organizational analysis.[2] This interest does not, however, seem to have influenced organizational theory. What is the state of art in this theory today? It seems that a handful of organizational models are used as recurrent reference points for empirical studies. The theory is somewhat revitalized from time to time when new models are introduced. The discussion on how organizations actually function takes a new turn when concepts of these new models become common goods in the disciplines concerned. The order that Weber introduced with his hierarchical pyramid is replaced by the anarchy inherent in the garbage can of Cohen, March & Olsen. The rationality of goal-oriented action advocated by Simon is contested by the haphazardness of the unconventional soccer game suggested by Weick.[3]

However, whether the current organizational models actually influence mainstream thinking is open to question. Their influence seems to be limited, if one may judge from recent empirical studies of public organizations. Neither is such influence evident in the current political discussion on public bureaucracy. In spite of the fact that the rational-hierarchical approach has been criticized heavily, it seems to maintain its strong normative influence on scholars.[4] Politicians and their advisers seem to be equally untouched by the critique of traditional thinking. Instead, the "new" philosophy of public administration in Sweden reveals a strengthened faith in rationalistic solutions.[5]

How is this domination of old organizational models to be explained? One explanation might lie in the way alternative models are presented. There seems to be a tendency to overthrow every assumption comprised in an old model, and supplant it with completely different ones. Hierarchy is thus replaced by anarchy, and goal-rationality by chance. This renders the new model only an inspiring and evocative catch-word, without any empirical applicability. Another shortcoming of new models might be a feature they share with old models, namely, the use of mechanistic analogies to order our thinking. Thus, both new and old models have in common that they rule out what in empirical studies appears as the essential feature of organizations, namely, the fact that organizations are created and maintained by human activity. The study of culture seems to be the "missing link", a way to combine the features of order and disorder in organizations; a way to make sense of hierarchy and chance in organizational life.[6]

"... culture (...) emphasizes organization as a complex pattern of human activity."
(Inside Organizations 1988)

Ethnography literally means "portrayal of a people". Usually it is defined more narrowly as the study of culture.[7] Thus, ethnography should be particularly well suited to manifesting the human dimension of organizations. A further consequence of an ethnographic approach would be that attention be given to day-to-day activities. In the model proposed here decision-making is a key notion, representing the day-to-day activity which structures institutional activity at large. The concept of decision is conceived in a broad sense. It is, thus, not limited to forms by which it leaves a concrete trace, as, for example, a written document. Instead, it includes every act of choosing one action instead of another, when there are alternatives. These alternatives may be implicit as well as explicit.

The research questions of my studies turn around the decision-making activity. At what level of the organization are particular sets of decisions made? What is the time schedule for decisions of varying importance? Who decides at each level, and what is decided? Which alternatives are considered, and who has the privilege of formulating alternatives? How are decisions motivated? What aims are discernible in the decision-making activity? Where are the lines of conflict? What constitutes power, and when is it deployed?

In what way does culture enter into the description of decision-making which may be derived from the analysis proposed above? First it is necessary to clarify that culture is, in this context, not only meant to refer to bureaucratic culture in a general sense. Neither is it limited to the professional culture of the school, the culture characteristic of the teaching profession. Instead culture is employed as an overarching concept indicating the notional aspects of human life, i.e. ideologies, beliefs and values, which are relevant for the decisions studied.

Bureaucratic culture marks decision-making activities when hierarchical principles determine at what level decisions of varying scope and importance are made, when the day-to-day decisions are impregnated with "rules of thumb", and when the prevailing order is determinative of decisions on future activities. Professional culture bears upon decision-making, when professional ideologies are used to define problems, design solutions, choose amongst alternatives, and give rational explanations to decisions.

In the present context, bureaucratic and professional cultures mark school activities in general and constitute the overarching background to the instruction of immigrant pupils. Decisions on this instruction do, however, represent a potential conflict. The teachers involved adhere to two different professional ideologies, one favouring bilingual instruction, the other prescribing instruction in Swedish language only, or mainly. A line of conflict separates the staff of schools with immigrant pupils into two camps and, thereby, exhibits themes of competing ideologies. These themes come into the open when decisions concerning positions, resources and schedules are made. In situations of conflict another range of cultural themes becomes more explicit, namely those

referring to commonsense beliefs and values. These beliefs and values refer to immigration and immigrants, in general, but also, more specifically, to immigrants' status and rights in Swedish society. In addition Swedish nationalistic sentiment, as well as that of immigrants, is actualized.

Situations created by immigrant pupils confronting Swedish schooling, thus, offer a window into the decision-making of professional organizations. Though cultural themes are a constant feature of decisions made, they are rarely visible. In situations of conflict when alternative solutions to problems exist these themes are made explicit. When the conflict is about immigrant instruction, the themes referring to professional ideologies regarding this instruction, and common sense beliefs and values on immigrants come to the fore. These themes are embedded in school culture, and, thereby, constitute contexts of meaning which in part are maintained, in part transformed, through day-to-day activities and relations. They are interwoven with themes of the bureaucratic and professional cultures of the school. These are, in turn, submitted to similar processes of confirmation and change.

In my studies, a model of organization is outlined which emphasizes cultural themes in decision-making and stresses the sense-making character of organizational activities. People working in social institutions are, thus, guided by a "sense of the game" in their decisions and actions. (Cfr. "sense de jeu" in Bourdieu 1979 and 1988.) This is an understanding of the proper way of doing things, an understanding shared by members of each institutional setting that structures and gives meaning to daily activities. These patterns of meaning and rules of behaviour are generally not discussed or made explicit. To the contrary they are reproduced in situations that resemble one another. Situations of conflict, when competing patterns of meaning and sets of rules make alternative ways of acting possible, offer an opportunity to question the "natural" character of normal procedures and to describe the cultural traits of decision-making.

"C'est en termes d'obstacles q'il faut poser le problème de la connaissance scientifique."
(Gaston Bachelard 1986)

In this section I will narrate the story of my own research process. It is based on events which occurred during an extended period of research on the Swedish primary school. These events are reinterpreted in the explanatory light of a concluded research process.

When I first became engaged in a project studying immigrants, it was in the multi-disciplinary ambience of the Commission for Immigration Research, which then, in 1979, was responsible to the Ministry of Labour.[8] Some ten researchers embarked on a study of the long-term effects of immigration to Sweden. Two municipalities, Borås and Nacka, were chosen for field work. My original research plan was written in traditional political science terms, and concerned different avenues available to the immigrant population for political influence. I started my field work on election day in September, 1979.

Foreign citizens in Sweden are entitled to vote for the municipal and provincial chambers, but not for the Swedish Riksdag. The elections to all three levels are, however, conducted on the same day and at the same polling stations. The only difference between Swedish citizens and foreigners is that the latter hand in two ballots only, while Swedes hand in three. On this day I intended to watch for foreigners to observe and, hopefully, also to interview them. My knowledge about the municipality that I decided to visit was as yet quite meagre. My principal motive to participate in this way may well have been less to gather information, than to recognize a promise of startling new discoveries for our new research project.

The fact is that my first intention of direct observation was more revealing than I appreciated at the time. I met with and talked to various persons about issues pertaining to the immigrant population of Nacka. One conversation, which in hindsight appears particularly important, was with a Finnish teacher who was also an active member of the Finnish Immigrant Association. He declared that election outcomes were not the prime concern of Finnish immigrants. What concerned them more was the deficient instruction in Finnish language, culture and society offered to pupils of Finnish origin in the Swedish primary school. He, therefore, suggested that I study the school instead of traditional means of political influence. Elections and elected chambers, participation in commissions, boards, and political parties seemed less important to him.

At the time I interpreted his suggestion as merely representing a petition from one professional group to monopolize my research effort, a group which incidentally appeared to be much better off than the major immigrant population which mainly held working class jobs. Unmoved I therefore went on with my original plan, and soon thereafter began studying the Immigrant Boards of the two municipalities.[9] I participated in meetings of the boards during the autumn of 1979 and the spring of 1980, and I studied the documents of previous board meetings.

"Täytyykö meidän lapsistamme tulla ruotsalaisia?"
(Immigrant Board member in 1979)

This sojourn in the field served to confirm the information I had received on election day. The issue that, again and again, appeared in documents and during meetings concerned the instruction received by immigrant pupils in primary school. Why is the instruction in home language not functioning adequately? Why are teachers changed so frequently? Why do weeks sometimes pass without any instruction in home language at all? Is one or two hours of instruction per week really sufficient to maintain a language, and to learn something new? Do we have to accept what we now observe –that our children turn completely Swedish, refuse to speak and actually seem to forget the language of their parents as soon as they enter the Swedish school?

The Swedish Riksdag passed a law on home language instruction for immigrant pupils in 1977. From these visits to the field it seemed obvious that there were deficiencies in the implementation of the reform. Was it possible, then, to explain the constant preoccupation with school issues among immigrants, within the context of the main research project? Schooling in Sweden is nationally controlled. School laws and curricula are decided by the Riksdag, and so are the national resources for school activities. The actual organization of schooling does, however, fall under municipal responsibility. It seemed possible, therefore, to include a study of home language instruction in the project. So I decided to make a summary evaluation of the reform, and, thereafter, to return to my original research interests.

However, this excursion proved fatal to my plans to study the "real" issues, as conceived in the text-books of political science. My interest in schooling and in the relation of this institution to immigrants lasted until 1988! First, my evaluation was extended to cover pre-school; later, it expanded into a doctoral thesis published in 1987. Another extension was my engagement in a separate research project on immigrants and schooling; this running from 1986 onwards, and focused on the municipality of Eskilstuna. This last project included an in-depth study on immigrant families and their actions, wants, thoughts and feelings concerning Swedish schooling. The explicit aim was to study school organization and activities from the viewpoint of immigrant parents, focusing exclusively on families of the largest immigrant group, namely those from Sweden's nearest neighbour and former colony, Finland.

"More often than not, informants can identify urgent research more clearly than the ethnographer."
(James Spradley 1979)

In the aftermath of this venture the decision to study the education system seems the only sensible one. Since purpose was to learn more about the influence of immigrants in politics, it was imperative to choose a subject which was of true relevance to the majority of them. Obviously, only very few participate in party politics, or become members of commissions, boards and elected chambers. In fact, the importance of the immigrant vote has diminished due to the fact that with every election fewer immigrants participate in elections.[10]

Quite contrary to these public institutions which seem to have little relevance to the lives of immigrants, schooling is the omnipresent representation of the Swedish state and society. Through the instruction given at school these entities are introduced into the very heart of immigrant families. According to many immigrant adults, school seizes the minds of the rising generation and implants cultural values that are exclusively Swedish in them. These values sometimes include explicitly negative attitudes toward immigrant cultures. More often negative attitudes are communicated by indifference to these cultures. Socialization of Swedish values compounded by the lack of instruction

in home language, first, makes it impossible for the immigrant families to return to their home countries when the circumstances that induced their migration change; secondly, it sows discord into the family life of immigrants in Sweden.[11]

Immigrants come into contact with many other socializing institutions in Swedish society. Some are state controlled, like social services and health care, the police and judiciary; while others pertain to civil society including workplaces, housing communities, associations with varying purposes, other leisure activities, and the mass media.[12] To judge by interviews with immigrants, none of these seems, however, to be given as much importance as school. Likewise, no immigrant group has ever gone on strike, because of segregated neighbourhoods, poor living conditions or discriminatory labour markets, though the grounds for such concerns are stated in a series of official publications.[13] School strikes have, however, happened with recurring insistence, the longest and most renowned lasting two months.[14]

The importance given school by immigrant families can only be understood in relation to the overall situation of immigrants in the society. The bulk of the Swedish immigrant population consists of labour migrants. They came in search of better economic conditions, something that they have generally achieved, though many times at the expense of satisfaction in other aspects of life. Many families, therefore, have greater aspirations for a better life for their children, than they have lived themselves. Consequently, they are very much concerned about school, and well aware of the fact that a good education is a prerequisite for success in life. Policies referring to taxes, work, housing, and other matters which condition their present existence, may therefore be considered less important than those affecting the future of their children. Moreover, school marks the identity of the coming generation and, thus, touches upon existential matters. It belongs to another dimension of life than do material conditions. Therefore, in-depth studies of immigrants' reasoning regarding their lives in Sweden are required to understand fully the centrality of school issues in their preoccupations and preferences.

This was an insight which was conferred on me during my research rounds among immigrants in the three municipalities. It caused me to gradually change my approach from the conventional evaluation of the school by means of a check list to a much more humble approach. This meant listening to how the persons involved actually reasoned in relation to school matters, how they made choices and solved problems, how they gave meaning to their activities, to their "selves", and to their relations with others. In short, how they conducted their lives in relation to school. This also represented a change of approach, in both theory and method. Ethnography, particularly in the form sometimes denominated "modern" ethnography (Hastrup and Ovesen 1980), seemed to be of more assistance in the field, than did traditional political science. Ethnomethodology with its emphasis on the knowledgeable character of human action seemed to furnish a better frame of reference for understanding what was observed than did traditional social theories (Heritage 1987).

"Ja, berätta om dina misstag, misslyckade försök och förtretligheter!" (Peter Kemp 1979)

Thus, initial self-assurance regarding possible ways of posing fruitful research questions did not prove well founded, and this realization resulted in reconsideration at a theoretical level. Which issues are political and of real importance might not be defined in the same way by an outside observer as by someone immersed in the political struggle of a particular group. The school, an institution of utmost political importance, could not be evaluated without a much greater research effort than was originally planned. In the aftermath of the project the initial errors prove to be more instructive than do successive research designs. The research process which followed proved to contain many more misformulations and misconceptions, some of which were subsequently corrected. Others were probably not noticed, or noticed too late, and they may, therefore, still burden my reports from the project.[15]

The above story illustrates how contingencies influence the research process. It also describes a sequential modification of a research design via interaction with the field. What happened was not planned beforehand, but in an unconscious way it followed a procedure that is sometimes advised in ethnography. According to many ethnographic text-books an ethnographic approach has two principal aims. The first is the general anthropological one of understanding the human species. The second is common to many social sciences, namely the service of humankind. In this context the second aim entails the obligation of consulting "with informants to determine urgent research topics" and, thereafter, to "develop a research agenda to relate these topics to the enduring concerns within social science" (Spradley 1979:14). Such an ethnographic approach to field work was subsequently adopted in my studies in a more conscious manner.

Naturally, this entails leaving room for contingencies derived from the field to influence the research process. This occurs in the initiation phase as the example above illustrates. However, it is characteristic of the ethnographic approach to field studies that feedback from the field influences the research design throughout the research process. In this respect ethnographic studies of organizations will differ from approaches more common in organizational studies where the research design is determined at the beginning of the process.

A preconceived research design of a traditional bent was, however, still at the forefront of my mind when the actual interviewing was initiated. Thus, it was assumed that the home language reform of 1977 was the most decisive factor in the organization of this instruction at school. Consequently, a few key questions were prepared on the basis of the reform text, and interviews were made with persons in charge of school matters at the municipal level. At this point a quick assessment of the reform's implementation continued to be the aim of my research.

"Det där har du fått om bakfoten. Ingenting har hänt på invandrarundervisningens område sedan slutet av 60-talet."
(School principal in interview 1979)

The first interview round left me confused. It became obvious that only one of the persons interviewed had any substantial information about home language instruction. He was a home language teacher engaged at the municipal school office, and he was responsible for organizing this instruction. He supplied me with statistics referring to immigrant children, and gave me information on different ways of organizing the instruction. The other persons interviewed, all of them in higher positions at the school office, had less specific information to offer, but talked extensively and in general terms about the immigrant issue.

This was the first indication of what would turn out to be one of the main conclusions of my study. Educators and school administrators were not generally familiar with reform ideology and regulations. Only those directly involved in home language instruction had this information.

Another conclusion was derived from an incident which occurred at an interview. When my taperecorder had been turned off the interviewee said that he, off the record, wanted to tell me how things really were. "We do not bother that much about complying with reforms. We use state resources which drop down to us to solve the problems that we confront. Instruction in home language, as you seem to conceive it, is just a form of luxury. We have pupils with much more urgent needs than to learn a foreign language." The conception of this instruction, as exposed here, was quite contrary to the reform text. Home language is there defined as a mother tongue, not a foreign language. Good knowledge of it is considered a necessary condition for the harmonious development of immigrant children, not a luxury. It also disturbed me that this interviewee obviously perceived me as a potential threat. If he defined me as someone who was inclined to judge his performance, to what extent were his replies influenced by this? How true were they?

These first interviews taught me that there was much more to know about how decisions were made at the administrative level of the education system. Nevertheless, I proceeded with the preparation of interviews at the school level. This resulted in a plan, according to which principals of schools with many immigrant children were to be interviewed first, school teachers thereafter. For my first interview with a principal, I had prepared a questionnaire which began with an introduction to the subject in which I presented the purpose of the interview followed by a few key questions covering different aspects of home language instruction. In this school there were special classes for Finnish children in which the instruction was mainly in Finnish. I therefore expected to receive essential material on how the reform was implemented.

In fact, I did receive essential information, but not what I had expected. After introducing myself by stating that I was conducting an assessment of the home language reform of 1977, this principal made a surprising comment. He said: "That is something you must have got wrong. Nothing has happened in the home language issue, since the end of the 60's".

The interview proceeded, and he responded to all the questions I posed. During the course of the interview this person obviously regretted his first comment, and made some general remarks about the regulations of the 1977 home language reform. He did, in fact, comment about a reform which he apparently did not know existed! It was even more surprising that when I played this interview back and took time to reflect his comments seemed quite sensible. Obviously, his general knowledge about school and school policies was a sufficient base for discussing any school matter. Did this apply to other school employees as well? In that case, how accurate was the information gained from interviews?

Succeeding interviews with administrators and principals conducted in both municipalities gradually convinced me that something was seriously wrong with my approach. The field did not appear as I had conceived it. It became more and more obvious to me that the persons interviewed had prepared themselves for the interview by reading some information on the home language reform. Most of them had, in fact, not been familiar with the reform, neither its general ideas, nor many of its regulations, until they received my introductory letter. This was so, in spite of the fact that they were, formally at least, in charge of implementing the reform. The reason why the first principal interviewed met me unprepared was that he had been busy all that morning before I arrived. There had been a burglary in one of his schools over the weekend, and the interview occurred the following Monday.

As the interviewing proceeded, I began to perceive a great gap between what I considered important to ask based on the reform text, and what the interviewees talked about whenever they expanded beyond a formal reply to my questions. Gradually, it became clear that their own perception of school reality was quite different from mine. In this reality home language instruction was a marginal issue. This view corresponded well with the way this instruction was organized in schools. Home language instruction was generally an activity which did not interfere with other school activities, and which only concerned the immigrant teachers and pupils. This was quite contrary to the reform text, according to which this instruction was to be an integrated part of general school activities. Moreover, I gradually came to understand that reforms and other school laws were of less literal importance than I had expected. They did not have a direct influence on local decision-making concerning school. This meant that state control of the school was much less extensive, than is generally thought.

"Members' accounts are reflexively and essentially tied for their rational features to the socially organized occasions of their use for they are features of the socially organized occasions of their use." (Harold Garfinkel 1967)

To recognize a gap in understanding, in spite of intelligent questions receiving informative replies, was not a straightforward conclusion. It required various

interviews, and repeated analysis of them. This phenomenon is generally recognized as a serious problem in research, and many social science textbooks describe both the problem and ways in which it may be overcome. Thus, respondents will provide the answers that they expect the researcher to want. This occurs both in interviews and in surveys, but may constitute a more serious problem in surveys, since there is no opportunity to check on the interviewees' interpretation of the questions. It is generally advised that great emphasis be placed on the wording of research queries in order to increase the validity of answers.

My conclusion was, however, that the gap was much greater than is generally recognized, and much more difficult to master than is traditionally assumed. In my case a report based on the information received in the interviews conducted in this way would have made perfect sense. To approach the field with a check-list of relevant facets of the reform text would have been accepted as normal procedure, and the paragraph written on validity taken as a guarantee of truth. Nevertheless, my report would have said nothing worthwhile about decision-making on school issues.

To understand the breadth of this problem we shall turn to studies of human interaction which employed an ethnomethodological approach. According to these, deep differences in the meaning interlocutors give their contributions to a conversation generally seem to pass without notice. Thus, the sense-making strategies of every human communication seem to lead to the presumption of understanding, even when this does not exist or is only superficial. Thus, not only will the interviewee misinterpret the questions, the researcher will contribute to the general misunderstanding by interpreting responses in accordance with her/his preconceived notion of the field (Garfinkel 1967).

How is such a gap in understanding to be overcome? The solution adopted in my study was twofold. It was, first, to make this gap a topic of study, and second, to stop asking questions and start listening and learning. It was obvious that daily activities organized at the school level resulted in immigrant pupils receiving instruction in their home language. This was so in spite of the fact that many of those persons responsible for implementing the home language reform did not know that this reform existed. If the reform was not important as a guide to organizing this instruction, what *was* important? The only way to know seemed to be to become a participant observer. This approach promised to yield an opportunity to learn how activities were organized, how the participants reasoned in their day-to-day activities, how they arrived at decisions, and how conflicts over alternative ways to organize these activities were solved.

The approach adopted is best described in the terms of ethnography. As has already been mentioned, this approach is more open-ended than traditional ones. This does not, however, mean that the research process is a haphazard one. Instead, recurrent analysis and continuous innovation in the preparation for each visit to the field is necessary. The first step in an ethnographic study is usually to "map the field".[16] In studies of organizations it seems particularly important to acquaint oneself with formal organizational properties before getting immersed in the daily activities of the field. These properties concern

organization charts, decision-making routines, time schedules, buildings, etc. They give an overview of the organization, and, thus, help avoid the risk of altogether missing important parts of it. They also constitute a reminder of the traits of order and consensus which are usually predominant in organizational life, even though we are more struck by events of disorder and conflict.

"... ethnography is a method of discovery and interpretation." (Inside Organizations 1988)

The method referred to as ethnographic is not one, but various methods. Thus, all possible information is gathered about the themes which are considered important for the study. The term participant observation is often applied to field work in ethnography. This does not necessarily mean that observation is more important than interviews. Quite to the contrary, interviews are usually the predominant means of gathering data. Nevertheless, observation is a necessary complement. It serves as a means of evaluating information received in interviews, as well as yielding additional information.

Observations often contradict verbal statements. This is sometimes a result of people seeking to project an official "image" of themselves and their activities in interviews. However, as insiders they do know that what is really going on in the organization is completely different. Contradiction may also follow from the effort made by the interviewees to translate inside experience to the narrow horizons of the researcher. Subsequent interviews modified in regard to the themes touched upon or more deeply exploring previous themes are necessary to expose the source of such contradictions. Observations may also suggest a line of questioning, and themes to be introduced in further interviews. It is assumed that interviewees are as insiders unaware of the most common features of the field. Therefore, they will not volunteer this information. (Cfr. Spradley 1979:193)

More importantly observations may convey the meaning conferred on activities. For example, in my studies the low status given to home language instruction in some schools became clear when observations revealed that this instruction ocurred in corridors, stock-rooms, or cellars. The lack of integration was exhibited by the fact that pupils always left their class for home language instruction. Furthermore, observation on-site reduced some of the stories related in interviews to more realistic proportions. This gave firmer ground for follow-up interviews to pursue the meaning of such story-telling.

Observation of lessons in languages which I do not speak or understand provided opportunities to experience situations where organization of space and forms of expression other than language was important. This article is organized in a way that illustrates these situations. Citations in different languages are assimilated by the reader in varying ways. Sometimes they just organize space, sometimes they are partly understood, while on most occasions they make perfect sense.

The collection and analysis of documents was another complement to interviews. Minutes of political board meetings were studied along with background information on board decisions. This source of information was particularly important for the reconstruction of past activities. During the course of the research process, it became obvious that participants in organizations generally lack information on the organization's past. The evidence found in documents was matched to the information received from the organization's "old timers". These "old timers" had much to say including stories which were often familiar to newcomers, but the fit with a reconstruction of history based on documents was not always adequate. It became obvious that stories of the past are adjusted in the light of the present. Interviews are, therefore, frequently unsuitable as the sole source of evidence of the nature of the past. (Cfr. Garfinkel 1967 and Boje 1991.)

"Learning from people", an ethnographic catchword, is mainly achieved in conversations. (Cfr. Spradley 1979:3 and Schatzman & Strauss 1973:25.) These are not only interviews, but casual talks during participation; in my case during lessons, meetings, breaks and parties. An ethnographic interview is generally described as a friendly conversation. The rules of ordinary communication are followed, rules which are particular to each field of study. The interviewer is advised to learn these rules, and also to learn "the native language" (Spradley 1979: 232). The features of turn-taking and affirmative behaviour are modified, however, to suit the interviewer's interest in listening rather than talking. A relaxed atmosphere totally exempt from critique or control is considered necessary for successful communication.

"... to grasp the native's point of view."
(Bronislaw Malinowski 1922)

The interviewer's learner's attitude marks the interviews. Especially during the initial part of the field work, care is taken not to convey any preconceived opinion as to how the field is structured. Instead, the "native" view is given pre-eminence. Thus, the questions posed are formulated in very general terms. In my case at this stage of the research process presentation of my study, as well as initial questions, did not mention reforms, curricula or any other norms or rules concerning the education system. My interest in the instruction of immigrant pupils was stated, and the questions posed were purposely vague. Are there any immigrant children at this school, or in this class? What are the relevant facts when a child is classified as an immigrant pupil? What procedure is followed when the statistics are collected? What instruction do immigrant pupils receive? How are decisions made on different matters which concern them? Which arguments are employed in selecting one alternative solution over another?

Furthermore, the interviewees were encouraged to furnish examples of actual decisions and arguments relevant to these decisions as well as of problems experienced and solutions adopted. Initially, interviews were conducted in a

way which would lead to descriptions of the field. Subsequent interviews contained more specific questions pursuing cultural themes sometimes in the form of in-depth interviews (Spradley 1979: 67).

In sum, questionnaries seem to be an entirely inappropriate way of conducting ethnographic interviews. In the last of my school studies questionnaires were, however, employed in interviews with a random sample of parents and pupils. On that occasion general information was required on the entire population of Finnish immigrants in the municipality concerned. Therefore, a more structured approach seemed to be the most appropriate one. The questionnaire portion of the interview also served as an introduction to a free and friendly conversation concerning school matters. In some families there was no interest in continuing the conversation after the formal questions had been answered. In others the formal part of the interview served as a way of becoming acquainted, and was followed by lengthy informal conversation.

In these the replies to the questionnaire were amplified, but quite different themes also emerged, and were discussed. Thus, a questionnaire appeared to provide more effective access to these immigrant families than a tape recorder might have. When the questionnaire was set aside and this latter artefact presented for the second part of the interview, it seemed a normal way of continuing to record the interview. This is just one example of the double strategy followed throughout these studies. Thus, traditional methods of data collection were utilised along with the methods of participant observation.[17]

Another catchword of ethnography is "the inside view". When studying culture one must be careful not to place an outside pattern of interpretation on that culture. Researchers are themselves immersed in a specific culture, and they, therefore, have no automatic access to perspectives on the world other than their own. It is generally thought that the study of other cultures will result in greater awareness of the relative status of every "normal" world. Today, when ethnographic studies are performed in low-status cultures (the handicapped, vagrants, immigrants) in our own countries, the question as to whether dominance and normality always coincide becomes even more relevant. Knowledge of other cultures through ethnographic studies might render scientific analysis less ethnocentric, and more aware of the possible contribution of science to relations of dominance and subordination.

"Meanings are expressed through all the components of society, including social organization, language, philosophies, artifacts, actions, and attitudes of people, and methodologies of social scientists."
(Severyn Bruyn 1966)

Ethnography involves the search for meaning in the study of institutions. Meaning is created by the use of symbols. Cultural knowledge is conceived as patterned systems of symbols. The task of ethnography is described as the decoding of cultural symbols and the identification of underlying coding rules.

This is done by discovering the relationships among cultural symbols (Spradley 1979: 97-99).

This concerns the patterns of meaning that institutional participants apply to organize their actions and define their experience, including the symbols employed and how they are related to one another in explanations, arguments and stories. These patterns are formed and confirmed in recurring situations of organizational life. In my studies interest has also been paid to patterns of meaning involving the role of personality in the organizations under observation. When the activities of welfare institutions bring questions of personal or group identity, self esteem and respect to the fore, meaning in personal life pervades the organizational patterns of meaning.

Methods of discovering meaning in institutional activities have already been mentioned. These include observation of activity, and document analysis. However, the main source of discovering meaning will always be the actual posing of questions. When probing for meaning in interviews it is advised to focus on use rather than on meaning itself (Spradley 1979: 98). Such replies will yield information on relations between terms, and this will lead to the decoding of meaning in institutional culture. In the same way illustration of use will delineate relationships between terms, and provide information on meaning. (Cfr. Skinner 1988: 55.)

"...a postulate or position, declared or implied, and usually controlling behavior or stimulating activity, which is tacitly approved or openly promoted in a society."
(Morris Opler 1945)

As ethnographic field work proceeds an effort is put forth to depict cultural themes. The concept of theme is used to describe general features of a culture. It relies on the assumption, common in ethnography, that every culture is more than its constituent parts. It is, instead, conceived of as "a system of meaning that is integrated into some kind of larger pattern". Recurrent themes are used to organize life into dynamic wholes (Spradley 1979:186).

The main cultural themes employed in my studies of immigrant instruction have already been mentioned. The first is resumed in two competing professional ideologies, one for and one against bilingual instruction. The second refers to commonsense beliefs and values concerning the position of immigrants in Swedish society, and the way this society is to relate to immigrants. Are immigrant cultures and languages worth less, the same or more than Swedish culture and language? Will a multicultural and multilingual society offer a better future than a homogeneous one?

Naturally reality is infinitely complex, and so is every institution when conceived as a cultural scene. Describing cultural themes reduces a complex reality to managable proportions. In my descriptions of the school the overall school culture existed as a background to the cultural themes mentioned above. These themes seemed to be the most important ones in the decision-making in

regard to immigrant instruction. Other cultural themes may refer to the history of the organization, its current spirit and ethos, procedures considered right or wrong, as well as the status and position of persons, or groups of persons in the organization. These themes will be apparent in the actual organization of activities, as well as in the explanations and arguments employed for these activities. They will also appear in the narratives about past and present events.

Cultural themes in decision-making are generally implicit. They are part and parcel of institutional know-how. The ethnographic approach employing the methods described above is one way of rendering these themes visible, and thereby subject to analysis. The fact that cultural themes become more visible when they are contested has also been noted. Conflict over the instruction of immigrant children made professional ideologies and commonsense values explicit. The issue of immigrant instruction has thus been used as a contrasting device, i.e. to illustrate general patterns in institutions of welfare. A different perspective on the school would have made other cultural themes appear more relevant, themes which in my studies have been left in the background of the analysis.

"Det här är inte en invandrarskola."
(School principal in conversation with a Finnish parent 1985)

The way meaning enters decision-making is illustrated by how definitions are employed in the procedure of collecting statistics on immigrant children in school. The National Bureau of Statistics uses the definition "pupils with home language other than Swedish" for the population to be registered. When the forms of the Bureau are filled out by the main teacher of each school class, many different definitions are used in practice to decide which pupils are to be included. Though teachers working together usually use a common definition, alternative definitions may be used by teachers working in the same school. In my interviews I have encountered the following alternatives:

- Every child with at least one parent born in a foreign country
- Every child with a foreign surname
- Every child from a family where a language other than Swedish is spoken
- Every child with "sufficient" knowledge of the language other than Swedish spoken in her/his family
- Every child whose parents choose home language instruction when this is offered by the school
- Every child whose parents demand home language instruction when this is not offered by the school
- Every child whose parents insist on home language instruction
- No child in the 1st grade whatever the criteria used in other grades
- No child whatever, the argument being: "This is not an immigrant school."

Obviously, the statistics which are the result of this process hide decision-making processes that are loaded with meaning. The definitions employed are re-

lated to the cultural themes mentioned above, which in turn are related to the way teachers define school activities in general and immigrant instruction in particular; including the way they view their own position at school and their relations to other teachers. Furthermore, the selected definition is related to the "image" the teachers wish to present of the school where they work.

"Die Natur erklären wir, das Seelenleben verstehen wir." (Wilhelm Dilthey 1924)

Above I have introduced an ethnographic approach to the study of institutional change along with the story of my own personal and professional development. As a researcher I traveled from a "traditional" stance to scientific inquiry to an alternative position. Should this journey be described as one from "positivism" to "Verstehen"? Does it imply the assumption that two clear-cut alternative approaches exist?

The proposition that a unified positivistic position exists is examined in a recent publication (Bryant 1985). A description of the on-going transformation of positivism from Saint-Simon to Lazarsfeld and later precursors of instrumental positivism in American sociology denies this possibility. The conclusion is that there is no one and only positivism, neither among its advocates nor its critics. In fact, the latter many times disagree about what it is they are criticising. It is noted that one effect of the many critical voices is that the term positivism has so much become a pejorative one, that "self-avowed positivists are hard to come by" (Bryant 1985: 1). On the other hand, the many attacks on positivism evidence its presence in current research. This presence is, however, not expressed as an explicit adherence to the philosophical postulates of positivism. It is, instead, implied by the prevailing theoretical logic and methods of research.

A close examination of the "Verstehen"-position reveals a similar clash between assumptions made in the actual research process, and the philosophical basis for this practice. Thus, important differences among the most prominent philosophers of this tradition seem to exist, differences which involve even the meaning of their key concept, namely that of "Verstehen" (Furberg 1981). In spite of this reference to a "Verstehen"-based approach as an alternative to a positivistic one often seems to presume a unitary school of thought.

Advocacy of one approach which is considered to be an alternative to a "traditional" one, may therefore well resemble a Quixotic fight with windmills, a fight where there is no knight nor any giants. Nevertheless, comparison seems to be the only practicable way of clarifying some points concerning ontology and epistemology which arise from an ethnographic approach to the study of institutions. In such comparisons both the "traditional" approach and its alternatives are best conceived as *ad hoc* constructions. With this in mind the question is what is there to be compared? Which are the relevant questions and the competing alternatives?

The controversies of scientific theory and method are generally discussed in terms of dichotomies. Stands are taken on objectivism/subjectivism, quantitative/qualitative methods, deductive/inductive theorizing and deterministic/voluntaristic theories. The usefulness of this debate has been questioned by Alexander who observes that the theoretical issues in contention "do not illuminate the basic presuppositions that inform theoretical logic" (1982: 64). In other words, this debate has not advanced social theory.

A similarly distant stance is taken by Bourdieu (1988) who considers this debate largely to be a fight for academic positions, and commanded mainly by those who want social science to be a matter of method. He advocates, instead, a complementary approach, where the means of reaching theory are determined by the research problem at issue, not by any preconceived articles of faith. His own work in which survey data is enriched through qualitative interpretation and imaginative theorizing is a remarkable expression of this choice.

The view put forward here is related to that of these two sceptics. No attempt is made to provide an overview of the debate, instead, the pragmatism of Bourdieu is adopted in choosing a double edged alternative. Both the traditional empiricist approach and its "Verstehen" counterpart are needed in the scientific endeavour in order to adequately describe human reality. An either-or choice results in a "one-eyed" perspective from which the scientific theories are either so general in their objectification of this reality that they are irrelevant to the human experience [18], or they are so particular that they do not seem applicable to the society at large. In fact, even when research problems are tackled with a dual approach scientific theories may only partly illuminate the infinite complexity of human reality.

"Es gibt, streng geurteilt, gar keine "voraussetzungslose" Wissenschaft, der Gedanke einer solchen ist unausdenkbar, patalogisch: eine Philosophie, ein "Glaube" muss immer erst da sein, damit aus ihm die Wissenschaft eine Richtung, einen Sinn, eine Grenze, eine Methode, ein Recht auf Dasein gewinnt."
(Friedrich Nietzsche 1887)

Thus, the dichotomy used below, i.e. positivism versus phenomenology, is for the purpose of comparison. In this context the positivistic position is conceived as one whose methodology is quided by the Kantian precepts of science. These originally referred to the natural sciences, and dealt with the spatio-temporal world of fact employing causal relations as explanations. The alternative position is one which populates these worlds with human beings who act, think, have purposes, and give meaning to their lives. Thus, it includes the treatment of actors' knowledge in the analyses of action, adding telic explanations to the analysis, and introducing the quest for meaning into social research (Bruyn 1966: 2f, Heritage 1987: 229).

The option of a dual research strategy obviously implies that philosophical assumptions implied in positivist methodology are questioned. The first one

states that facts are separable from theory and other forms of "metaphysical" statements. It is expressed in the rule of phenomenalism stipulating that only that which is manifested in experience is accessible to human knowledge (Bryant 1985: 2f). This rule might well be the one most often repeated as the one characteristic of positivism. Durkheim stated that it was the first and most fundamental rule of the procedure that should be followed to discover empirical knowledge: "Consider facts as things". He later clarified what a thing is by saying that it "differs from an idea in the same way as that which we know from without differs from that which we know from within" (Durkheim 1912, cited in Bruyn 1966: 3).

The sociologist Znaniecki, contemporary with Durkheim, described this position as the "natural" way of viewing scientific data, and countered with the "cultural" one. He stated that data were always 'somebody's' and never 'nobody's' data. Knowledge of human activity would only be reached, when taken as it appeared to the agents themselves, and to those who cooperated with these agents or counteracted them. (Cited in Bruyn 1966: 4.) Experience was seen as interwoven with the inner life of those making empirical observations, whether scientists or subjects of scientific study. To this position I attribute the label phenomenology, which stands as the alternative to the positivist position. Participant observation is the method usually associated with this approach.

The first rule of positivism, basing scientific knowledge on empirical observation only, gives rise to other rules. One corollary is "(t)he rule that refuses to call value judgements and normative statements knowledge" (Bryant 1985: 5). The argument is that these have no empirical content, and are, thus, not accessible to scientific validation. Consequently, the image of a scientist at work is that of an objective, outside observer of social phenomena. As such she/he rids her/himself of values and norms during scientific work, or alternatively states values and norms explicitly. When values are objects of study within a positivistic or behavioural approach, they are fragmented into discrete units unconnected with a wider context of meaning. Culture is thereby reduced to structure. (Cfr. Alexander 1989: 210.)

Quite to the contrary values are cultural "objects" in phenomenology, and as such subject to scientific knowledge. Furthermore, they are of "essential practical determination with reference to human activity". (Znaniecki 1934, cited in Bruyn 1966: 4.) While the positivist view on values assumes a clear-cut fact/value split, the phenomenological view is that fact and value are "two sides of the same coin". They are joined in the concept of meaning, defined as "value-infused facts of society" (Bruyn 1966: 110). While facts are generally associated with observable social patterns and values with expressive symbols, in the study of meaning "symbols can be viewed as facts of society and patterns of organization can be observed to express values" (Bruyn 1966: 110).

Furthermore, researchers are like other human beings immersed in a social context where meaning is born and created; i.e. they are cultural creatures. They are, therefore, not able to assume the role of unbiased, and outside observers, neither do they possess automatic access to a privileged perspective

on the world. As has been shown above, participant observation is a method of gaining some access to other cultures.

"Una de las funciones de los filósofos de la ciencia podría ser proveer a los sociólogos de los instrumentos para defenderse contra la imposición de una epistemología positivista..."
(Pierre Bourdieu 1988)

Alexander also contests the first rule of positivism. He depicts scientific thought as a bi-directional continuum, each analytic level containing a varying degree of empirical observations and non-empirical metaphysical presuppositions. Statements closer to the empirical end are "empirical", because of their "specificity", while statements closer to the opposite end are "theoretical", because of their "generality" (Alexander 1982: 2f). This view suggests that there are no data without a theoretical content, and there is no theory independent of empirical observations. It makes the rule of phenomenalism an aberration, and it contests the positivist assumption of a clear split between theory and data. It suggests, instead, that the distinctions between scientific theory, general speculation, and mere data are used for analytical convenience, and differ from one theorist to another. Thus, at each level of analysis, statements on the metaphysical side are called theory, while those on the empirical side are called data. The continuum conception of science thereby emphasizes the interdependence of statements at each level, and the relative character of the theory/data split.

Phenomenology also employs a continuum conception which denies the positivistic assumption of a clear-cut distinction between subjective and objective statements. Therewith the positivistic refusal of subjective forms of knowledge is contested. It is believed that there is some degree of objectivity in all subjective knowledge. Likewise, scientific knowledge traditionally considered as the modern prototype of that which is objective is viewed as, to some degree, subjective (Bruyn 1966: 220). Thus, subjective forms of knowledge are considered necessary ingredients of social theory. Likewise, subjective sources of knowledge are seen as equally valid means of reaching theory (Bruyn 1966: 160f). Human meanings attached to objects and events are included in theorizing and in the interpretation of data. Knowledge reached, for example, by intuition is, not only accepted, but considered a fruitful path to scientific insight.

"There are those among us, who strive ... to belittle the significance of theory"
(Vladimir Lenin 1902)

According to Alexander debates on methodological controversies leave little space for the advancement of theory in the social sciences. These debates result

in less attention being paid to theoretical logic in scientific thought than to methodological sophistication. Another barrier to the creation of scientific theory is the narrow procedure for theorizing imposed by the positivistic persuasion to reduce theory to fact (Alexander 1982: 5). This is manifested in rules for theoretical thinking, rules which stipulate an inductive procedure for the formulation of theories, and a deductive procedure for the testing and verification of these theories.

The phenomenological approach implies an altogether different conception of theorizing, one which is generally associated with the "Verstehen"-school of philosophy. As has already become apparent, theory is seen as inseparable from fact in actual scientific practice, though many times separated in this practice for analytical purposes. Scientific procedure is conceived of as a recurrent interplay of theory and data continuously reaching higher levels of analysis and producing more profound insight into the research problem. The metaphor used for this procedure is that of a movement in the "hermeneutic circle", with theory on one side and empirical data on the other. Lately, the metaphor of a "hermeneutic spiral" seems to be replacing the circle (Ödman 1979).

However, the extent to which the positivistic procedure for theory formulation hampers theorizing might be of less importance than the positivistic postulates concerning the type of empirical data which is accepted as scientific. The fact that this procedure is manifested in scientific reports might be more an expression of the amount of timeserving in *Academe*, than an accurate description of the work performed.[19] The limits imposed on data do, however, mean an exclusion of the human perspective from social theory. The study of culture defined as the meaning human beings impart to social structure is banished from the disciplines which most feverishly aspire to become "real" science. Thereby, these disciplines are destined to serve the maintenance of social myths; i.e. to garland death metaphors with increasingly more sophisticated empirical data.[20]

"... jenes Stehen/Bleiben/Wollen vor dem Tatsächlichen, dem *factum brutum*, jener Fatalismus der 'petits faits'..."
(Friedrich Nietzsche 1887)

How is a social theory which includes the human dimension to be described? In this theory culture and structure are viewed as only analytically differentiated. Social form and symbolic meaning are empirically and historically interrelated. (Cfr. Alexander 1989: 212.) Social theories will, therefore, necessarily include propositions on both. Consequently, the methods dedicated to the study of social phenomena will adapt to the requirements imposed by this double interest. Statistical methods will be complemented with participant observation and with methods which are usually connected with the hermeneuti-

cal and interpretative tradition. When the bar to speculative theorizing is lifted, social theory will leave behind the much commented upon concern for trivialities, and turn to the most challenging and intricate puzzles of today.

The researchers' interest will turn from the mere compiling of data to the search for meaning; from "factum brutum" to interpretation. Instead of halting scientific inquiry when the statistical properties of a social phenomenon have been described, it is furthered by posing questions on meaning. What does this phenomenon mean to the participants? What meaning is conferred upon it in a wider social and cultural context? The underlying philosophical conception is that of intelligibility. There is a meaning to be discovered, not only at a personal and interpersonal level, but in a wider social context. Scientific problems are in this connection compared to puzzles. They have solutions, and the challenge to science is to find these, beyond mere description and causal explanation. Unlike jigsaw puzzles, scientific problems have more than one solution which is illustrated by the "Gestalt"-concept, applicable also to problems of natural sciences (Asplund 1970).

"We are in between stories. The Old Story – the account of how the world came to be and how we fit into it – is not functioning properly, and we have not learned the New Story."
(Berry 1978)

When organizational change is studied with interpretative methods the importance of cultural change is emphasized. Reform documents usually contain "soft" and "hard" parts, i.e. vague ideas and concrete rules, describing the change that is desired. If the implementation of reform is thought to be a process initiated at higher levels of the organization and followed by lower levels, the "hard" parts are the important ones. Collection of statistics and application of resources are rapidly changed in response to new regulations. If implementation is conceived as a process which starts at lower levels of the organization, the "soft" parts predominate. Professional ideologies change activities at these levels, in response to new problems. When these ideologies are reflected in a changed discourse in reform texts, the influence of this is limited. Those engaged in the organization who maintained an "old" ideology when new ideas became influential at lower levels, will not change because of a reform text. The "soft" parts of these texts are, after all, only "poetry"!

Decisions are made in day-to-day activity with the resources at hand. Time is divided into recurrent tasks, problems and solutions. Mostly activities are maintained by routine procedures. Only small modifications are made from one time to the other. Upon request, rational explanations are given to these routine actions, explanations that are usually coloured by professional ideology. In conflict when alternative decisions are possible and rival groups emerge, different interpretations of these ideologies become clear. It is also in conflict, that the commonsense worlds of rival groups clash, each group claiming that the only "normal" world is their own.

Thus, organizational activity appears to be more dedicated to problems, than to goals; more commonsense ridden than rational; and more ready to change in response to day-to-day problems than to reform texts. The many facets of this activity can be described by each one of the four organizational models mentioned above. Hierarchy is present in the distribution of decision-making power, and in the rules of problem solving. What is missing in organizational models that emphasize hierarchy are the sense-making strategies of persons involved, whereby hierarchical relations are legitimized in daily activities, and reproduced through organizational changes.

Likewise, organizations give many opportunities to identify "solutions in search of problems" as described in the garbage can model. However, this model pays little attention to the human activity of defining solutions and problems. Neither does it lead to the observation of obstacles to routine activities which open up for the perception of new solutions.

Goal orientation is also present in organizations, though it is less consciously employed in actual activities than in rational explanations which are attached to these activities. The many decisions that reproduce organizational structures and activities are, thus, more a result of routines than of rational considerations. When explanations are requested, decisions are conveniently clothed in rationalistic terms. Goal orientation is present, but more as a ritual than a principle guiding decisions.

As to the unconventional soccer game, this model obscures the fact that the game makes sense to the participants. That an outside observer fails to understand the rules of the game does not mean that they are unintelligible to the players. What this model has in common with the other organizational models commented on here, is that human beings who are actually producing observed events are absent from the analysis, and so are their ways of making sense of these events. These models lack the human dimension of organizations.

Notes

1) Citations in different languages are used instead of subtitles of sections throughout this article. In this note my interpretation is given of those citations which are in languages other than English, and the meaning of which are not evident from the text. In order of appearance they are as follows:

Nietzsche – Write first, philosophize then.

Asplund – What is the meaning of F?

Bachelard – The problem of scientific knowledge is best posed in terms of difficulties.

Kemp – Yes, tell us about your mistakes, unsuccessful experiments and misfortunes!

Dilthey – We explain nature and understand the soul.

Nietzsche – There is strictly speaking no science which is free from assumptions made beforehand, the thought of such a science is unthinkable, pathological: a philosophy, a belief will always have to be present first, so that science will gain a direction, a meaning, a limit, a method, and a right to existence.

Bourdieu – One function of the philosophy of science could be to provide sociologists with instruments to defend themselves against the imposition of a positivist epistemology.

Nietzsche – ...that wish to remain passive in face of the facts, the *factum brutum*, that fatalism of the "petits faits"...

I wish to thank Rebecca Christner and Kristina Riegert for proof-reading the main text, and the Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSFR) for financing my scientific excursions.

2) The special issue on qualitative research of Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, is one illustration of this interest. Another is a volume by Jones, et al., 1988, an anthology of articles on the so-called human dimension of organization.

3) Cohen, March & Olsen 1972, Simon 1947, Weber 1922, Weick 1976 and 1985.

4) For one such critique, see van Gunsteren 1976.

5) Goals and evaluations, instead of rules, are the new devices employed by politicians to master bureaucracy. This credo has been particularly explicit in school policy.

6) March & Olsen, 1989, have made a recent effort to combine order and disorder in the theory of public administration.

7) See Jones et. al. 1988:27 for the literal definition.

8) In 1983 this commission was split into two, one forming a department at Stockholm University, the Centre for Research in International Migration and Ethnic Relations, the other remaining a commission under the Ministry. Some of the reports from this project are gathered in Lithman (ed.) 1987.

9) The appointment of immigrant boards in municipalities was followed by the decision of the Swedish Riksdag of 1975 which identifies "equality, freedom of choice, and participation" as the general goals of the Swedish immigration policy.

10) According to Kommunaktuellt 1991: 25, only 43% of the immigrants participated in the elections of 1988, while 60% did in 1976, the first election in which immigrants voted.

11) One research report which was used in the reform text as an argument in favour of home language instruction showed not only that Swedish pupils had negative attitudes towards immigrant class-mates, but also that immigrant pupils had themselves adopted these same negative attitudes towards fellow immigrants, Takac 1975. See Municio 1987b: 47 for additional references.

12) See Municio & Meisaari-Polsa 1980 for an overview of participation in these areas.

13) SCB 1984

14) Jaakkola 1989

15) Municio 1983, 1987a och 1987b and 1990.

16) See Schatzman & Strauss 1973, Chapter 3, for "mapping up" strategies.

17) Another example of using quantitative and qualitative methods in the study of organizational culture, is given in Siehl & Martin 1988.

18) According to Schutz, cited in Heritage 1987: 230, this is when the world of social reality is "replaced by a fictional non-existing world created by the scientific observer".

19) According to Ford 1975:156: "What is sociological? RABBITS say they do and what they actually do are, however, quite different things."

20) See Bruyn 1966:133, for a discussion on the use of metaphors in social theory. According to him, dead metaphors are those which have lost their analogical power. When metaphors from physics and biology were introduced into theoretical models of society, the purpose was to provide for better perspective on and understanding of social phenomena. The way they are used today many times reveals a lack of awareness of the shift in perspective implied by the metaphor. Social "structure" is, thus, conceived as if it were an "objective" structure; a metaphor has become a social myth.

Literature

Administrative Science Quarterly, "Qualitative Methodology", vol. 24: 4, December 1979

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1982. *Theoretical Logic in Sociology, Volume One. Positivism, Presuppositions, and Current*

Controversies, University of California Press, Berkeley

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 1989. *Structure and Meaning. Relinking Classical Sociology,* Columbia University Press, New York

Asplund, Johan, 1970. *Om undran inför samhället,* Argos

Boje, David M. 1991. "The Storytelling Organization: A Study of Story Performance in an Office-Supply Firm", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* vol. 36:1, March 1991

Bourdieu, Pierre 1979. *La distinction,* Les Éditions de Minuit, Paris

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1988. *Cosas dichas,* Editorial Gedisa, S.A., Barcelona

Bruyn, Severyn T., 1966. *The Human Perspective in Sociology. The Methodology of Participant Observation,* Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

Bryant, Christopher G. A., 1985. *Positivism in Social Theory and Research,* Macmillan, London

Cohen, Michael D., James G. March & Johan P. Olsen, 1972 "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice", *Administrative Science Quarterly* vol. 17:1, March 1972

Douglas, M. & A. Wildavsky, 1982. *Risk and Culture,* University of California Press, Berkeley

Ford, Julienne, 1975. *Paradigms & Fair Tales. An Introduction to the Science of Meanings, Volume I,* Routledge & Kegan Paul, London

Furberg, Mats, 1981. *Verstehen och förstå. Funderingar kring ett tema hos Dilthey, Heidegger och Gadamer,* Doxa

Garfinkel, Harold, 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

Hastrup, Kirsten & Ovesen, Jan, 1980. *Främmande kulturer. Den moderna etnografins grunder,* Gidlunds

Heritage, J. C., 1987. "Ethnomethodology" in Giddens, A. & J. Turner (eds.) *Social Theory Today,* Polity Press, Cambridge

Jaakkola, Magdalena, 1989. *Rinkebyn Koululakko. Tutkimus ruotsinsuomalaisten etnisestä mobilisoitumisesta tukholmalaisessa lähiössa,* CEIFO, Stockholm

Jones, Michael O., Michael D. Moore & Richard C. Snyder, 1988. *Inside Organizations. Understanding the Human Dimension,* Sage Publications

Kommunaktuellt 1991: 25

Lithman, Yngve (ed.) 1987. *Nybyggarna i Sverige. Invandring och andragenerationen,* Carlssons, Stockholm

March, James & Johan P. Olsen, 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics,* Free Press, New York

Municio, Ingegerd & Meisaari-Polsa, Tuija, 1980. *Språkkunskaper och levnadsförhållanden,* Expertgruppen för invandringsforskning, Stockholm

Municio, Ingegerd, 1983. *Hemspråk i förskolan –en undersökning av genomförande,* Rapport nr 21, Expertgruppen för invandringsforskning, Stockholm

Municio, Ingegerd, 1987a. "Hemspråksreformen –gräsrotsbyråkrater, makt och genomförande", in Lithman (ed.)

Municio, Ingegerd, 1987b. *Från lag till bruk. Hemspråksreformens genomförande,* Stockholm Studies in Politics Nr. 31

Municio, Ingegerd, 1990. *Medpart, motpart eller icke-part? Finska föräldrar som brukare i svensk skola,* paper at the Nordic Congress of Political Scientists, Reykjavik, 15-19 August 1990

Schatzman, Leonard & Anselm L. Strauss, 1973. *Field Research. Strategies for a Natural Sociology,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

Siehl, C. & J. Martin, 1988. "Measuring Organizational Culture. Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods", in Jones et.al.

Simon, Herbert, 1964. "On the Concept of Organizational Goal", in *Administrative Science Quarterly,* vol. 22: 1, June 1964

Simon, Herbert A. 1947. *Administrative Behavior. A Study of Decision-Making Process in Administrative Organization,* New York

Skinner, Quentin, 1988. "Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas", in Tully, J. (ed.) *Meaning and Context. Quentin Skinner and his Critics,* Polity Press

Spradley, James P. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York

Statistiska Centralbyrån, 1984. *Tema Invandrare*, Rapport nr 38

Takac, Mirko, 1975. *Invandrarelev i svensk klass*, Göteborg

van Gunsteren, Herman R. 1976. *The Quest for Control. A Critique of the rational-central-rule approach in public affairs*, John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Weber, Max, 1922. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Tübingen

Weick, Karl E. 1976. "Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 21: 1, March 1976

Weick, Karl E. 1985. "Sources of order in underorganized systems: Themes in recent organizational theory", in Lincoln, Y. (ed.) *Organizational Theory and Inquiry. The Paradigm Revolution*, Sage Publications Inc.

Ödman, Per-Johan, 1979. *Tolkning, förståelse, vetande*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm