CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main objective of this chapter is to set the parameters within which the study is to be conducted, specifically justifying the use of qualitative research, informed by theory. It reviews the literature on quantitative and qualitative research approaches by examining the respective strength and weaknesses that provide justification for the research design selected for the present study. It then describes, discusses and justifies the choice of the research paradigm. Further, it discusses the case study approach that is employed as the methodology for this research. This will be based on the research questions established in Chapter One. The use of a single case study to answer the main research question of ***"How does the changing process of globalisation affect the indigenous film production industry?"*** will be discussed and justified. Following the discussion is the data collection method and the technique of analysing the data gathered. Lastly, the conclusion is drawn. This chapter argues for the subjective nature of the social world and that it can be assessed through the interpretive approach provided by the people involved in the context of the study.

4.1 QUANTITATIVE VERSUS QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

The terms 'quantitative research' and 'qualitative research' signify much more than ways of gathering data. Some researchers (e.g. Lincoln, 1991; Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Smith and Heshusius, 1986) distinguished between quantitative research and qualitative research, not on the basis of the type of evidence but on the basis of wholly different philosophical beliefs. Both quantitative and qualitative methods of research pose

common challenges to researchers in terms of their respective advantages and disadvantages.

Quantitative research is often conceptualised as having a logical structure in which the researcher applies a pre-ordained framework on the subject being investigated and adopts the posture of an outsider looking in on the social world. The main defect of this view of the research process is that it almost certainly overstates the centrality of theory in much quantitative research (Bryman, 1988). The extent to which quantitative research is explicitly guided by theory has been questioned and, instead, it has been argued that theoretical reasoning often occurs towards the end of the research process (Cicourel, 1982). Social surveys and experimental investigations are probably the main vehicles of quantitative research but there are three others: first, the analysis of previously collected data, like official statistics on crime, suicide, unemployment, and health; second, structured observation, whereby the researcher records observations in accordance with a pre-determined schedule and quantifies the resulting data; finally, content analysis, for example, the quantitative analysis of the communication content of media such as newspapers (Bryman, 1988). Survey research is structured in the sense that sampling and questionnaire construction are conducted before the start of data collection and are then imposed on the sample members. In other words, the issues to be focused upon are decided at the outset.

In contrast, the aim of qualitative research is to gain an in-depth understanding of a particular situation. Therefore, it tends to be more open, and there is a strong urge to 'get close' to the subject being investigated, that is, to be an insider. Denzin and Lincoln (1994, p.2) define qualitative research as involving a multi-method approach to studying things in their natural setting, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in

terms of the meaning people bring to them. Qualitative research tends to be associated with participant observation and unstructured, in-depth interviews (Bryman, 1988). Indeed, in-depth interviews are a data collection method that qualitative researchers relied on quite extensively (Patton, 2002). The advantages of conducting interviews arise from the quality of information obtained. Interviews are more flexible and permit a lengthy number of questions that cannot be included in a questionnaire survey. Further, researchers will be able to design the discussion to fit the understanding of the respondents. However, data from interviews are descriptive and narrative in nature and cannot be statistically analysed.

Since the qualitative approach is more flexible, it is a useful way of acquiring large amounts of data from interviews, document analysis and observations. Some qualitative research follows ethnographic methods and seeks to satisfy two conditions: (a) the use of close-up, detailed observation of the natural world by the researcher; and (b) the attempt to avoid prior commitment to any theoretical model (Jacob, 1987, 1989; Stake, 1983).

This discussion of these conflicting research methods does not intend to undermine either approach but rather is done as a justification for selecting the most appropriate method to achieve the objectives of the research.

4.2   RESEARCH PARADIGM

The four main research paradigms for conducting research will be examined. The term paradigm is used in explanation of the philosophical assumptions about the nature of knowledge and how that knowledge can be measured by researchers (Guba and Lincoln,

1994; Smircich, 1983; Morgan, 1983). Specifically, paradigm as defined by Guba and Lincoln (1994, p. 105) is "the basic belief system or world view that guides the investigator". However, it should be noted that the term is widely used, with a variety of meanings depending on when, where and by whom it is used (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Morgan, 1983a). According to Yin (2003), Perry (1994), Patton (1990) and Smircich (1983), there is no universally accepted paradigm and there is still much discussion and argument about which paradigm and, consequently, which methodology is best used to conduct research. Further, Cunningham (1993) argues that there is no single paradigm and/or methodology that meets the needs of all researchers and all research questions when investigating diverse, complex and changing contemporary society. Therefore, it is important for researchers to adopt the most appropriate paradigm and thereby the most appropriate methodology to conduct research based on the established research questions. What follows is a discussion of what constitutes a paradigm.

Ontological, Epistemological and Methodological

All paradigms share three common perspectives but each paradigm sees the world differently and it is the choice of paradigm that affects which methodology will be used to conduct research (Morgan, 1983). The three perspectives pertain to:

4.2.1   Ontological perspective

Ontology concerns the nature of the reality and poses questions such as:

- What is the nature of reality?
- What is already known about this reality?
- What is already known about the real world?
- Is this how things really work? (Perry, Reige and Brown, 1999)

This leads to the second perspective, i.e. the epistemological perspective.

4.2.2 Epistemological perspective

Epistemology refers to the relationship researchers have with the reality they have created, their justified belief and the truth of their final research findings (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Epistemology poses social questions such as:

- What is the relationship between the researcher and the reality, as they perceive it?
- Is the reality shared by others or only by the researcher?
- Have the perceptions of the researcher shaped the desired reality or is it a 'true' representation of the reality? (Guba and Lincoln, 1994)

This leads to the third perspective, i.e. the methodological perspective.

4.2.3 Methodological perspective

The choice of methodology depends largely on two factors. First, is the choice of paradigm established by the researcher and, second, the nature of phenomena under investigation. Thus the use of an appropriate methodology is crucial when establishing the truth about a phenomenon, as an inappropriate methodology will yield unreliable results (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Yin, 2003). The question is now:

- What technique can be used to measure the perceived reality?

4.3 THE COMPETING PARADIGMS

Understanding the differing paradigms is crucial before the selection of the most appropriate paradigm for the study. In conducting a scientific research, there are four main paradigms used by researchers to make sense of the world around us. These are positivism, realism (also known as post-positivism), critical theory and constructivism (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Perry et al., 1999). A summary of the nature of the relationship between the four paradigms is shown in Table 4.1, which also shows the three levels of distinction between the ontology, epistemology and methodology. It is

important to note that the nature of the relationship between each of the paradigms and the three levels is such that while there is a level of interconnectedness, in as much as they are all tools designed to measure the truth, there are boundaries that exist between them that cannot be easily breached, if at all (Moore, 2004; Guba and Lincoln, 1994). It is also crucial to realise that the responses to questions raised in the discussion of the three perspectives may well "constrain how the other may be answered" (Guba and Lincoln, 1994: p.108). What follows is the description of the four major paradigms.

4.3.1 Positivism

Positivism is based on the assumption that the reality of the subject of the research is both real and apprehensible and, thus, it is measurable (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). As the reality is real, then when a researcher investigates it, causal relationship can be consistently measured and categorised across both time and context (Perry et al., 1998). Positivism is used to test hypotheses and from this the 'truth' about the hypotheses is established using very structured verification methodologies such as laboratory experiments and surveys (Perry et al., 1998). However, positivism as a paradigm for conducting all research has been called into question as Cunningham (1993, p. 33) argues that "there appears to be a growing recognition of the difficulties of applying positivistic research paradigm for carrying out research and change in real-life settings." While Perry et al. (1999, p. 5) notes that using positivism as the only paradigm for conducting research is "…inappropriate when examining social science phenomena".

4.3.2 Critical Theory

The critical theory paradigm is based on the underlying assumption of "virtual or historical reality" derived from social contexts (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Advocates of the critical theory paradigm wish to transform the world around them by critiquing the

existing "social, political, economic, ethnic and gender values" (Perry et al., 1999, p. 6) that have shaped the current reality, from the previous one (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). To use the paradigm as a research tool would of necessity make the researcher, as argued by Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 112) a "transformative intellectual", one who wishes to change the world in which the participants live (Brown, 1997; Perry et al., 1996).

4.3.3   Constructivism

The underlying assumption of the constructivism paradigm is that there are multiple versions of reality and as a result, there can be no single truth (Perry et al., 1998; Guba and Lincoln, 1994). "Realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature…and dependent for their form and content on the individual person or groups holding the constructions" (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 111). Moreover, as the constructivist approach holds that each construction is based on the individual or group's own experiences, then the reality thereby constructed cannot be real or true in an absolute sense (Perry et al., 1998). Thus, as Perry et al., (1999, p. 6) argue, "perception is the most important reality" and, as a result, the level of certainty as to the truth of the findings may not be constant. Also, the findings may well be a creation or a synthesis of what the researcher has found, in which case the researcher is what Guba and Lincoln (1994, p. 111) describe as a "passionate participant".

4.3.4   Realism

According to Guba and Lincoln, (1994), the realism paradigm can be understood to mean that the real world cannot be known with absolute certainty, one that can be systematically and consistently measured, but rather it can be known only imperfectly

and, therefore, can only be imperfectly measured. Like positivists, realists believe that there is only one 'reality' but argue that this single reality can be defined and measured by triangulating the differing perceptions that people hold about it, rather than using a single measure (Eisenhardt, 1989; Denzin, 1978). Thus, researchers who adopt the realism paradigm focus on methodologies that allow them to explore, to develop new insights and understanding about a phenomenon, seeking to add to the body of knowledge rather than to test and prove (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Yin, 2003).

A summary of the relationship between the four research paradigms and the three levels of distinction and interconnectedness is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Basic Belief System-Paradigms for Alternative Methods of Inquiry

Item	Positivism	Critical Theory	Constructivism	Realism
Ontology (One's view of reality)	'Naïve realism': Reality is real and apprehensible. This is the reality where the investigator and the reality are independent of each other.	'Historical realism': Reality is 'virtual'. Shaped by the political, ethnic, cultural, gender, economic and social values that have crystallised over time in 'society'. So findings can come from the perceptions of participants and any other co-researchers.	'Critical relativism': There are multiple local and specific 'constructed' realities. As such, any reality that has been observed is likely to be a construct of that person alone and there is no such thing as a universal 'truth'. They are all relative to person, time, situation and circumstances.	'Critical realism': Reality is 'real' but only imperfectly so and is only improbably apprehensible (due to the limitations of the human mind and the complexity of the world) and so, triangulation from many sources is required, if one is to know it.
Epistemology (Nature of the researcher)	Objectivist: Findings are true as the researcher is an objective observer.	Subjectivist: Values mediate the findings. The researcher and the object of the research are assumed to be interactively linked, to some greater or lesser degree.	Subjectivist: The findings are created as a result of the interactive nature of the relationship between the researcher and the object being researched.	Modified Objectivist: Findings are likely to be true but, as the researcher is participating, to some degree, in the events, then the level of objectivity is reduced.
Methodology (Technique(s) used)	Experimental/ manipulative/ survey: Verification of hypotheses chiefly by quantitative means.	Dialogic/ Dialectical: Researcher is a 'transformative' intellectual who changes the world within which the participants live.	Hermeneutical/ Dialectical: Researcher is a 'passionate participant' within the world being investigated.	Case studies/ Convergent Interviewing: Triangulation interpretation of research issues by qualitative methods.

Source: Brown (1997) and Guba and Lincoln (1994).

4.4   JUSTIFICATION FOR THE USE OF THE REALISM APPROACH

The differences in research paradigm of scientific research have been discussed, and the most appropriate paradigm is then chosen for this study. Given that the main research question of the study is ***"how does the changing process of globalisation affect the indigenous film production industry?"*** indicating the necessity for the study to illuminate and gain greater understanding of the phenomena under study, the researcher contends that the use of the realism research paradigm is the most appropriate to achieve the research objective, as it offers a more flexible approach to investigating the research question as opposed to other paradigms. The researcher contends that other paradigms are not suitable for various reasons as follows: positivism – concerns the verification of theory which is not the aim of the study; critical theory – the objective of the researcher here is to transform the world in which participants live; constructivism – the researcher is not in a position to assume that perception is itself a 'reality'. On that basis, all three competing paradigms were rejected for this study.

In realism, the nature of knowledge to which people have access is both explicit and tacit. While it is possible to examine documents and other data that is explicit, the knowledge that is in the mind of participants is tacit and more difficult to access in a meaningful way. Furthermore, this tacit knowledge is often assumed to be known to participants, yet they are often only vaguely aware of what they do know. Therefore, the use of the realism paradigm offers a much more flexible approach. In addition, since the knowledge held by participants may not yet be 'fact', it cannot be readily verified by quantitative methods, and so the use of the realism paradigm is justified.

The selection of the research paradigm will lead to the appropriate methodology used for the study. What follows next is a discussion of the methodology employed for the study.

4.5   CASE STUDY RESEARCH

Following Yin (2003), the most appropriate methodology for undertaking research lies in the nature of the research question. The research question for this study is a 'how' question, which is the type that Yin (2003) identifies as one best answered using a case-based methodology. Moreover, the study focuses on a contemporary event over which the researcher has little or no control. Table 4.2 summarises this.

Table 4.2
A Comparison of Different Research Methods for Different Situations

Strategy	The Nature of the Research Question	Required Control over Behavioural Events	Focuses on Contemporary Events
Archival Analysis	Who, what, where, how many and how much	No, as it is a search for 'facts'	Yes and no, as it may be either a recent or a past phenomenon
Historical Studies	How and why	No, as it is a search for 'facts'	No, as events are usually in the past
Experiments	How and why	Yes	Yes, happening now
Surveys	Who, what, where, how many and how much	No	Yes, happening now
Case Studies	How and why	No	Yes, happening now

Source: Yin (2003).

Similarly, Rossman and Rallis (1989), Cooper (1991) and Miles and Evans (1987) argue that the case study is best used to research practical problems, as it allows the researcher to examine the phenomena more effectively and to a greater depth in its contextual conditions than the use of other methodologies. Case study research could engage a qualitative or quantitative approach or a combination of both (Bryman, 1999;

Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2003). In distinguishing case studies from other research strategies such as experiments, surveys or histories, Yin (2003: 13) defines a case study as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used".

Frequently, the case study is regarded to be 'soft' research. However, according to Yin (2003), the 'softer' the research strategy, the harder it is to do. Indeed, the case study methodology has been well established as a legitimate methodology in many disciplines including management, education, marketing and international business (Carson et al., 2000; Clarke, 1998; Denton, 1998; Marschan-Piekkari and Welch, 2004; Morgan 1983; Yin, 1989). For example in the area of international business, the application of qualitative methods has accelerated from the past decades (Marschan Piekkari and Welch, 2004). According to Ghauri (2004), case studies are dominating qualitative research in international business in which data is mainly collected from in-depth interviews. Relative to the quantitative approach, the qualitative method offers a more holistic approach to the research object and studies a phenomenon in its context and seeks to understand the meaning and beliefs underlying the action (Buckley and Chapman, 1996), which goes beyond merely measuring the observable behaviour. As a result, there are many calls for qualitative international business research (Marschan-Piekkari and Welch, 2004; Vernon, 1994; White, 2002; Yeung, 1995).

Case studies have been criticised as unscientific where generalisation cannot be made. However, Yin (2003) argues that like experiments, case studies can be generalised through analytical generalisation (expand and generalised theory) rather than statistical generalisation to the whole population. Data received from a particular case provides

theoretical insights that are a sufficient level of generality or universality. In addition, the choice of conducting a case study is a discreet choice, the main objective of which is to advance our understanding on a specific focus area and an attempt to generate theories to explain the reasons for observed phenomena rather than to produce generalisations (Ghauri, 2004).

Like quantitative research, case studies are able to achieve validation, i.e. through triangulation. The term 'triangulation' refers to the multiple points used to locate a target's position that was derived from navigation and military strategy (Jick, 1979). Triangulation reduces the likelihood of misinterpretation as data is gained from multiple sources (interviews, documents, observations) and/or multiple viewpoints (Appleton, 1995; Patton, 1999). Multi-method triangulation is a defining feature of case studies where data is gained from multiple sources. Campbell and Fiske (1959 cited in Ghauri, 2004) argue that the use of more than one method ensures validation. To further increase validation, Ghauri (2004) suggests the inclusion of multiple viewpoints from the in-depth interviewing. Indeed, case studies enable the incorporation of a variety of evidence such as interviews, documents and observation, which is their main unique strength.

4.6   THE USE OF THEORY IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Theory in quantitative research is often used as a basis for the hypotheses and the research questions that the researcher seeks to test. However, the use of theory in qualitative research is different from that of quantitative research. The theoretical framework in qualitative studies refers to theories used to guide the study. The description of the theory used is meant to 'frame' the study, which is known as the

theoretical framework (relationship about theories and the research project), which according to Morgan (1986, p. 12) provides "ways of thinking" and "ways of seeing" that unveil understanding of the phenomena being studied in novel and interesting ways. The theory allows the researcher to "enter the field with a theoretical language and attitude" (Schwandt, 1993, pp. 11-12 cited in Anfara and Mertz, 2006). Qualitative forms of enquiry demand that theory (i.e. theoretical frameworks) is used with imagination and flexibility. Anfara and Mertz (2006) define theoretical frameworks as any empirical or quasi-empirical theory of social and/or psychological processes, at a variety of levels (e.g. grand, mid-range, and explanatory) that can be applied to the understanding of phenomena (p. xxvii).

For the present study, the paradigm of the researcher focuses on an individual meaning and on people's perceptions of reality rather than any independent reality that might exist external to human perception. As, according to Burell and Morgan (1979, p. 28), the social world is perceived as an emergent social process, which is created by the human individuals concerned. The qualitative approach is useful for this study as it produces a rich and deep understanding of how research participants understand, think about, interact with and respond to the forces of globalisation. It concerns the understanding of the world as it is and to understand the fundamental nature of the social world at the level of subjective human experience.

The present study uses the globalisation theory from the viewpoint of economic development theories as a theoretical lens against the backdrop of developing countries that are embracing globalisation. Using theory from an economic discipline allows richness and diversity of theoretical frameworks that allow the researcher to see the film industry as a phenomenon in new and different ways from other previous studies

(Anfara and Mertz, 2006). Theory is used in this study to assist in organising ideas and identifying themes while remaining open to the possibility that new theories may emerge from the data.

4.7   THE PRESENT STUDY

The main purpose of the study is to examine the effect of the changing process of globalisation on the Malaysian film production industry. Subsequently, the effect of the government's role in the development of the industry will also be investigated. The advantage of employing the qualitative approach is its ability to discover new knowledge and new emerging themes (Wilkinson and Young, 2004). As Cooper and Schindler (2006, p. 169) puts it "qualitative research is designed to tell how and why things happen as they do and aims to achieve an in-depth understanding of a situation". To delve into the true meaning of a phenomenon, semi-structured interviews will be conducted using a standard set of questions prepared in advance.

The qualitative approach provides a more dynamic and effective platform to undertake a more comprehensive and in-depth study that permits a deeper understanding of behaviour, inner thoughts and feelings and meanings of the phenomenon being researched. According to Shin (2005), there is no 'one-size-fits-all' solution in responding to the challenges of globalisation as countries differ in terms of their previous paths of development, stages of development, structures of the economy and so on. This study aims to achieve a deeper understanding of how a particular industry in a country is affected by the changing process of globalisation, therefore, a case study is an appropriate method to better understand an individual country's specific response to globalisation.

According to Morgan and Smircich (1980) the choice of a philosophical or paradigm stance for any research method embodies a variety of assumptions regarding the nature of knowledge and the method through which the knowledge can be obtained, not merely on the basis of which method is more powerful. Based on the earlier argument, a qualitative approach case study is employed to achieve the objectives of the study.

4.7.1 Research Method Employed for the Case Study

Data was collected through secondary and primary data. The different methods of data collection were used to increase the quality of the research by employing the triangulation method during the data analysis stage. Secondary data was obtained from written documents and observation.

The primary data collection was mostly through semi-structured interviews conducted using interview question guidelines prepared in advance. Interviews were conducted because they are acknowledged as a powerful method of data collection. A key feature of the qualitative research interview method is the nature of the relationship between the interviewer and the participant. Other sources of primary data included press statements from mainstream local newspaper and governments' official websites. Triangulation of information was done during the data analysis process and, thus, data was gathered from multiple viewpoints pertaining to the research issues that would enable data triangulation at the later stage of analysing the data.

4.7.2 The Empirical Domain

The main objective of this study is to gain an understanding of the effect of the changing process of globalisation on the indigenous film production industry. The

selection of a single case study aims to achieve the objectives mentioned earlier. This is because the effects of economic globalisation differ between countries as countries are different in the degree and speed of integration and, thus, the effect may differ. Further, Shin (2006) argues that countries respond differently to the forces of globalisation. Therefore, a single case study is appropriate in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the chosen phenomena.

The empirical domain of the study is an industry within a single country. As stated earlier, a single country case was selected due to different effects of the process of globalisation, while, a single industry in a country, i.e. the film production industry, as each industry or sector has its own unique characteristics and, thus, including a different industry would be meaningless. According to Yin (2003) a single-case study design is an appropriate design under several circumstances. First, when a case represents a critical case. Second, when it represents an extreme or unique case and third, when it is a revelatory case. Since the objective of the study is to gain deeper understanding, it is an explanatory type of study and the employment of a single case study design will provide greater access to new information that will eventually stimulate further research and provide insightful policy actions.

4.7.3 Sampling Method

Scholars are divided with regard to sampling in qualitative research. The term 'sampling', which originates from the quantitative approach, is usually made with the objective of making statistical generalisations. It involves generalising findings and making inferences from a representative statistical sample from the population from which the sample was drawn. On the one hand, qualitative researchers are said to be pre-occupied with positivism in sampling and sample size consideration. On the other

hand, qualitative researchers argue that qualitative research does not intend to make statistical generalisation, and thus, sampling is not an issue in qualitative research. However, the researcher argues that providing information about sampling and sample size considerations will provide more richness to the storytelling and help to ensure that qualitative reports are public (Constas, 1992). According to Curtis, Gesler, Smith and Washburn (2000), rather than leaving the decision on the sampling method hidden, it is essential to be explicit about sampling consideration, as it will increase the credibility and quality of research findings. Thus, sampling and sample size considerations should be an integral part of the qualitative research process (Sandelowski, 1995).

The researcher is adopting the realism paradigm. Following the methodology or technique used, the case study method with triangulation of information is a common method employed in realism. Thus, the number of samples selected for the study must reflect the need for the data to be triangulated later in the data analysis process. The justification of a single case study has been discussed earlier. Although the present study employs a single case study, a single case does not mean a single sample, as the study of an industry involves embedded cases studies. Embedded cases are sub-units of analysis the outcomes of which are influential to the main single case. The main unit of analysis is the industry as a whole. In the case of an industry, it involves many different players. The central figure to the film production industry is the producer.

Sampling in quantitative research uses systematic and complex mathematical formulae and gives high regard to the use of random sampling. However, due to the nature of many qualitative researches, sample size considerations are neither mathematical nor systematic. It is a strategic choice of informants relevant to the study rather than statistically drawn samples (Stenbacka, 2001, p. 553). Thus, purposive sampling is a

common method used in qualitative research. Although the sampling method employed for the study is purposive, the study will justify the series of decisions made for the study, particularly concerning the sample size and how the respondents were selected.

Concerning the appropriate number of samples, Guba and Lincoln (1985, p.204) argue that sampling selection should be done 'to the point of redundancy' that is, until it is obvious that no new data emerges as a result of an increase in the number of samples. Patton (1990, p.185) suggests that the observational and analytical capabilities of the researcher and the validity, meaningfulness and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with the information richness than the sample size. Rather than achieving representativeness (as in the positivism paradigm), the present study will attempt to achieve credibility of the research by justifying the criteria of the samples.

According to data published by Sinema Malaysia, an agency under FINAS which provides data of the Malaysian film industry, there were 241 production houses in Malaysia as at November 2008.[10] The decision on sampling method is as discussed below. The purposive sampling of snowball or chain sampling was employed. This chain sampling begins with identifying the most relevant respondent that is willing to participate in the study as the purpose of the study is to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. The snowballing sampling works in a way that the initial interviews help to define later interviews. The criteria for the first sample selected is a company that is currently an active 'hard-core player' (the term used by industry people) in the production of films for cinema exhibition as well as for television broadcast. The in-depth interview and the information gained led to the identification of other respondents. In this case, another production house was identified, which is currently among the 'hard-core players' in the local film industry. The information gathered led

---

[10] www.sinemamalaysia.com.my/ directory.

further to other players in the industry, which include government agencies and television stations. The fieldwork then proceeded to enable information to be triangulated at a later stage of analysis.

As mentioned earlier, following chain sampling, there is no appropriate number determined for the sample. The decision to stop the fieldwork after interviewing is reached when the initial analysis of responses during the data collection process yields similarities of opinion. As such, the research then proceeded towards a detailed analysis of the responses obtained.

Other primary information gathered is from:

(i)   Local television stations – Television stations play a central role in the film production industry. Their policies, particularly concerning television content, affect the industry as programmes produced by indigenous producers are mostly aimed for the domestic market and broadcast by local television stations.

(ii) National government – Government as a policy-maker influences the industry through its policies. The level of government support in terms of subsidy, etc. as well as its regulation can make or break the local film production industry. Government is also responsible for regulating the behaviour of local television stations.

In addition, their views are important as it provides a deeper understanding of how the role of government and local television stations are affected by globalisation as their response to the external forces could directly or indirectly affect the local industry. For example, the government might be affected in its policy making as a result of global

forces (e.g. further liberalisation of media industries), and/or local television stations might have to change their organisational strategies to keep abreast with global changes in the television industry and their response might directly affect the development of the local film and television production industry. Data collection from the industry players is crucial as the outcome of their actions or policies influences the direction of the industry. Understanding the role of each industry player is crucial in grasping the idea of how these agencies are themselves affected by the changing process of globalisation.

Before the interviews, an interview question guideline was prepared. In most cases, interview questions were given to the respondent before the interview session to enable the respondents to be prepared for the interview session. Almost all interview sessions were recorded using an audio tape recorder. On average, the interview session normally lasted for 2-3 hours. The recorded sessions were then transcribed for later analysis.

A total of eleven production houses, two government agencies and two television stations were interviewed. The interviews were conducted in December 2008 and April 2009. The production companies are diverse in terms of their relative size. Some are larger than the others in terms of the number of employees and size of operation. They also vary in terms of years of operation and track record. The list of production houses and other agencies interviewed are included in Appendix 1.

4.8   QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

The most critical part of doing case study research is during the analysis and interpretation stage. This is because, according to Miles (1979), there are no well-formulated methods to analyse qualitative data. However, according to Ghauri (2004)

since qualitative research, especially in IB is becoming popular, the analysis of qualitative data is becoming systematic. Qualitative data analysis guidelines from authors like Miles and Huberman (1994), Eisenhardt (1989), Newman (1997), Patton (1990) and Yin (1994) are among the most useable guidelines for qualitative researchers.

In analysing qualitative data in case study research, the best approach, according to Miles and Huberman (1994), is to acknowledge the interconnectedness between data collection process and data analysis. The advantages of interweaving data collection and data analysis are (i) it reduces the risk of drowning in the increasing volume of data, (ii) it leads to new questions and new data collection, (iii) it allows formulation or reformulation of research questions and, (iv) it enables theory to develop alongside the growing volume of data (Ghauri, 2004).

The systematic analysis guideline by Miles and Huberman (1994) is a general guideline employed for analysing the data. The initial stage of data analysis involves transcription of the data collected during the field interview (this was done immediately after the interview session). The analysis consists of three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. Data reduction is the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming raw data collected during fieldwork. Data was reduced and grouped into different categories/issues manually. This process makes the data more organised and enables the emergence of patterns. This way, it helps the researcher to develop an understanding of how globalisation is affecting the film industry from the point of view of the interview participants.

The outcome of data reduction helps the development of data display. Data display refers to an organised assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action taking. In qualitative research, data displays could be in the form of matrices, figures, charts or graphs. It is an organised way of presenting the information collected during the data collection process. At this stage the data is arranged in a more precise and assessable way to assist the researcher. It helps in analysing and concluding the research at a latter stage. The third stage of conclusion drawing or verification is a process of noting regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows and propositions. Conclusions were drawn based on the researcher's interpretation of the participants' point of view and based on the theoretical lens of globalisation theory set earlier. By emphasising and reiterating the issues discussed, the researcher is able to receive feedback. Feedback is important as a source of assuring conformability of statements (Miles and Huberman, 1994). It is vital that the conclusion drawn is validated. The issue of validity is further discussed in detail.

There are many software packages developed to help qualitative researchers in their process of handling and analysing data. Examples of the software programs are CAQDAS, Nvivo and Nu*dist and Leximancer. It is advisable that the selection of software program depends on the data collection techniques used by the researcher. Although software packages are available to assist researchers in analysing the data, the present researcher did not use any of the software for the reasons stated below:

(i)   Generally, qualitative data collection results in a significant amount of data collected. Software packages are useful in data handling as it helps to reduce the clerical work of sorting words, concepts and passages contained in the transcripts. However, the identification of significant themes, patterns and

categories still has to be done by the researchers (Easternby-Smith et al., 1992; Richard and Richards, 1991). Further, according to Easterby-Smith et al., (1993) and Glaser (1978), the researcher's judgement is still needed and there are no software packages that can substitute for the interpretive skills of the researcher.

(ii)   The selection of software package depends on the research approach employed. Since the research employed the realism approach, the researcher does not need to map all the details of an interview's subjective reality. Thus, manual coding of interview data is appropriate for this process (Perry et al., 1998). Furthermore, Perry et al., (1999) further argue that constructivist tools like Nu*dist are not essential for realism research.

(iii)   According to Glaser (1998) the brain is much more flexible, therefore, doing it manually is essentially a creative process and can facilitate conceptualisation. Furthermore, the use of software is too structured and will eventually force itself into data (Glaser, 1978).

(iv)   In addition, case study research involves a small sample size and, thus, it is not difficult to handle and manage the data manually. By managing the data manually, the researcher is more comfortable with the accessibility of the data and, also, it enables the researcher to be more familiar with the data.

4.9   ACHIEVING QUALITY

Reliability and validity are the terms used in quantitative research signifying the quality of the research. Thus, any research paradigm would require and should demonstrate

reliability and validity (Golafshani 2003). The concept of 'reliability' and 'validity' are the two important concepts used in quantitative studies to test and demonstrate a good quality research. Although some researchers have argued that the terms are not applicable to qualitative research, in responding to the claims over the credibility of the research, qualitative researchers have developed their own concepts reflecting the concept of reliability and validity in the positivism paradigm. Since the concepts of reliability and validity have been argued as not being the appropriate concept for measuring the credibility of qualitative research, the new developed terms are used. The terms include rigour, quality and trustworthiness that signify the conceptualisation of reliability and validity (Lincoln and Guba, 1995; Seale, 1999; Stenbacka, 2001). This conceptualisation associated with the quantitative paradigm, developed by qualitative researchers, is the way to eliminate bias and increase the researchers' truthfulness about some social phenomena in qualitative study (Denzin, 1978).

Hence, credibility is an important criterion for evaluating qualitative evidence. Credibility refers to whether reported 'soft data' like perceptions match the researcher's portrayal. In order to strengthen research credibility, the researcher (i) collects data from multiple sources and multiple viewpoints (ii) retain the evidence-the data is tape-recorded (iii) and obtain feedbacks from the participants. In addition, the systematic process of data analysis follows the guidelines suggested by previous researchers to increase the quality of qualitative research (Ghauri, 2004). This is consistent with Cutclifte and McKenna (1999) that maintain that quality research can be achieved by:

- Making explicit of the qualitative approach the researcher use.
- Returning to participants and attempt to gain verification.
- Triangulating.

For Guba and Lincoln (1981), they maintain that qualitative data are credible when the audience can recognise experiences after having only read about them. In addition

One of the defining features of a case study is triangulation, mentioned earlier. Triangulation is a commonly used strategy to test or achieve quality in qualitative case study research. It is defined to be "a validity procedure where researchers search for convergence among multiple and different sources of information to form themes or categories in a study" (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 126). In addition, in the realism paradigm, Healy and Perry (2000) explain validity and reliability, which relies on multiple perceptions, i.e. the involvement of triangulation of several data sources about a single reality. Patton (2002, p. 247) further argued that triangulation strengthens a study by combining methods. Thus, the present study employs the triangulation of method and triangulation of data as a means of achieving the quality of the research.

(i)   Triangulation of method is where information from different methods of data collection is employed. Data collection of the present study is through interviews, written documents, and observation. The triangulation method enables the researcher to check and validate information from various sources and examine it from different angles. This method is also able to reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation.

(ii)   The triangulation of data refers to obtaining information from multiple viewpoints. The present study employs the triangulation of data by interviewing major players from local production houses as well as representatives from local television stations and government representatives.

4.10   SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In conducting a qualitative research, frequently researchers are silent on the research design employed. In this chapter, the researcher attempts to make the procedure of conducting qualitative research explicit, in particular a case study-based research. The chapter has reviewed, discussed and justified the choice of case study based research. It should be emphasised that the aim of case study research is to understand a particular case (Stake, 1995) and, hence, producing statistical generalisation is not the concern of this study.

The use of theories in qualitative research is to frame the study and how data will be collected and interpreted. This study used primary and secondary data from interviews, documents, archives, government and company websites, newspaper documents and other secondary data. The analysis is done through triangulation of people's perceptions of the phenomena under study. Both triangulation of method and data are used to increase the quality of the research.

Both quantitative and qualitative research need to demonstrate credibility. Thus, the terms reliability and validity as used by quantitative researchers usually refer to a research that is credible. The terms are used separately in quantitative research. Meanwhile, in qualitative research, terms like rigour, trustworthiness, quality of research are used to connote both 'reliability' and 'validity' as commonly used in quantitative research, thereby demonstrating how the research achieves the standard of scientific inquiry.