



LUND
UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

***Communication connected to organizational culture –
A phenomenological study of cooperation between the
academic world and small private companies***

**Johan Andersson
Nils Frisé**

Bachelor paper autumn 2004

Tutor: Roger Sages

Abstract

This project was conducted as a phenomenological study, focusing on organizational culture connected to communication, of the collaboration between the academic world and small private companies. The purposes were to get a deeper understanding of culture and communication and to use phenomenology as a research approach, to see what it can contribute with. Data collection was obtained by an internet questionnaire that held both a projective test and questions with predetermined answer alternatives. Analysis was conducted with the help of Sphinx and Minerva MCA software. The analysis showed that communication, in different forms, seems to be important to the participants. There also seems to be connections between organizational culture and communication and that there probably are underlying assumptions that affect both collaboration and communication. Unforeseen factors, such as the fixation about age differences and the experiencing of educational situations, were found. Phenomenology as a method shows that it helps to expose the core of the subject you are looking at, that it's applicable to our subject of research and that it gives interesting answers with the help of underlying theories.

Keywords: phenomenology, organizational culture, organizational communication

Acknowledgements

We would like to address a few people with our thanks regarding help with our work with this paper.

First of all we would like to thank our tutor/mentor senior lecturer Roger Sages at the Department of Psychology, Lund University. His inspiration and ability to raise questions along the way of our work, as well as patience with our lengthy work, has indeed been invaluable.

We would also like to thank Professor Curt Johansson, at the Department of Psychology, Lund University, who put us in initial contact with the people active within the krAft and UNIVA organizations. In the krAft organization we would like to thank Per Odenrick and in the UNIVA organization we would like thank Lars Svensson, Tommy Engström and David Nyberg.

For helping us with the construction of our questionnaire, mainly the problems we had with the Sphinx software, we would like to thank Professor Jean Moscarola at the University of Savoie.

A special thanks goes out to Lars Kindberg, data administrator at the Department of Psychology, Lund University, for always being there to help us with all kinds of computer/software problems.

We would also like to thank the participants in our survey, without you this would not have been possible.

Johan's girlfriend, Anna Kullman, has been a key resource to our paper regarding proofreading and knowledge in the English language. A big thank you from us both!

Finally we would like to thank family and friends, and anyone else, who have contributed to this paper/project and put up with us during the time we have been working with it.

Table of contents

Opening		6
	1.1 Project plan	6
	1.2 Formulation of problem, research hypothesis	9
	1.3 Goal	9
	1.4 Purpose	9
	1.5 About the authors	9
Theory		10
	2.1 Choice of theories, literature and articles	10
	2.2 Phenomenology	11
	2.3 Organizational Communication	12
	2.4 Organizational culture	13
	2.5 Connections between communication and organizational culture	15
	2.6 Attitudes, beliefs and implicit thoughts	15
	2.7 Problems with background theory	16
Method		17
	3.1 Qualitative research	17
	3.2 Participants	19
	3.3 Programs for construction and analysis	19
	3.4 Construction of survey/inquiry	20
	3.5 Pilot study	23
	3.6 Procedure - Internet survey	23
	3.7 Procedure – “Face to face survey”	24
	3.8 Problems with chosen method	24
Results		25
	4.1 Administrating data	26
	4.2 Projective test – free text	26
	4.3 Projective test – predetermined answer alternatives	26
	4.4 Questions about values	27
	4.5 Demographical questions	28
	4.6 Problems with the results	30

Analysis of Results	31	
5.1 Author's thoughts of analysis	31	
5.2 Use of programs for analysis	31	
5.3 Execution of analysis	32	
5.4 Modalities	33	
5.5 Entities	36	
5.6 Summary of analysis	43	
5.7 Problems with analysis	48	
Discussion	48	
6.1 Expected results	48	
6.2 Actual results	49	
6.3 Problems and questions	53	
6.4 Further research about the subject	54	
6.5 Summary	55	
References	58	
Appendix	60	
I	Internet Survey (Swedish)	60
II	Questions (English)	69
III	Example free text answer (English)	71
IV	Thoughts concerning the pictures (English)	72
V	Mail – Introduction (Swedish)	73
VI	Mail – Project plan (Swedish)	74
VII	Mail – Participation (Swedish)	76
VIII	Mail – Notice of participation (Swedish)	77

Opening

This paper is written as part of the examination at the level of bachelor at the Department of Psychology, Lund University. We as authors will dig deeper into a subject that we find interesting and we hope that our survey will result in interesting findings.

Within this section of our paper we will explain why we have chosen this special subject for our paper. We will also clarify our research hypothesis, goal and purpose to make it easier for the reader to keep up with our thoughts and reasoning. At the end of this section we will describe ourselves since we think our background is crucial for the analysis and the following results that we will present further on.

1.1 Project plan

Today new knowledge and ideas are important for companies of all sizes in their different action spheres. These are necessary factors to form new thoughts when developing competitive products etc., and in other ways improving the company's ability to become established, or to survive.

One possible way to improve the skill within the company is to form and develop ideas about products, production etc., with capable personnel and students at different universities. It might be even more important to come up with completely new and groundbreaking ideas instead of just exchanging ideas. The academic world may offer great potential in many different spheres and is possibly not always used in its full capacity of societal and economical interests. Do smaller companies miss out on valuable experience when they don't cooperate with the academic world? The concept of knowledge might be different in the two worlds and perhaps the corporate sphere finds that there is no knowledge at the university? Could it be that simple that the two different spheres, with their different organizations and cultures, do not communicate at all?

Both authors have experienced problems with getting interest from the corporate sphere when writing a paper/conducting a survey under university auspices. Often the problem is that the subjects don't suit the companies' interest, but most often it seems like a fear of what findings the work may result in. Here the reservation must be regarded from the companies considering the fact that almost all academic work becomes public documents, open for

everybody to read. But even with this regard in mind we find it quite peculiar that not more of the available recourses are taken advantage of.

Some of the companies in this study take part in more organized collaborations with the academic world and some do not. However they have all been involved in communication with the academic world concerning knowledge that in some way was meant to improve their strength as a company. Most of the companies in this study have collaborated with the academic world through UNIVA or krAft.

UNIVA is an institute which initiates and coordinates different commercial research projects in the economic and industrial sphere with people from the University of Lund. The institute started its work during the year of 2000 and is a stock company fully owned by the University of Lund, Sweden. The heart of the activity is the personnel from the University in Lund and their equipment and workspace. The UNIVA is able to undertake a large amount of various assignments, but up till now has mainly focused on work concerning product and product technical development, organizational- and business development and intervention judgment. The different assignments are varying in time between a few weeks up to a year. Some development programs can last for more than a year.

krAft or more correctly, krAft groups are 5-7 companies which participate in projects regarding internationalizing, market orientation, management, or other developing procedures. In the work to define the project the krAft group works with a project leader. The project leader comes from a university and his mission is to organize and lead the development program. To his disposal he has personnel and equipment from different universities.

The companies in this study which have not been in contact with UNIVA and krAft have also been collaborating with the academic world under similar conditions but not as frequently and most of the time with other Universities than Lund.

The companies in this study that participate in the collaboration with the academic world are what we call smaller organizations with less than 30 employees. They are all representatives of different organizational cultures in smaller companies. The concept “organizational

culture” is used to describe and explain which shared values that prevail within an organization/company.

Different organizational cultures are based on assumptions about customers, competitors and society, and can also be influenced by the background and personality of the company, organizational founder or leader (Smither, 1998). The organizational culture affects the way people communicate with each other and is therefore closely connected with and very important in all areas of collaboration. This is according to us as students very interesting and important in a situation where people from the academic world faces direct problems that need to be solved or investigated, compared to research which can take several years before anything is accomplished. This also includes the very basic needs of the academic world where people are communicating with the “normal society”, and their different organizational cultures, about different services and products.

Most companies which exchange experiences with the academic world are often larger companies with large and highly educated employee squads. Smaller companies, in particular in the industrial sphere are not known to have very many connections with the academic world and it would according to us be of much interest to see how they would experience collaboration with the academic world. By means of this we don't say that smaller companies should expand their collaboration with the academic world; simply that the opportunities exist. It would be very naive to think that every smaller company is identical in relation to the companies in this research. However we believe that the problem is worth studying.

An according to us appropriate way to see how individuals in companies experience their collaboration with the academic world is to have a phenomenological approach to the problem. Phenomenology emanates from Edmund Husserl's (1859-1938) thoughts. The fundamental thought in phenomenology is that the way a thing, an object, is made conscious, the way it's appearing, contains the major categorization of its meaning. This method helps us to not only to get a result but also to interpret the result in a realistic fashion. Normally a quantitative perspective is used for these types of research questions in psychology. One risk using this perspective is that you miss out on important aspects of the research objects' experience and this is to a broad extent avoided with a phenomenological perspective. This is why we find the phenomenological perspective most appropriate for our study. The aim of this paper is to study how the organizational cultures in smaller companies affect the employee's experience throughout exchanging information with the academic world. Analyze

has been made with a qualitative phenomenological approach developed by Roger Sages from the thoughts of Husserl, and by usage of the computer programs Minerva MCA (Johansson, 1997) and Sphinx Lexica.

1.2 Formulation of problem, research hypothesis

As we see it there is a problem with understanding and communication between the academic world and the corporate sphere. With this we mean for instance allowing students to write papers/conduct surveys, to let the companies understand the capability of the different faculties and academic collaboration organizations etc. Our project and research method will hopefully result in some interesting findings concerning “corporate people”, and maybe similarities between them, concerning their way of interpreting different situations. This might give us a clue about the complexity of the problem and why it exists. Seen in a long term this might result in a better understanding of the corporate sphere from an academic point of view and will increase and simplify the opportunities of collaboration.

1.3 Goal

The goal of our paper is to examine, and hopefully show, the apprehension that people in small private companies have of cooperation with the academic world. We have focused on communication connected to organizational culture and hope to find some unforeseen apprehensions accordingly to our research method.

1.4 Purpose

The main purpose of this paper is to get a deeper understanding of our subject, to show the connections and problems that our subject and survey holds, and hopefully stimulate further research and development within this sphere. With this we mean to see if there is a connection between organizational culture and organizational communication when it comes to communication and collaboration between the academic and corporate world. Our secondary purpose is to use phenomenology, which we are inexperienced in using, as a research approach and to see if this method can contribute to interesting findings and be a tool for further research within this sphere.

1.5 About the authors

Due to our choice of research method and the subject we are looking at we find it important to describe our background and ourselves. This is made so the reader better can understand our way of thinking and how we have conducted this report.

Johan Andersson is 28 years old and a student at Lund University. His major subjects are psychology, with direction towards work and organizational psychology, and media and communication studies, with direction towards organizational communication. Except being a full time student he also works as a bartender in Lund and has experience from different kinds of work; for instance as an operator at a heat exchanger factory, minor organizational consultant work at different companies in Lund, being responsible for computers and their accessories at three small companies and having served for 10 months in Bosnia-Herzegovina as a UN-soldier.

Nils Frisé is 31 years old and a student at the University of Lund. His major subject is psychology and he also has a great interest for organizational psychology. Along with psychology he studies economics. Before Nils started studying in Lund he lived for four years in Vienna, Austria, where he worked at Hennes & Mauritz doing construction work and interiors of shops.

Theory

In this section of the paper we will describe present and actual theories which are the foundation for our research and analysis. We will also pay attention to problems and advantages with the theory which we have selected for our research.

2.1 Choice of theories, literature and articles

In our research, before we conducted our study, we've tried to find relevant and current material concerning our subject. Due to our subject's nature, since both communication and organizational culture is rather interdisciplinary, we've been forced to look across boundaries between subjects; this includes sociology, anthropology, media and communication studies, business economics, management etc.

As a rather old philosophy with great usage within psychological research we find phenomenology very interesting and contributing. Though we find it fairly hard getting hold of written material that reflects our research, the phenomenological theory in its own holds a usage within a large spectrum of different subjects and their research. The usage of theories from different disciplines is much more pleasing when viewed in a phenomenological

perspective, using phenomenological theory as a foundation for research. One of the most important aspects is that a large part of our background material, literature etc. is looking at society and the evolvement from a large mass perspective, more like a sociological view, whereas phenomenology is aimed towards a differentiated view where every individual, situation and culture is unique in itself.

2.2 Phenomenology

Using phenomenology as a tool in research is rather different and thought creative. It can be resembled with an explorer on a journey, whose purpose is to find an up till now unexplored object or location. During the journey the greatest caution needs to be taken and one also needs to make sure that the journey reaches its goal in a satisfactory fashion. Phenomenology is very much the work of one man, the German/Czech mathematician and philosopher Edmund Husserl (1859-1938). What Husserl was fighting against was that reality should be interpreted in a subjective and estimated, quantitative fashion, as the prevailing psychological, hermeneutical and historical science did at the time and still does in many ways. The problem is that not everything is suited to be, or can be quantitatively measured, for example how people create meaning in their “life world” or how employees in smaller companies experience information from the academic world. Our experience of different phenomena is direct and intuitive. Life world is one of the key concepts within phenomenology.

Life world means that individuals experience and think about different phenomena and it is by studying the life world with humans that we can achieve this knowledge. Life world is also something that is taken for granted and unquestioned. Life world is also culturally bound which means that the life world in a European country, such as Sweden with its inhabitants, differs from the life world for the aboriginals in Australia (Karlsson, 1995).

In traditional academic psychology the researcher puts up hypotheses which originate from the researcher’s own perception of reality. The hypothesis, put in this way, consequently shows the researcher’s own understanding of the research in question. In phenomenology research the important part is instead the researcher’s ability to be conscious of his/her own preinterpretation of different phenomena and as far as possible try to avoid them. Husserl mentions this process as the application of the phenomenological *epoché* (Sander, 1999). The first process of the research is meant to give the author the ability to understand the

research object and the surrounding influencing phenomena. This understanding is then used as a tool, later in the research process. The starting-point for the phenomenology research process is by that quite different from the more traditional procedure (Gisladottir & Lindsten, 1997). The meaning we give to an object is nothing else than in what way this object gives us meaning in that very special moment it appears to us (Sages & Lundsten, 2004). The consequence is that the meaning and not the causality become fundamental for the explanation of the object. In research concerning the individual and other neighbouring concepts it is very important to see the individual as someone who both shapes and is being shaped by the situation as it exist. For example, how does the organizational culture in a smaller company affect the employees in interpreting information from the academic world? The individual cannot be understood independent from this. The situation is always specific and can only be interpreted to completion with regards to cultural, individual, material and ecological aspects in mind. All these aspects should be held in remembrance during the research process. From this point of view a phenomenological research design is very useful and helpful for us in this project. The construction of meaning intersubjectivity always proceeds with and within a life-world (Sages & Lundsten, 2004). This, in phenomenology, important concept elude to a description of the world in which a few individuals, for example the individuals in this research, live. In this world they participate in different activities that partly give them a preinterpretation of each other (Sages & Lundsten 2004). To be human also implies, unlike an object, that the human also has will, affects, thoughts, interests and feelings which are integrated parts of the human being. To be human implies furthermore that you exist in a social context. An individual might be a family member and might exist in a dependent relationship to others (Sages & Hensfeldt Dahl, 1999).As mentioned earlier the individual cannot be seen apart from the situation. This is why the ecological, cultural and other aspects are so important. If these aspects are not considered in research and in life in general it can lead to unwanted generalizations of different ideas (Sages & Lundsten, 2004).

2.3 Organizational Communication

For all of recorded history people have studied and discussed communication processes within their dominant organizations. In many respects, these discussions differ little from those present during the past three decades of institutional organizational communication study. They have been concerned with systematic manners by which communication practices can be used to help coordinate and control the activities of organizational members and relations with external constituencies. Our current situation is one of rapid social and

organizational change putting great pressure on researchers today to continue to develop useful concepts and studies to match the complex interactions characteristic of contemporary workplaces (Deetz, 2001).

One of many approaches to conceptualizing organizational communication focuses on communication as a phenomenon that exists in or between organizations. If such an object can be defined, then anyone who looks at or talks about that object is studying organizational communication. In this logic, any number of individuals from different academic units might study this phenomenon (Deetz, 2001).

Another approach to conceptualizing organizational communication is to think of communication as a way to describe and explain organizations. Communication theory can be used to explain the production of social structures, psychological states, member categories, knowledge, and so forth rather than being conceptualized as simply one phenomenon among these others in organizations (Deetz 2001).

Communication is one of the fundamental processes in each organization and works as the glue that holds the organization together. Without satisfying communication it is hard to imagine that other organizational processes such as decision-making, creation of cultures, creation of motivation or the attaining of organizational learning, will work properly (Jacobsen & Thorsvik, 2002).

2.4 Organizational culture

Alvesson argues that it is hard to define the concept of culture and he states that the term 'organizational culture' can, and has been, defined in many ways. He argues that culture is a very complicated concept as it is easily used to cover everything and accordingly misses a concise meaning. Often culture, verbally and in writing, only refers to different social patterns describing different phenomena at the surface, instead of searching for the meanings and ideas behind. Alvesson's view of organizational culture is something that goes on "between" the heads of a group of people in situations where symbols and meanings are openly expressed (Alvesson, 2002). The basic idea in cultural understanding of organizations is the support of more or less integrated patterns of ideas and representations that give some kind of stability and works as a starting point for coordination. These ideas and representations, which include hierarchic and other connections, the acceptance of goals, rules and different

frames for the organization – often lead to not questioning the existing conditions (Alvesson, 2001). However for an organization to function and survive it has to have limited ideas and representations. Alternate interpretations have to be ruled out or at least marginalized. It's partly this standardization of representations and values that culture deals with. The process of socializing within the organization and in society in general assorts digressive views on what's good or bad (Alvesson, 2001).

Schein, one of the founders of organizational psychology draws our attention to the content of an organization's culture and the importance the organization's basic assumptions about its surroundings, its value and its own manifestations has for its function. Schein defines organizational culture as a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration. This has worked well enough to be considered valid for the group and therefore it has been taught to new members as the correct way to perceive things and in the end they think and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 1992).

Schein has developed a model with the purpose to make it easier to better understand the concept of organizational culture. He uncovers three levels of culture in an organization and argues that in order to manage organizational culture we have to understand the deeper levels of the concept.

Figure: Levels of culture (Schein, 1999 p. 16)

Artifacts	Visible organizational structures and processes (hard to decipher)
Espoused values	Strategies, goals, philosophies (espoused justifications)
Basic underlying assumptions	Unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and feelings (ultimate source of values and action)

Schein means that the first level of culture consists of visible artifacts. They include symbols such as architecture, dress code, myths and stories. These artifacts are easy to observe but very hard to decipher. In other words, it's easy to see how people behave, but we cannot interpret why they behave like they do. If we try to deduce the deeper levels of culture solely on the basis of the artifacts, it's not likely that you get the right picture. The interpretations that you make will be greatly influenced by your own experiences and values (Schein, 1999).

The second level represents the organization's espoused values. They usually originate from and have been pronounced by the founder or leader and are then adhered to by the different members of the organization as they are joining and integrating in it. These values include for example mission, vision and goals. Sometimes inconsistencies can be found between an organization's espoused value and the artifacts. The reality can be that a deeper level of thought and perception controls the individual's explicit behaviour in the organization, and this brings us to the third level, the one of the basic underlying assumptions.

In order to fully understand the organization's culture this level has to be interpreted. The third level consists of the espoused values that proved successful to the organization and therefore have become taken for granted, or even subconscious. The basic underlying assumptions differ from the espoused values in that they are not just espoused by the organization's key leader or founder, but are the result of shared experience, "joint learning process" (Schein, 1999). It must be said that all levels in Schein's theory are interrelated, as each successive level reflects the previous one. A fair description would be that the basic underlying assumptions manifest themselves through the espoused values, which in turn, manifest themselves through artifacts.

2.5 Connections between communication and organizational culture

Studies have shown that cultural factors have great significance concerning how employees in organizations interpret information, events and activities and how they communicate with each other. A major aspect is that people communicate better with members of the same culture than with members of other cultures. The reasons are many, but most important is probably that people which are members of the same culture have greater confidence in each other since they share values, norms and basic outlook (Jacobsen & Thorsvik, 2002).

2.6 Attitudes, beliefs and implicit thoughts

Which are the most important driving forces behind shared values, norms and representations in an organization? Are these shared representations locally produced in work groups, do they originate from management, professional and line cultures, or are they imported from other societal units? These questions bring us on to another level where concepts like attitudes, beliefs but also implicit thoughts should not be left out. A simple definition of attitudes is likes or dislikes towards something. Perhaps an attitude regarding communication with the

academic world? Attitudes are a favourable or unfavourable evaluative reaction towards something or someone exhibited in ones beliefs, feelings, or intended behaviour (Briggs Myers & Myers, 1995). A more accurate description is; a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favourable or unfavourable manner with respect to a given object, e.g. things, people, places ideas, concepts, actions, situations (Fishbein & Azjen, 1980). These attitudes are formed by genetic and physiological factors, direct personnel experience, parental influence, group determinants, mass media etc. Likewise are attitudes formed or strengthened under these conditions in different organizations. Attitudes can be of a very aware and explicit nature but also harder to decipher and more implicit. It is sometimes hard to control and explain our physical and mental actions.

Cultural manifestations which according to actual theories include attitudes, beliefs and implicit thoughts are far from well formed, values are not easy to rank and cultural ideas can be unsystematic and disconnected. The dynamics and complexity of organizational life and the many cultural forces affecting the organization, forces the researcher to be aware of variation, inconsistency and fragmentation. This makes multiple interpretation and contradiction important aspects of organizational culture (Alvesson, 2002).

2.7 Problems with background theory

When first looking at organizational culture one might think that the subject could not be connected to phenomenology. This because the subject is all about generalizations of cultures from an organizational perspective. Much of the literature and articles, which deal with the subject emphasize that you should not look at the individual but you should look at a whole, a generalization. When you dig deeper into the concept of culture you can see the clarified connection to phenomenology by its direction towards the individual's emotions, thoughts etc. and that it is the individual who is present and shapes the culture. Organizational culture is a culture as any other and emanates from the same principles, assumptions and fundamental conditions. What can be considered as quite peculiar is that rather much of the literature and articles, which deals with organizational culture, somehow succeeds and/or wants to disregard the individual and goes directly to generalizations.

We as authors ask ourselves what lies behind this, since you have to examine individuals and their apprehensions to get the fact that you want to analyze. Is it so that most of the literature that deals with organizational culture is written by people with economical background and

thereby are directed towards rendering more effective control strategies? Can it be as simple as a tradition about organizations that sees a collective and not individuals and which thereby have influenced the subject? Maybe it's even simpler and is all about laziness, since it would take more time, is more expensive and much more difficult to investigate from an individual perspective. Most people strive to take short cuts, making things easier for themselves. This might be reflected in the way of conducting research where the researcher might be reluctant to look into too complex subjects or to use untried methods of research which in the end could result in a static condition concerning the subject of the research. This may be simpler and give some results but not the ground breaking findings which in the end can result in a paradigmatic shift.

The danger as a researcher is if you think that you have a good grasp of a subject, that it then becomes a routine. With the phenomenological approach one always tries to keep an open mind and see the problems for what they are from the individual's perspective and not from one's own experiences. Through this way of looking at phenomena, problems and research there's a greater possibility that you continuously evolve and learn new things, when in reality there is no individual like the other.

We as researchers think that a phenomenological perspective on organizational culture would give a more nuanced concept. However, we can't overcome the generalization when you want to give a comprehensive picture of a number of organized individuals.

Method

The method part of our paper will describe our survey and how we have conducted it. Included in this will also be a description of our participants and why they were chosen. To start with we will look into the background theory concerning qualitative research. This because the nature of our research is qualitative with a phenomenological approach. We will also describe our construction of the survey and how it was conducted.

3.1 Qualitative research

When conducting research with a phenomenological approach the goal is to describe the life world of the individuals and the horizons which are experienced by them. This is impossible to carry out from a positivistic approach because one is then focused on constructing and categorizing the world and not aimed at understanding the meaning in the life world (Karlsson, 1995).

Qualitative research is not looking for quantification. The questions to be answered are not “how much” or “how many”, but rather an understanding for the way people are living, the way they look at themselves and their relation to their surroundings. Isolating variables and trying to find connections between them that are valid for all individuals is not the focus. Instead we have to see the individual as a whole because the way people are living can't be fragmented, and it's not appropriate in any way to isolate a particular concept and try to measure it. What is searched for is an understanding of how the individual experiences his or her situation. Qualitative research has a focus on the way that people live, and this includes the meaning they put in connection with themselves and their situation. The thought is that this way of living is what decides different people's nature, and makes them the individuals they are. This meaning can't be examined only by observation, we also get knowledge about this meaning through interpretation of what is being observed (Hartman, 1998).

The qualitative research method has its origin in the hermeneutics. The hermeneutic theory expresses an understanding about an individual or a group of individuals by describing the representation these individuals have of themselves and their situation. A qualitative examination has by that a purpose to develop such a theory. We have to interpret human behavior, verbal and everything else, and through repeated interpretations and reinterpretations approach their subjective way of viewing the world (Hartman, 1998).

Qualitative methods involve a slight degree of formalization. The method's primary purpose is understanding. The focus is not on trying if the information has a general validity. Instead it becomes fundamental that the researcher through different ways of gathering information on one hand can get a deeper understanding of the problem complexity that we are studying, on the other hand that we can describe the totality of the connection this is contained in. The method's characteristic is its nearness to the source from which we gather our information (Holme & Solvang, 1997).

It is important to see the difference between hermeneutics and phenomenology. Hermeneutics and its philosophy see the human as “being-in-the world”. Here the theoretical ground is that all our consciousness is based on a precomprehension which is formed in an interpretation of what we know of something. Phenomenology is the theory about that which is present/appears/comes into consciousness. The bearing thought is that everything that is conscious is conscious about something, for instance that it's focused on an object. The

explanation form that is focused on understanding and explanation is often designated as hermeneutics. Today it's widely known that this expression denotes a more common theory of interpretation which holds various approaches of research such as phenomenology, pragmatism and post-modernism. Modern hermeneutics is to a very high degree inspired by phenomenology (Bengtsson & Grøn, 1997).

3.2 Participants

Through connections via the department of psychology we found a number of suitable participants that were somehow in collaboration with the krAft concept. We extended our number of participants via a connection with the UNIVA department of Lund University. Totally we had a list of 16 participants which we set ourselves in contact with.

Due to problems with getting our initial participants to answer our Internet survey we had to include 6 other participants. These participants were not active in UNIVA or krAft collaboration but had somehow collaborated with or had a connection with the academic world, but as we see it not under such arranged circumstances as UNIVA and krAft. These other participants were found through contacts with friends who in turn put us in contact with the new participants. These participants were not known to us in advance and fit our profile by being active in small companies that somehow collaborated with or had been collaborating with the academic world.

Why we had problems with getting participants to our survey is not entirely known to us. We found some indications why and drew some of our own conclusions. These will be described further on in the paper.

Totally we got six participants to answer our questionnaire.

3.3 Computer programs for construction and analysis

For the construction of our survey we used a computer program called Sphinx. Sphinx is an all-in-one program for the design, administration, processing and analysis of surveys. In Sphinx there is a module called Eureka which is used for the design of questionnaires. With this program there is also the option to "publish" the survey on the Internet, which is how we mainly conducted our survey. A part for textual analysis, called Lexica, is also a part of the Sphinx software and is used as a means of assistance in a rather large mass of text.

The other program used was Minerva - Meaning Construction Analysis. Minerva MCA is designed for the analysis of smaller quantities of text and is based on phenomenological background theory, which served our purpose well. The software and its usage will be explained further on in this paper.

Minerva MCA and Sphinx Lexica allow for any kind of text to be analyzed in a rigorous and controlled way. Although based on different background thoughts these software are converging and complement each other. By allowing also for statistical treatment of the results of the process analysis, they erase the now almost classical distinction between qualitative and quantitative measures. Sphinx expresses an evolution of quantitative methods towards a qualitative one, from positivism to constructivism. Minerva MCA comes directly from the phenomenological approach and it stresses the meaning in depth and subjective oriented understanding but it is also open to quantitative analyses. Sphinx Lexica is culturally independent, allowing for the unveiling of cultural preconceptions. Minerva MCA is lexically independent, allowing for the unveiling of intended meaning. Sphinx Lexica is very well fitted to explore large text quantities or to select key fragments from very large data sets. From the selection made in Sphinx one can use Minerva MCA to focus on the selected fragments and produce a new text quantity of partial intentions, the size of which need a new analysis in the Sphinx manner (Sages, Lundsten, Lahlou, Kurc, Moscraloa, 2002).

As a comparison between the two programs, for instance, when prospecting a large area for metal findings, Sphinx is used to view a larger area to see if there are any interesting findings. These findings are then investigated further with Minerva MCA to make a deeper and more specific analysis. As we see it these two programs don't compete with each other, but rather complement each other.

Both Minerva MCA and Sphinx Lexica are independent from theoretical and/or common sense preconceptions (Sages, Lundsten, Lahlou, Kurc, Moscraloa, 2002).

3.4 Construction of survey/inquiry

Using phenomenology as a research method was rather unknown to us before we conducted our survey. We tried to think about the background theory and the means of phenomenology in the construction process. The survey is found in Appendix I.

In the beginning we were looking at other Internet surveys that were constructed with Sphinx. We found inspiration looking at a survey made by Jean Moscarola, investigating implicit thoughts and attitudes towards foreigners. The survey was hosted on the Sphinx online webpage, www.sphinxonline.com, but is unfortunately not anymore.

The choice to use a projective test in our questionnaire was made because we hoped it would reveal some interesting findings concerning communication and organizational culture. We were mostly interested in finding out if there were any underlying thoughts that affected the answers. If we had based our survey on interviews, instead of the Internet questionnaire, it's possible that a projective test wouldn't have been the method chosen. In our questionnaire the participants got a little guidance so that they could type down their answers in a, for us and hopefully themselves, satisfying way. We disregarded the possibility that we could get the participants to type free text answers without any guidance. This because our initial list of participants was very limited and we were dependent on getting answers. As we saw it this was the only way to get material for our phenomenological analysis.

We staged two different situations which we photographed. These two situations were supposed to represent cooperation between the academic world and small companies, see Appendix I.

- First picture – a younger man instructs an older man about something by a computer. We've tried making a distinction between them by differences in clothing and positions, the older sitting down, the younger standing up pointing at the computer.
- Second picture – a man is showing information on a flip-chart for a number of people sitting down by a table. There is a distinction between the people in the picture by positions, one man standing up and the others sitting down.

One picture we got sent to us, this mostly because it was showing a larger group of people which we found hard to stage without looking unnatural. The picture still fulfilled our initial thought about representing cooperation between the academic world and small companies.

- Third picture – a man is about to show information/hold a speech at a larger gathering. We've tried to find a picture that made a distinction between the people in the picture by positions, one man standing up at a podium and the others sitting down.

In all our pictures we've tried to stage the situation, our choose pictures, so that one individual appears to be in a different position than the others. The man is also conducting some kind of activity that separates him from the other persons in the picture. This we thought would symbolize an individual from the academic world. We also staged the pictures in different constellations, number of participants and different locations. More information about our thoughts concerning the pictures is found in Appendix IV.

With the pictures followed an instruction to the participants to write down, in free text, a story about their apprehension, feelings and associations about the situation in the picture. If possible they were also supposed to write the story in period of past, present and future.

After these three situations were answered the pictures appeared again, now with fixed answers which were to be answered through checkboxes, see Appendix I and II. Our thought here was to find out whether there was a possibility to see similarities or not between the free text answers and the ones with fixed answers. Maybe this could contribute to our analysis in a way that might be interesting. This part of the questionnaire could also serve as a tool for controlling ourselves regarding the construction of our questionnaire. Maybe the questionnaire was too complicated, maybe the language was too difficult and so on.

This was followed by a number of questions, with fixed answers, which were supposed to examine an overall apprehension about communication, organizational culture and the companies' climate, see Appendix I and II. Here the idea was to examine how the participant thought about subjects important to our survey. We also hoped that this could contribute to our analysis.

The survey was concluded with some demographical questions about the participants and their company concerning age, gender, educational level, company size etc., see Appendix I and II. This we did mostly to see if differences in answers, in the different parts of the questionnaire, were to be connected with any demographical variables and might be an interesting factor in our analysis.

The questionnaire was constructed so that to continue, the questions on the actual webpage had to be answered. The function is called mandatory response. This also meant that the participants couldn't view the whole questionnaire before beginning to fill it in.

We made an evaluation of how much time would be needed to fill out our questionnaire and estimated that it would take between 10 to 45 minutes depending on how much was written on the questions which were based on free text.

3.5 Pilot study

In our initial pilot study we found out that it was rather hard for us to get satisfying answers to the questions which were answered with free text. By satisfying answers we mean that the length of the free text was too short to get substantial material for analysis. The participants also disregarded the instruction to answer in different time dimensions.

To solve these problems we constructed a sample of a staged situation with free text answer, see Appendix III. The picture was taken from a skiing sports event. The situation was chosen so that it had nothing to do with our subject and would hopefully not affect the answers to the rest of the questions.

After the questionnaire was modified, with the added example in the beginning, the answers were of satisfying length but still without answers in different time dimensions. We then chose to disregard that aspect of our questionnaire, mostly because of lack of time but also because we were unsure of how to tackle the problem.

3.6 Procedure - Internet survey

An initial contact was made with all the participants in concern through a telephone call. We informed them that we were conducting a study and asked if the person in question would like to participate, see Appendix V and VI.

First we tried our finalized questionnaire, like a second pilot testing, by sending a link via email to the two most distant companies in our list of suitable participants. This worked very well, we got satisfying answers and it was a good omen for the future of our study, see Appendix VII.

Thereafter we sent out an email with further information and a link to the webpage which hosted our survey. Accordingly to phenomenological theory we were very restrictive with actual information about the inquiry and how the results were supposed to be analyzed, this because we wanted to affect the results as little as possible, see Appendix VII.

Due to some known and some unknown circumstances we had a very hard time getting answers to our study. This resulted in us sending out a number of reminder emails which did not help at all. The replies given contained reasons such as inability to answer our questionnaire due to either technical problems or a failure to understand our questionnaire see Appendix VIII.

3.7 Procedure – “Face-to-face survey”

Due to problems with Internet connections, incompatibility with operating systems and web browsers we were forced to conduct one of our surveys directly with the participant.

The location for conducting our survey was chosen by the participant and was a separate coffee room. The survey was conducted by us showing the same questionnaire as a slideshow on a laptop, the instructions were spoken and we recorded the answers on a MiniDisc™.

3.8 Problems with chosen method

Constructing a survey is taught from the very beginning when studying behavioral sciences. However it's not the same when constructing a survey that is supposed to be viewed on the Internet. In our work new views have to be considered. One aspect is color, an ordinary questionnaire is almost always in black and white. Others are; placing of buttons for continuing on to the next page, disposition of questions, instructions, pictures etc. This must be more or less artistically correct and pleasing to the eye in a neutral way. All these factors in some way affect the participant's answers. It may be so that a questionnaire that is irritating to watch is much less pleasing for the participant to answer.

When it comes to conducting a face-to-face survey we could have chosen to use a “stand alone” variant of our Internet survey but chose not to regard time aspects, the peculiar role we would have taken on during the test and so on. With “stand alone” we mean that the questionnaire is functioning as a program that doesn't need Internet access and that the computer containing the program was brought to the participant. We discussed this minor

problem and decided that a slideshow with instructions would be more suitable and more familiar to the participant. The most important factor when conducting surveys in organizations/companies is that you as a researcher might be stealing valuable time from the participant. Therefore it is important to be concerned about being as efficient as possible.

We have chosen to disregard that the possibility of only using men in the “academic role” in all the pictures may be offending to some people. This has not been made purposely but only through convenience, by being two male students staging two of the pictures and by choosing a third picture that suited our questionnaire.

Of course there is a problem combining qualitative and quantitative methods when planning a survey, especially when conducting it with a phenomenological approach. Our main focus in the questionnaire is the free text answers. We chose not to view all the other data until we had made the textual analysis of the answers because we didn't want to be affected by the answers from the other parts of the questionnaire when we conducted the phenomenological analysis.

There is a problem concerning anonymity when using demographical variables. These variables can help the researcher identify the participant if he has facts about this person in advance or if he obtains the information afterwards. In our case we did not have any substantial background information about the participants. The exceptions are the two participants that we conducted a face-to-face survey with, where it was impossible for us not to get information and build ourselves an opinion about the participant. The only thing we knew about the other participants were name, email address and which company they worked for.

Results

In this part of our paper we will present the “raw material”. By this we mean the material from our survey before it was analyzed. We will also present how it was administrated. The free text will not be presented here because it takes up a great deal of space and there is a risk of repetition since we will show this in the next section of the paper. Instead of presenting the results for each participant, which is a more qualitative way, we have chosen to present the results for the whole group of participants. Mostly this is done for an easier overview, getting a grasp of our group of participants, but it is also done as measure of saving space.

4.1 Administrating data

The results of our internet survey were downloaded on a server in the Sphinx regime. By our own choice we made it impossible to identify the participants in the Internet survey, by choosing not to register the participants' IP-address. This was done for research ethical reasons and to make sure we were following Swedish law concerning administrating personal data, which often is disregarded. The account on the server which held our data was password protected and only we as researchers had access to it.

The face-to-face survey was impossible to make anonymous, but as soon as we input the data from the "interview" in the Sphinx program, which administrated all our data, the MiniDisc™ was erased.

4.2 Projective test – free text

The projective test, i.e. the three staged situations, with the free text answers gave us a rather good amount of text to analyze. The size of text varied from one small sentence up to five substantial sentences.

Getting the participants to write the story in different time dimensions didn't really work as we planned and this instruction was disregarded.

4.3 Projective test – predetermined answer alternatives

In this part we will present the answers to the projective test with predetermined answer alternatives, shown in answering frequencies. The questions are found in Appendix I & II.

Table 1:

Picture:Question	Answer 1	Answer 2	Answer 3
1:1	3	2	1
2:1		5	1
3:1	1	3	2

(Answer 1=yes, Answer 2=no, Answer 3=don't know)

The answers to all the different pictures show a tendency either to yes or no and there is no picture where an uncertain answer is in majority. In the second picture the participants fairly agreed to no, 5 "no" and 1 "don't know". The third picture has the greatest amount of uncertainty, 2 out of 6.

After the first question with predetermined answer alternatives the second question was that the participant should motivate, in free text, why he or she had answered the way they had on the previous question with predetermined answer alternatives. Here the free texts usually were one sentence that very simply explained the participant's answer, as seen in the two examples below.

"Looks like a meeting."

"The age difference is the reason for my previous answer."

Table 2:

Picture:Question	Answer 1	Answer 2	Answer 3	Answer 4
1:3	2			4
2:3			1	5
3:3	4	1		1

(Answer 1=businessmen, Answer 2=friends, Answer 3=fellow-student, Answer 4=employees)

In this question we also see a tendency towards a majority in one of the answering alternatives. In the first and second question it's "employees" and in the third "businessmen".

Table 3:

Picture:Question	Answer 1	Answer 2	Answer 3	Answer 4
1:4	2	2	2	
2:4	4	1		1
3:4	3	2		1

(Answer 1=having a meeting, Answer 2=having a seminar, Answer 3=having an run through with a salesman, Answer 4=having a break)

In this part of the questionnaire there is a little more uncertainty, which shows in the first question where the answers are equally distributed between answer alternatives 1, 2 and 3. The other two questions have a majority of the answers in the alternative "having a meeting".

4.4 Questions about values

Here we will present the answers, the actual answering frequency, of the part of our questionnaire which contained questions about values. The questions will be found in *Appendix I* and *II*.

Table 4:

Question	Answer 1	Answer 2	Answer 3	Answer 4
1				6
2			2	4
3			1	5
4			5	1
5			1	5
6		1	5	
7		1	3	2
8		1	4	1
9			4	2
10		1	3	2
11			3	3
12				6
13			2	4

(Answer 1=not important at all, Answer 2=not important, Answer 3=important, Answer 4=very important)

The questions which had the highest answering frequencies, 6, in one answer alternative were questions 1 and 12, which regarded “being able to communicate internally in a company” and “that employees are satisfied with their staying at the company” which both had the answer alternative “very important”. The second highest, 5, had the questions “develop internal communication” – “very important”, “develop external communication” – “important”, “collaboration with other companies” – “very important” and “collaboration with the academic world” – “important”, which also were the only questions which didn’t have any answers in the “very important” alternative.

14	2		3	1
15	2		2	2

(Answer 1=not good at all, Answer 2=not good, Answer 3=good, Answer 4=very good)

In question 14, “collaboration with your company and the academic world, only one answered “very good”, the others were “good” and “not good at all”. The answers on question 15, “the communication between your company and the academic world”, were more spread and equally divided among answer alternatives “not good at all”, “good” and “very good”.

4.5 Demographical questions

Here we will show the results from the demographical questions in our questionnaire. The results will be presented in numbers, which shows how many of our participants have chosen the specific answer. The questions are found in *Appendix I & II*.

Table 5: Gender

Male	Female
5	1

A majority of our participants in this survey are male. As we said before we have chosen not to have a gender perspective with our survey. This is mainly because the connections with different collaboration organizations and their contact persons were not chosen by us.

Table 6: Age

Years	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+
	1	3		2	

Most of the participants, three, are in the age category 30-39, only one is in the younger category while the rest are in the category 50-59.

Table 7: Education

Level	Grade school	High school	College	PhD
		1	5	

As seen in this table one participant has only finished high school. The rest of the participants, five out of six, have some kind of college education.

Table 8: Employees

Number	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	25-30	31+
	2		1			2	1

The numbers of employees in the participants’ companies differ quite a lot. The definition of a small business is not totally clear but we find that at least 5 out of 6 fit in this description, this because we do not know how many employees the company the one with the 31+ answer really has.

Table 9: Area of work

Occupation	Economy	Development	Manufacturing	Services	Other
		1	3	2	

A majority of our participants are involved in “manufacturing”, three, while the others are in “services”, two, and “development”, one. Here we found categories which fit our participant’s line of business, which is comforting, compared to if all had answered “other”.

Table 10: Employees educational level

Level	Grade school	High school	College	PhD
	2	3	1	

In this table we can see that only one of the participants' companies has employees that are mainly on a "college" level when it comes to education. The others have an employee level on "high school", three, which is the highest answering frequency and "grade school", two, which is the second highest.

Table 11: Participation with the academic world

Months	1-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36	37+
	3	2					1

The highest answering frequency is in participation "1-6" months, with three participants choosing this alternative. The other answers were "7-12" months, two participants chose this alternative, and "37+" months as only one participant chose.

4.6 Problems with the results

Our initial thought was that it would be easier, both for us and the participants, to use an Internet survey. The reason for this was the wide spread locations of the companies and the problem of getting paper questionnaires to be sent back to the researchers. The vision we had would show not to be true. Instead we had problems with everything from the participants' understanding of our project, which made them reluctant to answer our survey, to technical difficulties which had its origin in everything from unfamiliarity with computers to incompatible software.

As with all new technologies people put a big trust in these and glorify them and their potential. The real problem is that it takes time for these technologies to reach out to the larger mass of individuals and to become accepted and widely used. This problem is evident in our survey, that it's not yet fully accepted to use an Internet survey. The problems, as we see it, lie both in the participant's perception of the phenomena and in incompatible technologies, for example different software, operating systems, fire walls etc.

It is important as a researcher to be critical to the choice of method and how the survey is planned, constructed and conducted. We would like to shed light on the possibility that the problem with the survey and getting answers may not originate from the participants, instead

it might be our underlying thoughts, as researchers, and the construction of our survey that for us may seem understandable and correct, but for the participants seems awkward and hard to understand. We will try to interpret this at the discussion part of this paper and perhaps see where the main problem is found.

Analysis of results

This part of the paper will describe our method of analysis and present the results that the analysis gave us. We find it very important for the reader to understand our way of thinking and reasoning since it will, whether we want to or not, affect the results of our analysis because of the nature of our method. This is why we will start with describing our thoughts of the analysis process.

5.1 The authors' thoughts of analysis

We will initially show the results from the phenomenological analysis of the free text answers from the projective test of each of the participants. These results will be compared with the other results from our questionnaire to see if there are some interesting parts worth looking into further, which will be done in the discussion. Conclusively we will make a summary of our findings and see if there are some further interesting discoveries when comparing all the participants' results from the questionnaire. We have chosen to present it this way because we are initially interested in individual findings from all parts of our questionnaire and how they correspond with each other. As a bonus we will see if there are different groupings among participants, how they are distributed and what they can tell us.

The presentation of our analysis may seem odd since we begin with showing the most common results or categorize them at start when we are really supposed to look at each individual first. The analysis was conducted individual by individual and we didn't draw any conclusions or make any summaries until the whole process was finished. This form of presentation makes, as we see it, the focus on the individual more interesting.

5.2 Use of computer programs for phenomenological analysis

As described in the method part of this report we had two programs to use for the analysis of our results, Sphinx Lexica and Minerva MCA.

Minerva MCA was used as the main tool for our work of analysis. Minerva MCA is designed for analysis of smaller quantities of text and is based on phenomenological background theory.

Sphinx Lexica was used as a tool to help us find which expressions/words (entities) that were used the most by our participants as a group.

5.3 Execution of phenomenological analysis

The free text answers from the questionnaire were analyzed with the computer program Minerva MCA. The answers are first split up in *meaning units*, small different units of the text carrying separate meanings. The purpose is to gain information about the participant's life world in relation to the research object.

The next step in the analysis process is to characterise the meaning units using *modalities*. Modalities are based upon the way the participant expresses himself concerning the meaning units. The modalities, which are presented first in the results section, are intended to describe the participants' attitudes (*the complete noema*), and every modality is lined up in different categories, which will be further explained in the part called **Modalities**. Analyzing the modalities enables the researcher to discover the "self-evident thesis" and assumptions, which always are part of our experiencing. The modalities indicate the attitude of the individual in relation to the expressed meaning (Sages & Lundsten, 2004). Through this process, working with meaning units and modalities, the participant's experience in relation to the subject of research is obtained as well as how the participant experiences the topic's meaning structure (Sages 2003).

The second part of the results is presented with *entities* which can be described as the core of a sentence for example; "communication is very important". Communication is here the entity of this sentence. Entities are chosen from the questionnaire to get a good picture of the subject of research. Each part is a piece of how the participant experiences the life world in relation to the subject of research. This information about the participant's life world is created through a dividing of every partial intention. The partial intentions connected to each other are the original meaning units. The partial intention also contains an entity which in turn is characterized of the meaning units' remaining words, the *predicates*. The predicate expresses how the participant represents the entity. The entity is what exists for the participant, the

connection between these and the predicates is what shows and explains the participant's understanding of the research object. The modality perspective works as a context of how a person expresses his/her view of different objects and shows together with entities and *predicates* the total picture of a meaning structure –the noema- created by the participant (Sages 2003).

5.4 Modalities

Modalities express a degree of *belief*, i.e. how sure the participant is of his/her answer. The categories are doxa-affirmation (absolute certainty), probability, possibility, hesitation, and assumption. They can also express *function*, i.e. how the participant expresses himself about how he/she sees the situation. The categories are signitive, imaginative or perceptive. Every formed meaning is always an acceptance of one form or another of thesis (like certainty, probability, possibility or negation, according to the natural attitude), intending its contemplated object in one form or another of *function*. The modality *time* expresses the way the participant uses a time perspective in his/her answers (past, present, future, present→past, present→future, always/recurrent, empty). In the modality *affects* the intention is to try to see how the participant expresses him-/herself in a positive/negative way (positive-prospective, positive-retrospective, neutral, negative-prospective, negative-retrospective). With the use of the modality *will* the intention is try to see how the participant expresses engagement (engagement, wish-positive, wish-negative, aspiration, unengagement, none). The modality *property* expresses the belonging (my, your, his, her, its, our, their, others, not stated). As the last modality analyzed the modality *subject* expresses who is stating something (I, we, one-all, unspecified).

Comments to the modality “belief”

The most dominating category is *doxa-affirmation*. Participants 4 and 6 have very high percentages in this category. Participant 5 has high *doxa-affirmation* in picture one and two, but in picture three this participant differ from the others since the result shows high percentage in the category *probability*. The remaining participants all have rather high percentages in *doxa-affirmation*.

Comments to the modality “function”

The modality “function” does not differ in percentage between the participants. The predominant categories to this modality are *perception* and *signitive*. The only divergent result is from participant 4 who shows *perceptive-signitive* in all three pictures. The

percentage between the categories *perception*, *signitive* and *perceptive-signitive* does not differ notably.

Comments to the modality “time”

There was a problem with this modality in the questionnaire because the participants missed out on the aspect of time in their answers, which gave *present* the highest percentages. Only participants 3 and 6 expressed themselves in *present*→*future* and this was done in one sentence, where number 3 used it to all the pictures but number 6 only used it to two pictures. If the missing time perspective with the other participants is due to a lack of instruction from our side we don't know, and this will be discussed further on.

Comments to the modality “affect”

The category *neutral* is dominating in all pictures for all participants. The percentages in comparison do not show any notable differences between the participants in this category. What may be interesting is that participant 2 shows a higher percentage in the category *negative-prospective* compared to the other participants.

Comments to the modality “will”

Here the categories *engagement* and *none* are equally dominating. Participant 5 shows category *none* in picture one and three, but not in picture two, where *engagement* is the category. Participant 1 shows category *none* in picture two and three but not in picture one. Participant 3 shows *none* in all three pictures. The remaining participants 2, 4 and 6 all show *engagement*. What may be interesting here is that participant 6 shows very high percentage in comparison to participants 2 and 4. It should be said that participant 2 only answered one of the pictures.

Comments to the modality “property”

There is no dominating category in the answers in relation to the modality “property”. Participant 6 is the only one who shows category *his* in all three pictures, but the percentage does not differ in comparison to other categories.

Participant 1

The most dominating calculated modality in all three answers to the pictures is *affects* with category *neutral*. As we see it the participant has no direct emotions involved in the

description of the different situations, neither positive nor negative. In picture 3, **belief: doxa-affirmation** has a high percentage. Here the participant is very assured about what's going on in the situation which shows in how the answer is written, "Food and information combined...". Picture 2 shows a high percentage of **will: none**, compared to the other two pictures. This is seen in the answer where there is no indication of trying to describe the situation with a feeling insight, it is more like a rattle of objects "...some sort of consultant, working with information...".

Participant 2

Participant two has a high percentage in modality **belief: doxa-affirmation**, **function: perceptive** and **property: its**. The text is stating what the picture is showing, "The picture shows...". Compared to the other participants this participant also has a rather high percentage in **affect: negative-present**. This is seen in the text such as "simple tools" or "not a stimulating environment".

Due to reluctance to answering our questions to picture 2 and 3 in a satisfying way we could only analyze picture 1. The answers to picture 2 and 3 contained criticism to us, as researchers, and our pictures.

Participant 3

The most dominating modality in all three answers to the pictures is **affects: neutral**. This is seen in all of the participant's answers, stating nothing about emotions. Pictures 2 and 3 show a high percentage of the modality **function: perceptive-signitive**. This is reflected in the answers, how the participant first experiences the situation and then becomes certain about the situation, "maybe a lecture, it is a situation about learning anyway". Modality **will: none** shows high percentage in pictures 1 and 2. There is no sign of any engagement in the answers. This participant was one out of two who expressed themselves with the modality **time: present→future**. This was done in all the pictures, "in the future...", "further on..." and "the future holds...".

Participant 4

Here the answers to all three pictures show a high percentage of modality **belief: doxa-affirmation**. The answers are written with great confidence about the situation which also is shown by high percentages in the modality **will: engagement**. This is also one of the two participants who uses "I" in sentences, for instance "When I first look at the picture...", which makes *doxa affirmation*, in the modality **belief** even more profound. Modalities

function: *perceptive-signitive* and **affects**: *neutral*, also show high percentage in all three pictures. For instance “*The company has chosen to have...*” and “*Here a couple of...*”.

Participant 5

Participant five shows high percentage in the modality **property**: *his*, in picture 1 but not in the other pictures which show high percentages in **property**: *not stated*. For instance “*older man sitting by the screen...*”. Modality **affects**: *neutral* is dominating in all three pictures. **Belief** with category *doxa-affirmation* is high in picture 1 and 2, but **belief**: *probability* dominates in picture 3. An example of picture 3 is “*probably in connection with...*”.

Participant 6

In the answers to all pictures modality **belief**: *doxa-affirmation* shows high percentage. **Affects**: *neutral* shows high percentage in all three pictures and modality **will**: *engagement* is also high in all pictures. This shines through mainly by engaged description of the situations, “*the group of teachers which you see...*”. Modality **function**: *signitive* is high in picture 1 and 2 but not in picture 3. This is seen in the participant’s answers, where he/she is certain in the first two but more uncertain in the third. This participant was the second one who expressed himself with the modality **time**: *present→future*. This was done in the answers to two of the pictures, 1 and 2, and an example of this is “*in the future I*”. As seen in the previous example this participant was also the second of the two who used “*I*” in a sentence.

5.5 Entities

First we will present the four most common entities with all our participants. These entities were found using Sphinx Lexica as a tool for analysis. They were thereafter further analyzed by Minerva MCA. Further on we will continue our analysis with looking into each individual.

The most frequently used entity is “*the picture*”. The entity is mostly used as a way of describing the situation, what happens in the picture. Often the entity “*picture*” replaces the supposed entity “*the situation*”. By this we mean that instead of answering “*the situation shows*” the participants tend to answer “*the picture shows*”. Below follows an example of a sentence that uses the entity “*picture*”.

“*The older man in the picture hasn’t had a computer...*”.

An explanation of this could be that the questionnaire contains three pictures showing different situations and the participant is looking more to the picture than to the situation itself. Another explanation might be our instructions and example, see *Appendix I and III*, which may or may not have affected the answers.

The second most used entity is “*he*”. This entity is mostly referring to the person that was described previously in the answer. The entity “*he*” can also be seen as a replacement for another entity that more closely would describe the person in question. Below follows an example of a sentence that uses the entity “*he*”.

“He got tired of this and has ...”.

All of our pictures show situations where one male stands out from all the other people present in the situation. This was made with intention and has most surely affected the answers.

The third most used entity is “*old*”. This entity is often used to categorize/differentiate the people in the picture. In a way this seems like the preferred way, of all our participants, to refer to the people in the different situations, by using terms of age. Below follows an example of a sentence that uses the entity “*old*”.

“Older man that sits by the screen”.

We find it peculiar that there is a fixation about age in the different answers regarding the three different situations. Maybe it has got do with our pictures and that the age difference between the people in the pictures is too big.

The fourth most used entity is “*young*”. This entity is used in the same way as the entity “*older*” Below follows an example of a sentence that uses the entity “*young*”.

“The younger person is obviously telling him something”.

Here too is a fixation about age in the same way as in the *entity “older”*.

When presenting the different participants and their important entities we have chosen these with concern to what we think is important for our study. The most important entity is presented with their modalities, with an explanation of in what context they were found. Other important entities are also presented, as well as the context in which they were found. The four most common entities, which we presented above, will also be presented if they are connected to other important entities.

The results from the projective test with predetermined answer alternatives, which work as a sort of re-test of the participants' answers, will contribute to our analysis with us trying to make it even more profound by comparing these to the free text answers. With re-test we mean that we will look into if the free text answers correspond with those with predetermined answer alternatives, including the ones where the participants were supposed to motivate their answer.

Participant 1

Picture 1- entity “*work assignment*”. **Modalities;** *doxa-affirmation, perceptive, present, neutral, none and its*. This entity is used, combined with “*younger*”, “*older*” and “*the picture*”, when the participant describes what’s happening in the picture. Other important entities are “*company*”, which is used in a context describing something that has been started, and “*interest*”, which is used in a context describing something that someone has in common.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture belong to the same organization, the motivation is similar to the free text answer. The other answer was that the participant thinks they are businessmen.

Picture 2 –entity “*informing*”. **Modalities;** *doxa-affirmation, perceptive, present, neutral, none and not stated*. This entity is used, combined with “*older*”, when the participant describes whom the information is for and “*he*”, who is giving the information. Other important entities are “*consultant*”, used in a context describing a person in the picture, and “*self-employed person*”, used in a context describing the same person.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don’t belong to the same organization, the motivation is similar to the free text answer. The other answers were that they are fellow students and that they are having a meeting.

Picture 3 –entity “*information*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, perceptive, present, neutral, none and not stated*. The entity is used when describing the activity in the situation. Other entities are “*owners of small businesses*”, which is used two times in contexts describing why the situation appears as it does, and “*tasks*”, which is also used in a context describing why the situation appears as it does.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don’t belong to the same organization, the motivation is quite similar to the free text answer. The other answers were that they are businessmen and that they are having a meeting.

Participant 2

Picture1 –entity “*business*”. **Modalities**; *probability, perceptive, present, neutral, none and its*. The entity is used, combined with “*the picture*”, to describe what’s in the picture, not what’s happening or what persons there are. Another entity is “*environment*” which is used in a context describing the situation combined with “*not*” and “*stimulating*”, making the answer negative.

In our re-test the participant is uncertain if the people in the picture belong to the same organization, the motivation is “*don’t know*” which corresponds fairly well with the free text answer. The other answers were that they are employees and that they are having a seminar.

The other texts were not possible to analyze because they didn’t contain material about the pictures, but questions and criticism to us and our questionnaire.

Participant 3

Picture 1 - entity “*problem*”. **Modalities**; *possibility, signitive, future, positive-retrospective, engagement and his*. The entity is used, combined with “*older*”, to describe the nature of the activity in the situation. Other entities are “*educated*”, which is used in a context describing one of the persons in the situation, and “*instructions*”, which is used in a context describing the activity in the situation. In this picture this participant describes the person standing up as “*the guy in the brown shirt*”. Here the entity “*guy*” can be seen as rather similar to the entity “*young*” but the “*age entity*” in this text is combined with “*brown*” and “*shirt*”. This is not found in any of the other participants’ answers.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture belong to the same organization, the motivation is similar to the free text answer. The other answer was that they are businessmen.

Picture 2 – entity “*academic education*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, perceptive, present, neutral, none and not stated*. The entity is used combined with “*fellow*”, which can be seen as a synonym to younger man, when describing a person in the situation. Other entities are “*consultant’s work*”, which is used in a context describing the activity in the situation, and “*educational situation*”, which is used with certainty in a context describing the activity in the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don’t belong to the same organization, the motivation is similar to the free text answer. The other answers were that they are employees and that they are having a meeting.

Picture 3- entity “*consultant’s work*”. **Modalities**; *possibility, perceptive, present, neutral, engagement and not stated*. The entity is used when the participant is describing an alternative activity going on in the situation. Other entities are “*informing*”, which is used in a context describing the main activity in the picture, and “*well educated*”, which is used when describing a person in the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture belong to the same organization, the motivation is quite similar to the free text answer if the uncertainty in the free text answer describing an alternative activity is disregarded. The other answers were that they are businessmen and that they are having a meeting.

Participant 4

Picture 1 – entity “*company*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, signitive, present, neutral, none and not stated*. The entity is used, combined with “*the picture*”, describing the first impression of the picture. Other entities are “*computer problem*”, which is used in a context describing the activity in the situation, and “*disadvantage*”, which is used in a context combined with “*older*”, “*man*” and “*younger*”, describing “*the older man’s*” feelings.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture belong to the same organization. The participant's motivation, which differs from the free text answer, describes the closeness of people as the reason for his answer. The other answers were that they are employees and that they are having a meeting.

Picture 2 – entity “*commitment*”. **Modalities**; *probability, signitive, present→future, neutral, engagement and not stated*. The entity is used, combined with “*young*” describing a person in the situation. Other entities are “*go-ahead spirit*”, which is used in a context combined with “*young*” describing a person in the situation, and “*listening*”, which is used in a context combined with “*women*” describing the activity in the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don't belong to the same organization. The participant's motivation, which differs from the free text answer, describes the age difference and the dress code as the reason for his answer. The other answers were that they are employees and that they are having a seminar.

Picture 3 – entity “*owner of small business*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, perceptive-signitive, past, neutral, engagement and their*. The entity is used describing the initiation of the activity in the situation. Other entities are “*knowledge*”, which is used in a context combined with “*share*” to describe the activity in the situation, and “*solutions*”, which is used in a context describing the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don't belong to the same organization, the motivation is similar to the free text answer. The other answers were that they are businessmen and that they are having a seminar.

Participant 5

Picture 1 – entity “*speaks*”. **Modalities**; *probability, perceptive-signitive, present, neutral, engagement and his*. The entity is used, combined with “*younger*” describing what one of the persons in the situation is doing. Another entity is “*instruct*” which is used in a context combined with “*younger*” and “*older*” describing the activity in the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don't belong to the same organization. The participant's motivation, which differs from the free text answer,

describes the place of activity as the reason for his answer. The other answer was that they are employees.

Picture 2 – entity “*presentation*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, signitive, present, neutral, none* and *not stated*. The entity is used describing the activity going on in the situation. Another entity is “*easy thing*” which in a context combined with “*being busy*” describes the activity in the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture belong to the same organization. The participant’s motivation, which differs from the free text answer, describes the “*flip-chart*” in picture as the reason for his answer. The other answers are that they are employees and that they are having a meeting.

Picture 3 – entity “*information*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, signitive, present, neutral, none* and *not stated*. The entity is used describing the situation as it is. Other entities are “*results*” and “*speech*” which both combined in a context is describing the activity in the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture belong to the same organization, the motivation is similar to the free text answer with a reservation that “*it’s hard to know*”. The other answers were that they are businessmen and that they are having a meeting.

Participant 6

Picture 1 – entity “*ideas*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, signitive, present→future, neutral, engagement* and *their*. The entity is combined with “*old*” and used to describe the future of the situation. Other entities are “*knowledge*”, which in a context combined with “*older*”, “*picture*“, “*man*” and “*young*” describes the activity in the situation, and “*prejudice*”, which in a context combined with “*older*” and “*man*” describes the future of the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don’t belong to the same organization, the motivation is opposite to the free text answer. The other answers were that they are employees and that they are having a meeting.

Picture 2 – entity “*communication*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, signitive, present, neutral, engagement and their*. The entity is used, combined with “*the picture*”, to describe the nature of the activity in the picture. Other entities are “*education*”, which in a context combined with “*he*” describes a person in the situation, and “*difficulties*”, which in a context combined with “*education*”, “*communication*” and “*women*” describes the people in the situation.

In our re-test the participant has answered that the people in the picture don’t belong to the same organization, the motivation is quite similar to the free text answer. The other answers were that they are employees and that they are having a meeting.

Picture 3 – entity “*meeting*”. **Modalities**; *doxa-affirmation, perceptive-signitive, present, neutral, engagement and not stated*. The entity is used describing the activity in the situation. Other entities are “*ideas*”, which in a context combined with “*man*” and “*groundbreaking*”, describes a person in the situation.

In our re-test the participant is uncertain if the people in the picture belong to the same organization. The participant’s motivation, which differs from the free text answer, describes the age association as the reason for his answer, with a reservation that it is hard to associate to the picture. The other answers were that they are employees and that they are having a meeting.

5.6 Summary of analysis

In this part we will make a rather brief summary of the phenomenological analysis of each participant and see if we can connect these results with the other answers. By this we mean the answers from our questionnaire that were not in free text form from the projective test.

Participant 1 - This participant is female, age 20-29. She has a college education, and works in a company active within industry/manufacturing which has 26-30 employees mostly on a grade school level of education. The company has collaborated with the academic world during 7-12 months. This participant is one out of three that has collaborated with UNIVA or krAft.

This participant shows no direct emotions, neither positive nor negative, when describing the situation in all three pictures. Interesting is that the participant is very assured about what’s

going on in picture 3, “*information*”, and that this is combined with three of our most occurring entities. This is also confirmed by the results from our re-test. In picture 2 the use of the entity “*informing*” plays a central role which is confirmed by our re-test. In our questions about values she thinks that being able to communicate both internally and externally is very important, as well as to develop the communication internally. That the employees get on well in the company and that the company makes a profit is also very important to her. The participant does not believe that mediating the organizational culture that exists in the company, or that the personnel have a high level of education is important.

Participant 2 - This participant is male, age 50-59. He has a college education, and works in a company active within industry/manufacturing which has 31+ employees mostly on a high school level of education. The company has collaborated with the academic world during 37+ months. This participant is one out of three that has collaborated with UNIVA or krAft.

This participant is in his answers rather assured about what’s going on, what he is experiencing in the different situations, which is seen in the high results in the modalities *belief: doxa-affirmation* and *function: perceptive*. He also shows a rather negative attitude towards the situation, compared to the other participants, which is seen in the important entities we found in his answer. The re-test shows that the participant expresses no comprehension about the people in the picture. As said before we could only analyze the answer to the first picture, the others contained negative criticism against us. In the questions about values this participant has answered “very important” to all except the question concerning “cooperation with the academic world” where the answer was “important”. An overall impression of this participant is that the negative attitude towards our survey/questionnaire more or less shines through in all the answers.

Participant 3 - This participant is a man in the age group 30-39. He has a college education, and works in a company active within technology/development which has 26-30 employees mostly on a college level of education. The company has collaborated with the academic world during 7-12 months. This participant is one out of three that has not collaborated with UNIVA or krAft.

This participant shows no sign of positive or negative thoughts when answering the projective test, shown by the modality *affects: neutral* scoring is high in all three answers. The modality

function shows a high percentage in *perceptive-signitive* in pictures 2 and 3, stating an initial uncertainty which then becomes certain in the description of the situations. The most interesting entities in all the different answers are often about education or something similar. This participant was the only one who used the description of clothes as a way of differentiating the participants, and this was done in the answer to the first picture. The re-test shows a confirmation of the free text answer, they are all quite similar. This participant was the only one using the time aspect in all his answers, describing what happens in the future in the different situations. In the answers to the questions about values this participant doesn't think that charting the organizational culture is important. That the employees have a high level of education and that they are educated further is however important to this participant.

Participant 4 - This participant is a man in the age group 30-39. He has a college education, and works in a company active within restaurant/services which has 11-15 employees mostly on a high school level of education. The company has collaborated with the academic world during 1-6 months. This participant is one out of three that has not collaborated with UNIVA or krAft.

This participant is rather assured about what's going on in the different situations and is so with feeling insight, shown by a high percentage of the modality *belief: doxa-affirmation* and the modality *will: engagement*. The most interesting entities used by this participant are often meaning units loaded with subjective judgments, such as “*disadvantage*”, “*commitment*” and “*go-ahead spirit*”. The use of the entity “*I*” also shows an engagement in this participant. Confirmation is made by the re-test through similarity in answers and the use of feeling insights in the motivations. In the questions about values this participant only uses “important” and “very important” and has a rather even distribution across the answers.

Participant 5 - This participant is male, age 50-59. He has a college education, and works in a company active within industry/manufacturing which has 1-5 employees mostly on a grade school level of education. The company has collaborated with the academic world during 1-6 months. This participant is one out of three that has collaborated with UNIVA or krAft.

This participant expresses a rather high degree of certainty in the first two pictures, modality *belief* with category *doxa-affirmation* is high, but he is unsure when it comes to the third picture, modality *belief: probability* is dominating. The most interesting entities show a

concern about a teaching situation/discourse, with the use of for instance “*instruct*”, “*presentation*”, “*speaks*”, “*information*” and “*speech*”. The re-test shows a difference in answers, the motivation stating something that has not been mentioned in the free text answers or an uncertainty about the situation. In the questions about values this participant only uses “important” and “very important” as answers with predominance to “very important”, for eight out of thirteen questions. When considering this participant’s use of entities it is interesting that he has answered “very important” to the questions about the employee’s level of education and their further education.

This participant is the only one who took the questionnaire as a face-to-face survey. The answers from this participant are rather simple and brief compared to the other participants’ answers. Other distinctions could not be made when comparing the answers.

Participant 6 - This participant is a man in the age group 30-39. He has a high school education, and works in a company active within restaurant/services which has 1-5 employees mostly on a high school level of education. The company has collaborated with the academic world during 1-6 months. This participant is one out of three that has not collaborated with UNIVA or krAft.

This participant is rather assured about what’s going on in the different situations and does it with engagement, which is shown by a high percentage of the modality *belief: doxa-affirmation* and the modality *will: engagement*. The answer to the third picture states an uncertainty of what’s going on, and this was the only answer from the participant which was not expressed in different time aspects. The most interesting entities concern the concept of knowledge, for instance “*ideas*”, “*knowledge*”, “*education*”, “*difficulties*” and “*groundbreaking*”. The re-test differs more or less in all the answers, where a picture 1 stand out since the motivation is the opposite of the free text answer. In the questions about values, “important” and “very important” is in majority. The participant finds that cooperation with the academic world is “not important”. This participant has also answered “very important” to the questions about the employees’ level of education and their further education.

Summary of participants

Comparing the different participants from the two types of collaborations they have had engaged in with the academic world, there are no great differences. The little difference there

is lies mostly in the way the participants are expressing themselves, with the ones who have not been engaged in the arranged collaboration having more a certain and engaged way of expressing their answers.

The only difference in modalities, when comparing participants active in different lines of business, which we could discover is that the two participants active in services, show a higher degree in the modality *will: engagement*. Their answers contain more liveliness with an assurance which is confirmed by high percentages in the modality *belief: doxa-affirmation*.

The four most common *entities* in our study occur somewhere in every participant's free text, but not in the same places or in the same answers. We can see that a fixation about age differences in the pictures is spread among our participants. This can't be related to any of the results from our questionnaire, where the participants belonging to an age group might be the one most likely to affect the results.

Two of the participants who have not been involved with the academic world under the same arranged circumstances, such as UNIVA and krAft, are very negative in their answers to the questions which concern collaboration and communication with the academic world. All the other participants have answered "good" or "very good" to these two questions.

We believe that the entity "*picture*" has made the answers impersonal and maybe replaced the entity "*I*". The entity "*I*" is only used by two participants in our study. It occurs two times in participant 4's answer, in two sentences answering the first picture. Participant 6 uses "*I*" one time, in the answer to the second picture.

The entities that we thought would be important and often occurring didn't show as much as we had thought. These were "*information*", "*education*", "*academic education*", "*colleague*", "*knowledge*" etc. These entities do occur, but not very many times and we've tried to show them with the different participants in their different free text answers.

The entities which we found important to our study are almost always in a situation where the modality *belief* is *doxa-affirmation*. This we think shows that there is a certainty of the activity in the situation, that the participant experiences what's going on.

5.7 Problems of analysis

Our survey was conducted only in Sweden which made it natural to choose Swedish as the language for our survey. There is always a risk that parts of a text is distorted or lost during the translation process. This is more or less a fact considering the saying that a book, poem, novel etc. is best experienced in the original language. We have regarded this fact in our process, and therefore the analysis was done in Swedish and the results were translated into English.

An initial look at the main program for our analysis, Minerva MCA, gives a confused and bothered impression. The program's simplicity fools the researcher initially but fast enough he/she will find its underlying complexity that is based on phenomenological theory. Being rather good at the grammar of the language that the texts for the analysis is written in is a presumption for doing a satisfying analysis.

Discussion

In this part of our paper we will look into the results of our analysis, compare them to expected results and from there try to draw some conclusions from our research project. We will also discuss further research and development of the subject of our paper.

6.1 Expected results

When using phenomenology as method of research it is important not to disregard that the researcher has a state of mind which gives an expectation of the results.

To have a plan for the research, which means finding an interesting subject, preparations, making initial contacts etc., also gives the researcher preconceived ideas about the findings and the project as a whole. This is a contradiction to the phenomenological theory, where the researcher always should keep an open mind, but as long as one is aware of these facts and consider them along the way with the work of the study the risk that it will affect the analysis of the results is minimized. Therefore we think it's important to show what results we initially expected. We have chosen to show this as a list where we rank the different factors which we thought would affect the answers. Number 1 is the one which we thought would affect the most:

1. Initially we thought we would see differences between participants active within different lines of business.

2. We also thought that level of education of the participants would somehow affect the answers.
3. The form in which the questionnaire was taken, internet or face to face, might affect the answers.
4. How collaboration with the academic world and the participant had been conducted could also be a contributing factor to the answers.
5. Even though we do not have a gender perspective in our survey we thought that the gender of the person who answered our questionnaire might affect the answers.
6. Age might also play a role in the way of answering our questionnaire.

The way our pictures were staged we hoped would stimulate the participants to write answers which were related to our research project. The thought that our instructions for the projective test were too narrow and specific crossed our minds. We chose to keep them the way they were to guide the participant into interesting subjects and to simplify the answering process.

We hoped that the free text answers would contain information/phrases/words which were closely connected to our sphere of interest and that the dissipation would be kept to a minimum.

6.2 Actual results

Three out of four of the most common entities in our analyses are used to describe the participants in the different situations. These entities are “*he*”, “*old*” and “*young*”. The entity “*he*” does not raise any direct questions or uncertainties. Considering how we staged our situations this seems like a natural denomination and it’s no surprise that it’s occurring as often as it does. Only participant 3 describes the persons’ clothes and this is done in the free text answer to the first picture. It seems like it has been easier for the participants to use the age differences or gender to distinguish between the people in the pictures. When it comes to the entities “*old*” and “*young*” we were at first rather surprised that they occurred as often as they did. All participants have used them, some in all answers, some not. An explanation for this might be that the participants have preconceived thoughts about age differences rooted in the organizational culture of their company. One problem here lies in that we have not conducted our research in the academic sphere and that we therefore do not know how participants from this arena would have described the situations. It might be that the society in general has a fixation about age differences and that this is accepted in different

organizational cultures. Schein describes organizational culture as a pattern of shared basic assumptions. These basic underlying assumptions differ from for instance strategies, goals and philosophies and are the result of shared experience (1999). We as researchers think it's rather hard to tell whether the way a participant expresses him-/herself originates from society in general and its culture or if it originates from the organization where the participant has his/her place of work. There is a rather great possibility that this problem can't be divided into just these two spheres of culture, but that the problem is far more complex, with many different cultures which interact. In our answers we didn't find out whether the participants thought the age differences were good or bad, just that they were there. Maybe the most likely explanation to the frequent use of the entities, "*old*" and "*young*", is that our pictures have too great of an age difference between the people in the different situations and that this catches the participants' eyes independent of cultural affiliation.

When it comes to the entity "*the picture*", which is the entity that was the most common in the answers, it came as a surprise to us that it occurred as often as it did. In the analysis process it became obvious that it might not be that peculiar after all. In our instructions and example of a free text answer we as manufacturers have used the word "*picture*" on different occasions. We seem to, with this action, have guided the participants into a specific way of expressing themselves in the answers. It's important to be aware of phenomenological theory, as Sages & Lundsten says, in research concerning the individual and other neighbouring concepts. It is very important to see the individual as someone who both shapes and is being shaped by the situation as it exists (2004). For us as researchers it seems like this entity, "*the picture*", has replaced the supposed entity "*the situation*". The entity "*I*", which is very seldom used in the answers, may also have been replaced by "*the picture*".

There are interesting analysis results concerning our subject of research, but they are rather widely spread in different entities used by different participants. The modalities for these words often had the category doxa-affirmation, and rather often the category engagement.

There is a rather large focus on educational situations, when we look into interesting entities. This is most prominent in participant 3's answers, but is more or less occurring in all participants' answers. Participant 3 verifies this by answering "very important" to the questions about values concerning education. This is also shown by participant 5 who often expresses himself about a teaching situation/discourse. Jacobsen & Thorsvik argues that

cultural factors have great significance concerning how employees in organizations interpret information, events and activities and how they communicate with each other. A major aspect is that people communicate better with members of the same culture than with members of other cultures (2002). The reasons are many, but most important is probably that people who are members of the same culture have greater confidence in each other since they share values, norms and basic outlook. This might be an explanation why an educational situation is the first one that comes to the participants' minds when what they see in the pictures is collaboration and/or communication between people who don't seem to be members of the same culture.

Entities concerning the concept of communication are also rather common and often used describing a teaching situation/discourse by many participants, where the most common entities are "*information*" and "*informing*". An approach to conceptualizing organizational communication, is to think of communication as a way to describe and explain organizations where communication theory can be used to explain the production of social structures, psychological states, member categories, knowledge, and so forth (Schein, 1992). In this context, information connected to some kind of teaching situation seems to be an important factor for the participants. This might be showing a wish for more knowledge/education, for the participant himself or the coworkers. It might also be that the participants' awareness regarding communication is that they know, conscious or unconscious, that this is one of the fundamental processes in each organization and works as the glue that holds the organization together. Without satisfying communication it is hard to imagine that other organizational processes such as decision-making, creation of cultures, creation of motivation or the attaining of organizational learning, will work properly (Jacobsen & Thorsvik, 2002).

When it comes to the concept of knowledge this is also occurring more in the answers than we thought it would, maybe showing that knowledge is not same in the two spheres or that it is. Particularly participant 6 has interesting entities concerning the concept of knowledge and the use of the entity "*groundbreaking*" which may show the participant's will to believe that the academic sphere can contribute with something to the corporate sphere. Concerning attitudes they can be described as a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favourable or unfavourable manner with respect to a given object, e.g. things, people, places ideas, concepts, actions or situations which are formed by for instance physiological factors, direct personnel experience, parental influence, group determinants and mass media (Fishbein

& Azjen, 1980). This might be a factor which affects participant 6 as he is the only one who doesn't have a college education and that he in some way would like to have one or that he has respect/admiration for those who have a higher education.

Participant 2, who only gave us one satisfying free text answer, expressed himself rather negative according to the modalities. This is quite interesting since it reflects a state of mind in the first answer, which thereafter is verified in the rest of his answers that only contained criticism to us, as researchers, and our pictures. Maybe this is rooted in his company's culture which gives the employee preconceived ideas about how other businessmen are conducting their business just by looking at their office? Artifacts, offices etc. might affect the answer. Alvesson describes that the process of socializing within the organization and in society in general assorts digressive views on what's good or bad (2002). We as researchers feel rather satisfied when what we described above seems to show that this research method works.

Two participants, 3 and 6, distinguished themselves from the others by having answers with more feeling insight, which also is shown in the modalities. Interesting here is that both the participants are active in the same line of business, services. Deetz says that communication theory can be used to explain the production of social structures, psychological states, member categories, knowledge, and so forth rather than being conceptualized as simply one phenomenon among these others in organizations (2001). This also includes attitudes where Briggs Myers & Myers says that a simple definition of attitudes is the likes or dislikes towards something. Attitudes are a favourable or unfavourable evaluative reaction towards something or someone exhibited in ones beliefs, feelings, or intended behaviour (1995). It might be that these participants, 3 and 6, are active in a line of business where different attitudes, for instance freethinking, compared to the other participants, are more common and accepted and that this might be the reason for their way of expressing themselves.

Only two of the participants had negative answers to the questions about collaboration and communication with the academic world. These two participants were not engaged in the arranged collaboration, such as UNIVA or krAft, and were both active in the service business. All the other participants thought that the collaboration and communication worked well, this includes one participant not engaged in arranged collaboration.

6.3 Problems and questions

In our culture, spoken language differs a lot in different situations and written language is rather consistent. This we have seen when we conducted our face-to-face survey. The answers to our survey, the part with the projective test, were shorter in length and didn't contain the same amount of information as the written ones, they were much simpler. But instead the participant in the face to face survey was very eager to talk about almost everything, without us asking any questions. This would have given us additional information for our study but we neglected this due to the fact that our analysis process and the whole arrangement for our study didn't include this type of material.

The questions we ask ourselves as researchers, which by the way we think all researchers should, is how much are we already influenced by our subject of our research? As we have discussed before it is important for researchers to be aware of preconceived ideas, previous knowledge etc. but can it be that the research problem only exists in our own world of understanding and not in any others? We still think that the problem exists, this based upon both previous experiences and our work of research in this paper, but it is important to think the situation over and often we found that it is rather complex. Maybe it is important to conduct a smaller survey, with a good mix of participants, to see if the problem really exists before planning and conducting the research. It might be that it is connected to a certain group of people, a certain organization or that it is mainly a Swedish phenomenon. These are questions that we as researchers would like to have answers to as a reassurance that the problem is there and worth looking into.

There is always a problem with background theory for research. A researcher searches for answers which often results in that the "right" questions are asked. By knowing the background theory of the problem well the researcher also knows where to look to find the answers. We don't say that the theories are wrong or that the research is counterfeit, just that it is easy to walk in the same footsteps as the predecessors and by this not getting new views of the problem or new ideas of research.

We think it is important to regard the fact that people take on different roles in different parts of life, for instance parent, lover, worker, friend etc. Which role did the participants take when they took our questionnaire? These questions will most certainly never be answered, but the thought is worth considering. We believe that for most people it is impossible to fully

take on one of the different roles, there are almost always a couple of roles interacting. After all “we are only humans”.

As we have described before we had a hard time getting the participants to answer our questionnaire. Initially all the participants were supposed to be connected to UNIVA or krAft but as time passed by, and we needed answers to our questionnaire, we had to extend our list of participants to include some who had not been connected to UNIVA or krAft. Even after the new contacts were made we had problems getting answers to the questionnaire. The explanations for our problem can, as we see it, be many and we don't know which one that could be the most prominent. All our problems might have its origin in a tradition of non-cooperation between the academic sphere and the corporate sphere. There may also be some sort of mistrust between the two spheres based upon a lack of understanding between the two, where the role of communication, and how it is supposed to be conducted, becomes even more important. If we search for answers in our questionnaire it is perhaps so that the subjects are too complex, such as organizational culture, or too basic, such as communication, that our research is seen as too basic, too complex or just uninteresting.

In the future we might see more effective software, using some sort of Artificial Intelligence (AI) programming for the analysis work with meaning units, entities etc. This would shorten the time for the analysis process and perhaps make the method/software more appealing to those who today are critics.

6.4 Further research about the subject

One of the problems with our study is that it has only examined companies which have had collaboration with the academic world, which only shows the opinions of one of the spheres. A development of our study would include the academic world and then comparisons could be made to see what kind of differences there are between the two different organizational cultures/spheres. This perhaps would lead to a better understanding of each other and lay a ground for better development of the collaboration between these two “worlds”.

As seen with our questionnaire the construction and using of it is not completely painless. The greatest problem as we see it is the choice of pictures for the projective test. Here it is worth thinking about “trying” the pictures before using them in a questionnaire. With this we mean conducting a pilot test with the pictures to see how they are evaluated. This might be

necessary for us as researchers as a confirmation to see if the purpose of the pictures is fulfilled before using them in a questionnaire.

One way to develop our study is to first conduct the questionnaire which gives the researcher qualitative data. This data can then lay the ground for further investigation in the form of interviews to get deeper into the subject. With the help from the programs that we used this is very doable and gives the researcher a larger and a more solid material which hopefully results in a better and more solid analysis.

The method of phenomenological analysis is indeed a great work effort. Even though we only had six participants we have several hours behind us conducting our analysis. The problem as we see it is that research in this manner is very time consuming and it is hard to see any indications/tendencies/results and almost impossible to present partial results until the whole analysis process is finished. We understand that there is a reluctance towards using phenomenology in research work, this because of the reasons we have mentioned above. As we see it there is no other method of research that gives such an understanding of the subject and the participants which also opens for unexpected findings.

6.5 Summary

Our research can not answer the question whether smaller companies miss out on valuable experience when they don't cooperate with the academic world. As we see it there is great potential in collaboration between the two spheres and the advantage is mutual. Therefore we think that a more active role from the academic world when it comes to explaining what they are doing and in showing that collaboration in different constellations is a win-win situation for all parts, should be stressed.

Regarding the concept of knowledge we can not tell whether there are differences between the two spheres or not. We think that this could be something worth investigating, based on the results we found in our research, and could be a subject of another academic paper. It is important to know whether the partner of the collaboration uses the same concepts and if they have the same meaning. This we think is a crucial condition to increase collaboration and communication between the two spheres.

As said before in this paper there might be a rivalry or mistrust between the two spheres. There seems to be no communication, or not a prosperous one, between smaller companies and the academic world unless the both parts are engaged in organized collaboration. Here we think that both parts perhaps should engage themselves in a greater interest for each other. Our reason for this opinion is that all of today's big companies and concerns have in the beginning of their foundation been small and been searching for groundbreaking ideas and new winning concepts.

All in all the different participants have given rather similar answers for our questionnaire. None of the participants really stand out from the whole group, except participant 2 by known reasons, with completely opposite or different answers. The question we then ask ourselves is if these answers are characteristic for the corporate sphere of smaller companies? The question is rather hard to answer and we will not give any complete solutions, only the thoughts we have as the researchers who have conducted this survey. First, the fact that we have rather few participants and would need more to see if the findings still are similar, must be regarded. Second is that we have only conducted this survey with participants from the corporate sphere and would need to have participants from the academic sphere as well to see if there are any differences. If there aren't any differences the explanation for this could be that the participants experience the same things in the situations because of the culture of our society and its organizations. We think it is important to keep in mind that the overarching culture that affects us is the one which leaven all through society. Then, even more questions are raised, for example, is this specific for this certain province of the country? Maybe it is specific for our country and that borders have to be crossed with the survey to see differences?

The goal of our paper was not to present findings that are generalizations of the results of our analysis process. Instead we try to point out individual differences and if there are any, similarities that were interesting for our research subject. Our choice of method is not meant to "produce" results of general validity, instead it will pay attention to the differences that each individual has concerning our research subject. We think that we have found unforeseen factors, such as the fixation about age differences and the experiencing of educational situations. Those factors we thought would affect the answers, such as that age differences among the participants would affect the answers, were conspicuous by their absence. Our analysis of the results has shown that communication seems to be important to the

participants in different forms. Whether the differences in how important the participants found communication to be is caused by cultural differences we can not tell, just that the differences exist.

We as authors think that the main purpose of this paper is fulfilled. This by showing that there seems to be connections between organizational culture and communication and that there probably are underlying assumptions that affect both the collaboration and the communication between the academic sphere and the corporate sphere. In a longer perspective we believe that there are still many things worth considering for a better relationship and collaboration between the two spheres to be a wanted activity. Our analysis have shown that there is potential for further research within the subject and with this we mean evolvment of method and use of larger and/or more non-homogenous groups of participants. The secondary purpose of our paper we think is more than well fulfilled. The projective test seems to be functional, the participants' answers are interesting and rather unforeseen which in the end results in interesting findings. When using a phenomenological approach in our analysis we find that, compared to other methods of research, it in a way helps to expose the core of the subject we are looking at, that it is fully applicable to our subject of research and that it gives interesting answers with the help of underlying theories. As we see it the phenomenological method of research does contribute to the subject of our research and we find it an excellent tool for further usage, either by us or by other researchers, within our sphere of interest.

References

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding organizational culture*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M. (2001). *Organisationskultur och ledning*. Malmö: Liber Ekonomi.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2000). *Kritisk samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Bengtsson, J. & Grøn, A. (1997). *Filosoflexikonet – filosofer och filosofiska begrepp från A till Ö*. Stockholm: Forum.
- Briggs Myers, I., & Myers, P. B. (1995). *Gifts Differing: Understanding personality Type*. California: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Deetz, S. (2001). Conceptual Foundations. In Jablin, F. M & Putnam, L. L (Ed.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research and methods* (pp. 3-47). Thousand Oaks California: Sage.
- Gisladottir, J. & Lindsten C. (1997). *En fenomenologisk analys av hur åtta kvinnor upplever sig själva som chefer*. Lund: C-uppsats institutionen för psykologi.
- Hartman, J. (1998). *Vetenskapligt tänkande: Från kunskapsteori till metodteori*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Holme, I. M., & Solvang, B. K. (1997). *Forskningsmetodik: Om kvalitativa och kvantitativa metoder*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Jacobsen, D. I., & Thorsvik, J. (2002). *Hur moderna organisationer fungerar*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Johansson, E. (1997). *Livsvärld och organisationsförändring: fenomenologisk analys av landstingsanställdas meningskonstitution i en förändringsprocess*. Lund: C-uppsats institutionen för psykologi.

Karlsson, G. (1995). *Psychological qualitative research from a phenomenological perspective*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Sages, R. B. (2003). Truth as Unveiling. In Lindén, J, Szybek, P. (Ed.), *Validation of Knowledge Claims in Human Science* (pp. 51-81). Lyon: L'Interdisciplinaire.

Sages, R. B., & Hensfeldt Dahl, P. (1999). En fenomenologisk analysmetod inom arbetslivsforskning. In Lindén J, Westlander, G & Karlsson, G (Ed.) *Kvalitativa metoder i arbetslivsforskning - 24 forskare visar hur och varför* (pp. 132-154). Stockholm: Hellmans förlag.

Sages, R. B. & Lundsten, J. (2004). *The ambiguous nature of psychology as science and its bearing on methods of inquiry*. In press in Lahlou, M. & Sages, R. B. (Ed.) *Méthodes et Terrains de la Psychologie Interculturelle*. Lyon: L'Interdisciplinaire.

Sages, R. B., Lundsten, J., Lahlou, M., Kurc, A. & Moscraloa, J. (2002). *New methods and approaches in the study of values for management decision making*, Warszawa: Isswov Congress.

Sander, Å. (1999). Edmund Husserls Fenomenologiska Tradition. In C. Allwood & M. Erikson (Ed.) *Vetenskapsteori för psykologi och andra samhällsvetenskaper* (pp. 101-136). Lund. Studentlitteratur.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1999). *Process consultation revisited: building the helping relationship*. Harlow: Addison-Wesley.

Smither, R. (1998). *The Psychology of Work and Human Behavior*. Longman

Appendix I – Internet Survey (Swedish)

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

På nästföljande sida kommer att du att få se ett exempel på en situation och hur du kan svara på våra frågor enligt de instruktioner som anges. Detta är endast till för att underlätta din svarsprocess. Du är absolut inte bunden till att svara på samma sätt som i exemplet, utan se det bara som en vägledning.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Exempel - Situation och svar



Skriv en berättelse som löper över tidsrymden dåtid, nutid och framtid, om din uppfattning, dina associationer och dina känslor avseende situationen på bilden.

På bilden ser jag en person som genomfört någon form av skidlopp och innan dess tränat och slitigt under en längre tid för att uppnå sina mål. Personen på bilden ser ut att ha gått i mål som vinnare i en tävling. Personen i fråga ser glad och nöjd ut medan hans konkurrenter ser ut som om de är ansträngda och kanske lite besvikna. Troligtvis kommer en medaljceremoni att genomföras ganska snart efter att denna bild har tagits. I ett längre perspektiv kommer deltagarna fortsätta att träna och tävla och genomgå framgångar och motgångar.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

På nästföljande tre sidor kommer att du att få se tre olika bilder på olika situationer. Besvara med fri text, kopplat till kommunikation mellan den akademiska världen och ditt företag, enligt de instruktioner som anges.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Situation 1



Obs! Du är inte begränsad vad gäller mängden text du skriver som svar på denna fråga. Desto utförligare och större mängd text, desto bättre och mer för oss att analysera!

Skriv en berättelse, som löper över tidsrymden dåtid, nutid och framtid, om din uppfattning, dina känslor och dina associationer avseende situationen på bilden.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Situation 2



Obs! Du är inte begränsad vad gäller mängden text du skriver som svar på denna fråga. Desto utförligare och större mängd text, desto bättre och mer för oss att analysera!

Skriv en berättelse, som löper över tidsrymden dåtid, nutid och framtid, om din uppfattning, dina känslor och dina associationer avseende situationen på bilden.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Situation 3



Obs! Du är inte begränsad vad gäller mängden text du skriver som svar på denna fråga. Desto utförligare och större mängd text, desto bättre och mer för oss att analysera!

Skriv en berättelse, som löper över tidsrymden dåtid, nutid och framtid, om din uppfattning, dina känslor och dina associationer avseende situationen på bilden.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

På nästföljande tre sidor kommer att du att få se samma tre bilder som innan. Besvara frågorna enligt de instruktioner som anges.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Situation 1



Tillhör personerna på bilden samma organisation?

Ja Nej Vet inte

Precisera varför du har svarat som du har gjort på den föregående frågan.

Vilka är personerna på bilden?

Företagare Kompisar Studiekamrater Anställda

Vad gör personerna på bilden?

Har möte Har seminarium Har genomgång med en försäljare Har paus

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Situation 2



Tillhör personerna på bilden samma organisation?

Ja Nej Vet inte

Precisera varför du har svarat som du har gjort på den föregående frågan.

Vilka är personerna på bilden?

Företagare Kompisar Studiekamrater Anställda

Vad gör personerna på bilden?

Har möte Har seminarium Har genomgång med en försäljare Har paus

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Situation 3



Tillhör personerna på bilden samma organisation?

Ja Nej Vet inte

Precisera varför du har svarat som du har gjort på den föregående frågan.

Vilka är personerna på bilden?

Företagare Kompisar Studiekamrater Anställda

Vad gör personerna på bilden?

Har möte Har seminarium Har genomgång med en försäljare Har paus

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

På nästföljande 3 sidor kommer att du att få svara på ett antal frågor angående dina värderingar vad gäller de saker som vi vill undersöka.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Frågor om dina värderingar

Kunna kommunicera internt inom ett företag

Inte alls viktigt Inte viktigt Viktigt Mycket viktigt

Kunna kommunicera med externa intressenter(t.ex. kunder, partners, konsulter)

Inte alls viktigt Inte viktigt Viktigt Mycket viktigt

Utveckla den interna kommunikationen

Inte alls viktigt Inte viktigt Viktigt Mycket viktigt

Utveckla den externa kommunikationen

Inte alls viktigt Inte viktigt Viktigt Mycket viktigt

Samverkan med andra företag

Inte alls viktigt Inte viktigt Viktigt Mycket viktigt

Samverkan med den akademiska världen

Inte alls viktigt Inte viktigt Viktigt Mycket viktigt

Kartlägga den organisationskultur som finns inom företaget

Inte alls viktigt Inte viktigt Viktigt Mycket viktigt

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag**Frågor om dina värderingar****Förmedla den organisationskultur som finns inom företaget**
 Inte alls viktigt
 Inte viktigt
 Viktigt
 Mycket viktigt
Utveckla den organisationskultur som finns inom företaget
 Inte alls viktigt
 Inte viktigt
 Viktigt
 Mycket viktigt
Att personalen inom företaget har hög utbildningsnivå
 Inte alls viktigt
 Inte viktigt
 Viktigt
 Mycket viktigt
Att personalen inom företaget fortbildas
 Inte alls viktigt
 Inte viktigt
 Viktigt
 Mycket viktigt
Att de anställda trivs på företaget
 Inte alls viktigt
 Inte viktigt
 Viktigt
 Mycket viktigt
Att företaget går med vinst
 Inte alls viktigt
 Inte viktigt
 Viktigt
 Mycket viktigt
Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag**Frågor om dina värderingar****Hur anser du att samarbetet mellan ert företag och den akademiska världen (UNIVA, krAft) fungerar?**
 Mycket dåligt
 Dåligt
 Bra
 Mycket bra
Hur anser du att kommunikationen mellan ert företag och den akademiska världen (UNIVA, krAft) fungerar?
 Mycket dåligt
 Dåligt
 Bra
 Mycket bra

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

På nästföljande två sidor kommer att du att få svara på ett antal demografiska frågor. Detta för att vi ska kunna få oss en grundläggande uppfattning om dig och ditt företag.

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Demografiska frågor

Kön

Man Kvinna

Inom vilken ålderskategori hamnar du?

20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+

Vilken är din högst avslutade utbildning?

Grundskola Gymnasieskola Akademisk utbildning Doktorerat

Hur många anställda har ert företag?

1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 31+

Inom vilket område passar ert företags verksamhet bäst in i?

Ekonomi/Juridik Industri/Tillverkning Övrigt
 Teknik/utveckling Restaurang/Tjänster

Samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och småföretag

Vilken utbildningsnivå ligger merparten av de anställda i ert företag på?

- Grundskolenivå Gymnasienivå Akademisknivå Doktorerat

Hur många månader har ert företag samarbetat med den akademiska världen (UNIVA, kraft)?

- 1-6 7-12 13-18 19-24 25-30 31-36 37+

Tack för din medverkan!

Appendix II – Questions (English)

Projective test:

Write a short story, which extends along a timeline past, present, future, about what you experience, feels and your associations concerning the situation in the picture.

Projective test with pre determined answer alternatives:

Answer alternatives: yes, no, don't know

Do the people in the picture belong to the organization?

Specify why you have answered as you have on the forth going question.

Answer alternatives: businessmen, friends, fellow student, employees

Who are the people in the picture?

Answer alternatives: having a meeting, having a seminar, having a run through with a salesman, having a break

What are the people in the picture doing?

Questions about values:

Answer alternatives: not important all, not important, important, very important

1. Be able to communicate internally in a company?
2. Be able to communicate with external participants (for instance customers, partners, consultants)?
3. Develop the communication internally?
4. Develop the communication externally?
5. Cooperation with other companies?
6. Cooperation with the academic world?
7. Chart the organizational culture that exists in the company?
8. Mediate the organizational culture that exists in the company?
9. Develop the organizational culture that exists in the company?
10. That the personnel have a high level of education?
11. That the personnel within the company are educated further?
12. That the employees get on well in the company?
13. That the company is a paying concern?

Answer alternatives: very bad, bad, good, very good

14. How do you think the collaboration between your company and the academic world works?
15. How do you think the communication between your company and the academic world works?

Demographical questions:

Answer alternatives: male, female

Gender?

Answer alternatives: 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+

In which age category do you fit in?

Answer alternatives: grade school, high school, college, PhD
Which is your highest, finished, level of education?

Answer alternatives: 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 25-30, 31+
How many employees does your company have?

Answer alternatives: economy, development, manufacturing, services, other
In which sphere does your company's line of business fit in best?

Answer alternatives: grade school, high school, college, PhD
Which level of education has the main part of your employees?

Answer alternatives: 1-6, 7-12, 19-24, 25-30, 31-36, 37+
How many months have your company collaborated with the academic world (UNIVA, krAft)?

Appendix III – Example of a free text answer (English)

In the picture I see a person who has conducted some kind of ski sports event and before that has trained hard for a long time to reach his/her goals. The person in the picture seems to have crossed the finish line as a winner in a competition. The person in question looks happy and satisfied while his competitors look strained and perhaps a little bit disappointed. Probably a medal ceremony is about to be conducted rather soon after this picture was taken. In a longer perspective the participants will continue their training and competing and experience successes and setbacks.

Appendix IV – Thoughts concerning the pictures (English)

Picture 1 – A picture of a meeting between a businessman and an outsider, in this case our thought is that the outsider is supposed to represent someone from the academic world. The situation is supposed to represent that the person who sits down, he who is a businessman/employee, is being showed/taught/demonstrated something on the computer. The outsider is differentiated mainly because he is standing up, showing something on/in connection with the computer. The thought is that the picture is supposed to show communication between two individuals. The situation is staged by us.

Picture 2 – A picture of a gathering/coffee break/demonstration between a couple of employees and an outsider. The situation shows that the outsider is demonstrating something during a shorter meeting. The outsider is differentiated mainly because he is standing up, showing something on a flip-chart. The thought is that the picture is supposed to show communication in a smaller group. The situation is staged by us.

Picture 3 – A picture of some sort of meeting/lecture/seminar/gathering. The thought here is to show a gathering of a larger crowd of people from one company or more. The picture we think has a good composition and a relaxed atmosphere and it shows for instance a dinner situation, a formal dress code and what seems to be a meaningful situation with a man in a suit standing by a whiteboard. The thought of the picture is that it's supposed to show communication in a rather large group. We haven't staged the situation by ourselves because we got the picture emailed to us. However we do think that it fits our series of pictures.

Commentaries

Maybe our pictures are too much alike concerning the situations they are showing, for instance one person standing up speaking/lecturing/demonstrating. This person we would like to represent the one from the academic world in all our pictures. Perhaps we should have included pictures where a group is cooperating where you can't make out the outsider. Our thought though was to somehow make a distinction between the outsider and the other individuals in the situation and thereby more or less "force out" an answer. This is not a totally correct way to proceed, accordingly to phenomenological theory, but with the size of the paper and our limited time in mind we would rather be finished with our survey than be waiting along time for the answers and maybe not get answers which contained satisfying material.

Appendix V – Introduction (Swedish)

Hej!

Vi är två studenter, Johan Andersson och Nils Frisé, som just nu håller på att arbeta med vår kandidatuppsats inom arbets- och organisationspsykologi. Uppsatsen ingår som en delexamination i vår tredje termin inom ämnet psykologi.

I vår uppsats vill vi skapa oss en djupare förståelse för kommunikation kopplat till företagskultur. Vi har båda två ett djupt intresse in dessa bägge ämnen och hoppas kunna fördjupa oss och öka vår förståelse.

För vår undersökning har vi valt att titta på kommunikation kopplat till organisationskultur hos samarbetet mellan UNIVA, ett institut som initierar och koordinerar kommersiella forsknings- och utvecklingsuppdrag från företag och organisationer, och småföretagare. Förutom att vara ett intressant ämne för forskning hoppas vi att kunna öka förståelsen kring kommunikation/samarbete mellan den akademiska världen och företag och på så sätt göra det ännu intressantare.

Vi ämnar använda oss av fenomenologisk ansats på vår undersökning/vårt arbete där vi kommer att se till individens åsikter, tankar och känslor kring det vi vill undersöka.

Vårt uppsatsarbete sker i samarbete med Roger Sages, lektor i psykologi vid Lunds Universitet, och Per Odenrick, verksam inom UNIVA.

Vi skulle vara oerhört tacksamma om ni tittade på den projektbeskrivning som vi bifogar, reflekterar över denna och kontaktar oss om det är något som behöver förtydligas eller om ni vill veta mer oss och vad vi håller på med.

Inom en snar framtid kommer vi att fortsätta vår undersökning på det sätt som beskrivs i projektplanen och hoppas då att ni vill låta oss ta del av era erfarenheter och upplevelser.

Vid eventuella frågor kontakta:

Johan Andersson Tfn: 0705-14 53 69 Email: johan.andersson.595@student.lu.se

Nils Frisé Tfn: 0703-51 57 89

Roger Sages Tfn: 046-222 87 56 Email: roger.sages@psychology.lu.se

Med vänliga hälsningar

Johan Andersson & Nils Frisé

Appendix VI – Projectplan (Swedish)

Projektbeskrivning

Bakgrund

Vi är två studenter som just nu läser vår tredje termin inom ämnet psykologi, med inriktning mot arbets- och organisationspsykologi, vid Lunds Universitet. Som en delexamination i vår utbildning ska vi nu skriva en kandidatuppsats, som omfattar ungefär en halv termins arbete. Vad vi är intresserade av är kommunikation kopplat till organisationskultur.

I vår undersökning vill vi undersöka kommunikationen mellan små företag och den akademiska världen. Småföretagarna som vi kommer att kontakta är de som på något sätt har samarbetat med UNIVA, ett institut som initierar och koordinerar kommersiella forsknings- och utvecklingsuppdrag från företag och organisationer, och från den akademiska världen kommer vi att kontakta personal som är verksam inom UNIVA.

Syfte

Med vår uppsats vill vi på ett djupare sätt undersöka kommunikation kopplat till organisationskultur och på så sätt också intressera och ge läsaren en djupare förståelse. Vad är det som påverkar en individ/organisations sätt att kommunicera mellan olika organisationskulturer och hur de kommunicerar. Vi kommer att utgå från era beskrivningar och vad de kan betyda för den situation/miljö/kultur som ni befinner er i.

Då det inte gjorts några större studier om hur kommunikationen mellan småföretagare och akademiska världen/UNIVA fungerar/uppfattas anser både vi och de handledare/kontaktpersoner vi har att ämnet är intressant ur ren forskningssynpunkt men kan också ligga både i småföretagarnas och universitetets/UNIVA:s intresse. Vi hoppas därför att ni tar tillfället i akt och ser denna undersökning som en möjlighet att påverka/förbättra den kommunikation och det samarbete som redan finns mellan företag och den akademiska världen.

Metod

Inom en snar framtid kommer vi att, via mail/Internet, förmedla ett interaktivt frågeformulär till er. Frågeformuläret kommer att innehålla grundläggande frågor om bakgrund etc. för att ge oss en uppfattning om ert företag. Utöver detta kommer formuläret också att innehålla ett antal iscensatta bilder med anknytning till kommunikation och organisationskultur kopplat till samverkan mellan småföretagare och den akademiska världen/UNIVA. I samband med bilderna kommer ni att ombes att skriva en fri text till varje bild om hur ni uppfattar situationen och vad ni tänker kring denna. Desto utförligare texterna är desto mer information får vi att behandla vilket förhoppningsvis innebär att vår undersökning/uppsats blir intressantare.

När vi har fått in vårt material från bilder samt tillhörande frågor kommer materialet analyseras och vi hoppas att få en nyanserad bild av det vi är intresserade av att undersöka. Eventuellt kommer vi att komplettera vårt material med intervjuer. Intervjupersoner kommer i sådana fall att väljas ut i samråd med våra handledare/kontaktpersoner.

Analysen av resultatet bygger på en fenomenologisk tradition där vi kommer att sträva efter att låta individen få uttrycka sig med sina egna ord och det blir då individens upplevelser som står i centrum. För att underlätta analysen kommer vi att använda oss av två olika datorprogram som baseras just på ett fenomenologiskt tankesätt. Våra resultat kommer att presenteras som en kandidatuppsats i mitten av januari och kommer att delges er efter överenskommelse.

Vad gäller insamlingen av data via vårt interaktiva frågeformulär på Internet kommer detta att ske helt anonymt, dvs. det enda som blir synligt för oss är era olika svar på frågor och era fria texter och vi har ingen möjlighet att spåra vilka ni egentligen är.

Hoppas på ett fortsatt intressant samarbete

Med vänliga hälsningar

Johan Andersson & Nils Frisé

Appendix VII – Participation (Swedish)

Hej

Vi är två studenter, Johan Anderson & Nils Frisé, som just nu håller på att skriva en uppsats inom arbets- och organisationspsykologi vid Lunds Universitet. Vår uppsats kommer att handla om kommunikation, kopplat till organisationskultur, mellan den akademiska världen och företag.

Genom kontakter via krAft, främst Per Odenrick, och liknande organisationer, UNIVA, har vi blivit förmedlade adresser till företag som deltagit i olika verksamheter som kan kopplas till den akademiska världen. Vi hoppas nu att du vill delta i vår undersökning som ligger till grund för vårt uppsatsarbete.

Vår undersökning sker via ett interaktivt frågeformulär, se länk nedan, där man får frågor om situationer, värderingar och bakgrund. Formuläret innehåller en del frågor som ska besvaras med fritext och andra är rena kryss-/alternativfrågor. Konstruktionen är sådan att när man väl börjat besvara formuläret måste man besvara alla frågor innan resultaten kan skickas iväg. Likaså kan man inte gå tillbaka i formuläret när man en gång har besvarat en fråga. Formuläret tar ca 10-30 minuter att fylla i, beroende på hur mycket du skriver på de frågor som ska besvaras med fritext.

Länk till formulär:

www.sphinxonline.com/enquetes/lund/samarbete_mella/questionnaire.htm

Svaren från formuläret skickas till en server och laddas sedan ner utav oss. Enkäten är helt anonym och vi kan inte på något som helst sätt spåra vem som svarat på enkäten.

Resultatet från vår undersökning/vår uppsats kommer att presenteras för dem som deltagit i undersökningen i lämplig form kort tid efter det att uppsatsen är klar.

Slutsatserna och resultaten från vår undersökning/uppsats kan kanske komma till gagn både för krAft/UNIVA och de företag som samarbetar med den akademiska världen. Se detta tillfälle som ett sätt att kanske kunna påverka och förbättra.

Då det är ett begränsat antal företag som vi har fått adresser till hoppas vi att du förstår hur pass viktigt det är för oss att du deltar i vår undersökning. Om du skulle välja att inte delta i vår undersökning så meddela oss detta via mail snarast.

Om du har några frågor/synpunkter om eller till oss så går det bra att maila!

Tack på förhand för din medverkan!

Med vänliga hälsningar

Johan Andersson & Nils Frisé

Appendix VIII – Notice of participation (Swedish)

Hej!

Vi, Johan & Nils, vill återigen påminna och ber dig om att delta i vår undersökning om samarbete mellan ditt företag och den akademiska världen. Då endast väldigt få, ett företag, har svarat på vårt interaktiva formulär skickar vi detta påminnelse- och ”vädjansmail”.

Då vi har ett väldigt begränsat antal företag som vi vill ska delta i denna undersökning är det av största vikt att ni deltar eller om ni väljer att inte delta, att ni meddelar oss detta snarast.

Vissa har haft problem med att nå länken till vårt interaktiva frågeformulär. Om så är fallet ber vi dig höra av dig till oss så att vi kan lösa detta på något sätt.

Länken till vårt interaktiva frågeformulär:

www.sphinxonline.com/enquetes/lund/samarbete_mella/questionnaire.htm

Har du redan svarat på vårt interaktiva frågeformulär ber vi dig att bortse från detta mail.

Tack på förhand för din medverkan!

Med Vänliga Hälsningar

Johan Andersson & Nils Frisé