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Torsdag, 14/10/16
Methodology...

chose I, II, III, IV.

IS SSM = AR?

- SSM follows a cyclic route
  BUT the object being investigated
  by SSM is the real model
  problem, not the stubbing

\[ F = SSM \leftarrow \text{Game model} \]
\[ M = SSM \]

The problem with checkland is:

Trick the framework = systematic
In the case of Choudhury et al:

\[
\begin{align*}
F &= OR model \\
M &= method explained in
       unbroken chapter
\end{align*}
\]

What are the research intents in this case?

We want to evolve

- check robustness of models
  
- improve models
  
- add new models

or

- improve method (seven steps method)
  
- discuss principles aspect of method

What else would one be interested in?
So, what is the problem?

The dual aspect means that we are trying to improve upon our own research methodology...

This is, in fact, what I try to do...

\[ 4 \times 60 = 240 \]