SECTION 3

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 11

Study Critique

This dissertation originally was conceived as a two stage process. In the first stage, a theoretical foundation was established that sought to link developments that were occurring in both the fields of policy analysis and organizational theory. An examination of the literature of policy systems and interest group theory tended to show a movement away from the previous linear analytical models that have traditionally grounded the area of policy analysis. A similar type of trend was also revealed in the literature and theoretical base of organizational theory.

Both fields of study appeared to be moving toward a more sociological orientation, seeking to reveal deeper human meanings and interactions within both governmental organizations and policy subsystems. In an attempt to bridge these two fields, and their movement toward a more sociological explanation, I proposed that the use of Anthony Giddens theory of Structuration would allow for both organizational analysis and policy subsystem analysis to be forged into a single analytical model. The new model, it was proposed, would offer a deeper understanding of the processes involved in both the governmental and private organizational systems as they interacted within the boundaries of a shared public policy arena.

In order to accomplish this process of analysis, several models of both organizational analysis and policy subsystem development were reviewed. Modifications in the various models were suggested in order to conform to the general principles outlined by Giddens theory, and a final developmental and analytical model was proposed.

The proposed model was then focused on a specific policy arena with an extensive history of private and public interaction. The field selected was the telephone policy subsystem of the United States, and a study was conducted from the earliest inception of wire-based communications in this country to the final passage and enactment of the Telecommunications Deregulation Act of 1996.

During the study, changes in the analytical model and process occurred, and other potential areas of both research and theory were revealed. This last chapter is an attempt to discuss some of those changes, and also what their possible implications might be for anyone else attempting to pursue a similar type of project with a similar type of theoretical foundation.

The first issue to be discussed is the nature of what is defined as political versus economic.

During the 150 years that encompass this study, the definitions of what is political and what is economic have shifted. In addition to shifting definitions of what is political and economic, we also see shifting definitions of what is public versus private, and what is external versus what is internal. So the first, and most obvious question, is why are these boundaries and definitions changing?

The answer to the above question lies within the heart of what Giddens refers to as structuration. In essence, what is political and economic, public and private, external and internal are not based upon natural laws of science. Rather these societal elements are socially constructed by people living within different time periods who are applying prevailing standards and norms to the social entities that they are continuously constructing.

While these social agents are trying to apply these prevailing social norms to these social constructs, organizations, they are also experiencing both the intended and unintended consequences of creating these social systems. Unintended consequences, in particular, lead to new issue and problem areas that have not been forecast, and require further refinement of the definitions and the social constructs. Thus the environment, both internal and external, impact on the social constructs, and establish a process of continuous re-creation of the social construct.

Although the social construct is being redefined to resolve unintended consequences, there is also a tendency on the part of social agents to make these social adjustments relate to previous social constructs and definitions. Bodies of social knowledge, such as law and economics, form a series of socially accepted principles in which we attempt to interpret meaning. Thus when we are faced with the necessity of redefining or reconstructing any of our social systems, we attempt to link the new definition to previous areas of social meaning, and in the process reify the continuation of the former social value. Also, at this level of redefinition, we see the impact of the double hermeneutic process, and often observe that social researchers explanations for events and processes are adopted by social agents to aid in the redefinition. Concepts such as a "natural monopoly", "universal service", the "information society" , all have their roots in academic research which ultimately are translated into social meaning and social construction by social agents.

Usually this process of adjustment of meaning is incremental, and requires only slight alterations in the underlying principles of social knowledge. This process of incremental adaptation actually speaks to another area of Giddens theory, namely the necessity to sustain basic ontological security within the existence of society's membership. Major redefinition of underlying principles require fundamental shifts in both social knowledge and social meaning. Such major shifts destabilizes social systems, and create a sense of ontological insecurity in the membership of society. Thus, to avoid developing ontological insecurity across the social order, incremental shifts in meaning are advanced, and occur over extended periods of time which allow for incorporation of the new definition within the existing social knowledge base.

The obvious result, though, of this incremental shift process is that there is a tendency to reify existing social relations, including existing hubs of both economic and political power. Thus, if one is to look at A. T. & T., and it's former corporate entities, during the period of time from 1875/1880 to 1975 one sees that there is a major shift in the definitions of political versus economic, public versus private, internal versus external, but the configuration of both political and economic power has remained fairly consistent. Society has adjusted both meaning and social forms, organizations, over the time period, but have still reified the previous structural principles in terms of what Giddens refers to as allocative resources and power.

Even major social disorders, such as the expiration of Bell's patent monopoly, the First and Second World Wars, the Great Depression, and technological innovation, up to 1975, have not changed the basic social construct referred to as the telephone system.

A researcher attempting an extended period of analysis, and seeking to use methods or heuristic devices that apply concepts such as political and economic, must be prepared to examine the incremental redefinition periods, and to adjust the frames of analysis to include these shifts in social meanings. In addition, the researcher must be on guard against assuming that an incremental redefinition in social meaning has resulted in a major restructuring of the social construct. Redefinition can lead to major shifts between political and economic, public and private, internal and external, but not disrupt the existing social construct in terms of it's structural properties, and actually, continue to reify existing hubs of power and resources.

This of course leads one to the conclusion that all social systems are social constructs, and, that since these social constructs are based on bodies of socially accepted knowledge, such social constructs as law, economics, property rights, public interest, regulatory systems, free markets, etc., are humanly malleable, and have no distinct nature outside of the human mind and social relations.

This social redefinition process also presents problems for researchers attempting to apply methods of belief analysis.

In the case of Sabatier, we have three levels of belief. Core levels represent underlying base beliefs that are difficult or impossible to change. Near Core beliefs are the next level, and form a discursive level of knowledge where core beliefs are translated into basic policy positions. The final level of belief, Secondary Aspects, represents the level of beliefs which are transformed into specific laws and rules of actions. While the above typology appears to represent a fairly straight forward manner of categorizing individual's overall belief systems, in fact the study would tend to say that even this typology requires adjustment.

Since the social system is constantly adjusting definitions and meanings to account for incremental changes in social principles, it is also apparent that social members are also adjusting internal social beliefs to conform to this same redefinition process. In order for social and individual ontological security to be maintained, the adjustment process is framed in such a way that it links to prior knowledge at an incremental level. Thus redefinition, at any one stage, require only slight adjustments.

While the initial stage of adjustment is slight, the cumulative effect of adjustment can be very great. In time, as redefinition upon redefinition occurs, one begins to see changes in the underlying basic belief principles of both the social order and individuals. In this study, we see a fundamental shift in the core belief as it relates to government involvement in the private sector. Initially the system of belief, in the 1840s, rejects the role of activism by government. Yet, 150 years later, the core belief has been profoundly changed, and instead government is viewed by the private sector as necessary to maintain fair competitive practices. In the process of redefining these beliefs, all levels of the individual social agent's beliefs, engaged in the process, are also changed.

Once again, we see the same problem here in belief analysis that we saw previously in the political economic analysis, namely the researcher must be prepared to shift the frames of analysis as beliefs are altered through each period, and must focus on the transition periods when changes in these beliefs are incrementally being developed. To some extent, this development was originally recognized in the proposed research model, especially at the Near Core belief and Secondary Aspects level. Utilizing concepts proposed by Giddens, adjustments were made in the model, and then applied. The problem, though, became more difficult within the research model as the time frame became longer and more involved.

In the end, both political economy analysis and belief analysis present problems to researchers who extend their analysis beyond a very narrow focus in time. Since the definition of meaning for both political and economic are shifting, and the definitions for underlying beliefs are shifting, it is difficult, if not impossible, to quantitatively analyze these redefinition processes. Since the object of quantification is constantly changing over time, any attempt to establish a numerical ordering of these definitions will not necessarily have correlation with numerical ordering established at another point in the social system's development.

One can only conclude that qualitative methods of analysis which focus on linguistic meaning and structure are probably the most valid method of analysis with this type of research. During the original research for this project, elements of this phenomena were recognized, and an attempt was made to adjust for this through proposing the use of Yin's method of social agent interviewing. While an attempt was made to apply Yin's methodology, an unusual development occurred which needs to be discussed.

The original research model planned for a series of one-on-one interviews with individuals actively engaged in the development of the telecommunications deregulation act. The data from these interviews was to be compared against the actual record of the development of the bill, and other original source data related to the telecommunications industry. By comparing interview data against the development record of the bill and other relevant source material, a form of triangulation would occur that would reveal aspects of the final bill's development. In addition, the interviews would serve as a check against other materials, and hopefully provide richer and deeper insights into the motives and actions of other persons involved in the bill's final format. Unfortunately, the researcher had little success in this matter.

While thirty-eight persons were contacted to elicit interviews, only eight people actually agreed to be interviewed. In addition, all eight interviewees requested both personal and organizational anonymity. While the interviews were conducted, the interviewees were reluctant to provide any additional information concerning the actions or motives of other participants, and in general only provided information that was already available through published records and accounts.

The researcher concluded that problems with obtaining interview data was related to unfortunate timing. By the time that background research had been conducted, and interviews could be scheduled, the entire issue of implementation had become embroiled in a series of Federal and State lawsuits. All of the major telecommunications organizations, and a good number of the political leaders, were either named in these lawsuits, or had filed positions with the various courts either in support or opposition to the issues being presented to the court. Thus, it was fairly easy to obtain information on the official position of various organizations, but extremely difficult to obtain information beyond the published record. At this point in time, the researcher was somewhat stymied, and unsure of how to proceed.

Eventually, though, this problem was dealt with by an unusual method, one in fact grounded on the very network that the researcher was examining.

The original idea for this research project goes back to 1992. At that time, the researcher was a local government official in the State of South Carolina, and heavily involved in the process of automating functions within local government. The high cost of obtaining dedicated data transmission lines, especially into rural areas, was a major problem in extending aspects of automation to field locations. In order to deal with this matter, the researcher, along with other local government officials, was attempting to have the South Carolina Public Utility Commission develop a discount rate for data lines for all forms of government and non-profit agencies. In order to gain support for our position, we also attempted to lobby Senator Hollings office to obtain his support for our position. While unsuccessful in obtaining the line discount rate, the information obtained would later prove useful in the research project.

In 1993, the researcher resigned his position with the local government agency, and returned to academia to pursue a Ph.D. in Public Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University located in Blacksburg, Virginia. Shortly after moving to Blacksburg, Virginia the researcher became aware of a local network project called the "Electronic Village".

The local project was a combination of public and private funding that attempted to establish a network research platform to examine the use of advanced network technology to promote both education and electronic commerce. In order to establish the research platform, the backbone local communications network was upgraded to provide for high speed access, and upgraded connectivity was wired into both the campus of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and local homes and businesses. In addition, the local telephone provider, Bell Atlantic, provided discounted rates for

local access, and free access to faculty and students connected with Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The researcher immediately availed himself of the opportunity offered by the local project.

At the same time that this development occurred in Blacksburg, the use of the Internet began to emerge. One of the first levels of emergence was within both the telecommunications industry, and the Federal government, especially those agencies involved in telecommunications. The White House and Congress also began to utilize the Internet, and correspondingly, so did the various public interest groups lobbying Congress. Very quickly, the majority of these groups, organizations, and government agencies, developed "web sites", and began to use these sites to both post positions on various issues, and also to communicate with their membership located in other parts of the country. The same level of development also occurred overseas, especially in Europe and Japan, and various international groups and agencies began to also post positions and communicate with their membership.

An interesting development occurred during this process of tapping the newly emerged network. The majority of groups involved in developing these web sites were still in the formative stage of determining how to use this new medium of communications. With no previous knowledge of how such networks actually operated, there was a tendency on the part of these organizations to use their web sites "liberally". As a result of this "liberal" use pattern, there was a tendency to post "everything" to their web sites. Information, public positions, warnings to membership for political action, all tended to be listed on these servers. While this type of information, in older communications formats, might have been dampened or at least presented with consideration toward possible public relations positions, in the new format the organizations tended to perceive that the communication was only being monitored by it's own membership.

The researcher had decided, by this time, that his final dissertation project would be related to the telecommunications industry and regulation. Realizing the potential that such data might have for the future project, the researcher obtained software for his computer that could be preset to search the Internet, and designated sites, and download information from these sites that had been posted on a daily basis. Starting in the Fall of 1993, the researcher's computer began to poll these various web sites on a nightly basis. The polling process continued through the Winter of 1996. Eventually, the downloaded data file exceed 100 million bites of information.

The information that was obtained through the polling process was used, initially, to examine various proposals for changing the regulatory structure of the telecommunications industry, and to compare these positions with bill drafts submitted in Congress.

When the researcher encountered the problem of obtaining interviews, he went back to the download file, and began to examine the contents more carefully. In the process of examining the file, he discovered that a great deal of the information that he sought from the interviews of various people engaged in the political and lobbying process, had previously been posted to the various web sites. In addition to the membership information and position statements, the file also contained email messages to membership on issues, and membership responses to proposals. Without realizing it, the researcher had in fact "wire tapped" the Internet, and had unintentionally "hacked" into the web sites. As a consequence of this development, the researcher was looking at the policy subsystem's subunits decision making process.

Once this data potential became clear to the researcher, he was able to take the original analytical framework, and reordered the downloaded data of the various subunits to substitute for the lack of interview data. In the process he was able to offset not only the interview problem, but also to

reveal the subunits adjustment process that occurred as the various proposals worked their way through Congress.

While this research development proved extremely useful to the researcher, it also has implications in terms of the study, especially as it relates to the development of policy subsystems that are based in a high level of technological dependency.

When one examines the history of the telephone policy subsystem, and the related telecommunications industries, the first thing that becomes evident is that there is a strong relationship between the concept of the "network" and the forms of both organizational and regulatory structures that are created.

All telecommunications industries are resource dependent on access to the network. The communications network, in essence, is the production process. The network has an input cycle, a through put cycle, and an output cycle. In addition, it also has a feedback and redundancy loop that connects output to input. Thus, the communications network is a classic example of what is referred to as a "system", and physically operates under traditional methods of systems theory.

In order to maintain the highest level of through put efficiency, the network also tends to enforce very rigidly established standards for both transmission signals and the hardware platform that handles the signals. This is done in order to eliminate, or reduce, the levels of "noise" or "distortions" that are able to enter the network from the outside environment. Thus, the configuration of communications networks tends to be a "closed system", one which attempts to bound the system from external influences.

To sustain this closed system model, the network concept also seeks to link various elements within the network together in a hierarchical arrangement and series of protocols. These hierarchical arrangements allow the elements within the network to be "tightly coupled", and linked in a manner that reduces the levels of "noise" entering the network at the points where elements meet. This "tight coupling" within the network elements allows for the maintenance of stability within the network system, and the establishment of equilibrium between the rates of transmission, the units of transmission, and the elements of transmission.

The above network model of a tightly coupled, closed system is the classic model of a communications network whether it be wire-based or wireless based. The interesting thing, though, about this model, in terms of this study, is that it is also the initial model for the development of the telephone policy subsystem and the telephone industry.

The first half of the development of the telephone industry and the telephone policy subsystem, 1875 to 1934, mirrors exactly the classic model of developing a closed, tight coupled communications network. Once the initial fight between Bell Telephone and Western Union is settled, the industry's structure, and the subsequent development of government oversight, follow the model of a closed system. Even the period of competition, ultimately, results in reifying the closed system model of network communications. A. T. & T. becomes the "network manager", and all the other systems conform both their technical and organizational structures to the network model developed within A. T. & T. Even the governmental regulatory model conforms it's structure for oversight to A. T. & T.'s network model, and demands that other connecting networks adhere to A. T. & T.'s technical standards, equipment access, rates, service elements, and reporting systems.

507

When "broadcasting" appears, it also is subsumed under the closed network model, and standards for transmission, spectrum allocation, and access rights conform to the prevailing pattern.

By the 1920s we thus have a classic closed system model being applied both within the communications network, and the communications industry. The model is also extended into the public/private arena, and forms what is commonly referred to as a classic "iron triangle" configuration within the policy subsystem.

The second half of the life of the telephone policy subsystem, though, does not conform to the model developed during the first half of life. During the second half of development we see both the industry and the policy subsystem move from a closed system model to an open system model, and we see that the elements within the network move from being "tightly coupled" to being "loosely coupled", or even "decoupled". So the obvious question is why would the system, at first, moves toward being a closed system, and then moves toward being an open system?

The answer to the above question lies within the area of science and technology. The initial level of technological development within the telephone industry was based on a technological platform that was extremely sensitive to environmental impact. Whether it was outside lines strung on poles, heat within vacuum tubes or loading coils, or feedback signals from telephone sets, the entire network was delicately balanced and sensitive to any form of signal or heat/cold impact. While you could attempt to close the system in terms of equipment and standards, you could not close the system from the external environment without an extraordinary effort and discipline within the industry.

But once the technological platform began to move to a more sophisticated level, one in which the environmental factors were lessened, then the necessity for a closed, tightly coupled system of transmission became less relevant. From 1934 on, we see a major improvement in both equipment and methods of transmission within the network. A lot of this development occurred because of research within the Bell Laboratories, and also because of a great deal of research support provided by the Department of Defense. Many of the older issues related to environmental factors affecting transmission were dealt with, and newer types of alternative communications systems were created. In the process of technological improvement, the necessity for maintaining a closed system within the network became unimportant, and the designation of a "network manager" to oversee the network became irrelevant. In addition, during the 1970s and 1980s, we see the base of the platform converging around a single transmission base further eliminating the need for either the closed system model or the network manager model.

Interestingly, though, the movement away from a closed system model to an open system model, also changes the nature of resource dependency within the network. Previously, telecommunication industries were resource dependent on access to transmission within a single type of transmission network. The convergence of the transmission platform, though, changed the nature of resource dependency, and the industrial members found themselves, in essence, on being resource dependent on access to all the communications networks. Thus having "network access" no longer meant having access to a single communications network, but rather came to mean having access to a "network of networks".

As the concept of the "network" moved toward an open system of decoupled "networks" we see that both the telecommunications industry and the governmental regulatory systems also, once again, follow the same path of technological development. The industrial system is opened and decoupled, and the regulatory structure is opened and decoupled. Both the industry and the governmental structure conform to the technological base.

One might conclude, by examining this history, that their possibly could be a form of technological determinism occurring within this industry and policy subsystem. It would not be unreasonable to assume that both the industry and the government follow the path of technological development within the network. In fact, if one examines the scholarly and industrial literature of this area, one finds that there is a strong leaning in exactly this direction of interpretation. But such an explanation ignores other "facts" that are also evident within the history of the industry and it's relationship with government.

For 150 years, the United States has wrestled with making sense of telecommunications. During this time period, many different types of industrial structures, governmental operations, and even methods of communications have been proposed. We have been offered, over and over again, opportunities to define the industry, government involvement, and even the very technology in different ways than how we presently see the system. We could have nationalized the entire network, and even did for a brief period of time. We could have, initially, merged telephone and telegraph together, and eventually we did merge the systems. We also could have merged wire based with wireless, and eventually we did merge the communications platforms together. We could have developed an open network model as early as 1894, and, once again, we eventually did, but waited 100 years before doing so. All of those possibilities were evident from the very first emergence of the technology, and subsequent technological improvements.

It can be argued that those possibilities were not common knowledge at the time of each one of these technological developments. But while the possibilities were not commonly known, they were known by the scientists and engineers that developed these technical applications, and, as the study has shown, they were also known by industrial leaders, and even certain governmental officials. So why did we delay developing these other possibilities, why did we close off these other potentials, at least for awhile?

One argument that could be presented is that the industry intentionally delayed such developments until it could secure it's own economic position in relation to the new technological developments. A. T. & T. obviously attempted to do this by developing Bell Laboratories, and constructing both a patent and research wall around the industry. To further buffer this research wall, A. T. & T. built a massive equipment manufacturing system that controlled the actual physical production of any technological development. And it reinforced this element by establishing an equipment interconnection requirement that all but prohibited technological innovation without corporate approval.

But for all of A. T. & T.'s attempts to buffer itself and the network from technological innovation, these prohibition walls began to crumble as early as the late 1940s. So while there is some evidence that the intentional delay argument has some basis in fact, the process of technological prohibition only slowed the process of innovation, but did not stop it. So while corporate control is an element of technological innovation, it is not exclusively under the control of any single developer, and thus can emerge within other channels of development. So what are these other channels of development?

The nature of a technological development, initially, is somewhat dependent on the research laboratory. Within the laboratory, scientists and engineers, working within specific bodies of research knowledge and underlying paradigmatic frames of reference, experiment with different types of network improvements and innovations. The more successful findings, that is the ones with the greatest potential for development, are selected for further applied research. These selected targets are then further experimented with, and possible types of applications begin to emerge.

During this stage of development, recognition and selection are highly dependent on the preexisting knowledge and research framework of the individual researchers.

Once the path of potential development is selected, then further refinement is undertaken, and eventually another round of selection occurs. Those applications with high application potential are selected for development, and the innovation is further refined. Eventually the refinement leads to actual emergence of a specific technological innovation which is then placed into the network.

During this process of development, there are many possible avenues of development that could occur, but only one or two areas of development are selected for further refinement. Thus the process is one of elimination as well as selection. But eliminating one path of development does not in anyway eliminate the potential for alternative development. This potential continues to remain within the innovation, even if it is not selected for research and implementation.

While a technological innovation, developed along a specific path, may eventually be implemented within a network, that does not preclude the possibility that in the future another researcher may recognize the suppressed potential, and then select that potential for a further round of development.

To a great extent, this process of selection and development form the history of the telecommunications industry and policy subsystem. The development of the network was based on a selection process that precluded other potentials for development. While these other potentials were initially suppressed under the path selected for development, eventually they were "rediscovered" by later researchers who chose to develop these other potentials. Eventually, these alternative innovations became included within the network, and changed many of the existing structures and concepts operating within the communications system.

To some extent, then, technological innovation and development is also a form of social construction. Paths of development or elimination are dependent on human frames of reference, prior knowledge, paradigmatic position, and ability to "recognize" meaning, all of which are highly subjective processes. In addition, future technological "meaning" is always possible, even within older normative frames of technological meaning, through the process of "rediscovering" suppressed or eliminated potentials within each technological concept. This process of continuously defining the technological application and meaning is beginning to present serious problems for both policy makers and industrial leaders.

During the research for this project, and the examination of the statements made by the various social agents engaged in developing the new telecommunications regime, it became very evident that there does not exist a consensus, either on the public or private side of social existence, as to what is this newly emerged "network". The problem, very simply stated, is that this new technological innovation is in fact an all encompassing system. It could actually be called a "virtual network".

The new system that has emerged covers the entire spectrum of all previous types of networks, plus a wide range of other technologies and industries not previously associated with telecommunications - such as energy utilities. When one approaches this network, seeking to discover it's social meaning and construction, an interesting phenomena occurs. One can approach this new network concept from any preexisting frame of social knowledge, and recognize within the network elements of their previous knowledge references. The reason why this occurs is because the new structure is all inclusive, and is no longer definable within any single framework of knowledge. Previous symbolic references within each person's mind can be attached to the new

concept, thus facilitating social recognition. But, any other person could also approach the same concept, from a completely opposite symbolic reference, and also construct social meaning in a totally different pattern.

When both policy makers and industrial leaders joined in the process of redefining the new network concept they were unable to develop a consensus view of the concept. Free marketers, social activists, conservatives, liberals, technological innovators, industrial moguls, etc., all referenced the network with different social constructions.

Unable to reach understanding of the nature of this new "thing", both policy makers and industrial leaders allowed it to enter the social arena with a minimal amount of societal oversight. Rather than seeking to eliminate any one potential path of development within the network, and thus framing a unified meaning to the system, all potential avenues of development were allowed to coexist. The eventual selection of the meaning will thus be achieved by a combination of industrial competition and user selection.

To a great extent, the science of technological development, and it's associated social meaning, have escaped the control of both the political and industrial leaders. This problem poises great risks for society. Previously, we have sought to ground meaning within the network to prior knowledge and customs. While it was a slow and incremental process, it was successful in allowing our society to eventually bring technological and social benefits to the overwhelming majority of the members of the society. We achieved almost one hundred percent universal access to the telephone network. We did achieve one hundred percent universal access to broadcasting services.

This new approach, though, to technological development and innovation, does not attempt to ground itself in previous social constructs or frames of social knowledge and recognition. Yet, we are gambling that by taking this risk our society will eventually emerge as the dominate world leader in the new information industry and world order. But without framing it's meaning in prior knowledge will we be able to understand what is before us, and how to use it? Will we be able to extend it's benefits through out our society, or will it be limited to only a few? Will it lead to stability within our industrial order, or will it lead to open conflict and destablity within the economic base of our society? These are only a few of the questions that are left unanswered by the new law.

We have not yet reached a stage of being able to collective agree on what are the problems that exist within this new technology. In many ways, we have entered the first window of the policy development process. We are back to square one, with people seeking to develop social meaning and agreement on the technology, and unable to recognize each others concerns or issues. But one thing is certain. Eventually, some type of meaning will emerge, and when it does, some form of social structure will also emerge. When that point of convergence occurs in the future, Giddens concept of structuration will help researchers understand how the eventual convergence came into existence.

The methodology attempted in this project is an attempt to bring this concept of structuration research into this field of social development. Any weaknesses within the study, and the methodology, are completely the responsibility of the researcher, not the theorist. Giddens ideas and theories stand in spite of this researchers difficulties. The concept of structuration has a great potential for helping the field of public administration to understand the many hidden aspect of both political and social ordering. I hope other researchers will see that potential, and walk down that development path with me in the future.