**Research methodologies and techniques**

## Research Methodology

## Methodology" is a concept with a very large volume and the possibility of different interpretation. More generally, we can give the following definition:

## "Methodology" is a system of principles and methods for the accumulation of scientific knowledge. In particular, and in the narrower sense, the following levels may be given (ranked from higher to lower):

## "Philosophical Methodology" is called a system of principles for consideration of phenomena and processes of objective reality (Kothari, 2004).

**Research Approach**

**Inductive** It is a way to transfer knowledge from the person elements of the procedure to the knowledge of the overall process.

**Deductive** It is the pursuit of knowledge from the abstract to the concrete, i.e. transition from general patterns to their actual manifestation.

**Purpose:** In this study examines the inductive approach, hence it does not integrate any definite theories.

**Justification of Selection of Inductive**

The movement of thought from the individual (experience, facts) to the general (their generalization in the conclusions) and deduction is the ascent of the process of knowledge from the general to the single. These are opposing, mutually complementary thoughts. Deductive reasoning allows one to obtain new truths from already existing knowledge, and moreover with the help of pure reasoning, without resorting to experience, intuition, common sense, etc.

**Research Design**

**Descriptive**is research that focuses on collecting and recording data in order to give the most accurate picture of the market situation, using quantitative methods. In selective descriptive studies, the magnitude of the incidence rates will exceed the official statistics and more accurately reflect the prevalence of the phenomenon. At the same time, the accuracy of the research results may be adversely affected by selected methods, diagnostic criteria and the accuracy of the questionnaire questions (Marczyk, DeMatteo and Festinger, D. (2005).

**Explanatory**

It is a study that uses the results of observations of reality to test a theory or to deepen ideas about behaviors within a certain theory.

**Research Purpose Adopted.** The basis for the research was the rules of jurisdiction must have a high degree of predictability and be supported on the main authority of the defendant's abode.. It is more appropriate to use exploratory approach for this research.

**Analysis**

In our opinion, the following generalized working definition can be proposed: *human rights* and choices should be understood as the totality of sociopolitical, economic, ethical and other norms that define the fundamental basis of the safe, democratic and humanitarian status of an individual and its relationships with other people, society and the state. Today, these rights can be reduced to several main groups:

**Main Groups**

* Personal or civil rights guaranteeing the free development of the individual (such as the human rights to life, liberty and safety, citizenship and equality before the law, freedom from arbitrary detention, arrest and exile, etc.);
* Political rights ensuring the possibility of wide and active participation of every person in state and public affairs.
* Financial, public and educational rights and freedoms ensuring the necessary living conditions for individuals in relevant areas of public life (the right to property, entrepreneurship, work and the freedom to choose work, to a decent standard of living, social security, education and participation in cultural life, etc.

**Fundamental human rights**

A crucial role in ensuring human rights is played by international non-governmental organizations. Their central task is to promote positive social and economic changes in people's lives (Beck, 2002). Among other advantages, these organizations have the ability to quickly accumulate process, distribute a variety of information, including the “hottest”, information on a specific problem and use it effectively. In many countries, including Russia, in addition to national ones, there is an extensive network of public human rights organizations operating quite actively within their territories.

**Terrorist activity as a social manifestation means discrimination**

Personality, infringement or restriction of its rights and freedoms, creates a threat to human security and, ultimately, to his very life. This is manifested in various spheres: spiritual and political life, the state of the economic situation, etc. In recent years, the number of victims of terrorist activities has reached hundreds, or even thousands of lives.

**Methods and techniques**

The methods and techniques of terrorist actions are constantly evolving and improving. At the same time, if in the past, terror was understood to be actions against individuals or groups, now terror against entire nations and states is widely spread, carried out by well-organized and technically equipped structures, including state and international ones United States (Office of Homeland Security,2002).

The terrorism of our era is distinguished by a qualitatively new technical and organizational level. However, it is characteristic that, despite the growing number and scale of terrorist acts, numerous victims among the population, the ultimate goals of terrorists are almost never achieved (with the exception of individual episodes when financial demands are advanced). Although manifestations of terrorism often have bloody consequences and cause a state of shock and tension in society, practically no act so far did not lead to serious sociopolitical consequences (meaning the change of the ruling regime, political course, etc.).

The technologies of society have led to an increase in the possibility of carrying out terrorist acts, causing massive death of people. At industry and transport facilities, for example, there was a threat of terrorists applying measures to provoke environmental disasters (De Rivera, J., & Páez, D. 2007).

It should be borne in mind that traditional terrorism did not threaten society as such, did not affect its systemic foundations. High-tech terrorism of the new era is characterized in that it, as a rule, is aimed not at individual personalities, but works “by squares” and affects large masses of innocent people, which is why it is capable of producing a systemic crisis in the entire world community.

Recently, the transformation of terrorist targets has been noticeable. Often, they commit terrorist acts without making any demands or taking responsibility for the crimes committed. Their task is to inflict as much damage as possible, to sow panic in society, to cause people to disbelieve in the ability of the authorities to control the situation and ensure a safe and secure life for (citizens Thomas and Tow, 2002)..

**Characteristic signs of hostage-taking as crimes of a terrorist nature are:**

• The effectiveness of pressure in this way on state authorities and various organizations and individual structures in order to achieve their goals. It is this, in our opinion that determines the increasing attention of terrorists to the commission of such crimes (De Rivera and Páez, D. (2007)..

• Publicity, demonstrativeness and publicity of the taking of hostages. Terrorists not only do not hide their accomplishments, but on the contrary, announce this to the authorities, law enforcement agencies, dictate the conditions for the release of the hostages, and also threaten reprisals if their demands are not met. The more public resonance is received by a terrorist action - the taking of hostages, the more daunting effect it has on the population, state authorities and other addressees of criminal violence.

• Coercion to certain actions in the interests of terrorist’s authorities and management, various organizations and structures.

• Increased public danger means that this kind of crime in order to achieve their goals, terrorists strive to inflict serious damage to the most important human values: life, personal freedom, health, human immunity, property, and public order. Anyone can become a hostage, even one who has nothing to do with the conflict that gave rise to the commission of a terrorist act (Thomas, N., & Tow, W. T. (2002).
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