“Sitting on many fences, ready to utilize numerous paradigms…”

Question:

Write a philosophically developed, conceptually informed, methodologically framed and empirically grounded engagement with the statement: The researcher you are is the person you are.

"There is a fifth dimension beyond that which is known to man. It is a dimension as vast as space and timeless as infinity. It is the middle ground between light and shadow, between science and superstition, and it lies between the pit of man's fears and the summit of his knowledge. This is the dimension of imagination. It is an area we call the Twilight Zone."


3000~4000 wordsDue Date: Friday, December 21st, 2007
Imagine a man, sitting at his computer, contemplating the essence of what it means to be a researcher in the context of his very own personal connection to his educational setting and encounters in life. He wonders what on earth brought him to a position in which he had to reflect on the very essence of his philosophical thinking and position? A part of what drove him to this point lies within a complex mesh of professional and personal experiences, and a vast array of interrelations with people over his relatively short teaching career. Also the affecting influences of growing up in his own part of multi-cultural Australia, then living and working in Japan, and the struggle to identify his stance within his surroundings has made it possible to be reflexive in his own teaching. Throughout his life he has been shaped by a multitude of events, the essence of which have contributed to the very foundations of his ideology. A belief system that is now situating itself on many fences, ready to utilize numerous paradigms in a variety of different ways, yet very much favoring a post-structuralist - Hermeneutistic view incorporating cultural ethnographic inquiry. His view remains flexible in order to take advantage of a number of different perspectives, in the search for greater usability, reflexivity and better understanding. That is the person I am and this essay is my attempt to explore my epistemological (theory of knowledge), ontological (nature of being and purpose of existence) and axiological (nature of values) perspectives in a way that permits me to focus on the essential question of who I am in relation to being a researcher. My own research identity is based on beliefs about the following key aspects: objectivity/subjectivity, qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods choices, data collection and analysis, impact and utility of research work, and lastly cultural dimensions. These aspects will
be discussed in order to try and find a practical and social context for my research distinctiveness.

Hermeneutics, a philosophical approach initially outlined by Heidegger, and further delineated and extended upon by Gadamer (Moran, 2000), is an approach that has brought a new dimension to my epistemological view. It is one of many philosophical reactions that have surfaced that has caused academics to question the effectiveness of purely rational scientific reasoning. Rationalists tending to rely on deductions based on ‘a priori’, and rarely including an account of beliefs and attitudes of the participants of studies and how their attitudinal and situational states affect an investigation.

According to Moran (2000; Moss, 1994), Heidegger and Gadamer are concerned with how we understand. Within this Hermeneutic approach, the interpretation of ‘meaning’ is reflected both in a holistic and integrative way. That is, it is like a jigsaw puzzle; the perspective is focused on a greater picture, rather than each individual part. Each piece is therefore considered in relation to how it eventually fits in with the whole puzzle. To solve a jigsaw puzzle, it is necessary to seek out a number of aspects, such as shape, color, and position. This empirical data is sufficient for experimentation and manipulation of variables, but when working with complex and intricate problems may not be adequate in determining the most efficient pathway in solving the puzzle. Along with direct observation and manipulation of data through experimentation, one can also take into account the depth and breadth of our own (the researcher) previous experiences and knowledge, and use the context of the specific problems themselves (look for any pragmatic information that is available) in order to
search for new perspectives and ideas that can bring about more creative solutions. These could possibly formulate clearer and alternative ways in trying to ascertain the answers to problems. This is where Heidegger and Gadamer’s view of Hermeneutics can help by not only taking into account the empirical data (or text) that may be collected in controlled settings, but also trying to account for how that information relates to the specific milieu of experiences that encompass the observation, in the real world. Interpretation here is a key aspect to this paradigm, and it provides a useful tool in questioning the way one views all of the observed data. This is particularly significant in my own personal axiological perspective, as my ideology favors contextually fixed principles that take on a more pragmatic, socially responsible stance to research, and it’s impact on societal change. (Somekh & Lewin, 2006; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005; Moran, 2000).

According to Moss (1994), the main goal of this paradigm (framework of reference) is to move toward the creation of an interpretation of empirical evidence, yet maintain openness to variations in subsequent revisions, until they can account for all the available evidence. However, this constant review may create concerns about inconsistencies between observations that cause one to question validity of an investigation. Moss states that these discrepancies should not necessarily be feared, as they just emphasize the need for more evidence. As with the puzzle scenario above, if one piece cannot fit in, we don’t just throw away the piece, but put it down and at some later stage consider other ways in which it may go into the puzzle. Sometimes, an added piece will contribute to making it fit in. Other times a change in perspective or even a change in attitude toward the problem at hand.
Practically speaking, the implementation of this Hermeneutics approach has been divided into what Moss posits as three distinct anchor points within this particular paradigm, referred to as *hermeneutic theory* (producing relatively objective or correct interpretations; making sure of correct interpretations), *hermeneutic philosophy* (recognizing the readers perceptions, prejudices and foreknowledge) and *critical/depth hermeneutics* (taking into account the idea that social dynamics may alter data and interpretations thereof). This goes beyond just observation, and situates the inquiry in a position that reflects the context of the study. Empirical observations are not just a set of isolated experiences, but experiences that are interconnected with other experiences and have different forms when the surroundings are altered. This is important when looking at research across cultural boundaries, when one observation in one culture can have vastly different results in another.

Developing theories about meaning can be done in a variety of ways, yet understanding that those interpretations are correct or are based on sound perceptions is difficult to determine. Having some awareness of our pre-conceptions and of the assumptions we make even before we ask our research questions and then grounding our interpretations within the social context that exists may help to balance the kind of subjectivity that could cloud our interpretations. Interpretative approaches have been criticized for allowing researcher bias into many parts of the process and objectivity has been used as a counterweight balance against post-positivistic theories. The next part of this discussion will focus upon whether objectivity is a realistic concept within the human sciences, specifically with educational research and provide some justification for allowing subjectivity a place within the research process.
Objectivity/Subjectivity

Historically, there have been two opposing schools of thought in relation to how much we are to concern ourselves with the idea of objectivity in Educational research. The positivists of the Vienna Circle have sought to apply scientific method to the human sciences whereas the post positivists of the Frankfurt School have tended to reject rationality in order to explore underlying social themes. The division has created some controversy over the usefulness of subjective observation in educational research, and conversely there has been some skepticism over the role of objectivity (Van Heertum, 2005). What is objectivity, and how can we utilize the idea in a world that now includes post-structuralist ideals? Can we eliminate all bias, and how free of opinion and personal influence should we make our research?

Objectivity is defined by Somekh & Lewin (2006, p.347) as the, “removal of the persona (emotions, knowledge, experience, values and so forth) of the researcher from the research process.” It is an idea that tries to quantify empirically observed experiences by the application of scientific method. Subjectivity on the other hand is the inclusion of the researcher’s character, as a central element to the research activity. Subjectivity in this way is committed to exploring underlying social connections and favors a multi-faceted view of epistemological truth (Van Heertum, 2005). Logical positivists have called for strict adherence to objective empirical testing and then verifying, justifying or falsifying their argumentation. Theorists such as Feyerabend (n.d., Tibbets, 1977) on the other hand, a post-positivist, comments on the need to avoid dogmatic beliefs and remain open to all potential sources of information. This would mean being open to a variety of different perspectives, each with their
prejudices and biases. As we can see, there are theorists on both sides of the continuum.

Chalmers (1982, p.115) defines objectivity in his book, ‘What is this thing called science?’ and states that, “the objectivist gives priority, in his analysis of knowledge, to the characteristics of items or bodies of knowledge that individuals are confronted with, independently of the attitudes, beliefs or other subjective states of those individuals.” Positivists with a strong desire to base all theory in empirically observed fact (epistemological truths typically based on Aristotle’s deductive logic or syllogism) might favor the idea that it is imperative to separate the researcher from data collection and promote experimentation devoid of any prejudice or bias caused by the person doing the investigation. A key concept here is with the idea of being able to separate oneself from all empirically observed data. Post-positivists in the Frankfurt School would argue that it is impossible to eliminate all researcher predispositions. Even choosing the method of inquiry is open to researcher bias. Choice of questions, and methods of implementation can either have slight or dramatic influences on observations. Research questions that are too general may overlook and questions that are too specific may miss essential information. Also analysis and presentation of findings will have varying amounts of researcher influence. Researchers in all methods need to realize that it may not be possible to have a purely objective study, especially within a real life context.

The kind of subjectivity that is being avoided here (in line with purely positivist perspectives) could be said to cause misinterpretation in many stages of the research design and implementation. The initial questions asked in a study may
include researcher perceptions, prejudices and foreknowledge (Moss, 1994). For instance, we can quite easily convince ourselves of something, based on our own needs, even though those beliefs can be at odds with other individuals or groups. Urban myths are a classical example of people believing stories that have a ‘ring of truth’, but cannot be proven beyond belief, in testimonials (sometimes word of mouth) and rationalizations based on some unsubstantiated ‘givens’. We can even defend those beliefs rigidly, even though the consequences of those beliefs produce results that seem contradictory. Therefore, shedding them by separating oneself from the process may be seen as a way to provide unaltered observations of events that happen. Also, there are external forces, especially with politically volatile high-stakes research or in local, yet politically charged action groups, in the form of parental pressure groups, such as the PTA (parents and teachers association) in Japan. They may influence the analyses, by putting pressure on school boards. Lastly, cultural patterns may sway decisions at all levels, and determine the issues under investigation. Different cultural groups place different emphasis on various issues. For instance, Japanese culture tends to favor group-orientated results, whereas many Western cultures put emphasis on individualism. With much of the above affecting the research process, subjectivity may create a foundation in which false hypotheses are made. For those favoring scientific methods, objectivity could be seen as a cure for this and a way to obtain epistemological truths free of value judgments. However, if one were to accept that subjective bias is intrinsic to the data collection and evaluation process, one could account for it by understanding how it affects the procedure, and balancing the effect with extensive observation and detailed description of the
processes used to obtain them.

Even though, objective empiricism has long held favor with those opting for more of a scientific method, it has been challenged as not being able to be an achievable goal (Van Heertum, 2005). Van Heertum adds that absolute objectivity, at least in the way many positivists proclaim, is fraught with limitations that accompany any empirical rationalism, or deductive/inductive type argument. Rationalism suffers with the problem of infinite regress (you can rationalize anything) and deduction needs verification or falsification (therefore you may never truly have a workable theory), and the problem with induction, is that we can’t really know how many cases are needed to actually justify a generalization. Aristotle suggests establishing first principles, but then a problem arises in accepting why these principles don’t have to be proved (Newall, 2004; Newall, 2005). Feyerabend (1975, as cited in Tibbetts, 1977) concludes that scientific theory, based on objectivity is inconclusive and that scientific truth is intangible. He goes on to say that it is the successful judgments and predictions that are made, which are the key and not absolute infallibility (Tibbetts, 1977). So, how can we develop a good understanding of what are successful judgments and predictions? For an answer to this, we may look to other paradigms and belief systems, and try to come up with a balance between what is thought of as truth and what is believed to be true.

Using a number of different paradigms and looking for a balance between the successes and limitations of each, one can gain a greater holistic knowledge of inquiry and also have the detail required to be specific to individual conditions. Yet, is it possible to have two or more paradigms standing side by side, and both being equally
objective and reasonable? Relating back to what I stated in the introduction, about sitting on the fences of a number of different paradigms, I would like to clarify, that even though paradigms have been said to be incommensurable, I strongly believe in the capacity to draw on multiple paradigms, in a triangulated effort to determine touchstones (Walker and Evers, 1988); that is, there being a commonality between a number of paradigms so that one can establish certain premises that work in a number of different perspectives. Fereyabend extends the discussion of paradigms by pointing out that there are multiple methods of description, validation, choice, aesthetic reasoning and knowing and not just the one rational method that should be used to prove something wrong. We can look on at Epistemologies as having different flavors and therefore can be valid if they are based on some internally self-consistent, socially grounded method, including personal choice (Tibbetts, 1977).

In addition, many post-positivists may say that subjectivity is essential or unavoidable, especially within many kinds of research designs that require the researcher to participate in the data collection or having an informant, as in many ethnographic studies (Damen, 1987). They tend to balance the criticisms of subjectivity bias with gains in creativity and openness to a variety of means to achieve data. One way in which they balance the influence of researcher bias is with reflexivity (reflection with self critical analysis). A process, which helps to validate qualitative, research designs.

**Quantitative/Qualitative**

The classical dichotomy in research design open to researchers, which mirrors the objective/subjective debate, comes in the form of the
quantitative/qualitative debate. Both rely on empirical observations, but traditional views of quantitative methods have often relied on realism, objective-casual explanation and universal truth, as opposed to interpretive, value laden, contextual, and socially dependent knowledge (Ponterotto & Grieger, 2007). According to Niglas (2004), the traditional paradigmatic view of research has tended to offer up two or three different paradigms that tend to pigeonhole both the quantitative approach with the positivistic paradigm and qualitative methods with an interpretive paradigm. Niglas also makes the point that this inclination to separate the design aspects, or keep them incommensurable will limit the quality of educational research. Statistical analysis (used in quantitative research) can provide a great deal of information about trends between variables, but by itself lacks understanding about the motivational issues and detail that contribute to the reasons for such results. Therefore, the reader of the results can make inaccurate assumptions about why people do things. This can easily be seen when looking at any political poll on who is favored in an election. Number crunching can give wonderful ratios that can show distinct comparisons, but may not give any indication why people vote the way they do. A qualitative survey or interviews can give thick description and a way in which the reader can determine not only the comparison, but the reasoning behind the choices made, and allow greater accuracy in inducing correct predictive hypotheses for the use in the future.

Quantitative methods have often been favored in the past due to their rational and logical nature, and the ability to enumerate empirically observed events, for easy analysis and comparison. They have been seen as being objective and given preferentiality over qualitative methods for the ease of analysis, and because of the
problem of bias creeping into experimentation and investigation, as cited earlier. However, when applied to the human sciences, there has been some frustration on the limitations of quantitative research. Disillusionment with the quantitative method has crept in because quantitative methods do not suit all kinds of studies. Smaller and more focused analysis on specific groups, such as action research and case study tend to require more detailed ‘thick description’ (as the numbers to provide accuracy just aren’t there) and more in-depth participation by the researcher. Cultural ethnography may require greater understanding of the particular culture that can only be obtained through participation in the particular culture (know by doing, rather than watching). Also, I have often found that my Chinese students of English in Japan are more responsive to a teacher speaking a little Chinese. Showing an affinity toward the cultural group you are studying can help to breakdown barriers, but may also create problems with researcher influence.

Qualitative studies have the advantage of operating in natural settings, having a concern for context. Validity is maintained through logical argument and well-documented comprehensive research. Yet, even with this, people tend to be wary of qualitative research alone (Ponteretto & Grieger 2007). The main argument against qualitative designs has to do with credibility and trustworthiness of the analyses, which can affect the validity of a particular study. To account for this, Wiersma and Jurs (2005) have compiled a list of qualitative study guidelines that helps to improve the validity of qualitative research.

1. Owning one’s own perspective (understanding your approach).

2. Situating the sample (establishing context).
3. Grounding in examples (how it relates to real life examples).

4. Providing credibility checks (checking that data is collected and interpreted without error or oversights).

5. Having coherence (logical reasoning of argumentation)

6. Accomplishing general vs. specific research tasks

7. Resonating with readers (end users can understand and utilize results).

(Wiersma and Jurs, 2005)

Using these guidelines can help to avoid gross generalizations that have no specific realistic framework or are based on false assumptions. It also incorporates some skepticism over the data collection, as a method of ‘checks and balances’, and creates a product that is easily understood.

Quantitative research design concentrates on explaining or controlling variance. The researcher tries to create the conditions in which the variables are controlled and accounted for. Having statistical control will for the positivist, enable more accurate understandings about specific affecting variables. Classical data collection techniques involve large-scale survey, record taking, and techniques that create numerical data. Qualitative research design incorporates understandings about the underlying assumptions about the subjects and the processes involved in collecting information. Phenomena are viewed with more flexibility, as the epistemology that underlies this kind of research is more descriptive in nature, open to more interpretation. Qualitative research favors small action research, case studies, ethnographic studies, and the Hermeneutics paradigm, because of its context dependant component.

Often these methods are thought of as having opposing qualities, but quantitative
and qualitative studies can have a complementing nature, and both methods can be used individually and in mixed methods (a number of different methods) type studies, depending on the purpose and needs of either the participants, the supporters, or the end users of the study. Niglas (2004) comments on the complementary nature of both methods by making the points that: they are not diametrically opposite and that their ontological viewpoints can have similarities. Niglas states that quantitative studies can have idealistic and relativistic perspectives and qualitative design can have realist perspectives (traditionally opposite). The next section will introduce the practical side of research, and compare the kinds of data collection available to both qualitative and quantitative studies.

**Data collection and analysis**

The collection of data for analysis is a very important consideration in all research designs. A main concern is to how one should go about the collection of data (usually some kind of empirical observation, yet not necessarily so). This is done so that one can go about the process of evaluation and analysis in the best possible way, in order to make valid assumptions about the general characteristics that unveil themselves. The design, partly determined by one’s paradigm, determines the way in which one proceeds in collection, and the tools that are available for obtaining information. In pure scientific studies, it is often empirically based, on objectively obtained data. For this, quantitative methods provide a firm foundation for data collection. In other kinds of designs (also empirically driven, but may view subjectivity as part of the process), such as ethnographic cultural studies, often qualitative methods may be used, although there may be the case where mixed methods are called for, depending on the
Wiersma & Jurs (2005) discuss data collection, within the context of the approach taken. Quantitative type studies (often numerical) are contrasted with qualitative studies that include more inductive methods with so called ‘thick description’. They are by no means exclusive, as quantitative methods can also be used in qualitative type studies and vice versa, as Niglas (2004) illustrates in a discussion of the combined use of qualitative and quantitative methods. However, the information obtained by either means produces very different kinds of data. The statistical procedures of quantitative type studies tend to produce three main types of data: Nominal (non-numerical meaning such as yes/no questions), Ordinal (have a rank, such as 1 = unsatisfactory to 5 excellent), and Internal data (have true numerical value but no true zero, such as the results from a sliding scale) Somekh & Lewin (2006), whereas the inductive type methods tend to produce more detailed descriptions that need grounding (make study more reflective of practical situations) and coding (reducing the data to manageable chunks).

One of the most common approaches to data, according to Roulson (2001) is that of thematic analysis. This is a process where the information is collected in the form of empirical data, by the interviewer asking people to talk about their lives. A process whereby there are interviews, and the information that is collected takes the form of statements that report, describe interpret and evaluate. However, Roulson argues that this process is usually deficient in one aspect, that of researcher reflexivity. Roulson is of the view that the researcher is part of the research process, and that any attempt to collect information without understanding the impact that the researcher
has on the study, will end in results that do not produce a valid basis to make hypotheses. The subjectivity that the researcher brings to the study no matter how minimal will have an affect on the data collection. Therefore grounding the study, especially in ethnographic studies, will help account for the researcher impact on the inquiry. Unfortunately, the great amount of data collected in qualitative studies makes it difficult to distinguish raw data, from participant influenced data. Thought about concept identification (various kinds of coding), theoretical sampling (looking at how concepts fit together), category saturation (looking at the point where no new data is needed to contribute to the theory), and memo writing (keeping track of the developing theory), will help to ground the theory in a real life context and account for researcher influence and bias, within qualitative methods. Data is collected empirically, and the information is coded in a way that separates fact from thinking, the study is re-visited on a number of occasions and care is taken not to generalize or change the data in any way (Roulson, 2001). Consideration is with the adequacy of the data and how appropriate the interpretation from the data is in relation to the research problem and data itself.

Impact and Utility

The issue of impact and utility lies in the effectiveness of a research report to affect change and be accessible to the end users. Often research (especially within a quantitative framework) is done with the intention to enact change in a top-down way. That is, professionals do research that is filtered down to users from above. Fitzclarence (2003) argues against this kind of distribution of research, and promotes teachers (and informants) to become active participants in the research process, by
being directly involved and using active experimentation in their own classroom.

The barriers to research utility are access and readability. Often research is written in language that is not accessible to the general public, which makes using the information produced by researchers difficult, and severely limits access to the people who need it. The suggestion given by MacColl & White (1996) is to repackage the research in forums that are more widely available. Also, the readability can be improved by limiting or clarifying technical jargon so as to define the message in an easy to understand way, and reorganizing of the study so that it includes aspects that are readily identifiable by a greater variety of people.

The utility of qualitative research as a specific method has been questioned because it is not objective and the results cannot be generalized easily (Sandelowski, 2004). With a greater number of qualitative studies and better coding and distribution in a readable format, we will be able to start finding similarities and touchstones between different contexts. But, the main purpose of these qualitative studies is for the specific purpose of the inquiry, and if it accomplishes this, it has fulfilled its purpose. If there are correlations to the greater wealth of knowledge, then this is an added advantage.

Cultural dimensions

Culture has been a common denominator throughout my life, yet coming to Japan my cultural awareness and understanding has been put to the test, and has made me question many aspects of my worldview. It has changed my perspective, and has caused me to re-examine some of my personal beliefs and understandings of the world. It was not a conscious shift in my point of view, but an inevitable one,
considering the new ontological and axiological perspectives that I would encounter, within a new country and culture. Thus, the researcher that I am has a firm foundation within social practice, especially with cultural influences both on a personal and political level (including the power struggles that can accompany cultural difference). It is also context driven, and has a practical purpose in developing appreciation for cultural awareness. Initially it was with understanding of my own cultural background, also with my choice in career within an EFL environment in Japan, it has morphed into a general need to understand the characteristics of a cultural group that is not my own. Also the increase in the numbers of non-Japanese learners of English at our school has placed pressure on our curriculum writers and teachers alike to adjust our intercultural perspectives.

I would venture to say that my research paradigm mirrors the pragmatic, ethnographic view that Damen (1987) outlines in *Culture learning: the fifth dimension in the language classroom*. Damen defines the essence of various cultural patterns as the things that develop the rules that we live by, the values we hold and the beliefs we have in all parts of our social lives. These are the things that individuals develop throughout their socialization into a particular culture. Ethnographic research has a lot to offer the second language (SL) teacher, as it can stimulate exploration, description and deep understandings within a new culture (Damen, 1987).

Somekh & Lewin (2006) outline a central purpose of Ethnography to get involved in a social world, understand and describe how its culture works. The researcher in this view becomes involved in the study, creating qualitative ‘thick descriptions’ (Greetz 1988, as cited in Somekh & Lewin 2006) and any analysis of
data, to persuade the reader in what Lincoln and Guba (1989 as cited in Somekh & Lewin 2006) call transferability. This qualitative method may be open to criticism, because it opens up the possibility of introducing bias and prejudice as cited earlier. Damen (1987) suggests not only an *emic approach* (describing a culture in its own cultural terms from the point of the insider), but also an *etic approach* (standing far away from a particular culture, so its separate events can be compared with other cultures). Using these two methods together with a good level of reflexivity (study of the researchers own interpretations, position, and methods used) may be able to account for the influence that is brought on by researcher involvement.

This self-investigation into my own distinctiveness as a researcher has offered me a way to develop a framework for all my own future research work (formal and informal) and also has allowed me the opportunity as a teacher to participate in developing new understandings that will help further new breakthroughs in not only my own teaching, but in my surrounding educational setting (Somekh & Lewin, 2006). Within my own research framework, I intend to focus on specific problems within my college, that require qualitative action research or case study that address specific needs of teachers, students and the school program. My research philosophy is grounded within a post-positivist framework, based on a pragmatic approach to intra/intercultural inquiry. It remains open and free to the needs of the projects and the participants. The methods will suit the study, rather than prescribe. For this purpose, qualitative ethnographic research will provide the main thrust to many of the research projects I undertake. The results of which will hopefully benefit the context of particular studies and my immediate environment.
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