



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

INVESTIGATING THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP

By

Ke Yu

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR (PhD)

In the

Department of Education Management and Policy Studies

at the

University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Prof. J.D.Jansen

Pretoria

July 2008



DECLARATION

I hereby do declare that this research report, being submitted for the award of the degree of PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR (PhD) of University of Pretoria is my independent work and it has previously not been submitted for a degree or any other examination at this or any other university.

Ke Yu

_____ day of _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work would be impossible without the guidance and critical feedbacks provided by Prof. J.D. Jansen as the supervisor of this research.

Likewise, this work would also be impossible without the contribution of all my participants. I am thankful to their devotion of time and willingness to open to an academic inquiry. Originally, I planned to present my appreciation by providing them individual acknowledgement, particularly for those whose real identity was used upon their agreement. However, because of the university regulation, I was suggested to protect all my participants “by giving them full anonymity”, therefore all the names appear in this dissertation were pseudonyms and the opportunity to reinstate my gratitude would be limited by expressing my thanks to them all, but not providing individual acknowledgement.



ETHICAL CLEARANCE

ANNEXURE D



UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE

DEGREE AND PROJECT

CLEARANCE NUMBER :

EM08/02

PhD Educational Management , Law and Policy
Investigating the researcher-practitioner relationship in a
developing country context.

INVESTIGATOR(S)

Ke Yu – 24322548

DEPARTMENT

Educational Management

DATE CONSIDERED

1 August 2005

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE

APPROVED

This ethical clearance is valid for years and may be renewed upon application

**CHAIRPERSON OF ETHICS
COMMITTEE**

Dr S Human-Vogel

DATE

20 July 2007

CC

Prof Jonathan Jansen
Mrs Jeannie Beukes

This ethical clearance certificate is issued subject to the following conditions:

1. A signed personal declaration of responsibility
2. If the research question changes significantly so as to alter the nature of the study, a new application for ethical clearance must be submitted
3. It remains the students' responsibility to ensure that all the necessary forms for informed consent are kept for future queries.

Please quote the clearance number in all enquiries.

ABSTRACT

This research reports on the nature and preference of the relationship between researchers and practitioners, as expressed by both parties.

The research methods used in this study included a critical analysis of 28 Masters and doctoral dissertations from a large university in South Africa to examine how they described the researcher–practitioner relationship. This was followed by extended interviews with both the original researchers and the participants in three studies selected from these 28 projects. In addition, two research projects conducted by experienced researchers were included, as well as a discussion on how my participants interacted with me as a researcher. The data were explained through the theoretical frame of a general model developed by Huberman in 1990, not only focusing on the relationship manifested in the research process itself, but also locating the relationship within a broader theoretical frame that seeks to explain the patterns and consequences of such engagement.

The findings draw attention to the often uncovered similarities between the two communities, while also highlighting ethics as an area of concern that displays the biggest disjunction between the two communities. In addition, the findings confirm the powerful influence of organisational culture, in this case academic discourse on the behaviour of an individual researcher. On the other hand, however, the findings also point to the individualism manifested in research decisions and processes. Finally, the findings disprove the way in which power is perceived in research situations in the literature.

The significance of this study also includes a revisiting of existing theories about insider/outsider positioning and research utilisation and the proposal to extend current debates.



CONTENT

DECLARATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	III
ETHICAL CLEARANCE	IV
ABSTRACT.....	V
CONTENT.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES	XI
LIST OF TABLES.....	XI
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PURPOSE STATEMENT	1
1.2 BACKGROUND	1
1.3 RATIONALE AND UNIQUENESS OF THIS STUDY	4
1.4 EXPLANATION OF THE BOUNDARIES	5
1.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	6
1.6 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	7
1.7 METHODOLOGY	8
<i>1.7.1 Paradigm, epistemological assumptions and research approach.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>1.7.2 Research design</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>1.7.3 Research questions.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>1.7.4 Data collection.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>1.7.5 Data analysis</i>	<i>12</i>
1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH.....	12
1.9 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	13
1.10 ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS	14
2 THE PATTERNS AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP – A LITERATURE REVIEW	16
2.1 RESEARCH UTILISATION MODEL	16
<i>2.1.1 Modes of research utilization.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>2.1.2 Instrumental/conceptual utilization debate.....</i>	<i>19</i>
2.2 HUBERMAN’S GENERAL MODEL	22
2.3 RESEARCHER/PRACTITIONER CONTEXT—WHAT INFLUENCES THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP?	25
<i>2.3.1 Detachment or involvement—a choice deeply rooted in the epistemological stance?.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>2.3.2 Purpose of conducting research.....</i>	<i>29</i>
2.3.2.1 Intrinsic/extrinsic debate.....	29
2.3.2.2 Public/private good debate.....	32



2.3.3 <i>Beneficence</i>	33
2.3.3.1 Mutual benefit or benefits in conflicts	34
2.3.3.2 Who benefits of what?	35
2.4 EMPIRICALLY REPORTED RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP	38
2.4.1 <i>Researcher-participant collaboration</i>	39
2.4.1.1 Co-teaching	43
2.4.1.2 Co-presenting (co-author)	45
2.4.2 <i>Other publications</i>	50
2.4.3 <i>Summary</i>	51
2.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY	52
3 RESEARCH DESIGN	54
3.1 EPISTEMOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS	54
3.2 RESEARCH APPROACH	55
3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN	56
3.3.1 <i>Paradigm & research design</i>	56
3.3.2 <i>Theoretical framework</i>	56
3.3.3 <i>Data collection</i>	58
3.3.4 <i>Data recording</i>	61
3.3.5 <i>Data representation</i>	61
3.3.6 <i>Data analysis</i>	63
3.4 METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS	65
3.5 THE RESEARCHER AS BOTH AN INSIDER AND OUTSIDER.....	65
3.6 MEASURES OF VALIDATION.....	66
3.7 ETHICAL ISSUES	67
4. THE WAY IN WHICH DISSERTATION WRITERS DESCRIBE THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP.....	71
4.1 SAMPLING FRAME	71
4.2 TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP REVEALED IN THE TEXT OF THE DISSERTATIONS?	74
4.2.1 <i>Purpose of the study, recommendations and beneficence as manifested in the dissertation</i>	75
4.2.1.1 Purpose of the study and recommendations.....	75
4.2.1.2 <i>Beneficence</i>	76
4.3 HOW DID THESE RESEARCHERS EXPERIENCE THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER ENGAGEMENT?.....	78
4.3.1 <i>Accessing the participants</i>	78
4.3.2 <i>The researcher–practitioner relationship during the data collection period</i>	80
4.3.3 <i>The researcher–practitioner relationship beyond data collection</i>	83
4.4 HOW DID RESEARCHERS REFLECT ON THEIR ENGAGEMENT WITH THEIR PARTICIPANTS?.....	84
4.5 SYNTHESIS	86
5 THE WAY IN WHICH DISSERTATION WRITERS AND THEIR PARTICIPANTS EXPERIENCE THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP	89



5.1 CASE 1 (CATEGORY I):	90
FRANCIS—EXPLORING FACILITATION SKILLS IN ASSET-BASED TRANSDISCIPLINARY TEAMWORK (MASTERS)	90
5.1.1 <i>Researcher/practitioner context</i>	91
5.1.2 <i>Researcher–practitioner relationship</i>	95
5.1.3 <i>Evaluation of the relationship</i>	101
5.2 CASE 2 (CATEGORY II):	102
THABO –THE INFLUENCE OF CROSS-CULTURAL INTERVIEWING ON THE GENERATION OF DATA (MASTERS)	102
DE BEER—THE ACADEMIC SELF-CONCEPT OF LEARNERS WITH HEARING IMPAIRMENT IN TWO SOUTH AFRICAN PUBLIC SCHOOL CONTEXTS: SPECIAL AND FULL-SERVICE INCLUSION SCHOOLS (PHD) ...	102
5.2.1 <i>Researcher/practitioner context</i>	104
5.2.2 <i>Researcher–practitioner relationship</i>	113
5.2.3 <i>Evaluation of the relationship</i>	125
5.3 CASE 3 (CATEGORY III):	126
SEHLOLA-- SIR, ON WHAT PAGE IS THE ANSWER? EXPLORING TEACHER DECISION-MAKING IN THE CONTEXT OF COMPLEX CURRICULUM CHANGE (PHD)	126
5.3.1 <i>Researcher/practitioner context</i>	128
5.3.2 <i>Researcher–practitioner relationship</i>	134
5.3.3 <i>Evaluation of the relationship</i>	143
5.4 SYNTHESIS	144
5.4.1 <i>A brief summary of the cases</i>	144
5.4.1.1 Francis.....	144
5.4.1.2 Thabo & De Beer	145
5.4.1.3 Sehlola	148
5.4.2 <i>Similarities and dissonances between the cases</i>	150
5.4.3 <i>Similarities and dissonances between the researchers and the practitioners</i>	150
5.4.4 <i>Difference between the written text and oral relevance</i>	151
5.4.5 <i>Tackle the other puzzles</i>	152
5.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY	153
6 HOW EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS AND THEIR PARTICIPANTS EXPERIENCE THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP	155
6.1 CASE 4: HENDRICKS—EXAMINING CAUSES OF DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS IN A SOUTH AFRICAN BOARDING SCHOOL	155
6.1.1 <i>Researcher/practitioner context</i>	155
6.1.2 <i>Researcher–practitioner relationship</i>	159
6.1.3 <i>Evaluation of the relationship</i>	164
6.2 CASE 5: SANI—EXCEPTIONAL PATTERNS OF DESEGREGATION	165
6.2.1 <i>Researcher/practitioner context</i>	166
6.2.2 <i>Researcher–practitioner relationship</i>	172
6.2.3 <i>Evaluation of the relationship</i>	178



6.3 SYNTHESIS	179
6.3.1 <i>A brief summary of the two cases</i>	179
6.3.1.1 Hendricks	179
6.3.1.2 Sani	180
6.3.2 <i>Distinctive features of these two cases</i>	182
6.3.3 <i>Experienced researchers versus student-researchers cases</i>	182
7 HOW MY PARTICIPANTS INTERACTED WITH ME	185
7.1 RESEARCHER/PRACTITIONER CONTEXT	185
7.1.1 <i>Purpose of conducting a research study</i>	185
7.1.2 <i>Reasons for participation</i>	188
7.1.3 <i>Beneficence</i>	191
7.1.4 <i>Responsibility of a researcher towards his/her participants—the issue of confidentiality</i>	196
7.1.5 <i>Responsibility of a participant towards the researcher</i>	204
7.2 RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP	205
7.2.1 <i>Sampling</i>	205
7.2.2 <i>Accessing the participants & the gate keepers</i>	209
7.2.3 <i>Involvement/detachment</i>	210
7.2.3.1 <i>Judgement, critique and faking friendship</i>	211
7.2.3.2 <i>Formal or informal?</i>	215
7.2.3.3 <i>Research-based relationship or friendship?</i>	216
7.2.3.4 <i>The role of friendship in a research situation</i>	217
7.2.4 <i>Retreat from the field--Continuity or closure?</i>	219
7.3 POWER HIERARCHY?	224
7.3.1 <i>Power imbalance</i>	224
7.3.2 <i>Power sharing in research decision making</i>	232
7.3.3 <i>Power shift</i>	234
7.4 TRUST OR MISTRUST?	236
7.4.1 <i>Attitude towards research</i>	237
7.4.2 <i>Attitude towards researchers</i>	239
7.5 SYNTHESIS	240
8 RETHINKING THE RESEARCHER–PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIP	242
8.1 REVISITING THE FINDINGS	242
8.1.1 <i>How similar or different are these two communities?</i>	242
8.1.2 <i>Organizational influences versus personality</i>	244
8.1.2.1 <i>Organizational influences</i>	244
8.1.2.2 <i>Personal factors—returning to Huberman’s general model</i>	246
8.2 CONCLUSION	246
8.2.1 <i>The nature of the researcher–practitioner relationship</i>	246
8.2.1.1 <i>A power play?</i>	246
8.2.1.2 <i>A familiar source?</i>	247



8.2.2 <i>Rethinking involvement/detachment; insider/outsider; friendship</i>	248
8.2.3 <i>Rethinking research utilization</i>	251
8.2.3.1 Instrumental and conceptual utilization	251
8.2.3.2 Symbolic utilization and organizational culture.....	253
8.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	256
8.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR RESEARCH PRACTICE	257
8.5 SIGNIFICANCE	258
8.6 CONCLUSION	259
REFERENCES.....	260
APPENDICES	280
A: INFORMED CONSENT.....	280

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: General model (Huberman, 1990).....	23
Figure 2: Revised Huberman's model.....	24
Figure 3: integration of strategies for data analysis.....	64
Figure 4: method of data collection, adapted from Thabo (2004, p. 55).....	103
Figure 5: different views of research utilization.....	252

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Modes of knowledge production, adapted from Gibbons, <i>et al.</i> (1994).....	28
Table 2: Value of knowledge, categorised according to public/private good, explanation adopted from their text. Source: Lor & Britz (2005, p. 64).....	32
Table 3: Revised understanding of value of knowledge as public/private good.....	33
Table 4: How various aspects of collaboration is reported in Clark <i>et al.</i> (1996).....	49
Table 5: Interview protocol.....	58
Table 6: The two ends of a continuum of interview forms (Plummer, 2001, p.411).....	60
Table 7: exclusions to the database.....	72
Table 8: the representation of Masters and PhDs in the database.....	73
Table 9: the representation of Masters and PhDs in the final database.....	73
Table 10: description of categories.....	74
Table 11: categorization as per Masters/PhD distribution.....	75
Table 12: purposes of conducting research.....	188
Table 13: motives of participation.....	189
Table 14: understanding of benefits in research.....	195
Table 15: researchers' understanding of their responsibility towards the participants.....	196
Table 16: participants' understanding of researcher's responsibility towards them.....	197
Table 17: preference of anonymity.....	200
Table 18: how participants were acknowledged in acknowledgement page.....	203
Table 19: understanding of the responsibility of a participant towards the researcher.....	205
Table 20: perceived role of friendship in a research situation.....	218
Table 21: indicated preference of closure/continuity.....	220
Table 22: types of feedback participants requested.....	222
Table 23: original participants' view of the power issue in their original research.....	227
Table 24: original researchers' view of power (both as a researcher in their own project and as a participant in my study).....	230
Table 25: how all participants handled the informed consent encounter.....	235
Table 26: research preferred by practitioners/researchers.....	243