

Debates in Research Paradigms: Reflections in Qualitative Research in Higher Education

Amare Asgedom *

Abstract: This paper is a personal reflection of current debate in educational research paradigms. The study never claims an empirical process of data collection, statistical analysis and theory building; as has been the case of the dominant paradigm in educational research in the Ethiopian context. It is rather a modest reflection of my new self, a new development of how research should be carried out and taught in the Addis Ababa University. The style of writing does not strictly follow the conventional research format, but coheres with a highly personalized way of writing mainly to avoid the tradition of the objectivist pretension. As part of the international debate, I have strongly critiqued the scientific method, not only from a methodological point of view but also mainly from a philosophical stand point (epistemological and ontological). Using current literature and my own personal experience, I have shown how the new paradigm is helpful in understanding higher education process and the world at large.

Reflection

People see what they want to see; what they are prepared to see; and hear what they want hear. People do not want to see what they do not want to see; and do not hear what they do not want to hear (The Eye of the Beholder).

Personally, I believe that I have experienced a *paradigm shift* very recently as a result of my new experiences in reading current literature in the nature and criteria of knowledge. Although I have had some exposure to literature about the use of qualitative research methodologies before (such as, case studies, ethnography, grounded theories, etc.) and had often mentioned them in my teaching educational research courses, (Research Design and Methodology) for the last eight years in the Addis Ababa University, my treatment and coverage was indeed superficial. I often had thought the true

* Associate Professor, College of Education, Addis Ababa University.

source of knowledge was the scientific method and its deductive-inductive inferential models. I had always tried to “discover” knowledge and had been puzzled by the difficulty and the paucity of operational definitions to educational constructs. As a result, I had often felt ashamed that educational research is inferior to the experimental sciences (for instance, biological research, medical research, psychological research, etc.).

I now clearly understand that knowledge is “invented”, not discovered. Social reality is indeed constructed. It cannot have any existence without the human agency, thanks to constructivists (Schwandt, 1994:118-137; Chalmers, 1999). Their clarification has been a source of inspiration to me. The relationship between the inquirer and the inquired is also transactional rather than detached and objectivist. I have now revised the research courses I teach in the Addis Ababa University to reflect recent developments in the new self. I have also started valuing my own publications, which were methodologically qualitative but philosophically positivist (e.g. Amare, 2002; Amare, 2000, Amare, 1998a; Amare, 1998b, etc.). I had never thought of them as serious academic contributions but only practical exercises.

The idea of constructivists as a secular religion (Light and Cox, 2002:18) has now become consonant with my old views of communication theory, which I have taught as a part of a course, Communication and Media Studies, for the last 25 years in the Addis Ababa University. Communication, I believe, is not knowledge transmission (Shannon and Weaver, 1964) but meaning exchange (Osgood, 1976) an inter-subjectivity (Light and Cox, 2002: 21) between the source and the audience. I have regretted, however, the unnecessarily long time has taken me to make sense of the unity between communication theories (which I have pursued for the last 25 years) and qualitative research methodologies, which are ontologically, methodologically and epistemologically supportive of the former; the aim of qualitative inquiry being understanding and interpretation (Guba and Lincoln, 1994).

I now realize that my experience of teaching and research has been ridden with many contradictions. On the one hand, my communication course taught me clearly the dysfunctionality of the dominant paradigm, knowledge transmission.

Mediating factors, such as, audience predispositions, situatedness, needs, etc., intervene in the communication process. Theories, such as, *selective powers of the audience* (Klapper, 1960); *importance of student predispositions* (Salmon and Leigh, 1984); *pedagogy of the oppressed* (Freire, 2003), *communication policy for national development* (Tehranian, 1977), *Many Voices and One World* (UNESCO, 1984), etc., demonstrate the importance of the “other”, the audience of communication. That communication is commonness; and that; it is facilitated by “negotiated” messages. “Every human being, no matter how ignorant or submerged in the culture of silence, he or she may be, capable of looking critically at the world in a dialogical encounter.... People educate each other through the mediation of the world” (Shaul, 2003:34).

In my research course, I taught experimental methods, quasi-experimental methods, surveys, content analysis, etc., with little attention to case studies, ethnographic studies, historical methods, textual studies, etc. This is the result of intellectual blindness and a real failure to comprehend the unity of communication-theories and research-methodologies, in terms of both ontology and epistemology. I had thought only methodological rigor defined the strength of research without paying much attention to the philosophical basis of this discourse.

I had never questioned the value of the scientific method, which I had memorized since my childhood period (in Grade 7). I think, science (as a body of knowledge and method) in the Ethiopian context is still uncontested even in the social sciences and humanities. It is so overwhelming to us that our only fate is to study it by heart with more fascination rather than critically.

In my publication, *culture and development* (Amare, 1998a), I have shown that scientific cultures cannot be transmitted in their true forms-to traditional cultures. Only the surface contents (the trivial strands) are more pervasive in penetration. The deep content that requires understanding of the structure of knowledge is often distorted (Ramsden, 2003:39-61). During my college education (undergraduate and graduate programs) in the disciplines; Geography, Psychology and Media and Communication, both at the Addis Ababa University, and American University in Cairo, I have observed that research emphasis was all positivist, with methodological courses, such as, linear programming, spatial analysis, mathematics, statistics, including probabilities, experimental designs, survey designs, etc. All those had the effect of mental programming in me. Publication policies of research institutes and faculties in the Addis Ababa University had also the effect of reinforcing and sustaining the former. I remember, a contribution, which I still believe is my best work (Amare, 1998b), a critical review of a medium of communication, with the title, *A Habit of Learning with the Least Effort: Television Method of Learning* (which was later published as a conference proceedings in Bahir Dar College of Teacher Education), failed to withstand the preliminary review of the editors of the **Ethiopian Journal of Education**, the only reputable scholarly journal in Ethiopia in the field of education. The article was methodologically unscientific but theoretically useful and rigorous in its analysis.

Random sampling, hypothesis testing, validity, reliability, etc., are important critical values strongly emulated by colleagues in the Addis Ababa University. These had often reinforced the sustained dominance of the positivist paradigm, scientism, even in the field of educational research. The Evaluation and Measurement Unit of the Institute of Educational Research, Addis Ababa University, which I was heading for the last seven years (1996–2003), had always given training on psychometrics stressing quantification and operational definitions. I don not remember a case in training on qualitative methods. In a few occasions when used by graduate students of the Addis Ababa University, qualitiveness was applied in the context of

avoiding the use of statistics, without any reference to its philosophical foundations of epistemology and ontology.

Honestly, I never had any interest in reading books of qualitative research. Neither did I have opportunities of access to convincing books in our library collections, as often is the case in periphery universities (Altbach, 1998). Reading such authors as Hamersley (1999), Chalmers (1999), Creswell (1998), Denzin and Lincoln (1994, 2002, 2003), Miles and Huberman (1994), Silverman (1995), etc. has really brought about a change in my perspectives. This change is not only methodological but also paradigmatic (including changes in the way I look at reality and the way knowledge is gained). It is, however, so drastic that one can honestly doubt its authenticity; and conclude that it is like religious conversion. My claim is anyway true. This new experience has, however, resolved some of the intellectual conflicts that have been embedded in the self. I now feel some kind of coherence in my conscience. I could also argue that this conflict applies to many third world intellectuals, as a result of cultural transplantations.

As the essence of communication is to create a mutual understanding between the self and others, social science research cannot be any much different from this. Actually, this claim is supported by the research-teaching convergence theory in higher education (Ramsden, 2003). There is little possibility that an understanding can be established by a dichotomous activity, observing others; and being observed by others. I now believe that the self-other dichotomy constrains research as much as it does communication. This is not to deny the respective independence of each stance. Research and communication, however, demand virtual convergence. Observing the other doesn't produce facts; but "statement of facts, which are only, mirrored perceptions" (Chalmers, 1995: 5). No two normal observers viewing the same object under the same physical circumstances can necessarily have identical observations; neither can an observer see the same thing in the same way when changing time or space (P.6).

The issue of social scientists claim for science is rather ironic in that it might only confer status. Physical science is not capable of absolute certainty, the observer in physics is equally as important as the observed; the total predictability in a physical system is an impossible goal; and the most scientific reporting, in fact, falsely reports science as clear, logical and linear process (Christians and Carey, 1981:342-374).

There is no reason why educational researchers aspire towards science, when scientific methods, codes of conduct, and process are at best unclear and at worst lack the objectivity, certainty, logicity, and predictability falsely ascribed to it. Educational research should do best to aspire to being systematic, credible verifiable, justifiable, valuable and trustworthy (Christians, 2003:211).

“Qualitative studies are a self-conscious attempt to restore the critical and liberating function to intellectual investigation” (Christians and Carey, 1981:346). They do not view the social sciences as a natural science of society but as distinctive science of the human. They do not view society as a body of contingent and neutral facts to be charted but as an active creation of its members. They do not view social science as objective... but as an active intervention in social life with claims and purposes of its own (p. 346). “Research must not treat a person as a puppet on a string, or a prisoner rather than a live actor on a stage who constantly improvises as the drama unfolds” (Berger, 1963:6-8).

The independent observer doesn't really exist. Poststructuralists and postmodernists have contributed to the understanding that there is no clear window into the inner life of an individual. Any gaze is always filtered through the lens of language, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity. There are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the world of--and between--the observer and the observed (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003: 31). The logic of qualitative research, which will be discussed later in this paper, addresses issues

of knowledge acquisition, the roles of the observed and methodological discourses.

The Logic of Qualitative Research

A Qualitative Research approach is more appropriate to understand the dynamics of higher education in an Ethiopian context. The linkages and influences that arise from the different power sources of higher education governance cannot be grasped by a survey method. The intricate relationship between good teaching, research, and governance can marginally be understood by surveys that might only help to measure, count and correlate, addressing the quantitative aspect of higher education (policy research; product research, behaviorist research, etc.) to the detriment of understanding the complex nature of higher education processes (ethnographic research).

The word qualitative implies an emphasis on the qualities of entities and on processes and meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured in terms of quantity, amount, intensity or frequency (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:13). The contemporary qualitative research status is such that it now has many followers, many books in the field and large scholarly-journal literature. This stage, the sixth moment, in its history (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:13-28), however, has not been reached without much criticism mainly from positivists.

Advocates of quantification argue that, if a thing exists, it must exist in some quantity; it must be measurable. They insist on representativeness of the sample for generalizability to populations. "Empirically confirmed instrumental knowledge about human behavior has greatest predictive power when it deals with collective mass than when we are dealing with individual agents" (Christians, 2003:212 citing John Stuart Mill, 1843/1893, VI, 5, 1, p.596.)

They further argue that causality cannot be effectively established without the use of laboratory experimentations and the use of surrogates to operationalize and quantify human phenomena (Stamm, 1981:87-104; Kerlinger, 1964; Best and Kahn, 1989, etc.). Qualitative studies were also equated with historical propositions trying to explain only past events critically to the detriment of contemporary and future events although they only emulated historical explanation as a method, not history as a subject (Christians and Carey, 1981:345).

Denzin and Lincoln (2003:11-12) have documented the challenges and criticisms to qualitative researchers. Qualitative researchers are labeled as journalists or soft scientists with their work termed as unscientific or only exploratory or subjective. It is called criticism and not theory; or it is interpreted politically as disguised Marxism or secular humanism. Qualitative research is seen as an assault on the scientific tradition. They also further reported that positivists still allege that the new experimental researchers write fiction, not science, and that these researchers have no way of verifying their truth statements. Ethnographic poetry and fiction signal the death of empirical science, they argued and there is little to be gained by attempting to engage in moral criticism (p. 12).

Denzin and Lincoln (2003:12-13), however, clearly showed the province of qualitative research as being the world of lived experiences, because they believed that it is the individual's belief and action that intersect with culture (P.12). They then have shown clearly the positionality of qualitative research vis-à-vis the value-free framework of quantitative researchers (P. 13).

The positivist and post positivists have been attacked by many criticisms including the arguments that these paradigms are unable to deal adequately with the issues surrounding the ethic, emic, nomothic and ideographic dimensions of the inquiry. Too many local (emic), case-based (idiographic) meanings are excluded by the generalizing (etic) nomothic, positivist position (Guba and Lincoln; 1994: 106).

Constructivisms, critical theory, interpretive perspectives of all branches compete in critiquing positivists and post-positivists (Guba and Lincoln, 1994:99). Constructivism adopts relativist ontology, a transactional epistemology and hermeneutic dialectic methodology. Their research orientations are lowered production of reconstructed understandings replacing the positivist criteria of internal and external validity by the terms trustworthiness and authenticity. Their commitment is to distinguish themselves from positivists by studying the world from the point of view of the interacting individual (Schwandt, 1994: 118 – 137).

Marxist models (Critical theory) also circulate within the discourse of qualitative research (kincheloe and McLaren, 1994: 138-157). They articulate ontology based on historical realism, an epistemology that is transactional and a methodology that is dialogic and dialectical (Guba and Lincoln, 1994:106). These have their beginning in the Frankfurt School and now in their most recent transformation in post-cultural post-modern, feminist, and cultural studies theory. There are, however, some critical theorists who work to build testable, falsifiable social theory (e.g. Carspecken and Apple, 1992:547–548). Most critical theorists and Marxists nevertheless work more closely from within a traditional, qualitative grounded theory approach to validity and theory construction, stressing the extended case study as the focus of analysis (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:101).

Feminists use a variety of qualitative interpretive styles focusing on interpreting human actions whether found in women's reports of experience or in the cultural products of reports of experience (Olesen, 1994:158). Three types of feminist interpretive perspectives are identified. These are standpoint epistemology, empiricist and post-modern cultural studies. Standpoint epistemologists reject standard good social scientific methodologies; because they produce people as objects ... they import the relations of ruling into the text they produce (Olesen, 1994:162-163).

Feminist empiricists closely adhere to the current norms of qualitative inquiry. Their work proceeds on the assumption of inter-subjectivity and commonly created meanings and realities between researcher and participants (P. 163).

Postmodernist feminist researchers regard “truth” as a destructive illusion (Olesen, 1994:164). They view the world as endless stories or texts, many of which sustain integration of power and oppression and actually constitute us subjects in determinant order “(Hawkesworth, 1989:349). Their focus is therefore narrative and the nebulous distinction between text and reality (Hawkesworth, 1989: 348). Carrying the imprints of feminist forbears from deconstructionism and postmodernism (French feminists, such as, Cixous and Irigaray, and Foucault, Lyotard, Bandrillard, etc.), feminists’ research, in the rapidly developing area of cultural studies, stresses representation and text (Olesen, 1994:164).

In a later publication, Schwandt (2003:292) has discussed three types of epistemological stances in qualitative inquiry. These were interpretism, hermeneutics and social constructionism. The former two arose as a result of the debate that was going on since the late 19th and early 20th century on the issues of the precise nature of the difference between the natural and social sciences (P. 295). The latter was discussed in earlier presentations.

Using design traditions, Creswell (1998) has distinguished five types of qualitative research. These are biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case study. Only a few years ago, some called qualitative research ethnographic (Creswell, 1998:3). Qualitative research comes from diverse disciplinary perspectives. For example, ethnography originated in anthropology, grounded theory in sociology, and biography in history and sociology (ibid).

Although not fully mutually exclusive, the five types of qualitative studies have differences in purpose and focus. The focus of biography is on the life of an individual, and the focus of a

phenomenology is on understanding a concept or phenomenon. In grounded theory, one develops a theory grounded on data. The case study examines a specific case. A cultural group is portrayed in ethnography (Creswell, 1998:38). These all are not mutually exclusive but each has its own concern and focus.

In a book, **The Qualitative Inquiry Reader**, Denzin and Lincoln (2002) have identified five types of interpretive inquiry; reflexive ethnography, autoethnography, poetics, performance narratives, and assessing the text. These divisions reflect the ways in which contemporary researchers have implemented the narrative turn in their writing.

Interpretive ethnographers make the world visible through their writing practices. The reflexive ethnographer is morally and politically self-aware, self-consciously present in his or her writing, often speaking with the first person voice. The reflexive ethnographer is part of the inquiry. He or she uses his or her own experience in a culture reflexively to bend back on self and look more deeply at self other interactions (Ellis and Bochner, 2000:740).

In autoethnography, researchers conduct and write ethnographies of their own experiences. The researcher becomes the research subject (Denzin and Lincoln, 2002:71).

The poetic, narrative text erases the usual distinctions between fact and fiction- writers of poetry devises, such as, dialogue, multiple points of view, composite characters and scenes, an emphasis on showing not telling. Poems are written in facts not about facts. The goal of representing lived experiences is emphasized. This is not simple retelling of lived experiences. The poetic form juxtaposes

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds), **Handbook of Qualitative Research** (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications. PP. 733 – 768.

voice, temporality, point of view, and character while privileging emotion and emotionality (P. 155).

In performance narratives the ethnographer gravitates to these narratively structured, liminal existential spaces in the culture. In these dramaturgical sites, people take sides, forcing, threatening, inducing, seducing, cajoling, nudging, loving, living abusing and killing one another. These all raise questions of power and control, such as, whose story? Who is doing the telling and who has the authority to make their telling stick? As ethnographic starting, performances are always enmeshed in moral matters and they enact moral stance asking the audience to take stand on the performance and its meanings. In these productions, the performer becomes a central critic (Denzin and Lencoln, 2002:181-182).

The fifth type of qualitative research is assessing the text, rooted in the concepts of care, shared governance, neighborliness, love and kindness. Such work provides the foundations for social criticism and social action (Christians, 2000). The criteria for evaluating qualitative work are moral and ethical (Denzin and Lincoln 2002: 229). It is a blending of aesthetics, ethics and epistemologies. The assessment process is informed by the stance that nothing is value-free. Knowledge is power. Those who have power determine what is aesthetically pleasing and ethically acceptable (P. 229–230). All aesthetics and strands of judgment are based on particular moral standpoint. There is no objective, morally neutral standpoint (Christians, 2000).

Qualitative research, in general, is a situated activity that locates the observer in the real world. It consists of a list of interpretive material practices that make the world visible (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:4-5). It is multidimensional in focus involving interpretive and naturalistic

³ Christians, C. (2000). Ethics and politics in Qualitative Research. In N.Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications. PP. 133 – 155.

approach to its subject matter (Holstein and Gubrium, 1994:262). Qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

Silverman (1995:23) has observed that there is no standard approach to how qualitative research is defined. By quoting Bryman (1988), Silverman (1995:23-24) has, however, suggested six possible criteria for characterizing a qualitative research methodology. These criteria are:

- Seeing through the subject's perspective; or taking the subject's perspective
- Describing the mundane detail of everyday settings
- Understanding actions and meanings in their social context
- Emphasizing time and process
- Favoring open and relatively unstructured research design
- Avoiding concepts and theories at early stage

In the same vein, Hammersley (1990:1-2) has offered similar criteria defining ethnographic research. These are:

- The use of everyday context rather than experimental conditions
- A range of sources of data collection (the main ones are observation and informal conversations)
- A preference for unstructured data collection
- A preference for micro features of social life (a single setting or a group)
- A concern with meanings and functions of social life
- The assumption that quantification plays a subordinate role

Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyses words, reports detailed views of informants and conducts

the study in a natural setting (Creswell, 1998: 15). Creswell (1998:16–17) also argues that qualitative research shares good company with the most rigorous quantitative research and that it should not be viewed as an easy substitute for a “statistical” or quantitative study. He suggested that qualitative researchers must do the following:

- Commit to extensive time in the field
- Engage in the complex, time-consuming process of data analysis--the ambitious task of sorting through large amounts of data and reducing them to a few themes or categories
- Write long passages, because the evidence must substantiate claims; and the writer needs to show multiple perspectives
- Participate in a form of social and human science research that does not have firm guidelines or specific procedures and is evolving and changing constantly.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994:2) added that what constitutes qualitative research must be viewed from a historical field. The generic description, according to them, is that it is multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. They further argued that the qualitative researcher is a “*bricoleur*” constructing a “*bricolage*”--‘a Jack-of-all-trades’--or a kind of ‘professional-do-it-yourself person’ (p. 2). The bricolage is a pieced-together or close-knit set of practices that provide solutions to a problem in a concrete situaty, they further underlined.

Speaking about qualitative research data, Miles and Huberman (1994:1) said, “qualitative data are sexy” and added that:

They are a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes in identifiable local contexts. With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, see precisely which events led to which consequences and derive fruitful explanations. Then, too, good qualitative data are more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and to new integrations. Finally, the findings from qualitative studies have a quality of un deniability. Words, specially organized into incidents or stories

have a concrete, vivid, meaningful flavor that often prove far more convincing to a reader--another researcher, a policymaker, a practitioner--than pages of summarized numbers.

Comparing qualitative research with quantitative one was also a tradition of qualitative researchers (Creswell, 1998; Vidich and Lyman, 1994; Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Kincheloe and McLaren, 1994, etc). In fact, Denzin and Lincoln (1994:6) contended that critiquing positivists is one of the responsibilities of qualitative research, the second one being commitment to naturalistic interpretive approach.

According to Ragin [(1987) cited in Creswell, 1998:15)], the key difference characterizing qualitative and quantitative research is that quantitative researchers work with a few variables and many cases, whereas qualitative researchers rely on a few cases and many variables.

In distinguishing qualitative inquiry from quantitative research, Denzin and Lincoln (1994:1–17) have argued that, the word qualitative implies an emphasis on process and meanings that are not rigorously examined (p. 4). Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied and the situational constraints of what is studied, such researchers emphasizing the value-laden nature of the inquiry (Guba and Lincoln, 1994:109). In contrast, quantitative studies emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes. Inquiry is purported to be within a value-free framework.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994:1–18) have discussed the five ways in which qualitative research is different from quantitative research. These are: (1) uses of positivism/post positivism; (2) acceptance of post-modern sensibilities; (3) capturing the individual's point of view; (4) examining the constraints of everyday life and; (5) securing rich descriptions. They argued that, historically qualitative research was

defined within the positivist paradigm where qualitative researchers attempted to do good positivist with less rigorous methods and procedures.

Guba and Lincoln (1994:105–117) have shown qualitative/quantitative distinctions in terms of two major quantification critiques. One is internal to the conventional paradigm (that is, in terms of the metaphysical assumptions that defined the nature of positivist inquiry) and one external to it (that is, in terms of these assumptions defining alternative paradigms). Thus, they called them as intraparadigm and extraparadigm critiques.

The intrapardigm critiques include context tripping, exclusion of meaning and purpose, disjunction of grand theories with local context (the ethic/emic dilemma), inapplicability of general data to individual cases; and exclusion of the discovery dimension in inquiry. These intraparadigm problems are challenges to conventional methods, but could be eliminated or ameliorated by use of qualitative data. The extraparadigm critiques have raised four important points of argument. These are:

- The theory-ladenness of facts--challenging conventional inquiry's view of independence of theoretical and observational languages.
- The indetermination of theory--not only are facts determined by the theory- window through which one looks for them, but different theory-windows might be equally well supported by the same set of facts.
- The value-ladenness of facts--just as theories and facts are not independent, neither are values and facts. The value free posture is compromised.
- The interactive nature of the inquirer–inquired—science pictures the inquirer as standing behind a one-way mirror, viewing natural phenomena as they happen and recording them objectively. Indeed, the notion that findings are created through the interaction of the inquirer and phenomenon is often a more plausible description of the inquiry process than is the notion that findings

are discovered through objective observation as they really are, and as they really work.

References

- Amare A. (1994). Give them what they need or give them what they want? **IER Flambeau**. 3(1):1-14.
- _____ (1995). How Do we Improve Status of What Are Called "Teaching Aids"? (Translated). **Educational Journal**, 1[1]: 4-7.
- _____ (1996). Learning from the Media: Five Models, **Educational Journal**. 3:93-105
- _____ (1998b). A Habit of Learning with the Least Effort: Television Method of Learning, **Bulletin of Bahirdar Teachers' College**. 9(1): 1-14.
- _____ (1998a). Culture and Development, **IER-Flambeau**, 5:1-6
- _____ (1998c). Communication Theories and Instructional Practice: A Limited-Effect Perspective, **IER Flambeau**, 5: 39-49
- _____ (2000a). The State of Educational Research in Ethiopia. **The Ethiopian Journal of Education** 20(2): 19-48.
- _____ (2000b). I Do not Agree with Globalizing the Curriculum of Higher Education. **The Reporter**, Vol. IV. No. 209.
- _____ (2001). An Androgenic Approach to Teaching and Learning, **IER-Flambeau**, 8(1): 73-88.
- Altheid, D.L. and Johnson, J.M. (1994). Criteria for Assessing Interpretive validity in Qualitative Research." In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research**. London: SAGE Publications. PP. 485-499.
- Asmussen, K.J. and Creswell, J.W. (1995). Campus Response to a Student Gunman, **Journal of Higher Education**. 66:575-591.
- Bryman, A. (1988). **Quantity and Quality in Social Research**. London: Unwin Hyman.

- Chalmers, A.F. (1999). **What is thing called Science?** (3rd edition). Indianapolis/Cambridge: University of Queensland Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). **Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions**. London: SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research". In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research**. London: SAGE Publications pp. 1-18.
- Eshetu Chole (1992). Ethiopia at the Crossroads: Reflections on the Economics of the Transitional Period, *DIALOGU*. 1(1): 59-82.
- Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research'. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research**. 105-117 London: SAGE Publications. Pp.105-117.
- Hammersley, M. and Gomm, R. (2002). Introduction. In R. Gomm, et al (eds.), **Case study Method**. London: SAGE Publications. PP. 1-17.
- Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J.F. (1994). Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology and Interpretive Practice. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research**. London: SAGE Publications. Pp. 262-272.
- Howe, K. and Eisenhardt, M. (1990). Standards for Qualitative (and Quantitative) Research: A Prolegomenon. **Educational Researcher**. 19(4): 2-9.
- Kincheloe, J.K. and McLaren, P. (1994). Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.). **Handbook of Qualitative Research**.
- Light, G. and Cox, R. (2002). **Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: The Reflective Professional**. Thousandoaks: SAGE Publications.
- Lincoln, Y.S. (1995). Emerging Criteria for Quality and Qualitative and Interpretive Research. **Qualitative Inquiry**. 1:275-289.
- Merriam, S. (1998). **Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994). **An Expanded Source Book: Qualitative Data Analysis** (2nd edition). London: SAGE Publications.

- Osgood, C. (1976). **Focus on Meaning, volume 1: Explorations in Semantic space**. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ragin, C.C. (1987). **The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies**. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schwandt, T.A. (1994). Constructivist, Interpretivist approaches to Human Inquiry. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research**. London: SAGE Publications. PP. 118-137.
- Shannon, C.E. and Weaver, W. (1964). **The Mathematical theory of Communication**. Urbana: The University of Illinois
- Silverman, D. (1995). **Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction**. London: SAGE Publications.
- Stake, R.E. (1995). **The Art of Case Study Research**. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- _____. (2002). The case Study Method as a Social Inquiry. In R. Gomm, et al (eds.), **Case Study Method**. London: SAGE Publications. PP. 19-26.
- _____. (1994). Case Studies. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research**. London: SAGE Publications. PP. 236-247.
- Viditch, A.J. and Lyman, S.M. (1994). Qualitative Methods: Their History in Sociology and Anthropology. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research**. London: SAGE Publications PP. 19-22.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). **Case Study Research: Design and Methods** (3rd edition). London: SAGE Publications.
- Altbach, P.G. (1998). **Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University and Development**. Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong.
- Berger, P. (1963). **Introduction to sociology: A Humanistic Perspective**. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V.(1989). **Research in Education** (6th edition). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice - Hall. Inc.
- Carspecken, P.F. and Apple, M. (1992). Critical Research: Theory Methodology and Practice. In M.D. Lecompte, W.L. Millroy and J. Preissle (Eds.); **The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education**, New York: Academic press. PP. 507-554.

- Christians, C. (2000). Ethics and Politics in Quantitative Research. In N. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research** (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications. PP. 133-155.
- Christians, C.G. (2003). Ethics and Politics. In N.k. Denzin and Y.S. and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), **The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues**. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications pp. 208 - 244.
- Christians, C.G. and Carey, J.W. (1981). The Logic and Aims of Qualitative Research. In G.H. Stempel, III and B.H. Westley (Eds.), **Research Methods in Mass Communication** Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice - Hall, Inc. pp. 342-374.
- COSMOS Corporation (2002). **Cross-Case Analysis of Transformed Firms Case Studies**. Gaithersburg, MD: National Institute of Standards and Technology, US Department of Commerce. pp.111-123.
- Denzin, N.K and Lincoln, Y.S. (2003). **The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues** (Eds.). Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2002). **The Qualitative Inquiry Reader Educational and Psychological Inquiry**. New York: Holt, Rinchart and Winston, Inc.
- Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P. (2000). Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, reflexivity. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), **Handbook of Qualitative Research** (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE
- Hammersley, M. (1999). **Researching School Experience: Ethnographic Studies of Teaching and Learning** (Ed). London: Flamer Press.
- Hawkesworth, M.E. (1989). Knowing known: feminist theory and Claims of Truth. In M. R. Malson et al (Eds.), **Feminist Theory in Practice and Process**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press:
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1964). **Foundations of Behavioral Research**:
- Klapper, J.T (1960). **The Effects of Mass Communication**. New York: The Free Press.
- Olesen, V.L. (2003). Feminism and Qualitative Research at and into the Millennium. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), **The Landscapes of Qualitative Research : Theories and Issues**.
- Olsen, V.L. (1994). Feminism and Models of Qualitative Research. In N.k. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), **The landscape of Qualitative Research : Theories and Issues**. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications. pp. 158-174. pp. 327-351. pp.30-34.
- Ramsden, P. (2002). **Learning to Teach in Higher Education** (2nd ed.). London: Rout ledge Flamer.
- Salmon, G. and Leigh, T. (1984). Predispositions about learning from Print and Television. **Journal of Communication**. (Eds.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. 34:119-153.

- Shaul, R. (2003). Forward: Pedagogy of the oppressed in P. Friene, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (30th Anniversary Edition)
- Stamm, K. (1981). Measurement Decisions. In G.H. Stempel, 111 and B.H. Westley (Eds.), **Research Methods in Mass Communication**. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.pp.87-104
- Teheranian, M. et al (1977). **Communication Policy for National Development**. London: Rout ledge and Kegan Paul Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications. pp. 332-397
- UNESCO(1980). **Many voices, One World: Communication and Society Today and Tomorrow**. Paris: UNESCO.