WHAT IS RESEARCH?

Let’s begin by defining some of the basic terms we use in research, through the rhetorical device of going to textbook definitions of ‘research’ itself, so that we are on common ground. The *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* defines research as:

n. & v. Systematic investigation into and study of materials and sources, in order to establish facts and reach new conclusions.

Of course, a simple definition cannot explicitly encompass such a complex noun, so to start our ‘systematic investigation’, let’s examine the sentence more closely. Take ‘new conclusions’, for instance: a pretty flat and bland phrase, as it stands, to define what we may discover in the arts/humanities about human behaviour, the imagination and the shifting and dynamic forms of our experiences. Most universities, in their research degree instructions, make the demand for ‘new knowledge’, and leave it to the researchers to define what they mean by that and justify how they have achieved it. With arts and humanities researchers, ‘gaining new insights’ is popular, implying that ‘in-sights’ (or ‘ways of seeing’) are as important as ‘out-sights’ like facts or conclusions. This is in contrast to research into pharmacy, or engineering, which we expect to be entirely verifiable and objective—we don’t want pills or bridges that are open-ended, dynamic and ambiguous. But to stay with such a distinction is too simple.

Our approach to educational research in this book needs to acknowledge that many of the facts we discover—whether through ‘in-sights’ or ‘out-sights’—and the conclusions we draw from both these ways of seeing are not objective, nor are they certain truths. In this book, we are drawing attention to the manner in which both of these ways of

CHAPTER OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- discern why ‘research’ is systematic investigation, and how its purposes and contexts vary
- understand that perspectives — ‘ways of seeing’ — will point towards ‘ways of knowing’
- learn how to find out about some main traditions of scholarship in research.
seeing occur, in the ‘subject’ world, because we believe that research methodology books tend to overlook this, at least for beginning researchers. In the Introduction, we made the point that the ‘object’ world is very well served—research is what happens ‘out there’—and we do not wish to belittle those activities or the achievements that result. There are great truths to be found. We are looking within the ‘subjectivity’ of research for both in-sights and out-sights. Accordingly, as educators, and as human beings, one of the very joys of the arts—of the fictions we construct to make sense of our individual and social existence through literature, media, painting and drama—is their evanescence, their vivid impermanence—in Eugenio Barba’s lovely phrase ‘a fistful of water’ (1995, p. 100).

The dictionary phrase ‘materials and sources’ needs expanding, too. Many of the most basic products of our mind and spirit, and what for instance is important about those arts mentioned above, are not material at all. Our artfulness exists as a dialogue between abstract ideas and their bodily and linguistic manifestations. Arts and humanities experiences often work indirectly and obliquely, through metaphor, through irony, through allusion and analogy—that is the very basis of fiction, and experienced most powerfully subjectively. Research in these areas at least, and in some areas of social and health sciences, and even medical research, must take the power of this experience as central to research design, and thanks to contemporary developments in research methods and tools, it can do so.

The one part of the dictionary definition that must be allowed to stand is the phrase ‘systematic investigation’. Research always starts with a need to know, which is framed into a question that can be investigated, consciously and methodically. The outcomes of research may not always be anything as simple as an answer to that question—they may be more questions or other questions, or other answers. The idea of systematic investigation is very present in the USA’s National Research Council’s (2003) criteria for ‘high quality scientific research in education’—that a study must:

1. pose significant questions that can be investigated empirically
2. link research to relevant theory
3. use methods that permit direct investigation of the question
4. provide a coherent and explicit chain of reasoning
5. replicate and generalise across studies
6. disclose research to encourage professional scrutiny and critique.

Those of us engaging in arts and humanities or social science research need not be afraid to apply that word ‘scientific’ to our research! Although we may find later we need to modify these criteria, particularly the third and fifth, they will do pretty well for a start.

**WHY DO IT?**

Most people engage in research in Education with mixed motives and purposes, some of which are academic, some personal and some professional. One of the first tasks of the
researcher is to try and identify and separate these clearly and honestly. Although there is inevitably some overlap, here are some of the main motives.

To create new knowledge for its own sake

We are all driven by curiosity, and as educators we are also usually driven by a passion for our calling that gives us a powerful desire to know, deeply, more about how it works, why we do it and what effects it might have. There are, surely, ‘ways of knowing’ that excite us. Can we ‘create’ new knowledge? Creativity in itself is a wonderful and wonder-inducing phenomenon. But ways of knowing start with the perceptual: there are creative ‘ways of seeing’. What can this mean? Consider the famous contemporary representationalist painter Lucian Freud (grandson of Sigmund), who has expressed his curiosity and passion for the writing and artwork of John Constable. He noticed that Constable ‘knows’ from what he ‘sees’:

I love to read them [Constable’s letters]—there’s something so sympathetic about him. And very interesting things that look as if they’re made up, except you know they aren’t. People saying ‘Why are you using that thick paint and sploshing it all over your canvas? You’re just doing it to show off.’ To which he replied: ‘No, I’m not. I realise it looks awkward and rough and coarse, but in time the paint will settle down and it will become part of the landscape’. Incredible! Because when you look at them, actually the paint is so thick. Just amazing. (Freud 2006, p. 14)

To this curiosity about ‘ways of seeing’ as ways of knowing, we might add to test and/or seek verification of established knowledge—of what we think we know. This might be to test a belief or assumption that the researcher holds, or an ideological tenet, or some aspect of the accepted lore of education that perhaps might need challenging, or is unhelpful or untrustworthy. This is what we mean by being ‘scholarly responsible’; not all experiences will count as research. In fact, Lucian Freud goes on to affirm that his own creativity deliberately isn’t ‘researched’, as we understand it in this book:

Interviewer (Sebastian Smee): You’ve always said you wanted to avoid the look of having ‘composed’ your pictures. Why is that? What is it you’re resisting?

Freud: It’s the idea of adopting a way of doing things. Or doing things that have been done before. All those things (at least this is how I feel in my head) would work against me doing something which was disturbing, by which I mean alive. (Freud 2006, p. 15)

In researching creatively, we must ‘adopt a way of doing things’, and respect what has ‘been done before’. While our passion and curiosity can and should drive creative research, systematic investigation is the key to success, and to credibility. Creative research should generate knowledge for its own sake, but it has to be grounded in investigation that tests or seeks to verify what is already established. Even Freud, when he reflected on his own learning from Constable, was, as we saw, respectful of what had gone before.
To create knowledge in context

As practitioners in educational or workplace community contexts, we are working in complex and as yet very fluid disciplines. We still have lots to learn: in general, and about every classroom or adult’s learning context. Sometimes we conduct research to create new knowledge that we need for our educational purposes:

This may often take the form of a case study, where we choose a particular person, group of people or teaching context to investigate a phenomenon we have noticed, or a hypothesis we would like to test. Sometimes this is just to solve or at least investigate an ongoing problem or issue in our educational systems and schools:

Gayle’s concern with the quality of adult literacy learning among Somali women refugees in Melbourne led her to get their migration and settlement stories down on tape, as a way of provoking new pedagogical approaches more sensitive to the trauma of the past and the opportunities of the present (Morris 2004).

It may involve evaluation or verification of how we think education happens in our context, or what and how children of different ages and adults learn through our practices:

Wendy was curious about the reasons for enrollees undertaking inner-city community arts classes in drawing or dancing or singing (Hopkinson 2012). Her agency, a prominent inner-city Christian church, professed a desire to know if its view of ‘mission’ was matched by the participants’ reasons for signing up.

For all constructivist educators, we and our students are constructing our culture, and making cultural products, and so (especially but not exclusively if we are arts and humanities educators), either explicitly or implicitly, we are also artists. In the grown-up art world, research is of course an essential part of making an artwork. A production or artefact has to be researched, particularly one that is historical or foreign to one’s own culture, for its social and cultural context, its manners and mores and styles. Any creative piece or event, especially if documentary or based on facts or stories, or interviews
with witnesses, also has to be carefully and properly researched. This ‘making’ can be intensely personal, as Matisse wrote:

Suppose I set out to paint an interior; it gives me a sensation of bright red—and I put down a red which satisfies me; immediately a relation is established between this red and the white of the canvas. If I put a green near the red, if I paint in a yellow floor, there must still be between this green, this yellow and the white of the canvas, a relation that will be satisfactory to me … I must organise my ideas. (In Chipp 1968, p. 134)

Our book takes this ‘relationality’ very seriously, as the Introduction has made clear: there are ‘ways of seeing’, such as Matisse experienced, and wrote about, and these lead to ‘ways of knowing’, or understanding aspects of the world in particular ways. Teachers and trainers across the educational sector are rightly, in our view, encouraged to ‘see’ themselves within their practices. In TESOL (Teaching English as a Second or Other Language), for example, ‘only recently have scholars begun examining the everyday contexts in which policies are interpreted and negotiated in ways that reflect local constraints and possibilities’ (Ramanathan and Morgan 2007, p. 447). So for us, contexts are crucial, and we discuss this next.

**To create knowledge for a particular context**

Our need for research may spring from some very immediate contextual demand or problem. This includes analysing and critically reflecting on our own theory and practice, or that of colleagues, and of course improving it:

---

Stephanie wanted to recommend changes to undergraduate nursing curricula, because Australia’s ageing demographic is generating more nursing experiences in hospital contexts of grief caused by death and suffering (Lockhart 2008). By exploring through narrative enquiry how nurses have constructed accounts of these experiences, she was able to improve teaching programs for younger nurses.

---

We may have a particular problem or issue in our class or our community that defies our everyday attempts to solve it, and clearly springs from the deeper agendas and structures of our teaching context: for this we need action research.

---

Leadership can be tricky in a community organisation, where everyone is a volunteer. ‘Heroic’ men and women no longer have the credibility they once did (Byrnes 1999). As part of her DEd, Jenny worked in such an organisation on an action research basis for over one year, to install a model of participatory leadership that was built up by and ‘owned’ by the volunteers as an expression of their vision.
We may have a personal need for research that has nothing to do with the issues within our classrooms or professional settings. Perhaps a professional promotion or increased esteem in the establishment one works for relies on a history of active research, as is increasingly the case in university settings.

**To create knowledge for reimagining or reforming society**

Research into human behaviour, and the social behaviour of humans, is part of the very nature of education, especially in the arts and the humanities: there is always that intensity of human experience to draw upon. Novels, poetry, theatre, films, sculptures, some computer-generated environments—that grow from increasingly sophisticated gaming technology (de Freitas and Maharg 2011)—are ways of creating realistic models of not only how we are and how society works, but also how we and society might be. Through such fictions, we create possible worlds and behaviours that we can compare with and use to test the realities we perceive, which have no consequences in the real world unless we wish them to: worlds of fiction disappear as soon as we wish, and importantly, ‘this insubstantial pageant faded, leave not a rack behind’, as Shakespeare explained (*The Tempest*, Act 4, Scene 1). The arts offer some of the best and safest ways of investigating—even critiquing—society and speculating on possible new societies.

For many teachers, trainers and facilitators, some participation in social reform is part of our *raison d'être*, either at the level of helping to improve the social understanding, communication skills and interpersonal relations among our students, or making inroads into the greater injustices of society. If you are intending to change society, you need to know in depth what you are up against, and to monitor and evaluate your success in achieving the changes … or what other effects your activism produces.

---

**Neighbourhood Houses** are sites of adult education, but are lowly in status compared to TAFE institutes and universities. Allie was keen to bring to prominence the emancipatory work done in such Houses—normally by underpaid women, and for many less advantaged learners—in literacy and basic education (such as introductory IT) (Clemans 2005). Her PhD, based on recording the ‘whole-person’ experience, goes to the heart of humanistic research, and led to state-wide recommendations for reforms to the provision of adult learning.

**CONTEXTS OF FORMAL RESEARCH**

Whatever the initial motivation, anything beyond the most basic and informal research needs a context where it will be sufficiently supported. Finding an appropriate base camp can be the hardest part of the mountain climb, and it is certainly crucial: many well-meaning research studies have faltered because they were not underpinned with support. Usually this takes the form of *time, money, facilities and resources or access*.
Some climate of encouragement and approval is usually also necessary for the researcher to carry on, particularly if the uphill going gets steeper, the views more tedious, and the hoped-for outcome constantly seems to recede, or disappear entirely; in research, as in mountains, it often does.

**University study**

For many, the sensible entry point is the institution whose primary traditional function is research—the university—and usually it is through one form or another of postgraduate study. Australian universities have lecturers to help us learn how to research, facilities to help us to do it, and usually a range of courses tailored to our need and level of expertise. We should not be afraid to be picky, right from the start, but make sure that the courses and the teachers suit our needs and research focus. And of course, *caveat emptor* (buyer beware!): universities need students as much as we need their services, and occasionally offer more than they can effectively provide.

Most first degree courses in education are concerned primarily with producing professional practitioners, not researchers. However, the best of these encourage students to take a reflective and critical approach to all their studies, which provides at least an attitude and a viewpoint amenable to future research. Moreover, new ‘capstone’ regulations recently introduced to all Australian undergraduate courses require at least a preliminary research approach, or ‘pre-research’ focus, in the latter stages of the course. A few—and most honours courses—provide formal introductions to research methods. But because these one-semester starter packs usually have to be designed generically for maths and social sciences as much as for humanities, they are not always conducive to more subjective kinds of research. They can be off-putting initially, especially for people to whom abstracted numbers, diagrams and statistics are a mystery. Most useful are those that are tailored towards the most common forms of educational research. These programs tend to *investigate the quality and complexity* of human behaviour rather than *quantify what is measurable*—which is often the emphasis of introductory research methods courses. This is a distinction commonly made between *qualitative* and *quantitative* research, which, as we shall see, is not always useful or productive to us. However, the great British educator Dorothy Heathcote’s truism that you must ‘start where the student is at’ (1971) is just as important in research as it is in the classroom: we must feel comfortable and confident before we sign the contract. And we must not be put off—we will be able to find a method of research that is comfortable and that fuels our enthusiasm to engage in study.

A quite gentle introduction to research is usually to be found in the coursework degree sometimes called a graduate diploma, and sometimes a masters. A few of these do not offer any research training, but most combine research methods with other generic coursework to broaden our background, and a dissertation where we dabble in a basic research project. Some universities (and even a few TAFE colleges) offer courses—often ‘vocational training’ credentials—combining practice and research, which we can be sure are absolutely tailored to our employability. Many others offer a generic MEd or
equivalent, where we will find that we can spend virtually the whole time on topics and
tasks entirely relevant to our context and our passions. So we should not feel bashful
about shopping around and pestering the course convenors—remember, they are often
looking for students.

A very important corollary of this is the question of internal or external study.
We may be geographically disadvantaged, or we may prefer remote study anyway, in
which case we look for a university with a web-based or distance mode. In many fields,
these are sometimes accompanied by a summer school, for that valuable face-to-face
engagement that is at the heart of all educational experience.

Nearly all universities offer masters and doctoral degrees that are principally or
totally research, and project-based. A research masters is usually two years full-time or
four years part-time, and a doctorate (normally called Doctor of Philosophy or PhD)
three and six years respectively. In Australia (unlike America and many European
countries), the PhD normally has no coursework attached, with other nomenclature
for degrees where coursework leads into a dissertation, such a Doctor of Education
(EdD, or more unfortunately, DEd). These nearly always require some prior experience
of research methods, and consist of an independent research project, with the assistance
of one or more personal supervisors. If we think we qualify for a research higher degree,
there are two crucial considerations. The first must be answered by looking to the
university: finding a supervisor who is not only effective, but congenial. For the second,
we researchers must look to ourselves: can we commit the time, energy and focus
necessary for study spanning several years? This is not a question to be taken lightly.

If we qualify for research higher degree status, we may be eligible for a scholarship
or a grant, and we might even be just the person that a research team is looking for.
As well as teaching students, university lecturers are involved in research projects, many
of which need research assistants (providing some useful preliminary experience). Some
offer special scholarships, usually through the Australian Research Council, and the
university research team will be looking for scholars to fill them. When we start doing
the rounds of universities enquiring about research study, we should always leave a
calling card—let the universities know who we are and what our research interests are,
and we might find we fit a research team’s profile.

Sponsored research

As we have indicated, universities are the natural home of research, so if we are associated
with a university, either as a staff member or as a student, we will have access to other
funds. Some of these funds the university itself provides and some come from outside
bodies and government agencies that nevertheless work through the university system.
We will need to apply for these. Competition is always intense, with previous experience
and a track record of successful research a prized commodity. New researchers should
look for an experienced and successful mentor before applying for most of the grants.
In recent years, however, universities and even the Australian Research Council (ARC)
are actually encouraging new researchers with specially categorised grants.
Which brings us to the ‘big end of town’. For science and social science educators, this has usually meant the ARC. Up to the late 1990s, the ARC was virtually closed to arts and humanities educators, arts especially—out of twelve subject categories, of which ‘Maths’ was first, the whole of ‘Humanities’ (including everything from philosophy to musicology and languages to literature) came a very poor twelfth. Just as research methods have changed to become inclusive, so has the ARC, and educators right across the board have the same sporting chance of ARC grants. Moreover, our eclectic pursuits as educators are not, as sometimes, a disadvantage, as cross-disciplinary research is encouraged.

Our own bias is now briefly on display, quite deliberately, as the next few paragraphs are intended specifically to encourage the arts and humanities researchers among our readers—for whom some of the research opportunities and even the literature have not always been kind historically, as we have seen. The ARC is not the only source of statutory funding. More specialised bodies such as the Australia Council for the Arts currently acknowledge a responsibility for both research and education, and many state ministries such as Arts, Social Services and Health can be approached to come to the party, providing they can see some outcome that will or may ensue from the research that is profitable to their own interests.

In terms of profitability, the arts are at some disadvantage in our society. However much they may contribute to its social and cultural capital, in terms of GDP (gross domestic product) they are very small beer (apart from the astronomic salaries paid to a very few film stars and novelists, and the massive investment in the real estate business known as art-collecting). Just compare the money available to artists with that for pharmaceuticals, for instance, or ICT—but that’s not unreasonable in itself, as those may need much more expensive equipment. Not many industries directly need artists’ help, maybe, but they can use their shape-shifting wiles. A lot of money is spent on training, for example, and industry trainers are constantly looking for effective and efficient pedagogy—which is part of the core business of artists and all educators. Believe it or not, a majority of businesses actually use the arts in their training already (by performing ‘role-play’ or ‘simulation’, sculpture and art-making and even music, movement and dance), and as the research already shows, some of those use it execrably badly (e.g. Smigiel 1996; Taylor 2000), which is a very good reason for research.

Non-government organisations (NGOs) might provide both an outlet and some research funding for the highly developed sense of social responsibility common in the arts and education industry. Overseas, in the ‘developing world’ particularly, NGOs like UNICEF have, for many years, been ploughing millions of dollars into the arts. This is to help them communicate with villagers on health and environmental issues in remote areas without access to electronic communication or literacy. Not all the money has been wisely spent and only belatedly are these organisations realising that more research is needed in the discipline. Australasia has its own ‘developing worlds’ of disadvantaged communities with poor communication, and NGOs are making interventions of all kinds, from forum theatre to founding radio stations and rock groups, with visual arts, music and sport very prominent in Indigenous and human services settings.
Obviously education systems and the schools they operate need research, and may appear to be an obvious source of funding for the arts and humanities. In fact this is rarely so. For one thing, education systems are not really funded to deliver research, and there is always enormous political pressure on them to provide services, immediately and in the classroom. Money ‘siphoned off’ for the indirect and uncertain benefits of research is an easy target for populist criticism. Some educational systems have neither a research section nor any capacity to undertake research. These organisations can be included as an industry partner in applying for those statutory grants. Here again, arts and humanities teachers need to be doubly clever because we work from a position of disadvantage. First, education systems invariably have declared priorities and areas of special need, and they will be favourably disposed to consider partnering research that feeds into those areas of special need. Conversely, the arts and the humanities are, with the sole exception of literacy education, rarely among those systemic priorities. The arts, in particular, are still in the process of being established as valid curriculum rather than a marginal attraction. But we do have a spectacular pedagogical advantage, of which the systems are becoming dimly aware. Arts students and teachers fight way above their weight in pedagogical performance indicators, in schools, staffing and promotion rounds, excellence in teaching awards and university graduation statistics. (Or do we? There’s an assertion based on our perceptions, anecdotal evidence and inadequate statistics, which would be well worth researching.) If so, that is the opportunity for artists to shape-shift again. At the moment, bullying in schools (O’Toole and Burton 2006) and the pedagogical implications of Information Technology (Carroll et al. 2006) are two high priorities where enterprising drama educators are collaborating with education systems in research projects.

Another area of massive potential barely touched by the arts is that of literacy, or rather the newer nomenclature of ‘multi-literacies’, to which the arts have plenty to offer in the classroom. Languages other than English, English as a Second Language, Studies of Society, Health and Physical Education, as well as generic issues such as gender in education, are all areas where arts already make strong interventions in practice. These can sometimes be high official educational priorities and fertile ground for seeding research. Educational and governmental priorities in education often include innovative practice (particularly when allied to a high-status area like literacy), and there is also plenty of untapped potential for research in innovation and teacher inservice of the kind mentioned above, evaluating the effectiveness of a range of arts-based interventions. The problem is that grants for innovative practice are usually tied to practical implementation and professional development, and it takes persuasive talking and submission-writing to coax out extra money to demonstrate the praxis, that is, how the research component emerges from the practice.

Self-funded research

Particularly for those engaged with universities, it is easy to get into a ‘grant-welfare-dependency syndrome’—in other words, to forget that research is possible without...
either a grant or a scholarship. The admirable practitioner is constantly reflective and self-critical, and seeking new ways of making their discipline and their pedagogy more effective. But a word of caution: all research, especially formal projects, makes two demands: time and care. Reading the background literature and finding out what research has already been done, gathering data thoroughly and carefully analysing it, and then recording or documenting it—the basic tasks of all formal research—are time-consuming and labour-intensive, especially if we are personally involved as a participant researcher and have no assistants. Our research capacity will depend on our level of passion combined with our ingenuity in finding indirect ways of poaching time: the exceptionally lucky may pull off some kind of scholarship, fellowship or sabbatical for study; the super-dedicated may choose to give up long-service leave or even go on half-pay for a while; the quite dedicated may elect to give up another activity like sports coaching for a year or two … but we can’t just fit it in with what we are already doing in our spare time. Sacrifices must be made.

Whether we identify with the world of arts-humanities with its concentration on the subject world, or that of sciences with more focus on the object world, we need to map ourselves within the existing scholarship, including the ‘how-to’ scholarship. Clearly, all beginning researchers should become aware of the depth and extent of the scholarly work on how to do research well. Encyclopaedic efforts to do this are readily available. For example, the third edition of John Creswell’s *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (2008) is a monumental contribution to such mapping. He makes the wise note, in listing changes in the third edition, that:

> Quantitative and qualitative research approaches are no longer seen as two completely separate different approaches, but as forms of research that lie along a continuum … Often in educational research, the studies … contain some elements of both … mixed methods and action research reinforce this emerging trend in research. (p. vi)

He goes on to also note that

> ethical issues have been expanded … [and such] discussions now frame our introduction to research, and … in both quantitative and qualitative data collection. (p. vi)

Stepping outside Education for a moment, we also note the justified popularity of intensive analyses and surveys of qualitative approaches (e.g. Denzin and Lincoln 2005), of specific approaches (e.g. on action research: Zuber-Skerritt 1996), and then, combining specificity within Education (e.g. qualitative research in Education: Freebody 2003). We list a couple more on page 14.

In conclusion, we support a particular curiosity about research scholarship that is open, eclectic and even somewhat promiscuous. Those starting out should immerse themselves in the broad traditions, then situate accordingly their values and ‘ways of seeing’ and therefore of knowing, and finally move into their own researcher space, underpinned by scholarship as it is assembled by them, for their own purposes.
Lyn Yates (2004) has written superbly on ‘political and paradigm disputes’ in education research and her work is most helpful for beginners. Keeves, in his ‘Overview of Issues in Educational Research’ (in Keeves and Lakomski 1999, p. 3) states: ‘The research enterprise in education draws upon many disciplines and employs a wide variety of approaches to investigation … it is argued that the choice of procedures to be employed depends on the nature of the problem under investigation.’ We fully agree!

**REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS**

1. How would you go about researching creativity in your own field of educational practice?
2. What could the field gain by such close scrutiny of ‘ways of seeing’ and ‘ways of knowing’?
3. On the other hand, suppose that ‘curiosity killed the cat’. How amenable to systematic investigation is your field of educational practice? Would you survive it?

**WIDER READING**

