

**TITLE:**

Mapping the ethnographic journey: A 'road map' for novice researchers wanting to engage in ethnography, critical theory and policy analysis.

**AUTHOR:**

Dr Sham Naidu

**DATE PUBLISHED:**

6 March 2012

**Abstract**

In this article, the *researcher* narrates the issues faced by novice researchers in choosing the correct lenses to conduct research when searching for the truth via the use of qualitative methodology. It is argued that choosing an appropriate research approach and methodology can be described as an 'arduous' journey. For the inexperienced traveller [researcher], the journey may not run a straight course from beginning to end but the quest for new knowledge overcomes obstacles faced thereby enabling the traveller to transcend the actual. The ethnographic journey narrated here, describing the struggle to embrace qualitative research, the use of metaphors, using appropriate theory, choosing the correct lens, research as critical praxis, the characteristics of qualitative research, the emancipatory paradigm, appropriating critical theory, ethnography, 'partial ethnography', 'policy ethnography', 'critical policy ethnography', entering the field, managing reciprocal relationships, 'purposeful conversations', interviewer skills, ethical issues, ascertaining the truth and reflexivity, serves as a useful 'road map' for other novice researchers wanting to embrace ethnographic research.

## **Mapping the ethnographic journey: A ‘road map’ for novice researchers wanting to engage in ethnography, critical theory and policy analysis.**

**Dr Sham Naidu (PhD)**

### **Part A: The journey begins . . .**

As the *researcher* embarked on his chosen project, his first qualitative project as a student researcher, he ‘sought a simple but concise article or text that would assist him overcome some common obstacles’ (McCotter, 2001, p. 1) that confront novice qualitative researchers. This was not an easy task because researchers are ‘currently witnessing a proliferation of alternative ways of conceiving reality and legitimating forms of knowledge and social practices that support political and moral commitments to build a better world’ (Kendall & Michael, 1997, p. 8). In this regard, Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) also argue that there are multiple ways of observing and explaining social and other phenomena. These views posed a serious dilemma for the *researcher* but he was guided by McCotter’s (2001) article entitled: *The journey of a beginning researcher*. This article proved to be an invaluable source of assistance and helped to overcome some of the obstacles that the *researcher* encountered on several occasions during his journey.

### **Stage one: Embracing qualitative research—initial obstacles**

The *researcher’s* initial readings of the copious literature on qualitative research intrigued him. He became enmeshed in a quagmire of alien terminology. He was oblivious of the fact that research methodologies represent ‘complex socio-historical evolutions within the social sciences ranging from reductionist to reflexive sensibilities’ (Tuchman, 1994, p. 274).

According to Coombs (1995):

These inquiries each emphasise dissimilar variations of data analysis as found in their subsequent conclusions obtained from and during the research process.

These include a veritable cornucopia of methodologies, paradigms and methods.  
(p. 1)

Coombs' viewpoints provided the *researcher* with the basis for self-reflection. Reflecting on his limited previous research experience, he came to the conclusion that his knowledge of qualitative research was too simplistic in nature. It lacked any significant depth and understanding. This fact became a great cause for concern. Literally, he had ventured into the unknown world of qualitative research.

The *researcher* also had to bear in mind that what he wanted for his research project was a richer understanding of teacher performance management, teachers' work and teachers' experiences of performance management. What he was seeking was an account from teachers who were positioned to make credible meanings of a world currently not inhabited by himself. Thus, it became imperative that his research project should adopt an approach to make sense of what he was doing.

### **Using metaphor to find a theoretical way**

An early struggle on this epic journey was the difficulty of understanding the place of theory in research. The *researcher* was of the view that theory provided a discourse and a vocabulary to describe and use in order to make sense of what researchers think. Richardson's (1994) 'Writing: A method of inquiry' in *The handbook of qualitative research*, helped the *researcher* to view the place of theory in his research project. For Richardson (1994, p. 524), 'the place of theory is in "building" (structure, foundation, construction, deconstruction, framework, form, and so on)'.

Richardson is supported by Lakoff (1993) who proposes the idea of metaphor as a means of mapping how we think and reason. Lakoff (1993, p. 203) states that ‘the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualise one mental domain in terms of another’. Therefore, if one argues that qualitative research writing rests both on how researchers make meaning and how they communicate their understandings, it becomes essential to consider how metaphors may illuminate and illustrate meaning (Ely, Vinz, Anzul & Downing, 1997, p. 112). In this sense, a metaphor is a tool that moves both the researcher and the reader away from predictable lines of seeing. Thus, a metaphor can be viewed not only as a function of creative thought, capable of jolting researchers into new ways of thinking, ‘a central feature of the production and reproduction of meaning’ (Taylor, 1984, p. 20), but also as an indication of how researchers construe the world. According to Lakoff and Turner (1989), a metaphor is viewed as ‘more than a poetic flourish or a trick of language, but rather as something which resides in thought, not just in words’ (cited in Wallace, 2001, p. 727).

A metaphor:

offers a structure that aids us in establishing a relationship between something that we already know and something else we are attempting to understand. Metaphors are particularly useful when attempting to explain abstract concepts such as ‘class,’ ‘authority,’ ‘power relations,’ or ‘control’. (Ely, Vinz, Anzul & Downing, 1997, p. 113)

Because the *researcher's* project was concerned with issues of control, authority and power structures in teachers’ work, it was the *researcher's* intention to illuminate and illustrate these issues in the context of performance management from a new metaphorical angle. He began to consider theory as a map that would guide his decisions and give him direction as he tried to navigate his way through qualitative research.

## **Explaining the metaphor**

In the *researcher's* project, theory provided the background for research and it also represented the ideas that the research project would uncover. In doing so, theory did not approach any kind of objective reality, but aimed to give an understanding of that reality. This was because different theories posit and subscribe to different epistemological and ontological assumptions that comprise and provide distinctions about the research process (Guba, 1990). Similarly, maps do not show reality, but merely represent it. Researchers have to apply what they see on the map in order to effectively take cognisance of their surroundings. The manner in which the individual perceives these surroundings is dependent upon individual experiences. Theory also provided a discourse and a vocabulary to use and describe what researchers thought. It becomes ineffective if researchers do not know how to apply it. Maps also become ineffective if researchers cannot interpret what they are saying (McCotter 2001).

Another similarity relates to the abundance of maps and theory. There are numerous maps in circulation, each serving a unique purpose. For example, there are road maps, topographical maps, political maps, and geographical maps—each drawn to serve a particular function. Also, different maps encompass different ranges of area. McGee and Warms (1996) inform novice researchers that numerous theoretical models have been generated by qualitative researchers in the last decade. This is in part because no one kind of theory is applicable to all kinds of social and cultural phenomena. Different theoretical ways of questioning phenomena also tend to go in and out of use for a wide variety of reasons related to the general intellectual climate and the state of accumulated knowledge at various times.

Maps most often reveal the experiences of the cartographer. This is evident in the way maps are designed; the amount of information represented; and the ‘highlighting’ of certain features that the cartographer wants to draw the reader’s attention to. Each map is thus unique because of the diversity of experiences among cartographers. The onus rests upon the map reader to ‘make sense’ of the data given on maps. Thus, it could be stated that maps serve a guiding purpose (McCotter 2001). Given this perspective of maps, researchers can consider theory as a map. Theory guides researchers as they conduct their research. It provides an initial point from which to begin the research journey and also serves as a source of direction. The researcher has the opportunity to explore a variety of choices and directions offered by theory. An added advantage is that theory assists in the provision of a situational context from which the researcher can begin the research journey. Whilst theory lends experience to particular contexts, it is open to new routes and different perspectives.

### **Utilising the metaphor**

The *researcher’s* first task was to conceptualise the theoretical framework for his research journey. As stated earlier, he wanted to situate the research experience within the qualitative paradigm. With this point in mind, he concluded that he needed a personal map to guide him. This map would provide the base from which he could begin. This being so, his first task was to ascertain the purpose of theory. According to Patton (1990, p. 150), ‘purpose is the controlling force in research. Decisions about design, measurement, analysis, and reporting all flow from purpose. Therefore, the first step in a research process is getting clear about purpose’. Likewise, Wolcott (1990, p. 7) maintains that ‘the research purpose is the only basis on which decisions are made’. Therefore, the *researcher* believed that a sound understanding of a critical theory would aid his understanding of what teachers were now saying about performance management.

## **What do we mean by theory?**

Theory, considered in a broad sense, is basic to the way people make sense of the world. The making and using of theories is seen by Smith (1994) as the basis of human knowledge. He views learning as the construction of increasingly complex sets of such schemata. Theory has manifestations in everyday life—in the assumptions, biases and stances that are part of all our activities. Wolcott (1990) observed that:

Most people do not think in terms of grand design or regard themselves as theory builders . . . Personally, however, I am of the view that every human being is a profound theory builder, so long as the activity is defined to include the myriad 'little theories' necessary for each of us to negotiate our way through everyday life. (cited in Ely, Vinz, Anzul & Downing, 1997, p. 227)

Researchers often distinguish the popular use of the word 'theory' from its technical meanings. Flinders and Mills (1993, p. xii) note that theory is used popularly to mean 'any general set of ideas that guide action. This usage encompasses beliefs ranging from one's personal philosophy and intuitive hunches to implicit assumptions, guesses, and suspicions about the everyday world in which we live'. For Eisner (1993, p. viii), theory is 'supposed to make coherent what otherwise appears as disparate and disconnected individual events. Theory is no means through which we learn lessons that can apply to situations we have yet to encounter'. Adopting a stance compatible with the qualitative view, Flinders and Mills (1993, p. 103) define theory as 'an analytical and interpretive framework that helps the researcher make sense of "what is going on" in the social setting being studied'.

However, within the qualitative paradigm, there are also differences of opinion as to the definition of 'theory'. There are those who are closer to the positivist tradition and those who are closer to the postmodern, constructivist and interpretive positions (Ely, Vinz, Anzul & Downing, 1997). Comprehending these differences became less difficult for the *researcher* after reading Ball's (1991) account of how he came to his own stance on theory. His account

amplified the *researcher's* feelings about theory and its use. Ball (1991) distinguished between two approaches to theory: one that 'stresses explanation and prediction' and the other that 'highlights understanding and insight'. He maintains that this debate over the nature and purpose of theory is actually a debate over the nature and purpose of the social sciences.

Ball (1991, p. 189) argues against the first approach by questioning 'whether social life can only be or can be best known in terms of "if . . . then", predictable relations. Is it really useful to reduce all social life to this form?'. He also states that he prefers to work in the interpretive mode where there is understanding and insight. As a result, he describes his work as 'complex and interrelated rather than simple'. Emanating from Ball's arguments, theory can be viewed as a means to understanding and insight. Seen in this light, theorising functions as 'a self-conscious replication of the processes of knowing and making sense which are common to all human actors' (Ball, 1991, p. 189).

According to Ely, Vinz, Anzul and Downing (1997), theories:

provide us with sets of eyeglasses through which we look at the world . . . [and] may bring into focus, sharpen, and angle for us our understanding of what might otherwise be a blurred stream of perception . . . sometimes hamper us, can cut off angles of vision, peripheral or otherwise. (p. 228)

Thus, theories enable researchers to structure their knowledge of their discipline or profession and they guide researchers in their choice of a focus for research. They can select sets of lens that will help them to see up close or at a distance, different sets for different purposes. Having ascertained what theory was, the *researcher* was now confronted with the problem of selecting the correct set of lens to view teachers' perceptions of performance management.



### **Choosing the correct lens**

Encouraged by this new-found knowledge of theory, the *researcher* set out to locate the different approaches to theory, more so, for one that would suit the purpose of his research project. As stated earlier, his project embraced the qualitative paradigm. The *researcher's* reading of the literature on qualitative research revealed that this type of research was subjected to shift through five periods or moments which are all acting on and within the present. Denzin and Lincoln (1994a) described these periods as the traditional period (1900s to World War II); the modernist phase (post-war to 1970s); blurred genres (1970 to 1986); crisis of representation (1986 to early 1990s); and the postmodern present (early 1990s to present). This movement of qualitative research resulted in an increase in the number of paradigms that scholars could now draw from.

Paradigm, in this context, refers to an interpretive framework or a set of beliefs that guide action (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994b). It is a 'net of epistemological and ontological premises which—regardless of ultimate truth or falsity—become partially self-validating' (Bateson, 1972, p. 314). Thus, paradigm refers to the focus of research and related ways of approaching inquiry (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Instead of working out of a particular paradigm, some scholars draw from more than one paradigm; for example, Patti Lather works at the intersection of post-positivism, critical theory, postmodernism, and feminism. However, Denzin and Lincoln (1994a) argue that all qualitative research is interpretive, guided by a set of beliefs about the world and how it should be understood and studied. They claim that 'at the most general, four major interpretive paradigms structure qualitative research: positivist-postpositivist, constructivist-interpretivist, critical (Marxist, emancipatory), feminist-poststructuralist' (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994a, p. 9). Other researchers and scholars have

chosen to identify and divide the major paradigms in different ways. An alternate set of paradigms include: functionalist, interpretive, critical and postmodern.

The *researcher* also discovered that qualitative research was an umbrella term that had numerous variations. Depending on the writer, such variations could be called orientations (Tesch, 1990), theoretical traditions (Patton, 1990), strategies of inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994a,b), genres (Wolcott, 1990), or major traditions (Jacob, 1988). The issue of variety is elaborated by Tesch (1990, p. 58), who presents a list of forty-five approaches to qualitative research. Her list is a mix of designs (action research, case study), data analysis techniques (content analysis, discourse analysis), and disciplinary orientations (ethnography, oral history). The *researcher* was now confronted with the problem of deciding which of these paradigms to endorse. Lather's (1994) writing on qualitative research aided in solving this problem.

In a chapter on 'Critical inquiry in qualitative research', Lather (1994, p. 105) depicts various paradigms of the qualitative and arranges them according to purpose. The column for 'prediction', for example, lists the positivist paradigm; 'understanding' is the purpose of interpretive and constructivist research; 'emancipation' is the goal of critical and feminist research; and poststructural and postmodern paradigms seek to 'deconstruct'. Lather (1994, p. 105) offers this chart to 'help distinguish how each paradigm offers a different but not exclusive approach to generating and legitimating knowledge'. Of interest to the *researcher* was the column for 'emancipation'. Reflecting on the purpose of his research project, one of the primary areas of focus was the emancipation of teachers and this paradigm seemed most appropriate. However, it must be stated that the *researcher's* interest in this tradition was influenced solely by the purpose of his research project, rather than its identifying label.

Another motivating factor leading to the endorsement of the emancipatory paradigm in the *researcher's* project resulted from an understanding of Lather's (1988) article entitled, 'Feminist perspectives on empowering research methodologies' in which she discusses 'research as a change-enhancing, reciprocally educative encounter' (Lather, 1988, p. 571).

### **Educational research as critical praxis**

According to Lather (1988, p. 571), 'research as praxis' is a phrase designed to respond to Gramsci's call to intellectuals to develop a 'praxis of the present' by aiding 'developing progressive groups' to become increasingly conscious of their situations in the world'. The core of emancipatory social science is the dialectical, reciprocal shaping of both the practice of praxis-oriented research and the development of emancipatory theory. Lather (1988) maintains that:

In praxis-oriented inquiry, reciprocally educative process is more important than product as empowering methods contribute to consciousness-raising and transformative social action. Through dialogue and reflexivity, design, data, and theory emerge, with data being recognised as generated from people in a relation. (p. 572)

She also states that there are three interwoven issues in the quest for empowering issues to inquiry:

- the need for reciprocity;
- dialectical theory building versus theoretical imposition; and
- issues of validity in praxis-oriented, advocacy research. (Lather, 1988, p. 572)

In his research project, the *researcher's* task was to look at critical efforts toward empowering research designs, focussing mostly on his own empirical efforts to study performance management as a means of teacher evaluation. In other words, his research project developed a critical dialogue with teachers based on an emancipatory intent. In a

similar vein, Hollingsworth and Sockett (1994) characterised the *researcher's* impulse toward critical praxis within the teacher research movement as:

disenchantment with the view of control as a means of improving [teachers' work], a concern with teacher autonomy, and a growing understanding of knowledge as a source of power in society created through an ideological convergence which provides a clearer realisation of the interconnected nature of knowledge, research and practice. (p. 9)

Sirotnik (1991) defines critical inquiry, in this context, as taking an ethical stance, committed to empowerment. The *researcher's* project had as its goal the exposure of teachers' voices in relation to performance management. Thus, this critical inquiry called for a purposeful investigation into the values and beliefs systems that underlie researchers' knowledge and conscious consideration of the emancipatory intent before they could be adopted.

Stemming from Lather's (1988) viewpoints espoused earlier, critical inquiry also calls for an active dialogue. It acknowledges that our reality as researchers is so complex and that there are many sources of truth which must be woven together to generate our understanding.

According to Sirotnik (1991):

If we interpret dialectical methodology broadly as a knowledge-building process where what is presumably known is continually re-known through questioning, arguing, counter arguing, reflecting, challenging, contradicting, reconciling, modifying, revising, and so forth, then we can acknowledge and celebrate more formally what teachers already do—and could do even better—as they use and generate knowledge in the context of practice. (p. 247)

In order to establish insightful dialogue, Sirotnik (1991, p. 249) also calls for 'competent communication', comparing this to Habermas's 'ideal speech situation'. Lytle and Cochran-Smith (1994) likewise recognise the importance of a community of communicators:

We have defined intellectual communities of teacher researchers as networks of individuals who enter with others into a search for meaningful work lives and who regard their research as part of larger efforts to transform teaching, learning and schooling. (p. 32)

Sirotnik (1991) also suggests that to be critical, an inquiry must begin with a definition of current circumstances, followed by an exploration of the historical events leading to these circumstances. This is followed by delving into the values and beliefs involved, the interests being served by the situation.

Thus far, the *researcher* has narrated his initial struggle to endorse an appropriate empowering approach to inquiry in his research project. The *researcher* now turns his attention to elaborating on some of the characteristics of qualitative research for he believes it provides the base to ‘turn critical thought into emancipatory action’ (Lather, 1988, p. 577).

### **Characteristics of qualitative research**

Some scholars and researchers engaged in research tend to be guided by the assumptions described by Lather (1994) in ‘Critical inquiry into qualitative research’. These assumptions have implications for doing qualitative research. Listed below are some of these characteristics which have been adapted from Lincoln and Guba’s *Naturalistic inquiry* (1985, pp. 14–46) and Bogdan and Biklen’s *Qualitative research for education* (1992, pp. 29–33):

- *emphasis on qualitative methods*: Researchers most often use qualitative methods because of their ontological and epistemological assumptions. These methods include participant-observation, interviewing, and document analysis;
- *research done in field (natural) setting*: The researcher carries out research in the field—in the natural setting—to develop contextual and in-depth understandings;
- *human instrumentation*: The researcher(s) uses herself/himself as the primary data-gathering instrument instead of so-called ‘objective’ instruments such as tests;
- *non-random (purposive, theoretical or representative) sampling*: Because of their interest in developing in-depth, contextual understandings about a particular topic or issue, qualitative researchers are more concerned about ‘internal validity’ than

‘external validity’. Thus, the researcher is willing to sacrifice ‘breadth’ (random sampling) for ‘depth’ (purposive, theoretical or representative sampling);

- *open-ended, emergent design*: Researcher tends to use an open-ended design so that important understandings/insights are not foreclosed and overlooked. For example, research questions may be substantially modified during the course of the study and one’s sample of interviewees may be likewise modified;
- *grounded (inductive) generalisations/theory*: While some articulated theoretical notions (theory, perspective, assumptions) may guide research, understandings and generalisations are primarily grounded in the data collected and analysed. Further studies may be used for verification;
- *qualitative research is descriptive*: Data are in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers. Data include interview notes and transcripts, fieldnotes and transcripts, photographs, memos and videotapes;
- *‘sensemaking’ is the primary focus*: Qualitative researchers are interested in ‘meaning-making’, that is the ways in which people make sense of their worlds;
- *inductive and deductive data analysis*: Although variously informed by theoretical notions, data are generated inductively and tested deductively in an ongoing or ‘dialectical’ process;
- *negotiated interpretations*: In varying degrees, researchers invite ‘interviewees’ to participate in the data analysis, that is, in developing as well as testing understandings/interpretations/generalisations;
- *tentativeness in generalising*: To the extent they generalise, researchers are likely to be tentative in reporting on the ‘generalisability’ of their findings;
- *case study/multiple case study reporting mode*: In contrast to traditional reporting, many researchers use narratives and stories to present their ‘findings’;
- *multivocality in reporting*: In reporting their findings, researchers are inclined to represent the diverse voices of multi-positioned ‘interviewees’ through stories, narratives and quotations;

- *reporting and textual voice*: Some researchers are careful to distinguish their voices from those of their ‘subjects’, and some inform readers of who they are as ‘positioned subjects’; and
- *evaluation*: Traditional evaluation criteria, such as validity and reliability are still stressed though their form may change shape (many members of critical, constructivist and postmodern schools of thought reject these criteria in the evaluation of their work, preferring alternative methods, such as multivoiced texts, personal responsibility, verisimilitude).

In his research project, the *researcher* too was guided by many of the above characteristics of qualitative research. To summarise, his research project aimed at understanding and representing teachers’ points of view of performance management which are often obscured or neglected. The *researcher* had to articulate South Australian teachers’ experiences of evaluation in an illuminating language understandable by all. He had to describe and explain the complex trajectory that performance management followed and the outcomes resulting from such policies; and by using qualitative research, he looked carefully at the nature and effects of performance management as it was being played out in teachers’ work.

The next discussion briefly examines the emancipatory paradigm in qualitative research. In doing so, it describes the lens that the *researcher* had to employ in this research project and the finding of his theoretical route. Emanating from this discussion, the *researcher* presents an account of critical theory. This account examines why he appropriated critical theory in his research project and some of the philosophical underpinnings of critical theory. He also presents a discussion of critical theory and how it leads to ‘the emancipation of teachers’. The latter serves to reinforce the emancipatory intent of his research project. He then proceeds to discuss ethnography and policy ethnography. This discussion has two purposes: firstly, it

argues for the use of ethnography in his research project; and, secondly, it sets the foundations for the continuation of his ethnographic journey.

### **The emancipatory paradigm**

By emancipation the *researcher* refers to the liberation of people resulting from social action. That is, people become emancipated, through their reflection and their own social action, from an oppressive, problematic situation. Through the use of emancipatory theory, people rationally and freely determine the direction of their own lives by changing and improving their situation on a daily basis. In this case, theory becomes embedded in everyday life. Hammersley (1997, p. 4) informs us that ‘theorists in the emancipatory camp argue that all research is value-laden and is inevitably political, since it represents the interests of particular groups’. Here, research is concerned with bringing to the forefront the ‘voices’ of oppressed and marginalised groups in society. Also, these groups are considered subjects, rather than objects of the research. The primary purpose of research is to develop a better understanding of the world in order to change it. Lather (1991) describes this concern as such:

Rather than the illusory ‘value-free’ knowledge of the positivists, praxis-oriented inquirers see emancipatory knowledge . . . [which] increases awareness of the contradictions distorted or hidden by everyday understandings, and in doing so it directs attention to the possibilities for social transformation. (p. 52)

In a similar vein, Bernstein (1976) states that the experience of emancipation is the result of critical insight, through self-reflection, into the relationships of power, so that quasi-causes can be determined and remedied. However, this is only possible if theory is not abstract and obscure but accessible and translated into everyday life (hooks, 1994).

An important concept within this tradition of emancipation is ‘hegemony’—the oppressive system of the dominant culture. Apple (1996, p. 14) conceptualises hegemony as ‘a process



in which dominant groups come together to form a bloc and sustain leadership over subordinate groups'. He further posits that a hegemony 'is an organised assemblage of meanings and practices, the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and actions which are lived' which 'acts to "saturate" our very consciousness' (Apple, 1990, p. 5). Apple (1990, p. 11) goes on to explain that because hegemony is so total, it becomes part of the daily, taken-for-granted actions that are part of everyday life. These actions are not necessarily identified as oppressive, particularly by the oppressors. He also suggests that 'economic and intellectual controls are the two prerequisites for hegemony' and he positions schools as 'agents of cultural and ideological hegemony' (Apple, 1990, p. 6).

Another major theme of emancipation is related to the issue of 'resistance'. Weiler (1988) maintains that resistance emphasises that individuals are not simply acted upon by abstract structures prevalent in modern society. To make sense of resistance, they have to negotiate, struggle and create meaning of their own actions. McLaren (1994, p. 210) views 'resistance as the process of actively contesting the hegemony of the dominant culture'. The act of resistance demonstrates the 'agency of individuals in that they are not passively accepting the ideology or ascribed roles of society. Sometimes, this opposition can successfully allow people to create new roles which were not formerly part of the culture; at other times, the opposition can close doors for individuals by precluding any interaction with dominant society' (McCotter, 2001, p. 8). Scheurich (1995, p. 247), writing about this notion, states that 'resistance should not be romanticised'. Whilst Scheurich (1995) does not totally negate the concept, he suggests that 'considering individuals as resistant sets up a binary between oppression and resistance, and does not leave open space for another option, where systemic oppression does not exist' (cited in McCotter, 2001, p. 8). In his research project, the *researcher* found resistance an important and useful concept because primarily the project

was concerned with the manner in which teachers ‘resist’ the performance management policy.

The *researcher’s* project was guided in several ways by the traditions of emancipatory research. It was here that the theme of resistance was the key. The *researcher* observed teacher resistance to hegemonic practices in two ways in his research project:

- Some of the participants in the study resisted accepting the traditional functions of evaluation.
- By including the voices of his participants in his research, the *researcher* tried to resist the traditional paths of an independent researcher who is a disembodied, neutral authority.

The *researcher* was also guided by what Acker, Barry and Esseveld (1983) had to say about an emancipatory intent. They state that ‘an emancipatory intent is no guarantee of an emancipatory outcome’ (cited in Lather, 1988, p. 576). Lather (1988, p. 576) elaborates by stating that ‘too often, we who do empirical research in the name of emancipatory politics fail to connect how we do research to our theoretical and political commitments’. Whilst acknowledging Lather’s point of view, the *researcher* strongly believed that he had to interpret the issue of teacher performance management through a critical lens. This lens, his personal perspective of teacher performance management, emerged from a set of beliefs grounded in his own experiences and understandings of performance management. The *researcher* now had to connect his own experiences and beliefs to the larger body of established literature developed by those who explore similar questions about his understandings of performance management. Theoretically, it made sense to throw his weight behind a set of theorists commonly referred to as the ‘criticalists’ found within the emancipatory paradigm (Carspecken, 1996, p. 3).

According to Carspecken (1996), ‘criticalists’ seem to share common tendencies, namely:

- these researchers are value-oriented, concerned about social inequalities, and want to effect social change;
- their concern with social theory encompasses such issues as the nature of social structure, power, culture and human agency; and
- criticality intend their research to refine social theory and change social structures, rather than merely describe social life. (p. 3)

The above tendencies strongly echoed the *researcher’s* perspective of the world. Further motivation to endorse this theoretical perspective stemmed from his reading of Weiler (1988) who maintains that these theorists:

share a concern with the relationship between individual and oppressive social structure; demonstrate the tensions between paradigms of production and reproduction as theoretical approaches; and emphasise that social structure and knowledge are socially constructed and therefore open to contestation and change. (p. 4)

With this in mind, the *researcher* now proceeds to describe the second stage of his journey. Stemming from the first stage of his journey, he was now confident that he was headed in the right direction—towards critical theory. In this stage of the journey, he discusses why he appropriated critical theory in his research project.

## **Stage two: Critical theory**

### **Appropriating critical theory**

As stated previously, the aim of the *researcher’s* project was to critically examine the experiences and perceptions of teachers in relation to performance management as a means of evaluation. The rationale for this study lay in the use of a critical theory approach in investigating teachers’ responses to performance management because most people will always be subject to, and therefore interested in, oppression. Critical theory has the potential to open personal perspectives to important questions of self and schools, the character of

teachers' work and freedom. Critical approaches can also help understand, to the fullest extent possible, the ways in which all forms of teacher evaluation affect the consciousness, conscientiousness, and freedoms of people and the environments in which they work (Nichols, 1990).

Most importantly, perhaps, people need to continually try to understand why it is that they have become enmeshed in power relationships. In struggling with this most important of questions, perhaps people can do justice to teachers who ask, 'Why are we being subjected to this?'. This is the similar critical question McLaren (1994) asks, and when teachers and policy makers can consistently have honest and open conversations about issues of evaluation, researchers will have begun to make progress in understanding this contentious issue in teachers' work.

In other words, the *researcher* used a critical theory approach in his research project to:

- acknowledge that research was theory-driven. This had afforded him opportunities of choice and multiple avenues of exploring the issue of teacher performance management in South Australia;
- illustrate that there was a link between theory and value. He was opposed to the use of managerialistic principles and marketisation on teachers' work;
- accept the fact that the teachers' stories narrated in this research project were by no means 'complete' stories of teacher performance management. These were only partial stories intended to convey the 'whole' picture; and
- defend the partiality and engagement, by making use of the arguments of critical theory in relation to conventional research.

The *researcher* explains the use of critical theory in greater detail in the next section where he examines the philosophical underpinnings of critical theory.

## **Critical theory examined**

Critical theory is critical because it ‘stands apart from the prevailing order of the world and asks how that order came about’ (Cox cited in Menter, Muschamp, Nicholls, Ozga & Pollard, 1997, p. 20). In other words, critical theory questions the manner in which social and institutional power relations have come to be and ascertains whether these power relations are changing. Thus, critical theory is concerned with ‘action’ bent on transforming society for the better. For Horkheimer (1972), critical theory is rooted in ‘critical activity’ which is oppositional and which is involved in a struggle for social change and the unification of theory and practice.

Critical theory examines social and political phenomena as total entities and not as separate parts. It takes ‘as its starting point some aspect or particular sphere of human activity . . . which leads towards the construction of a larger picture of the whole . . . to understand the processes of change in which both parts and whole are involved’ (Menter, Muschamp, Nicholls, Ozga & Pollard, 1997, pp. 20–21). Thus, in educational policy, for example, performance management, critical policy does not attempt to provide solutions to the problems that teachers are encountering. Here, the critical theorist must endeavour to engage in research activity that is associated with social justice. The research must critique and transform this ‘dominant’ form of teacher evaluation by identifying and revealing the beliefs and practices underlining such policies that limit freedom, social justice and democracy.

Furthermore, according to Menter, Muschamp, Nicholls, Ozga and Pollard (1997), critical theory in relation to education policy can contribute to research in three ways:

1. It can draw attention to and challenge the assumptions informing policy and it can expose the effects of policy on the ground, in particular where policies increase inequality and impact unfairly on particular groups.
2. Research can set out how injustices are produced, reproduced and sustained.

3. Research can provide illumination of injustice and inequity that assists change and challenges 'common sense' assumptions about the official logic of outcomes and indicators. (p. 21)

For Hunter (1987, p. 6), 'critical work is about the inter-relationship between organisational behaviour, tasks, and structures with broader social and democratic processes'. She states that critical work is important because it:

- questions the common sense view within the literature that [schools] are objective realities that can be controlled towards particular goals;
- emancipate[s] those who are disciplined through objective power structures by questioning the power base of those located within privileged elite positions;
- problematises language, practice, beliefs and what are current and taken for granted assumptions about [school] realities and structures;
- reveal[s] the existence of contradictions and dilemmas within [schools] and the productive contribution of conflict;
- provides alternative ways of understanding [school] reality as a meaning of supporting critical evaluation; and
- supports practice through moving beyond tasks and techniques by conceptualising action within a social and political context. (1987, pp. 6–9)

Stemming from what Menter, Muschamp, Nicholls, Ozga and Pollard (1997) and Gunter (2001) had to say about critical theory and critical thinking, the *researcher* made the following comments: My research project 'drew attention to and challenges the assumptions' of performance management policy as being implemented in South Australian public schools by illustrating how it affected teachers. The research project also informed readers of the manner in which the text of the *Performance management guidelines* had placed considerable constraints on public school teachers in South Australia. Finally, the research project 'challenged' the 'assumptions' of performance management as a means of teacher evaluation. To summarise, my research project adopted a critical theory approach which gave a particular perspective on enhanced managerialism in the 'performative' state, thereby resulting in the adoption of performance management as an 'imposed' form of teacher evaluation in South

Australian public schools. Thus, a critical perspective ‘enables a critical view of new management discourses to be foregrounded; one that reads the underlying principle as enhanced control, rather than collegiality and empowerment’ (Menter, Muschamp, Nicholls, Ozga & Pollard, 1997, p. 15). This being so, how can critical theory lead to the possible emancipation of teachers?

### **Critical theory and the possible emancipation of teachers**

According to Usher (1996), the aim of critical inquiry is to critique and transform the dominant structures within society. It seeks to identify and reveal the beliefs and practices limiting freedom, justice and democracy. The prime motivation driving this process is restitution of rights and privileges of dispossessed and oppressed groups. Critical theory seeks a more just society in terms, not only of all people having equal access to the good things of life, but also and perhaps more importantly, of people being in cultural, economic and political control of their lives. Critical theory privileges the values of dialogue, communication and criticism; what Stokes (2000, p. 239) effectively calls a ‘discourse ethic’. This establishes the principles under which dialogue about substantial moral norms and conflicts can take place. Further, ‘no individual or subject is excluded from this dialogue, and only the force of argument can prevail’ (Stokes, 2000, p. 239). This is closely related to the importance of teacher engagement with policy that was the subject of the *researcher’s* project.

However, it must be remembered that the critical theorist does not regard research as a process of adding to existing knowledge so much as engaging in a dialectical revision of existing understandings with the aim of subjecting them to intense scrutiny and re-examination. This is exactly what the *researcher’s* project aimed to do. It scrutinised and re-

examined the current issue of teacher evaluation in the present context. Thus, critical research in teachers' work, in this instance, was informed by principles of social justice. It was not simply a matter of challenging the existing practice of teacher evaluation, but of seeking to understand what made this practice exist in the form it did, and challenged that, whilst remaining conscious that one's own sense of justice and equality are themselves open to review and persistent questioning.

Therefore, critical theory mirrors the broad aims of the emancipation itself and it requires individuals (teachers) to understand themselves as producers of, and products of, the social world (Peters, 1977). Peters also argues that 'rational individuals [teachers] have to be willing to reject conformity and dogma, and be willing to learn and revise opinions when confronted with situations that challenge them' (1977, p. 63).

It is also clear that 'critical researchers are politically minded' (Carspecken & Apple, 1992, p. 512), and unembarrassed by the label 'political' (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1998, p. 264). Personal values must impact on social research because critical researchers cannot separate their work from their lives and contexts (Firestone, 1990, p. 122). Thus, the selection of a research question and how it is framed is likely to derive from personal concerns, interests and values. Also, Firestone (1990) has sought to clarify the purposes of critical research as follows:

1. Research to achieve value-free knowledge with no larger political intention at all.
2. Research as social control in which the inquiry is conducted from within existing power structures as a means of exercising control over the rest of society.
3. Research as social engineering in which knowledge is sought that will improve the lives of those deemed [marginalised] by those in power.
4. Research as advocacy of the interests of the [marginalised]. This is conducted from outside the existing power structures. The interests of the disempowered



and [marginalised] are promoted and presented to the power elites who may or may not take notice of the research.

5. Research as a means of educating the [marginalised]. Here the research provides the means by which the [marginalised] sections of society come to a realisation that their status is not natural, necessary or inevitable. This realisation, and resultant liberation is reached via research and education.
6. Research is a voluntary device. The researcher's task is to demonstrate where the fundamental changes to existing social, economic and political structures are needed, and how to accomplish them. (p. 119)

The purpose of critical research in the *researcher's* project was located primarily in the third and fourth points above. The research project questioned the prevailing power relations being played out within the arena of teacher performance management and questioned how it served the interests of teachers (or not)—one which involved a framework of empowerment; one which gave voice to the subjects. It also examined how power relations in the educational workforce have led to the alienation and demoralisation of teachers. It has also meant the loss of autonomy for teachers. The *researcher* believed that critical theory could lead to the emancipation of teachers by focussing attention on, and opening discourses on 'issues about power, exploitation, fragmentation, and loss of professional identity' in teachers' work (Menter, Muschamp, Nicholls, Ozga & Pollard, 1997, p. 19). To elaborate, Linklater (1992, p. 83) informs us that critical theorists rely on discourse ethics to change the world. Thus, critical theory is concerned with ways to overcome the exclusionary situation in the world as it is, by emancipation. To solve this problem, some critical theorists use Habermas's notion of discourse ethics (Devetak, 1996, p. 179), in which Habermas distinguishes between a technical-instrumental interest on learning that enables humans to extend control over nature; a moral-practical interest through which humans learn how to achieve more consensual relations; and an emancipatory interest that leads to the identification of unnecessary confinements and constraints (Ashley, 1981, pp. 204–236). The *researcher* was of the opinion that the emancipatory interest should be the driving force of the discourses that he

mentioned above. The emancipatory interest could lead to, the *researcher* believed, a moral-learning, for example questions on exclusion and inclusion derived from a decision (teachers and policy making) within a society. Thus, educational conflicts could be resolved by discourse ethics, thereby enabling critical theorists to advocate for and pursue some form of action for change in the world. These discourse ethics are fostered by the application of ethnography as a research tool.

The next section, stage three of the journey, the *researcher* focuses on ethnography. He describes the philosophical underpinnings of ethnography, explains the term ‘ethnography’, and argues why the research project was a ‘partial ethnographic’ study. Leading from this discussion, he provides an explanation and discussion on ‘policy ethnography’. The *researcher* also illustrates how ‘policy ethnography’ can serve an emancipatory role in teachers’ work.

### **Stage three: Using ethnography in the research project**

#### **Ethnography and ‘partial ethnography’**

As stated in the introductory sections of this narrative, the *researcher* wanted to situate his research within the critical paradigm. It was for this reason that he had to envisage a research tool that would meet the demands of the research project as well as be potentially emancipatory for all involved. The research method he chose was that of ‘policy’ ethnography. As a way of introducing his understandings of ‘policy ethnography’, the *researcher* wishes to elaborate on the epistemological underpinnings of ethnography. ethnography first, followed by a discussion on ethnography, ‘partial ethnography’, ‘policy

ethnography’ and then proceeds to discuss ‘critical policy ethnography’ in order to fully comprehend the rationale for the choice of this research method.

### **The epistemological underpinnings of ethnography**

Ethnography, as an approach to qualitative research, has its origin in the discipline of anthropology. Under the influence of Malinowski (1922), traditional ethnography was developed with the aim to capture ‘the native’s point of view’ (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; de Laine, 1997). Thus, ethnography’s roots derive ‘primarily from phenomenology, anthropology and sociology, which have argued for its importance as a research method to provide a window on a culture’ (Lauer & Asher, 1988, p. 39). For the *researcher*, ethnography was a method of inquiry which involved direct and sustained contact with teachers, thereby enabling him to write about their experiences of performance management. Through the use of narratives, he provided rich descriptions of the ‘culture’ of teachers’ work in a disciplined and deliberate recording of their experiences. By ‘immersing’ himself in the lives of teachers, he provided ‘a corporeal knowledge that provides a practical comprehension of the world quite different from the act of conscious decoding that is normally designated by the idea of comprehension’ (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 135).

The underpinning assumption in ethnography is naturalism—an approach that was developed as a critical reaction to positivism. As opposed to the positivistic inspired ‘stimulus-response model’ applied in quantitative research, the naturalistic approach to inquiry embraces the importance given to research done in ‘natural’, rather than artificial settings. Hence, the argument is that the social world should be studied, as far as possible, in its natural state, remaining undisturbed by the researcher (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 6; de Laine, 1997, p. 21). It is for this reason that ethnographers immerse themselves in the lives of the

people they study for long periods of time. This point is elaborated by Van Maanen (1996), who maintains that ethnography typically refers to fieldwork (alternatively, participant-observation) conducted by a single investigator. This investigator usually lives with and lives like those who are studied. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) state:

The ethnographer participates, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions; in fact collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues with which he or she is concerned. (p. 2)

However, while describing a group or culture, the researcher must adopt a respectful attitude towards the culture that is being studied. It is significant that the researcher remains loyal to the phenomenon under inquiry, and does not give priority to the methodological principles. A naturalistic ethnographic approach to inquiry focuses on the existence of reality within the culture. Reality is constructed through the perceptions of those under study. The methods are mere instruments that must be frequently assessed in order to determine whether they respect the nature of those under study (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; de Laine, 1997).

### **What is ethnography?**

Traditionally, ethnography has been used as a research tool in anthropology and entered contemporary usage via the interpretative paradigm of research where researchers draw on experiential knowledge gained from physical participation in the field (Boyle, 1994). The role of the ethnographer is to draw a detailed picture of the social experience of people, in this case, teachers. Interpretative ethnographers are 'more interested in problems of cultural meaning than in social action' (Gitlin, Siegel & Bora, 1989, p. 242). In other words, ethnographers engage in the taking of 'snapshots' of certain cultural practices, rather than attempting to change them. Moss (1996) states that ethnography 'allows the researcher to gain a comprehensive view of the social interactions, behaviours, and beliefs of a community

or social group' (cited in Wiley, 1996, p. 389). This lends support to the traditional aim of ethnography, that is, to capture 'the native's point of view'. Through such findings, ethnographers may inform others of their findings with an attempt to derive, for example, policy decisions from such an analysis.

To reiterate, for many, the defining feature of ethnography is the use of participant observation entailing prolonged fieldwork (Holy, 1984). Van Maanen (1996, p. 263) makes a similar point by stating that 'when used as a method, ethnography typically refers to fieldwork (alternatively, participant-observation)'. This point is also argued by Agar (1996, p. 163), who states that the essence of ethnographic methods consists primarily in participant observation, an approach in which 'you are directly involved in community life, observing and talking with people as you learn from their view of reality'. According to Gold (1958), the levels of involvement in observation comprise four modes: the complete participant, the participant-as-observer, the observer-as-participant, and the complete observer. However, a typical ethnographer employs three kinds of data collection: observations, interviews and documents (Hammersley, 1990).

Spindler and Spindler (1992, p. 63) state that 'the requirement for direct, prolonged, on-the-spot observation cannot be avoided or reduced. It is the guts of the ethnographic approach'. However, they do concede that this does not necessarily mean that the ethnographer must engage in participant observation of those being studied. The role of the ethnographer may vary in different sites, depending on the 'kinds and intensity of participation' and the 'multiplicity of demands' imposed upon the researcher. Thus, 'there are no hard and fast rules' for conducting ethnographic research (Spindler & Spindler, 1992, p. 64).

Wolcott (1997) makes a similar observation. For Wolcott:

There is no way one could ever hope to produce an ethnography simply by employing many, most, or all of the research techniques that ethnographers use. Ethnography is not a reporting process guided by a specific set of techniques. Ethnographic significance is derived socially, not statistically, from discerning how [teachers] in their customary settings go about their everyday lives. (p. 333)

Acknowledging what Spindler and Spindler (1992) and Wolcott (1997) had to say about the role of the researcher in the field, the *researcher* chose to engage only in a single method of data collection—‘purposeful conversations’ with the teachers. The reason for the adoption of this particular stance was that much of the *researcher’s* teaching experience was guided by the question of how to improve teachers’ work, especially in the area of evaluation. This emancipatory intent had helped him to clarify his purpose in engaging in this research project. Thus, the purpose of the research project was to describe teachers’ perceptions and experiences of performance management; interpret the performance management policy as one associated with the issue of power and control; and to involve teachers in a dialogical process of meaning-making in relation to performance management policy.

In this instance, the *researcher* maintained that he could not ascertain teachers’ perceptions of these issues effectively through ‘participant observation’. Although ‘participant observation’ has the ability to provide some useful insights into performance management, he believed that ‘purposeful conversations’ open up greater possibilities for accessing richer stories of what the teachers are currently saying about performance management. He maintained that much of the richest data which ethnography can capture comes from the whole realm of informal talk between the researcher and informants; what Agar (1996, p. 158) calls ‘hanging out’ in places at the centre of ethnographic fieldwork. The essence of the informal interview is that the researcher does not have a formal list of written questions, but rather a set of guiding questions and a repertoire of question-asking strategies (interviewer skills) to select

from. The objective is to get an ‘experience-near’ as possible (Geertz, 1973), allowing the informant to control the discussion.

In his research project, the *researcher* used semi structured-interviews to aid his conversations with the teachers. Furthermore, by using semi structured-interviews, he directed his attention to the main issues being investigated but still allowed for a slight degree of flexibility during the conversations. This flexibility also allowed the teachers to ‘criticise a question, correct it, point out that it [was] sensitive, or answer in any way they [wanted] to’ (Agar, 1996, p. 140).

In the *researcher’s* case, the findings in his research project sought to inform the reader of the manner in which performance management, as a means of evaluation, had radically changed the nature of teachers’ work. Having stated that, the *researcher* now proceeds to describe how his research project constituted being a ‘partial ethnographic’ study.

### **Explaining ‘partial ethnography’**

Stemming from Holy (1984), Van Maanen (1996) and Hammersley’s (1990) research, the *researcher’s* project was to be considered a ‘partial’ ethnographic study because it did not constitute the makings of a typical ethnographic study. In other words, it did not ‘entail detailed observation’ (Wainwright, 1997, p. 1). Instead, the use of ‘purposeful conversations’ was the sole method of data collection.

Furthermore, drawing on the work of Massey (1998), the *researcher* argued that the research project was a ‘partial ethnographic’ study for the following reasons:

- This research project was a study of a culture—teacher culture. It attempted to understand the behaviour, values and meanings that teachers attach to performance

management in the context of teachers' work. Details of teachers' working lives were described within the wider social structures of teaching. Some questions that were asked in order to make sense of what teachers are doing were: 'What is going on in schools presently? How does teacher evaluation work for you? Why do teachers do these things?';

- Schools are complex organisations, thereby making the collection of data difficult. As an ethnographer, the *researcher* had to acknowledge that no single method of data collection would capture the 'rich descriptions' that he sought. Thus, he had to resort to 'purposeful conversations' as the main form of data collection coupled with the making of fieldnotes, observational notes, chance conversations and audiotapes;
- In order to 'truthfully' ascertain what teachers were saying about performance management, the *researcher* had to address the issue of 'engagement' in the field. Here, he had to take cognisance of two important concerns: his human connection with teachers and the amount of time he was to spend in the field. Firstly, he concurred with Gold (1997), who states that 'the fieldworker uses face-to-face relationships with informants as the fundamental way of demonstrating to them that he or she is there to learn about their lives without passing judgement on them' (cited in Massey, 1998, p. 3). In other words, it would be to the *researcher's* advantage if he 'hung around' and 'picked up things' from teachers in their own environment. It became imperative that he developed and maintained a positive personal involvement with these teachers in order to build a trustful relationship. He negotiated access and consent to 'speak' to both classroom teachers and staff with leadership positions in a high school and a primary school. All were permanent teachers, who had taught for a period of more than ten years in various schools in South Australia. In total, the *researcher* engaged with seven teachers. The second concern that he had to address was the issue of 'time' to be spent in the field. Here, he was guided by what Spindler and Spindler (1992) had to say with regard to this issue. They maintain that the core issue for the ethnographer is to determine the quality of work that can be conducted in the field and not the time spent. Time should not be confined to hours or days or years, but to the degree of understanding that the researcher must reach before leaving the field (Spindler & Spindler, 1992, p. 65). The *researcher* spent approximately eight months talking and listening to teachers. In his case, he found this time sufficient to achieve some kind of 'completeness';



- Another cause of concern that the *researcher* faced was the use of ‘myself’ as instrument in the data collecting process. Here, he was faced with the dilemma of building himself into this study as both a source of data and observer. He had to establish the uniqueness of his own experiences, as a former teacher, and to suppress his own participation in this research project in order to avoid discriminatory representations of the teachers. Therefore, he had to keep an open mind about what was currently happening in the arena of teacher evaluation. He also had to determine the most effective ways to write about what was being studied. Thus, he had to work in a systematic fashion, constantly engaging in a process of reflexivity. This entailed asking questions like: ‘Why and how particular decisions are made? Why were certain questions asked, whilst others were not? Why was the data to be generated in such a manner?’ In other words, he had to ‘articulate the assumptions and values implicit in the research, and what it [meant] to acknowledge [myself] as part of, rather than outside, the research act’ (Massey, 1998, p. 5);
- The *researcher* also had to look at what teachers were telling him from a wide range of lenses and perspectives. It is common knowledge that individuals perceive the realities of the world in unique ways. Therefore, he had to offer teachers’ narratives of evaluation in a manner that fostered critical and systematic examination. Whilst acknowledging that his role as researcher warranted him to position teachers’ narratives in the foreground, he had the ‘power’ to select information from what was seen or heard, that is, he had the authority to construct the final account. In order not to abuse this position and to provide credible narratives, the *researcher* was culturally open-minded from the beginning whereby he challenged his own theories and understandings. He also presented a wealth of data from which the reader could evaluate what teachers were saying about performance management. Furthermore, he shared with readers precise data to support particular claims about performance management. Also, the *researcher* engaged in ‘direct dialogue’ with teachers in respect to performance management. Here, he did not rely on preconceived frameworks for the collection and analyses of the data. These direct interactions with teachers provided him with opportunities to discover and create analytical frameworks for a deeper understanding of what they were saying about performance management;
- In his research project, the *researcher* used the information gleaned from the data to build on and modify present theories of teacher performance management. In this

instance, he developed new ‘theoretical considerations’ of performance management as it was played out in the ‘performative’ state. His stance here was consistent with the distinguishing feature of ethnography, whereby ‘the ethnographer’s sense of what needs to be looked at and reported on may change, and explanations of what is going on may be supplanted by ones which seem to fit better’ (Massey, 1998, p. 7); and

- The *researcher* was also conscious of the intention and the outcome of the research project. He had to make sure that the content and format of this ethnographic research project was dependent on the information needs of the primary stakeholders and the purpose of the research. Therefore, the *researcher* did not generalise the findings but provided the actual narratives of teacher evaluation as echoed by the teachers themselves. In this instance, focus was essential because he wanted to achieve a specific kind of understanding of teacher evaluation. Furthermore, by using vignettes of teachers’ stories as a means of data representation, the *researcher* hoped ‘to construct coherent (stories) that take the reader into a deeper and richer appreciation of the people who have been studied’ (Massey, 1998, p. 8). As Wilcox (1982) succinctly puts it, ‘the goal of ethnography is to combine the view of an insider with that of an outsider to describe a social setting. The resulting description is expected to be deeper and fuller than that of the ordinary outsider’ (Massey, 1998, p. 8).

The next section stems from the *researcher’s* discussions on critical theory, ethnography and ‘partial’ ethnography narrated earlier. Having described what critical theory, ethnography and ‘partial’ ethnography were and his reasons for endorsing these traditions, he now presents a brief review of ‘policy ethnography’, because his research project was primarily about the performance management policy being implemented in South Australian public schools.

### **‘Policy ethnography’**

In this section, the *researcher* discusses critical theory in relation to education policy analysis. Whilst it must be acknowledged that his research project was not a formal critical analysis of the *Performance management guidelines*, per se, it does, to a certain extent, engage in a discourse analysis of the stated policy in terms of its ideology. This was

necessary because the research project was interested in the manner in which teachers understand, live, experience, accommodate, resist or transform performance management policy in public schools. It is for this reason that he uses the term ‘policy ethnography’ as offered by Smyth and Shacklock (1998, p. 29).

Smyth and Shacklock (1998), citing Bowe and Ball (1990), offer this definition of policy ethnography:

For policy ethnography the concern needs to be both with exploring policy making, in terms of the process of value dispute and material influence which underlie and invest the formation of policy discourses, as well as portraying and analysing the processes of active interpretation and meaning-making which relate policy texts to practice. In part at least this also involves the identification of resistance, accommodation, subterfuge and conformity within and between areas of practice. It involves the plotting of clashes and mismatches between contending discourses at work in these areas, e.g. professional vs conformity, autonomy vs constraint, specification vs latitude, the political vs the educational. Policy ethnography should rest on the recognition of a clear distinction between intended and actual policy-in-use, and will attend carefully to processes of mediation and recontextualisation. Furthermore it is important to acknowledge that policy intentions may contain ambiguities, contradictions and omissions that provide particular opportunities for parties to the ‘implementation’ processes, what we might term ‘space’ for manoeuvre. (pp. 29–30)

The above definition clearly illuminated several concerns for researchers, like the *researcher* in question, who are conducting research associated with policy issues in teachers’ work.

Some of these issues that needed addressing were:

1. What were the reasons for the adoption of [a] particular policy/policies?
2. What were the effects of these policies on teachers?
3. How did the teacher interpret and make meaning of a particular policy?
4. How did the text of the policy actually relate to practice?
5. How did teachers view these policies in the context of their work?
6. To what extent were teachers prepared to tolerate these policies which impinge on their work?

Furthermore, if one has to view policy ‘as more than the “generation” by one group (usually politicians) and “implementation” by another (usually teachers and educational bureaucrats)’, there will always be ‘a continuous struggle over “representation” and “exclusion” of particular viewpoints and sets of interests culminating in temporary truces or uneasy settlements between contending groups’ (Smyth & Shacklock, 1998, p. 29).

Also, teachers in Australia, like those in the United Kingdom, have also been bombarded by a series of educational policies intent on reconfiguring their working lives. One such policy currently responsible for this reconfiguring is the performance management policy that is being implemented in South Australia. This policy, whilst professing to advocate the professional development of teachers, is, in the *researcher’s* opinion, the case of managerialism exerting greater control over teachers.

From the discussion presented in the previous paragraphs, it is obvious that there are numerous contentious issues associated with educational policy as it impacts upon teachers’ work. This point is also echoed by Bowe and Ball (1990), who state that ‘educational policy is still being generated and implemented both within and around the educational system in ways that have intended and unintended consequences for both education and its surrounding milieu’ (cited in Smyth & Shacklock, 1998, p. 30). Within this context, ethnography has an important role to play, because this research tool has the capacity to transform the policy agenda ‘as a form of educational inquiry designed to empower teachers to reconstruct their practice . . . through a process of reflection, understanding and rigorous critique’ (Carr, 1995, p. x).

Arising from the *researcher's* previous discussion on the emancipation of teachers and critical theory, he introduces the term 'critical policy ethnography' here in order to identify the existing power structures in policy issues.

### **'Critical policy ethnography'**

'Critical policy ethnography' implies that the researcher becomes conscious of the processes of marginalisation that occur in policy due to political, economic and social contexts. This point is elaborated upon by Thomas (1993) who locates ethnography in social and political conditions, raising questions of power structures and discriminatory practices. Thomas (1993) further raises features of critical policy ethnography, which involves a framework of empowerment, giving voice to the subjects of the research, the study of a particular culture, not just to describe it, but to change it, and its simultaneous hermeneutic and emancipatory being. Thus, the *researcher's* project has contributed to critical policy ethnography in the following ways:

- The *researcher* employed and organised the problematic of performance management policy in a consistent fashion. He studied this policy as it operated in some South Australian public schools in order to determine its action and meaning. This was done in order to encourage critique of the policy and to provide opportunities for teachers to challenge inequitable educational practices and unjust educational structures.
- The *researcher* situated his research project within a public sphere, that is, schools. This was the starting point for a critique and transformation of the oppressive and inequitable regulations of performance management policy. This enabled teachers to understand their mediations with the performance management policy and the political, economic and social contexts in which they were currently working.
- The *researcher* clearly reflected the emancipatory intentions of his research project. He maintained that the emancipatory interest was the key insight to understanding critical policy ethnography. He also believed that by stating his emancipatory intent, teachers would become conscious of using critical policy ethnography as a resource to

appropriate aspects of their work, to clarify their role functions and endeavour to seek new possibilities for transforming the performance management policy. (adapted from Simon & Dippo, 1986)

To summarise, critical policy ethnography seeks to locate policy practices under study within their wider social, historical and symbolic context. Simon and Dippo (1986) are of the opinion that critical policy ethnography is frank in its political motivation because it sees itself as having a practical purpose in revealing and challenging oppression from policy text, as experienced by those being researched.

Thus, in critical policy ethnography, the focus and process of research is concerned with issues of power, domination, voice and empowerment, as exemplified in the rhetorics of policy. The individuals (teachers) being studied are located in contexts of power and interests predetermined by policy texts. Thus, these contexts ‘have to be exposed, their legitimacy interrogated, and the value base of the research itself exposed’ (Quantz, 1992, pp. 473–474). Critical policy ethnography does such.

### **Part B: Continuing the research journey . . .**

In Part A: ‘The journey begins ...’, the *researcher* narrated his struggle to endorse an appropriate research paradigm to answer the research questions. That part built and elaborated on the chosen paradigm. It discussed critical theory as it is the philosophical framework for analysis of findings in the research project. The emancipatory intent of this particular paradigm, which was considered the most appropriate to meet the goal of the research project (that is, to explore, investigate and understand teachers’ attitudes and practices towards performance management) was also discussed. He also presented the

epistemological underpinning of ethnography, a discussion on ethnography itself, partial ethnography, policy ethnography and critical policy ethnography, an approach that lies within the interpretive and critical paradigms (Sarantakos, 1998). Thus, the base methodology of the research project was influenced by the works of critical theorists and sought to use similar qualitative methods to those in critical studies in order to obtain data for a group of teachers with different characteristics and from different teaching environments.

Also, the focus of the research project was on teachers themselves identifying, describing and interpreting their perceptions of performance management as a means of teacher evaluation. The method used, therefore, was qualitative. As mentioned previously, qualitative research methods ‘enable more intimate familiarity with social life, and provide more valid knowledge “through detailed, dense acquaintanceship” with social life’ (Lofland, 1976, p. 8).

With these viewpoints in mind and leading from the discussion presented in ‘The journey begins ...’, this Part B: ‘Continuing the research journey’, narrates the *researcher’s* experiences in the ‘field’. He begins by discussing his entry into the field and the management of relationships with informants. He proceeds to explain how the data was collected through the use of ‘purposeful conversations’ (Smyth, 2001a, p. 157). Following this, he presents a discussion on what he considers an important component of data collection—researcher skills and essential criteria required for successful conversations.

Thereafter, the *researcher* presents a description of how he went about collecting the data (conversations), analysing the data and the process used to identify common themes prevalent in the conversations. He concludes this part of the journey by discussing three important

concerns associated with ethnography: namely, ethical issues in purposeful conversations, ‘ascertaining the truth’ and the question of reflexivity in his research project.

### **Entering the field**

Delamont (1992) makes the point that obtaining access to educational settings is the critical first stage of the research journey. Many researchers experience difficulty in making the first contact, because this means that the researcher must put him/herself on the line in order to get fruitful cooperation (Michrina & Richards, 1996), without a clear pathway to follow. This is compounded by the fact that ‘gaining access . . . involves drawing on interpersonal resources and strategies . . . discovering obstacles to access, effective ways of overcoming them and providing insights into the social organisation of the setting’ (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 54).

In his research project, the *researcher* planned his initial approaches to the schools, bearing in mind Delamont’s (1992, p. 80) caution that access is a process and not a simple decision, and that ‘access negotiations to formal organisations, particularly those such as schools, which are embedded in larger bureaucracies, take a long time’. He chose to conduct interviews as ‘purposeful conversations’ (a term borrowed from Smyth, 2001a, p. 157 from Burgess, 1988) with teachers in public schools in South Australia. Here, he wanted to engage with teachers in a ‘non-fronting’ way ‘through a relaxed conversational style of interaction’ (Smyth, Hattam, Cannon, Edwards, Wilson & Wurst, 2000, p. 24). The *researcher* recognised that he had a ‘purpose’: to explore, investigate and understand teachers’ attitudes and practices towards performance management, and that ‘purposeful conversations’ were most likely to be an appropriate way to capture teachers’ stories on this issue.



Thus, permission was first sought from the Department of Education, Training and Employment in South Australia to conduct research in two state schools. The relevant ethical clearance forms, together with a copy of the proposal, were submitted to the research coordinator at the Department of Education, Training and Employment's Research Council Unit. Thereafter, permission was sought from the Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee at Flinders University. The senior educational management of a public high school and a primary school in South Australia were then contacted regarding their willingness for members of staff to participate in the study. When selecting the schools to research, the researcher was aware that, being a South African Indian, his physical presence might be considered obtrusive in a school environment which was predominantly Caucasian and Australian. Furthermore, he was also mindful that a school, having a reputation to protect, might not welcome an unknown foreign researcher in its midst. However, a letter from his supervisor, introducing him as a student and outlining the nature of his research project, assisted in overcoming these problems. Copies of the proposal and guiding questions for the interview with teachers were submitted to the principals of these schools. The principals then raised this issue with members of staff at a formal staff meeting. Seven interested teachers then contacted the *researcher* telephonically and voiced their willingness to participate in the research project.

The participants for the research project were representatives of two groups of teachers: teachers from a high school and teachers from a primary school. At his first meeting with the teachers, the *researcher* outlined the purpose of the research project. He followed up the talk with a letter in which he again outlined the purpose of the research project. He invited the teachers to give him a contact phone number. This was to make contact with each teacher to arrange a convenient time and place to talk. He did this because he wanted the teachers to

have the chance to discuss their interest in participating in the research project. He did not want teachers to feel obliged to volunteer because of his presence in the school. Thus, the *researcher* was attempting to set up research conditions that would be relatively free of his influence on the teachers.

Having successfully gained entry into these schools, the *researcher's* next task was to manage a professional and reciprocal relationship with seven teachers who had indicated a willingness to participate in the research project.

### **Managing a reciprocal relationship with the teachers**

Initially, the *researcher* had reservations about how he was going to interact with the teachers. His first meeting with teachers was characterised by nervousness and anxiety on his part. To overcome this, he engaged in 'casual' talk with them. He inquired about the nature of public schooling in South Australia. These conversations 'broke the ice' as the teachers and the *researcher* shared a common concern: that is, ascertaining the state of public education as it exists presently. During this meeting, he also courteously asked the teachers when he could talk to them again. He informed them that he was mindful of their busy work schedule and that he was available to meet with them at their convenience. He also informed them that each 'conversation' would last no more than thirty minutes. The teachers could also choose the place for these 'purposeful conversations' to take place. The teachers then informed him that they would contact him telephonically to set up convenient times to meet.

Subsequent to this, the *researcher* had several individual meetings with each teacher in which they engaged in 'purposeful conversations' over a period of approximately eight months. These meetings took place at the school, the *researcher's* home and, in the case of one

teacher, at his home. Further, these meetings occurred during the teachers' non-teaching time and after-school hours. There were occasions, however, when scheduled meetings did not occur because some of the teachers were sick, some were busy with school examinations, some had to attend staff meetings or professional development programs or some were too busy with administrative duties. In these instances, the teachers concerned were very apologetic and rescheduled meetings.

### **Collection of data through 'purposeful conversations'**

When the *researcher* first met with the teachers, he informed them that he was interested in speaking to them about performance management. He seldom used the word 'interviews' because he was afraid that this might conjure images of formality, thereby compromising the trusting and friendly relationship that he sought to build. Whilst the interview is 'the most utilised data collection method in qualitative research studies' (Oka & Shaw, 2000, p. 4), Woods (1996) suggests that the interview is not just a mechanism for gathering information, but also 'a process of reality construction to which both parties contribute, and by which both are affected' (cited in Hayes, 2001, pp. 21–22) and 'his reference to "both parties" is significant as a reminder that interviews are not merely "done" to people but involve a more complex form of social interaction' (Hayes, 2001, p. 22). Further, the *researcher* was conscious of the fact that his relationship with the teachers would determine exactly what they were willing to share with him. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) comment on this relationship as such:

[Teachers] are often more concerned with what kind of person the researcher is than with the research itself. They will try to gauge how far he or she can be trusted, what he or she might be able to offer as an acquaintance or friend, and perhaps also how easily he or she can be manipulated or exploited. (p. 78)

Hayes (2001, p. 22) warns that, although the conversations ‘might generate rich descriptions of lived experiences’, the researcher needs to consider the ‘face validity’ of what the teachers were saying about performance management and to avoid ‘premature codification, categorisation or interpretation of the data’. Thus, he envisaged ‘purposeful conversations’ as a method of inquiry that might alleviate some of these concerns expressed by Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), Woods (1996) and Hayes (2001).

The *researcher* now explains ‘purposeful conversations’ and further justifies why he used this method of inquiry in his research project.

Burgess (1984, p. 102) informs us that ‘there is a long tradition in social science research where interviews have been perceived as “conversations with a purpose”’. Proponents argue the use of both unstructured and semistructured interviews to obtain understandings from their respondents. Burgess (1984) prefers to use the term ‘purposeful conversations’, rather than interviews when describing this method of inquiry. For the purpose of the research project, the *researcher* chose to use the technique of interviewing as ‘purposeful conversations’ (Smyth, 2001a, p. 157), assisted by a list of guiding questions. The reason for this was that the *researcher* wanted to ‘provide a genuine space within which teachers [c]ould reveal what is real for them’ (Smyth, 1999, p. 5). In his conversations with teachers, he referred to the list of guiding questions to redirect conversations when he found them deviating from the issues being discussed. Conversations were also important because he wanted the teachers to see themselves as more than mere respondents in the conversations. Thus, it was in this context that ‘conversations’ were seen to be an appropriate tool in accessing meanings and understandings.

Kennedy, Smith, Jimenez, Mayer and Mellor (2001) cite the works of Clandinin and Connelly (1992, 1994, 1998) and Connelly, Clandinin, and He (1997) to illustrate the idea of ‘research conversations’ by stating:

Central to this work is the idea that teachers are professionals whose stories about their world are powerful reconstructions of their lived experiences. What is highlighted in these stories is not the researcher, or the research questions or a particular approach to methodology. Rather, what are central are the stories that teachers have to tell and the powerful learning that such stories can generate. (p. 10)

To summarise, the *researcher* also found that using the technique of ‘purposeful conversations’ in the research project was appropriate because the wide range of issues that he was investigating were simply not amenable to observation. In this case, asking teachers about their perceptions of performance management represented the most viable means of obtaining the data. ‘Purposeful conversations’ also encouraged teachers to ‘speak in their own voices’. In allowing teachers their own voice, they were encouraged to take cognisance of the ‘real’ factors that affected their work lives. In conversing with teachers, the *researcher* also became more aware of his inability to know the situation facing them. In his case, he had experience of being evaluated as a teacher in South Africa and he now became conscious of allowing South Australian teachers to speak freely and honestly about their experiences.

However, before the *researcher* describes how he went about identifying the common themes evident in the conversations, he would like to comment on the issue of interpersonal skills of the researcher. Here, he argues that a good range of interpersonal skills enhances the ‘conversation’ process. If researchers are to view ‘purposeful conversations’ in simplistic terms—a conversation between two individuals in which one seeks data from the other—then the *researcher* maintains that the issue of ‘conversation’ skills is taken for granted or

conveniently ignored. However, the importance of this issue cannot be overstated in his research project as conversations were the main source of data collection.

### **Interviewer skills**

The *researcher* reiterates that the success of ‘purposeful conversations’ is dependent upon the interpersonal skills of the researcher. Paterson (1997) makes a similar observation by stating:

As such, all [purposeful conversations] have their basis in human interaction. In my own experience, an awareness and knowledge of inter-personal skills has been an invaluable asset to the inquiry process. (p. 1)

Emanating from this viewpoint, he offers a humanistic framework to ‘raise awareness of the means by which researchers can move towards influencing the [conversation] interaction in facilitative ways’ (Paterson, 1997, p. 1). His framework is derived from the writings of Carl Rogers, a renowned psychologist and is concerned with an understanding of and the enhancement of human interactions. The framework comprises three interrelated attitudes essential for the development of interpersonal skills: namely, realness or genuineness; respect, acceptance, trust; and empathic understanding. Paterson’s (1997) framework appealed to the *researcher* as a novice qualitative researcher because it was sound in reason and it provided him with the necessary guidance to conduct ‘purposeful conversations’. He now presents a brief discussion of the utilisation of this framework in his research project.

#### ***1. Realness or genuineness***

Paterson (1997) expresses the view that realness or genuineness is an important attitude that benefits all those involved in the research project. Initial meetings should convey overtly open signs of genuineness. The researcher should state explicitly who he or she is without presenting a front or facade, and clearly explain the purposes and goals of the research project. This openness helps in cementing compatible relationships between researcher and teachers. Being accepted for who the researcher truly is helps foster better and genuine

conversations. This acceptance also helps the researcher to become an effective conversationalist.

To reiterate, the *researcher's* initial meetings with the teachers were conducted in an informal but respectful manner. He clearly explained to the teachers who he was and spoke about education in South Africa. The majority of them showed a genuine interest in this topic. This came as no surprise to the *researcher*, for all of them admitted that this was the first time they were getting an 'insider' account of the situation in South African schools. When questioned about some issues of teaching, both in South Africa and South Australia, the *researcher* answered in a genuine and truthful manner. He was also candid and honest about the purpose of his research project. He indicated to the teachers that he was:

interested in what [they] had to say . . . believe that the thoughts and experiences of [teachers] being interviewed were worth knowing. In short [he] had the utmost respect for people who were willing to share with [him] some of their time. (Paterson, 1997, p. 7)

## ***2. Respect, acceptance and trust***

Paterson (1997) maintains that the success of a 'purposeful conversation' is dependent on the collaboration of the teacher. In addition, the teacher's level of motivation to converse openly with the researcher can greatly influence responses. Another important factor influencing success is the value that the researcher places on the teacher. It is important that the researcher respects teachers and accepts them for who they are. Thus, the researcher must adopt a non-judgemental stance. But, in doing so, the researcher is confronted with the predicament of distinguishing between rapport and neutrality. Paterson (1997) explains:

Rapport is a stance vis-a-vis the person being interviewed. Neutrality is a stance vis-a-vis the content of what the person says. Rapport means that I respect the person being interviewed . . . Yet the content of what I am being told will not be subject to my judgement. (p. 7)

The *researcher* faced the same dilemma. How could he be non-judgemental of what South Australian teachers were saying about performance management in view of his experiences of evaluation? Would his bodily reactions, for example, nodding his head in agreement or disagreement or the widening of his eyes to indicate disbelief adversely affect the interview rapport? Paterson (1997, p. 8) advises researchers facing this predicament ‘to “bracket” judgemental feelings as “temporarily inappropriate”’. In a few conversations where the *researcher* encountered this problem, he tried to implement Paterson’s advice. However, he experienced great difficulty in its implementation. This could be attributed to the fact that the conversations he was now hearing sounded all too familiar—he was subject to similar experiences.

### ***3. Empathic understanding***

Patton (1990, p. 9) argues that ‘any credible research strategy requires that the investigator adopt a stance of neutrality with regard to the phenomenon under study’. The researcher should not embark on the research journey to verify a particular theory or control the data to arrive at prearranged truths. This means that the researcher must commit to ‘understand the world as it is, to be true to complexities and multiple perspectives as they emerge, and to be balanced in reporting both confirming and disconfirming information’ (Patton, 1990, p. 55). In other words, the researcher must be ‘empathic’.

In a specific sense of the word, ‘empathic’ here refers to ‘a sensitivity to respondents’ frames of reference’ (Paterson, 1997, p. 9). Empathy results from the researcher’s personal contact with teachers and it involves a complete understanding of the teachers, as well as seeing the world through the teachers’ eyes. In other words, researchers perceive the world of teachers by adopting their frame of reference.



In the conversational situation, empathic understanding is enhanced if the researcher acknowledges and accepts that different teachers will use dissimilar words to describe similar situations, and similar words to describe completely dissimilar situations. It should be noted that empathy and respect go hand in hand. Empathy is strengthened when there is respect for the teacher in the conversation. The *researcher* respected the teachers and valued their ideas and contributions to the conversation.

Thus, Rogers' framework, as adapted by Paterson (1997) in this case, outlined three central attitudinal qualities that helped enhance 'purposeful conversations': namely, realness or genuineness; respect, acceptance and trust; and empathic understanding. These qualities, without doubt, did provide a clear yet effective conceptual framework for the *researcher* to make sense of the wide range of skills required for effective conversation. Personally, it was of tremendous benefit in his coming to grips with using 'purposeful conversations' as a means of data collection. In all of the conversations conducted, the *researcher* strove to work within the parameters of this framework.

### **Identification of common themes**

Working with the transcripts; which were obtained from the *researcher's* audiotaped conversations with the teachers; he began to search for categories and patterns (themes). Common categories and themes were coded accordingly. He then engaged in a process of constructing the outline of the analysis (Fielding, 1993).

In the *researcher's* case, the identification of themes was made less difficult as a result of the initial preconceptions in the form of theoretical assumptions that he had brought to the conversations. It must be stated that these assumptions informed the guiding questions he

asked and the type of information he was seeking. However, he must confess that although the assumptions informed the questions he asked and the type of information he was seeking, they did not dictate a firm research orientation. Rather, the *researcher* used these assumptions as sensitising concepts, alerting him to what he should listen for and question while assisting in confirming or denying his initial assumptions. As he identified categories and themes, he began to develop a relationship between the themes and this helped form the beginning of an abstract level of understanding of the manner in which teachers viewed performance management. LeCompte and Preissle (1993, p. 272) maintain that ethnographic findings may be applied to theoretical findings that already exist. When data fits that framework, it is confirmatory and thus more general applications are indicated by the research findings.

Through frequent re-readings of the data, six major themes became clear. These were: performance management was a driven, top-down policy imposed on teachers; the purpose of performance management; the effectiveness of performance management; the question of time and resources; the issue of trust; and the professional recognition and development of the teacher.

Another interesting feature to emerge from the research project was the teachers' narration of the manner in which they fabricated their work in order to accommodate, resist or transform the performance management policy.

### **Ethical issues in 'purposeful conversations'**

According to Smith (1990):

Ethics has to do with how one treats those individuals with whom one interacts and is involved and how the relations formed may depart from some conception of the ideal. At a commonsense level, caring, fairness, openness, and truth seem to be the important values under-girding the relationships and the activity of inquiring. (p. 260)

In the context of ‘purposeful conversations’, the *researcher* had to adhere to some of the basic ethical issues associated with this method of inquiry. Some of the issues that he addressed were:

1. confidentiality: Teachers shared very personal information with the *researcher*. Thus, it was important to assure them that all information they offered would be treated with the utmost confidentiality. This was stated explicitly in a written statement that the *researcher* handed to teachers. Also, by using pseudonyms, he coded the names of teachers so as to protect anonymity;
2. informed consent: Teachers were truthfully told about the overall purpose of the investigation, as well as any possible risks and benefits from participation in the research project. The *researcher* also informed them that their participation in the research project was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Teachers then signed a permission form agreeing to participate in the research project; and
3. promises and reciprocity: The issue here is what the teachers get in return for their participation in the study. The teachers in this research project were informed that they would not benefit financially by participating. However, the *researcher* did ensure them that the teaching community would benefit in some way from the findings of the study. He also promised the teachers a summarised copy of the finalised research project. (Burgess, 1984; Woods, 1986)

Erlandson, Harris, Skipper and Allen (1993), in their discussion of ethical issues, also elaborate on the previously mentioned concerns with regard to confidentiality, harm, deception and informed consent. They add that, in qualitative research, situations may arise that could jeopardise the research by restricting freedom of speech or encouraging suppression of negative results. In the *researcher's* project, it can be categorically stated that no subject was harmed; anonymity and privacy were protected; no subject was deceived; and that informed consent was secured from all teachers associated with the research project.

### **Ascertaining the ‘truth’**

Woods (1986, p. 83) informs us that one of the difficulties in ‘purposeful conversations’ is determining whether the teachers are telling the truth or not. He asks, ‘Is not this sort of material impressionistic, subjective, biased and idiosyncratic?’ (p. 83). One possible way of

overcoming this problem, according to Hayes (2001, p. 25) is to ensure that the researcher has a set of well thought out questions, has good conversational skills and is well versed in the art of prompting. Woods (1986, p. 83) maintains that the researcher must ‘be altered to possible influences operating on [teachers]—ulterior motives, the desire to please, situational factors like a recent traumatic incident, values, etc.—all of which may colour their judgements’. Further, the researcher must recognise accounts that are ‘too emotional an account, too rosy a picture, unusual reactions’ (Woods, 1986, p. 83). In order to cope with fabrications that sometimes contaminate the accounts, the researcher must reflect on the ‘reliability of the [teacher], and . . . the mental set through which the material has been processed’ (Woods, 1986, p. 83). Also researchers should not be satisfied with just the one account. They must request further meetings with the particular teacher to verify the truth.

Hayes (2001), drawing on the work of Bridges (1999), maintains that researchers should differentiate between the forms of truth that they are seeking by offering five alternatives:

1. Truth as ‘correspondence’ in which truth ‘corresponds’ with the actual state of affairs or conditions.
2. Truth as ‘coherence’, which relies on an inclusive system of beliefs.
3. Truth as ‘what works’ (pragmatism), where ‘the proof of the pudding is in the eating’.
4. Truth as ‘consensus’, where there needs to be agreement among the relevant population.
5. Truth as ‘warranted belief’, in which truth is provisional and may change as new evidence and thinking cast doubt on previous beliefs. (pp. 25–26)

The *researcher* found this schema useful in his research project because it allowed him the latitude to position some of the conversations across these different categories of truth in order to ascertain the truthfulness of the conversation. In this particular instance, he found ‘truth as correspondence’ the most appropriate, because he wanted to hear what teachers were saying about ‘the actual state of affairs or conditions’ of performance management.

## **Reflexivity**

Reflexivity, according to Tripp (1998, p. 39), is ‘a particular dialectic between the research project as a constructed entity, and how people participate in constructing it, especially the researchers’. For Tripp:

Reflexivity involves a kind of circularity in understanding in which the person trying to understand the so-called ‘objective’ phenomenal world they are investigating, examines the way in which their developing understanding changes them and their relation, not only to both the phenomenal world they are observing and their knowledge of it, but also to know how they are observing and understanding the phenomenal world. (1998, p. 39)

Reflexivity is common in most ethnographic research and is central to critical research. In critical research it is one of the underpinning principles that ensures the development of an empowering and emancipatory research relationship. In practice, reflexivity leads the critical researcher to position himself or herself within the research according to personal identity politics. Thus, it demands self-awareness by the researcher, particularly regarding the difficulty the researcher has in representing self and other impartially. The addressing of this issue is crucial because ‘of all the human sciences and studies, [ethnography] is most deeply rooted in the social and subjective experience of the inquirer. Everything is brought to the test of self, everything observed is learned ultimately “on his [or her] pulses”’ (Turner, 1986, p. 33). Self-awareness enables an open acknowledgement of the partiality and situatedness of all claims to knowledge. It makes opening up the possibility for thinking about, acknowledging and experiencing identity, race, class and culture in ways that challenge power relationships.

‘As qualitative social researchers reflexively explore everyday lives, we must continually confront questions of the nature and assumptions of the knowledge we are producing, and who we are producing it for’ (Ribbens & Edwards, 1998, p. 4). Thus, as critical researchers, we must recognise our subjectivities and vulnerabilities. Behar (1996, p. 6) maintains that the

researcher must be aware of and record his or her own emotional involvement with those being researched. This helps in the research process by acknowledging that the researcher's own emotional involvement represents another way of understanding the lives of the researched.

Research generally implies a process in which the researcher endeavours to find out more about the world. Reflexivity, on the other hand, is 'finding out about how meanings, including the meanings given to and generated by research, are discursively constructed within the practice of research' (Scott & Usher, 1996, p. 39). Quantz (1992) believes that reflexivity is the hallmark of ethnography:

Neither positivism nor naturalism provide an adequate framework for social research. Both neglect its fundamental reflexivity, the fact that we are part of the social world we study, and that there is no escape from reliance on common-sense knowledge and on common-sense methods of investigation. All social research is founded on the human capacity for participation observation. We act in the social world and yet are able to reflect upon ourselves and our actions as objects in that world. By including our own role within the research focus and systematically exploiting our participation in the world under study as researchers, we can develop and test theory. (p. 472)

The point that Quantz (1992, p. 472) makes is that in ethnography the researcher should be part of the research. In other words, 'ethnographers should treat themselves as part of the social event being studied'. By doing so, the researcher can clearly state how he or she is making sense of the world, what his or her interests are in the research, and how this influences his or her understanding of the received knowledge (Haraway, 1988). In this instance, the researcher can also acknowledge that the research is shaped by the social contexts in which he or she is operating. Thus, the information that the researcher offers represents a partial account of a way of life of a group, rather than a total picture of the wider world. By acknowledging the limits and partiality of listening to and learning from the

different accounts of the real world, there is a greater possibility of acquiring a more realistic representation and understanding of the limits and contradictions of culture (Haraway, 1988).

When the *researcher* embarked on this research project, he realised that his fieldwork would be central to his understanding of performance management as perceived by a select group of teachers in South Australia. His decision to engage in the area of teacher evaluation was guided by several considerations. First, his personal experiences of evaluation in South Africa instilled in him a desire to research this area further. Second, he discovered the available literature on teacher evaluation to be limited in South Australia, particularly writing related to teachers' perceptions of performance management. Third, the current issue of performance management as a method of teacher evaluation was a contentious issue that warranted critique. His discussions with friends and colleagues convinced him that this would be a fruitful avenue of research for himself, for teachers, for the academic community and for society in general.

Also, the *researcher* wanted to explore teachers' experiences and perceptions of performance management from a different angle, from that of a researcher. As with any ethnographic study, this one took place at the dynamic intersection of self, other and text. It was clear that the dialectical nature of this project could prove interesting, that his subjectivity made him, as Richardson (1990, p. 194) suggests, a 'speaking subject, whose story must be heard, whose power comes from within'.

A 'partial' ethnography was chosen as the research approach in order to seek a personal perspective of teachers' perceptions of this mode of evaluation. This insider's perception of reality is the core of most ethnographic research (Agar, 1986). This ethnography attempted to

capture individuals' perceptions of meanings and events within specific contexts; in this case, performance management (Agar, 1996). The ethnographic research approach was primarily emancipatory in its intent, and generated new questions and theories that were grounded in the critical data. Such theories and questions are derived from the participants' 'thick rich descriptions' (Geertz, 1973), or descriptions that represent the central elements of the individuals' meanings of their experiences (Denzin, 1989). An interpretation of such descriptions was used to understand teachers' perceptions of performance management as a mode of teacher evaluation.

As stated in previously, the research participants in this study were a group of male and female teachers from a public high school and a primary school. These teachers had identified themselves as having experienced the process of evaluation in their work and they were willing to describe and share their experiences. The *researcher's* intent was to present a multivoiced text that represented the teachers' interpretations of performance management within the context of 'performativities and fabrications'. His agenda was to help with the discovery of diverse forms of teachers' experiences, and in doing this, to give voice to teachers. However, Scott and Usher (1996, p. 49) caution us that 'we need to be aware of reflexivity because even when we think our research is useful or even emancipatory we are still "objectifying", still speaking for others'. In addition, Scott and Usher (1996) maintain that 'reflexivity enables us to interrogate our own practice of research . . . through a "reflexive" acceptance either of the neutrality of research, of its "pragmatic" usefulnesses or its "emancipatory" potential, and in terms of how we contribute to such discourses despite our best intentions' (p. 49).



Turner (1986) maintains that the reflexive nature of ethnography involves a sharing of the researcher's inner dialogue with the dialogue of those being observed (Bruner, 1996). Thus, for those researchers studying experience, self-reflection can offer understandings of the other (Geertz, 1988). Thus, the dialectical nature of social research can be seen in part as a process of self-discovery (Bruner, 1996). This process of self-discovery should, according to Lather (1988, p. 572), 'produce an analysis which goes beyond the experience of the researched while still granting them full subjectivity'. This will result in a symbiotic relationship where both the researcher and researched are changed.

Changes to both the researcher and the researcher are dependent on personal experience. According to Abrahams (1986), both the researcher and the researched must experience the research on two levels: of participation, and of reporting the action. Indeed, all ethnography may be seen as an interaction between these two experiences—the ethnographer's experience of self and participant in the field; and the participant's experience of self and of the researcher (Bruner, 1996).

From the outset, the *researcher* was engaged in an intense process of self-discovery where he began to make sense of what South Australian teachers were saying about performance management. He allowed himself to find some common ground with the experiences described by the participants. Thus, it was critical that he remained reflexive at all times. His personal experiences of evaluation served as a yardstick for making sense of the informants' stories of performance management. Thus, the analysed data was meaningful to him because he could identify with what teachers were saying about their experiences. Furthermore, the conversations also afforded him a new opportunity to reflect on his life as a teacher; draw comparisons of his personal experiences of evaluation with teachers in another country; and

fill many voids that still existed in his mind with meaningful answers in relation to teachers' work. Also, by reflecting upon his experiences of the conversations, questions emerged about his role, about the participants' roles, and about the fieldwork. He questioned who he was and what he believed he was doing in the conversational setting.

To summarise, the *researcher* acknowledges that he came to the research process with bias, attitudes and values that influenced the research technique that he used, the data that he gathered and the way in which he interpreted the data. In short, he acknowledges his subjective involvement in the research project. However, he also acknowledges that his subjectivity represents one of a number of ways of making sense of what South Australian teachers were saying about performance management.

### **Part C: Ending the journey . . .**

The research journey that the *researcher* ventured on was an exciting and informative one. As a novice researcher he did face challenges. One such challenge was to build upon the theoretical framework for the research project. Thus, he had to explore this topic qualitatively by engaging in 'partial' ethnography. Through the use of 'purposeful conversations', he sought to find out how, if at all, the manner in which performance management policy was affecting teachers' work. Although the fieldwork was challenging, he did enjoy immense satisfaction from engaging in meaningful conversations with all those involved in the research project.

The data collected was rich in description of teachers' experiences of performance management. Furthermore, his set of semi-structured interview questions was devised to uncover performance management issues in all their complexity and in 'context'. Context, in

this instance, may be understood as a set of properties (social, cultural and political) that pertain to an event or phenomenon. Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 110) define context as ‘the particular set of conditions within which action/interaction strategies are taken to manage, handle, carry out, and respond to a specific phenomenon’. He was concerned with understanding human behaviour from the teachers’ frame of reference. He sought to critically examine the experiences and perceptions of teachers in relation to performance management as a means of evaluation. More specifically, his purpose was to uncover how teachers understand, live, experience, accommodate, resist or transform performance management as a means of teacher evaluation. Uncovering these issues also meant that he had to engage in an ongoing process of self-reflection. This, in turn, provided meaningful answers to his personal quest to understand.

## References

- Abrahams, R. (1986). Ordinary and extraordinary experience. In V. Turner & E. Bruner (Eds.), *The anthropology of experience* (pp. 45-72). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1983). 'Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research'. *Women's Studies International forum*, 6(4), 423-435.
- Agar, M. (1986). *Speaking of ethnography*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Agar, M. (1996). *Professional stranger: An informed introduction to ethnography*. New York: Academic Press.
- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Ashley, R. (1981). Political realism and human interest. *International Studies Quarterly*, 25 (2), 204-236.
- Ball, S. (1991). Power, conflict, micropolitics, and all that! In G. Walford (Ed.), *Doing educational research*. (pp. 166-192). London: Routledge.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bernstein, R. (1976). *The restructuring of social and political theory*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1992). *Qualitative research for education*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bowe, R., and Ball, S. (1990). *The micro-politics of radical change: Budgets, management and control in British schools*. Paper presented at the AERA Conference, Boston, April 1990.
- Boyle, J. (1994). Styles of ethnography. In J. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 159-185). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Bridges, D. (1999). Educational research: Pursuit of truth or flights into fancy? *British Educational Research Journal*, 25(5), 597-616.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burgess, R. (1984). *In the field: An introduction to field research*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Burgess, R. (1988). Conversations with a purpose: The ethnographic interview in educational research. *Studies in Qualitative Methodology*, 1, 137-155.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Aldershot, England: Arena.
- Carr, W. (1995). *For education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Carspecken, P. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Carspecken, P., & Apple, M. (1992). Critical qualitative research: Theory, methodology and practice. In M. LeCompte, M. Milroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 507-553). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Clandinin, D., & Connelly, F. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 363-401). New York: Macmillan.
- Clandinin, D., & Connelly, F. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 413-427). New Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Clandinin, D., & Connelly, F. (1998). Stories to live by: Narrative understandings of school reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(2), 149-164.
- Connelly, F., Clandinin, D., & He, M. (1997). Teachers' personal practical knowledge on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(7), 665-674.
- Coombs, M. (1995). *Representative research: A qualitatively driven approach*. [Online]. Available: [www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/coombs.html](http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/coombs.html). [2002, May 2].
- de Laine, M. (1977). *Ethnography: Theory and applications in health research*. Sydney: MacLennan & Petty.
- Delamont, S. (1992). *Fieldwork in educational settings: Methods, pitfalls and perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Denzin, N. (1989). *The research act* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (1994a). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994b). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Devetak, R. (1996). Critical theory. In S. Burchill & A. Linklater (Eds.), *Theories of international relations* (pp. 179-209). New York: Basingstoke.
- Eisner, E. (1993). Foreward. In D. Flinders & G. Mills (Eds.), *Theory and concepts in qualitative research: Perspectives from the field*. (pp. vii-ix). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ely, M., Vinz, R., Anzul, M., & Downing, M. (1997). *On writing qualitative research: Living by words*. London and Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.
- Erlandson, D., Harris, E., Skipper, B., & Allen, S. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Fielding, M. (1993). Ethnography. In N. Gilbert (Ed.), *Researching social life* (pp. 154-171). London: Sage Publications.
- Firestone, W. E. (1990). Accommodation: Toward a paradigm-praxis dialectic. In E. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 105-124). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Flinders, D., & Mills, G. (Eds.). (1993). *Theories and concepts of qualitative research: Perspectives from the field*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gitlin, A., Siegel, M., & Bora, K. (1989). The politics of method: From leftist ethnography to educative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 2(3), 237-253.
- Gold, R. (1958). Roles in sociological field observation. *Social Forces*, 36, 217-223.
- Gunter, H. (2001). Critical approaches to leadership in education. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 2(2), 94-108.
- Hammersley, M. (1990). *Reading ethnographic research: A critical guide*. London: Longman.
- Hammersley, M. (1997). 'A reply to Humphries'. *Sociological Research Online*, 2(4), 1-5. [Online]. Available: [www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/4/6html](http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/4/6html). [2002, May 12].
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14, 575-599.
- Hayes, D. (2001). Reflections on the meaning of 'non-participation' in research. *Research in Education*, 65, 20-30.

- Hollingsworth, S. & Sockett, H. (1994). *Teacher research and educational reform*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Holy, L. (1984). Theory, methodology and the research process. In R. Ellen (Ed.), *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 13-34). London: Academic Press.
- hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical theory*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Hunter, A. (1987). *The politics of resentment and the construction of middle America*. Unpublished paper, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Jacob, E. (1988). Clarifying qualitative research: A focus on traditions. *Educational Researcher*, 17, 16-19, 22-24.
- Kendall, G., & Michael, M. (1997). Politicizing the politics of postmodern social psychology *Theory of Psychology*, 72(2), 7-29.
- Kennedy, K., Smith, J., Jimenez, S., Mayer, D., & Mellor, S. (2001). 'Conversations about civics'. *Creating contexts for teachers to talk about experiences with and aspirations for civic education*. Paper presented at the biennial conference of the Australian Curriculum Studies Association, Canberra, June 2001.
- Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (1994). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 138-157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.). *Metaphor and thought* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). (pp. 205-251). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.



- Lather, P. (1988). Feminist perspectives on empowering research methodologies. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11(6), 569-581.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lather, P. (1994). Critical inquiry in qualitative research: Feminist and poststructural perspectives: Science 'after truth'. In B. Crabtree, W. Miller, R. Addison, V. Gilchrist & A. Kuzel (Eds.), *Exploring collaborative research in primary care* (pp. 103-114). New York: Sage Publications.
- Lauer, J., & Asher, J. (1988). *Composition research: Empirical designs*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- LeCompte, M., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalist inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Linklater, A. (1992). A question of next stage in international relations theory: A critical-theoretical point of view. *Journal of International Studies* 21(1), 77-98.
- Lofland, J. (1976). *Doing social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Lytle, S., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1994). Inquiry, knowledge and practice. In S. Hollingsworth & M. Cochran-Smith (Eds.), *Teacher research in educational reform* (pp. 22-51). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Massey, A. (1998). 'The way we do things around here': *The culture of ethnography*. Paper presented at the Ethnography and Education Conference, Oxford University Department of Educational Studies, Oxford, 7-8 September, 1998.
- McCotter, S. (2001). The journey of a beginning researcher. *The Qualitative Report*, 6(2), 1-26.

- McGee, R., & Warms, R. (1996). *Anthropological theory: An introductory history*. Mountainview, CA: Mayfair Publishing Company.
- McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.
- Menter, I., Muschamp, Y., Nicholls, O., Ozga, P., & Pollard, A. (1997). *Work and identity in the primary school: A post-Fordist analysis*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Michrina, B., & Richards, C. (1996). *Person to person: Fieldwork, dialogue, and the hermeneutic model*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Moss, B. J. (1996). *Ethnography and composition*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Nicholas, R. (1990). Speculations on a catastrophic future, education, and technology. *Journal of thought*, 25(1 & 2), 126-142.
- Oka, T., & Shaw, I. (2000). *Qualitative research in social work*. [Online]. Available: [pweb.sophia.ac.jp/~t-oka/papers/2000/qrsq/qrsq.html](http://pweb.sophia.ac.jp/~t-oka/papers/2000/qrsq/qrsq.html). [2002, July 10].
- Paterson, A. (1997). *A humanistic framework for interviewer skills*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of York, 11-14 September, 1997.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peters, R. (1977). *Education and the education of teachers*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Quantz, R. (1992). On critical ethnography with some postmodern considerations. In M. LeCompte, W. Milroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 447-506). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Ribbens, J., & Edwards, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Feminist dilemmas in qualitative research: Public knowledge and private lives*. London: Sage Publications.

- Richardson, L. (1990). *Writing strategies: Reaching diverse audiences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 516-529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social research*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1995). A postmodernist critique of research interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8(3), 239-252.
- Scott, D., & Usher, R. (Eds.). (1996). *Understanding educational research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Simon, R., & Dippo, D. (1986). On critical ethnographic work. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 17(4), 195-222.
- Sirotnik, K. A. (1991). Critical inquiry: A paradigm for praxis. In E. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 243-258). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Smith, F. (1994). *Understanding reading: A psycho-linguistic analysis of reading and listening to read* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Smith, M. (1990). Ethics in qualitative field research: An individual perspective. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 258-276). New York and London: Teachers College Press.
- Smyth, J. (1999). *Voiced research: Bringing in the epistemologically marginalised?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Melbourne, 29 November 1999.
- Smyth, J. (2001a). *Reflections on a 'damaged life': The 'hidden injuries' of teaching within the self-managing school*. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001.

- Smyth, J., Hattam, R., Cannon, J., Edwards, J., Wilson, N., & Wurst, S. (2000). *Listen to me I'm leaving: Early school leaving in South Australian secondary schools*. Adelaide: Flinders Institute for the Study of Teaching; Department of Education, Training and Employment; Senior Secondary Board of South Australia.
- Smyth, J., & Shacklock, G. (1998). *Re-making teaching: Ideology, policy and practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1992). Cultural process and ethnography: An anthropological perspective. In M. LeCompte, W. Milroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 53-92). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Stokes, G. (2000). Global citizenship. In W. Hudson & J. Kane (Eds.), *Rethinking Australian citizenship* (pp. 231-242). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basis of qualitative research: Grounded theory, procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Taylor, W. (1984). Metaphors of educational discourse. In W. Taylor (Ed.), *Metaphors of education* (pp. 4-20). London: Heinemann.
- Tesch, T. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Thomas, D. (Ed.). (1995). *Teachers' stories*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Tripp, D. (1998). Critical incidents in action inquiry. In G. Shachlock & J. Smyth (1998), *Being reflexive in critical educational and social research* (pp. 36-49). London: Falmer Press.
- Tuchman, G. (1994). Historical social science. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Turner, V. (1986). Dewey, Dilthey, and drama: An essay in the anthropology of experience. In V. Turner & E. Bruner (Eds.), *The anthropology of experience* (pp. 33-44). Urbana, UL: University of Illinois Press.

- Usher, R. (1996). A critique of the neglected epistemological assumptions of educational research. In D. Scott & R. Usher (Eds.), *Understanding educational research* (pp. 9-32). London: Routledge.
- Van Maanen, J. (1996). Ethnography. In A. Kuper & J. Kuper (Eds.), *The social science encyclopaedia* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). (pp. 263-265). London: Routledge.
- Wainwright, D. (1997). Can sociological research be qualitative, critical and valid? *The Qualitative Report*, 3(2), 1-20.
- Wallace, S. (2001). Guardian angels and teachers from hell: Using metaphor as a measure of schools' experiences and expectation of general national vocational qualifications. *Qualitative Study of Education*, 14(6), 727-739.
- Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Wilcox, K. (1982). Ethnography as a methodology and its application to the study of schooling: A review. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action* (pp. 456-488). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.
- Wiley, M. (1996). *Composition in four keys: Inquiring into the field*. Mountain View: Mayfield.
- Wolcott, H. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wolcott, H. (1997). Ethnographic research in education. In R. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 327-353). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Woods, P. (1986). *Inside schools: Ethnography in educational research*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Woods, P. (1996). *Researching the art of teaching*. London: Routledge.