

CHAPTER 2

A THEORETICAL RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the theoretical perspectives of research. In educational research, two main paradigms have dominated over the past 100 years - the quantitative and the qualitative research paradigms.

According to Scott and Usher (1996: 59-64), traditionally some methodological strategies (for example experimental, *ex post-facto*, correlational and survey) have been designated as quantitative and others (ethnography and condensed case study) as qualitative. In a similar way, some methods (structured interviews, questionnaires and focus group interviews) have been categorised as quantitative, while others (unstructured interviews and participant observation) have been categorised as qualitative. In the past the quantitative approach dominated the study of higher education, since the kind of research and line of inquiries were more based on quantitative-structural studies (Schwarz & Teichler 2000: 15). Conrad, Haworth and Lattuca (2001: xi), on the other hand, emphasise the rise and growing acceptance of qualitative research in higher education. In this regard, Pring (2000: 56) states that educational research seems to fall into two "philosophical and competing camps". One embraces a scientific model for understanding educational practice; the other emphasises that human beings cannot be the objects of science and that research must focus upon "subjective meanings". However, as Pring (2000: 56) argues, the many ways in which research is conducted

reveals a more complicated scenario. Understanding human beings, and thus researching into what they do, why and how they behave, call upon many different methods, each making complex assumptions about what it means to explain behaviours and personal and social activities.

Higher education as a discipline tends to cut across various disciplines. Schwarz and Teichler (2000: 14-15) identify four main "spheres of knowledge", structured according to the logic of themes and disciplines or related areas of expertise of higher education. According to them (2000: 15), many research projects that aim at cutting across disciplines and themes include the following typology:

- ◆ quantitative-structural aspects of research;
- ◆ knowledge and subject-related aspects;
- ◆ person- or teaching- and learning-related aspects; and
- ◆ aspects of the institution's organisational governance.

It is thus no surprise that the assumption that the qualitative and the quantitative research paradigms represent two distinct and opposed approaches to the study of the social world, is being challenged and has led to a fierce debate on these research methodologies by various writers.

2.2 DEBATE ON RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

Shulman (in McMillan & Schumacher 2001: 10-11) notes several reasons why educational researchers debate about appropriate research methods to study education, namely:

- ◆ Educational enquiry demands the selection of a particular set of measured observations or facts from infinite possibilities.

- ◆ Disciplined enquiry refers not only to a systematic investigation, but also to the disciplines themselves. Research principles are somewhat different in each of the disciplines.
- ◆ The major reason why research methodology is an exciting area in education, is that education itself is not a science or a discipline. Education is a field of enquiry where the phenomena, events, people, processes and institutions constitute the raw materials for inquiries of many kinds.

Scott and Usher (1996: 59-64), Pring (2000: 43) and Cherry (2000: 89) reiterate that the debate on quantitative and qualitative research is not to deny that differences between them exist, but that the two methods do not belong within separate research paradigms and thus can be used within the same investigation.

Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 8) confirm the tensions related to the opposed approaches of qualitative and quantitative research by stating that the academic and disciplinary resistances to qualitative research illustrate the politics embedded in this field of discourse. Qualitative researchers are called journalists or soft scientists, and their work is termed unscientific, exploratory, or subjective. Positivists further allege that so-called new experimental qualitative researchers write fiction, not science, and that they have no way of verifying the truth of their statements. But, as Babbie and Mouton (2001: 16) state, the search for "truth" does not imply a search for certainty or absolute truths, but a search for the most valid or best approximation to the world.

Conrad *et al.* (2001: 27-29) as well as Krathwohl (1998:5) agree that qualitative research is often contrasted with quantitative research. The picture is complicated when it is considered that, within each of these broad categories, there are "sub-schools of thought". Where a quantitative researcher might seek to know what percentage of people do one thing or another, the qualitative researcher pays much greater attention to individual cases and the human understandings that feature in those cases. Krathwohl (1998: 232) further states that in the past, qualitative researchers were defensive of their method, while quantitative researchers were extremely critical of it. Because qualitative methods are not identical to those of the natural sciences, some quantitative researchers view them as unscientific and never as satisfactory as experimentation.

The sharp contrast between qualitative and quantitative research methodologies is referred to as the "False Dualism" of educational research (Pring 2000: 43). He states that the sharp contrast between qualitative and quantitative research is made on the basis not of "appropriateness to task", but of "epistemology" and even "ontology". Researchers work within different paradigms. These differences are reflected in the respective languages of each and in the way in which key ideas or concepts take on a different logical character. These concepts link together in logically different ways and take on slightly different meanings. Such words as "objectivity" (and, by contrast, "subjectivity"), "reality" (and "multiple realities"), "truth" and "verification", "knowledge" and "meaning" are interrelated and defined differently. Cherry (2000: 89)

indicates that the distinctions *within* the so-called paradigms are often as significant as the distinctions *between* them. Quantitative research will cover enquiries which range from the detailed measurement and correlation of performances within a behaviourist tradition to the large-scale surveys of social trends. Qualitative research will cover symbolic interactionism, phenomenology, ethnography and hermeneutics. The failure to recognise the complexity of enquiry and of the nature of that which is being enquired into, causes the blurring of the distinctions within the research paradigms. This, in turn, leads to the sharp contrast between them.

Although differences and debates are characteristics of scholarly activities, Pring (2000: 87) cautions that the deep divisions between educational researchers based upon philosophical positions have a profound impact upon the conduct of research. The way in which we understand and explain the social world, and thus educational practice, is more complex than that. The researcher would like to embrace a combined method according to which the one supplements and complements/triangulates the other in order to reach the most correct interpretation of the research problem.

2.3 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DEFINED

Qualitative research is not easy to define, because qualitative research methodology has many different viewpoints. Separate and multiple uses and meanings of the methods of qualitative research make it difficult for researchers to agree to any essential definition of the field. Qualitative research ranges from cultural understanding (ethnography) to the larger suggestion of

an alternative philosophy paradigm (naturalistic), to the field of encircling assumptions and techniques (O'Connor 2001). O'Connor (2001: 18) elaborates by stating that qualitative research does not involve the same terminology as ordinary science. According to him, qualitative research is *grounded theory*, built up from the ground. Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 6-8) share the opinion of Crowson (1987: 3-4) that qualitative research is difficult to define clearly, because it has no theory or paradigm that is distinctly its own. They further describe qualitative research as a set of practices, embraced within its own multiple disciplinary histories, constant tensions and contradictions over the project itself, including its methods and interpretations.

The process of qualitative research emphasises the qualities of entries and the process and meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency. The socially constructed or nature of reality; the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied; and the situational constraints that shape inquiry; are emphasised by qualitative researchers. Such researchers accentuate the value-laden nature of inquiry. They seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning.

Nelson, Treichler and Grossberg (in Denzin & Lincoln 2000: 7) note that qualitative research is an interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary and sometimes counterdisciplinary field. It crosscuts the humanities and the social and physical sciences and is thus "multi-paradigmatic" in focus. Cherry (2000) states that qualitative research is a field of enquiry in its own

right. It crosscuts disciplines, fields and subject-matters. Winburg (1997: 3) defines qualitative research as research that produces descriptions of *how* and *why* people do certain things. According to Krathwohl (1998), Babbie and Mouton (2001), as well as McMillan and Schumacher (2001), qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world and involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This implies that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

Babbie and Mouton (2001: 53) add that qualitative research takes its departure point as the "insider perspective" on social action, which in turn creates room for participant observation. Qualitative researchers attempt always to study human action from the insider's perspective (also referred to as the "emic" perspective), as also emphasised by Ratcliff (2002) and Krathwohl (1998: 229); to "get inside" others to view the world as they perceive it. Krathwohl (1998: 229) also refers to the emic view as the "phenomenological" point of view. Bogdan and Biklen (in Krathwohl 1998:235) call it *thinking naturalistically* and argue that, through our experiences, we construct a view of the world that determines how we act.

Babbie and Mouton (2001: 53) indicate that different terms are often used by different researchers as synonyms for qualitative research, for example "ethnography" (Agar, Lofland, Hammersly & Atkinson); "field research" (Burgess); and "naturalistic research" (Denzin, Schatzmann & Strauss).

It is important to bear in mind that, behind the theory, method, analysis and methodology of qualitative research, stands the personal biography of the researcher, who researches from a particular class, gender, racial, cultural, and ethnic community perspective. The gendered, multiculturally situated researcher approaches the world with a set of ideas, "a framework (theory, ontology) that specifies a set of questions (epistemology) that he then examines in specific ways (methodology, analysis)", as Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 18) point out.

The quantitative research paradigm will subsequently be discussed to obtain a more balanced perspective on both paradigms in order to take an informed decision on the research methodology of the study.

2.4 QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH DEFINED

Babbie and Mouton (2001: 49), McMillan and Schumacher (2001), Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (2001), as well as Punch (2000), draw attention to the quantification of constructs in the quantitative research paradigm. The quantitative researcher believes that the best, or the only way of measurement is assigning numbers to the perceived qualities of things. Quantitative research as empirical research is indirect and abstract and treats experiences as similar, adding or multiplying them together, or quantifying them. Cherry (2000: 77) adds that in quantitative research statistical techniques have been developed so that quantitative methods can be applied using experimental approaches, cross-sectional/survey design and time series design. Related to the assignment of numbers to the perceived qualities

of things, is the central role of variables in describing and analysing human behaviour, which is known as "variable analysis". The central role is afforded to control for sources of error in the research process. The nature of control is either through experimental control or statistical control. If properly designed, quantitative research can more effectively control certain kinds of error, such as selective and biased interpretation (Cherry 2000: 77). However, human behaviour is much more complex than this explanation.

Not only do various differences between the two research paradigms exist, but also quite a number of similarities do. These similarities inform the discussion that follows.

2.5 SIMILARITIES BETWEEN QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

Similarities between qualitative and quantitative research as described by Blaxter *et al.* (2001: 65) include the following:

- ◆ While quantitative research may be used mostly for testing theory, it can also be used for exploring an area and to generate hypotheses and theories. Similarly, qualitative research can be used for testing hypotheses and theories, even though it is mostly used for the generation of theory.
- ◆ Qualitative data often include quantification (for example statements such as "more/less than", "most", "a few", as well as specific numbers), whilst quantitative approaches (for example large-scale surveys) can collect qualitative (non-numeric) data through open-ended questions.

♦ The underlying philosophical positions of the two research methodologies are not necessarily as distinct as the stereotypes suggest.

McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 11) emphasise that both quantitative and qualitative research require an explicit description of data collection and analysis procedures. Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 10) note further similarities, namely that both qualitative and quantitative researchers are concerned with the individual's point of view. Qualitative investigators think they can come closer to the participant's perspective through detailed interviewing and observation. They argue that quantitative researchers are seldom able to capture their subjects' perspectives because they have to rely on more remote, inferential empirical methods and materials. The empirical materials produced by interpretive methods are regarded by many quantitative researchers as unreliable, impressionistic, and not objective. Although many qualitative researchers will use statistical measures, methods, and documents as a way of locating groups of subjects within larger populations, they will seldom report their findings in terms of the kind of complex statistical measures or methods to which quantitative researchers are drawn.

As mentioned in paragraph 2.4, various differences between qualitative and quantitative research exist.

2.6 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

Not all qualitative researchers share the same point of view regarding the differences between qualitative and quantitative research. Blaxter *et al.* (2001: 85) note

that an important difference is with regard to the structure and process aspects. Quantitative research is especially efficient at getting at the structural features of social life, while qualitative studies are usually stronger on process aspects.

Another difference stated by Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 10) is that qualitative researchers are more likely to confront and come up against the constraints of the everyday social world. They see this world in action and embed their findings in it, whilst quantitative researchers abstract from this world and seldom study it directly. Qualitative researchers believe that rich descriptions of the social world are valuable, whereas quantitative researchers are less concerned with such detail, because it interrupts the process of developing generalisations. Qualitative researchers use - among others - ethnographic prose, historical narratives, first-person accounts, still photographs, life histories, fictional "facts", and biographical and autobiographical materials. Quantitative researchers use mathematical models, statistical tables, as well as graphs and usually write about their research in impersonal, third-person prose.

From the literature of the following writers, namely McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 11-15), Cook and Reichardt (in Ratcliff 2002), Babbie and Mouton (2001: 309) and Blaxter *et al.* (2001: 85), additional differences between qualitative and quantitative research are provided as illustrated in Table 2.1:

TABLE 2.1: Differences between qualitative and quantitative research

Qualitative research	Quantitative research
Multiple realities	A single reality
Phenomenological	Positivistic
Detailed description of phenomenon	Measurement and statistics
Extension of understanding by others	Results replicated by others
Primarily inductive	Primarily deductive
Process-orientated	Outcome-orientated
Holistic	Particularistic
Subjective/insider-centred	Objective/outsider-centred
Summary generalisations	Least complicated explanation preferred
Sources, evidence	Numerical data
Tentative summary interpretations	Statements of statistical probability
Anthropological worldview	Natural science worldview
Understanding a social situation from participants' perspectives	Establish relationships between measured variables
Relative lack of control	Attempt to control variables
Flexible changing strategies; design emerges as data being collected	Procedures are established before study begins
Ethnography using "disciplined subjectivity"	Experimental design to reduce error and bias
Prepared researcher becomes immersed in social situation	Researcher role: detached with use of instrument
Discovery-oriented	Verification-oriented
Goal of detailed context-bound generalisations	Goal of universal context-free generalisations

Explanatory	Confirmatory
Goal: understand actor's view	Goal: find facts and causes
Driven by subject's perspective	Driven by researcher's concerns

Many of these differences discussed between quantitative and qualitative research are not absolute. Researchers may combine both research methodologies in a single study, or some of the characteristics of these methods. This does not necessarily imply that the combination of these methods is in conflict or incompatible.

2.7 COMBINING QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

McMillan and Schumacher (2001) established that both quantitative and qualitative inquiry modes contribute significantly to our knowledge of education. This balanced treatment of both approaches in research is also emphasised by the perspectives of Babbie and Mouton (2001) as well as Blaxter *et al.* (2001) who state that, despite the fundamentally different premises and epistemological traditions, quantitative and qualitative approaches should not be seen as opposing or mutually exclusive. Although their respective basic premises cannot be reconciled, the two approaches should be regarded as potentially compatible systems of investigation, and procedures from both approaches can be co-operatively employed to serve the purpose of research even better.

Blaxter *et al.* (2001: 84) and Babbie and Mouton (2001: 368) emphasise that, although there is no question that certain types of questions necessitate certain types of

research design, and therefore also specific methods, this does not mean that a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods is not possible or desirable. Predominantly qualitative methods of data collection and analysis during the implementation evaluation study can be used. In the outcome evaluation study, a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods - both to collect and ultimately to analyse data - can be used.

It is now common for researchers to use more than one method. The main method might, for example, be a set of interviews or a series of observations, but this is likely to be complemented, at the very least, by some documentary analyses to enable the researcher to explore relevant literature or policy. Most research projects in the social sciences are, therefore, in a general sense of a "multi-method" nature (Blaxter *et al.* 2001: 84). The researcher might complement interviews within an institution with the analysis of available documents in order to compare written or spoken versions, including for example an analysis of policies and reports.

Both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection have strengths and weaknesses. The aim of any research study is to design and execute the project in such a manner that the eventual validity of the conclusions and results are optimised, as stated by Babbie and Mouton (2001: 368). No amount of design can anticipate every possible source of error.

By combining qualitative and quantitative methods, the strengths of each method can be capitalised on and higher quality data can be ensured. When qualitative and quantitative research techniques are employed, the

philosophy of one research methodology is used, for example the qualitative research paradigm, but with application of certain techniques of another research philosophy, like that of the quantitative research paradigm. During this study the above-mentioned approach will be used. The researcher will vary the usage of these techniques during this study.

In empirical research the sampling of the research group (respondents) is also of vital importance for ensuring high quality data.

2.8 SAMPLING

Two ways of sampling are described by Cherry (2000: 54), as well as by Babbie and Mouton (2001: 287), namely the traditional social science approach where a representative sample of the population is studied, and the phenomenological approach where a sample technique is employed.

The researcher will use "purposeful" sampling, also referred to as "purposive, judgement or judgemental" sampling (McMillan & Schumacher 2001: 175). The same authors reaffirm that "information-rich cases for study in-depth" is selected in this way. Silverman (2000: 104) adds that purposeful sampling demands that one thinks critically about the parameters of the population one is interested in and chooses one's sample carefully on this basis. Thus, using a purposeful sample is useful for obtaining the vital and most applicable information needed.

It should be borne in mind that human and social

phenomena are very complex. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), such an approach to purposefully selecting people or settings for a study acknowledges this complexity. The changing South African higher education landscape, specifically the process of mergers and incorporations of higher education institutions, necessitates acknowledgement of this complexity.

When deciding on the sample composition, size and representation of the research, the researcher also has to consider ethical issues in research.

2.9 ETHICAL ISSUES IN RESEARCH

Ethics is generally considered to deal with beliefs about what is right or wrong, proper or improper, good or bad, as McMillan and Schumacher (2001), Blaxter *et al.* (2001) and Babbie and Mouton (2001) reiterate. The same writers note that the conduct of ethically informed social research should be the goal of all social researchers. Although ethical issues arise predominantly with qualitative research methods of data collection due to the closer relationship and interaction between the researcher and the participants of the research, all social research gives rise to a range of ethical issues. These issues include privacy, informed consent, anonymity and being truthful.

Pring (2000: 140-141) argues that "ethics" is quite often used loosely, for example interchangeably with morals. Normally a distinction is drawn by philosophers between "morals" (concerned with what is the right or the wrong thing to do) and ethics (the philosophical enquiry into the basis of morals or moral judgement). Translated into the language of educational research, "ethics" for Simons (in

Pring (2000: 140) refers to the "search for rules of conduct that enable us to operate defensibly in the political contexts in which we have to conduct educational research".

Pring (2000: 140) elaborates that there is rarely a clear-cut and context-free set of rules or principles which can be applied without deliberation and judgement. There is a constant need to reflect on those values which inform the research and the ways in which those values might be made concrete in the research activity itself.

2.10 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

2.10.1 Document analysis

A proper literature review helps to place the researcher's work in context of what has already been researched, allowing comparisons to be made and providing a framework for further research (Fink in Blaxter *et al.* 2001: 120). Fink further notes that the literature review is a "systematic, explicit and reproducible method for identifying, evaluating and interpreting existing recorded work". McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 109) emphasise that the knowledge of the literature is used in stating the significance of the problem, developing the research design and suggesting further research.

In this study an in-depth literature study, which is relevant to branding in general but also to higher education in particular globally as well as in South Africa, in addition to Internet and newspaper reports/articles were used in order to provide valuable information and insights into the complexities of branding strategies.

2.10.2 Interviews

Focus group interviews as well as informal conversation interviews were held with the different respondents to the study.

2.10.2.1 *Focus group interviews*

McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 455) state that the focus group interview is a strategy for obtaining a better understanding of a problem or an assessment of a problem, programme, or idea by interviewing a purposefully sampled group of people rather than each person individually. According to them, a social environment in which group members are stimulated by the perceptions and ideas of one another can increase the quality and richness of data through a more efficient strategy than one-on-one interviewing.

Morgan (in Flick 1999:122) adds that the hallmark of focus group interviews is the "explicit use of the group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction formed in a group" (see paragraphs 1.7.1 and 4.4.3).

2.10.2.2 *Informal conversation interviews*

Interviews that are more like a conversation/discussion are referred to as "informal conversation interviews" by McMillan and Schumacher (2001:438; see paragraphs 1.7.1 and 4.9).

The findings of the focus group interviews as well as of the informal conversation interviews will be elaborated

on in paragraphs 4.5; 4.9 and 4.11. The focus group interviews were suitable for this study due to the collective discussions and shared views on entrepreneurial universities. In addition, the informal discussion interviews were suitable because the purpose thereof was to discuss the insights, perceptions and interpretations of the respondents' institutional branding strategies.

2.10.3 Case studies

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 490), case study research contains "description, analysis, and naturalistic generalisations". An extensive description of the case and its context is based on a wide variety of data sources, namely documentation, archival records, interviews, and participant observation. A few key issues, which are analysed further, are presented so that the complexity of the case can be appreciated.

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) identify several types of case studies, for example "intrinsic", "instrumental" and "collective". Intrinsic case studies are undertaken for better understanding of a particular case. In an instrumental case study, a particular case is studied to provide insight into an issue. The case is of secondary interest, facilitating our understanding of something else. The choice of case (see paragraph 4.10.1) is made because it is expected to advance the understanding of branding practices at South African higher education institutions. A number of cases may also be studied jointly in order to acquire into a phenomenon. This is called a collective case study - it is not the study of a collective, but an instrumental study extended to several

cases.

2.11 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF DATA

To give any research credibility, it is of the utmost importance to apply quality control measures. Two of the main mechanisms of quality control are validity and reliability of data. According to Mouton and Marais (1996: 79), the central consideration of validity concerning the process of data collection is that of reliability. They describe reliability and validity as "trustworthiness". This perspective is also emphasised in the literature by McMillan and Schumacher (2001) as well as Punch (2000). The reliability of data or observations is influenced by the researcher, the participant, the measuring instrument (focus group interviews, informal conversation interviews and case study), and the research context (South African higher education landscape) in which the research is conducted.

When enhancing validity and reliability in the qualitative paradigm, Babbie and Mouton (2001: 275) warn that one should be more concerned with triangulation, writing extensive field notes and reasoned consensus. Triangulation is defined by Denzin (in Babbie & Mouton 2001) as the use of multiple methods, a plan of action that will raise social science researchers above the personal biases that stem from single methodologies. By combining methods in the same study, observers can partially overcome the deficiencies that flow from one method. Triangulation can be done according to paradigms, methodologies, methods, and so forth.

Triangulation in this study involved using more than one method in the collection of data. A combination of the

following sources of data, namely documentation, informal conversation interviews (see paragraph 2.10.2.2), focus group interviews (see paragraph 2.10.2.1), a case study (see paragraph 2.10.3) and participant observation (see paragraph 4.8), were used. The information from the use of the combination of these sources of data will be analysed in Chapter 4 to establish the findings of the triangulation. Triangulation is generally considered to be one of the best ways to enhance validity and reliability in qualitative research. This statement is confirmed by Babbie and Mouton (2001) and Punch (2000: 247).

Although the researcher should strive with everything in his power to deliver truly valid, reliable, and objective studies, the reality is that this can never be attained completely. Rather, as Babbie and Mouton (2001: 276) indicate, it remains a goal, something to be striven after.

2.12 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Due to the multiple methods and multiple sources of data that are used to study human behaviour (Punch 2000: 174), there is a variety of techniques to analyse data, because there are different questions to be addressed and different versions of social reality that can be elaborated upon.

McMillan and Schumacher (2001) state that data analysis entails several cyclical phases which are, among other things, the following:

- ◆ Continuous discovery, so as to identify tentative themes and develop concepts and mini-theories. In this

regard Blaxter *et al.* (2001: 192) reiterate that data analysis is an ongoing process with earlier analysis informing later data collection.

- ◆ Categorising and ordering of data typically follow after data collection, so as to refine one's understanding of patterns and themes. The development of categories, as well as integration of concepts and connections to existing literature, are ways of reconstructing the data. Differences and consistencies can be found in this way.

The researcher made use of the constant comparative method (Maykut & Morehouse 1994: 134) of analysing qualitative data, which combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all units of meaning obtained. This method will be elaborated on in Chapter 4 in order to contribute to the proposed model in Chapter 5.

2.13 CONCLUSION

Although the similarities and differences of the two main research paradigms, namely the qualitative and the quantitative research methodologies were discussed in detail, the emphasis should not be on the differences, because the differences refer to a "False Dualism" (Pring 2000: 43). This "False Dualism" is being challenged and debated by educational researchers worldwide and it has led to a much more balanced perspective regarding the two research paradigms. The debate has further led to the question of whether quantitative and qualitative methods should or could be combined effectively in one study. This has been debated in some detail in the philosophy and methodology of the social sciences, as highlighted by

Babbie and Mouton (2001: 368). These cases increasingly become the exception to the rule, because social researchers are much more pragmatic and eclectic in their selection of methodologies.

In the next chapter theoretical perspectives on branding as a marketing approach will be discussed.