

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION AND THE SELECTION OF RESEARCH METHODS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: A SOUTH AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE

*J.S. Wessels
Academic Research Support Unit
University of South Africa*

ABSTRACT

This article builds on previous research and tries to establish the reasons for the selection of non-applicable research methods by Public Administration researchers in South Africa. For the purpose of this paper the hypothesis has been set that the methodological preference of the authors of the selected Public Administration articles and theses is determined by an association between the variable "research method" and the variable "institutional affiliation". Two data sets are analysed, namely the one based on a survey of the research methods of completed South African doctoral theses in Public Administration from 2000 to 2005 and another one based on a survey of articles published in three South African peer-reviewed Public Administration journals from 2000 to 2005. By means of a chi-square test on the two datasets it is shown that an association between the institutional affiliation of authors and the selection of research methods indeed exists, while there seems to be no association between research methods and research topic. It is consequently concluded that the selection of research methods by the authors of the selected scholarly articles was determined more by their institutional affiliation than the research topic. This article makes a contribution within the South African context by applying an association test to identify the reason for the seemingly inconsistent methodological choice.

categories are quantitative1 (eg surveys), quantitative2 (eg secondary data analysis), qualitative1 (e.g. participant observation), qualitative2 (eg policy analysis and programme evaluation), participatory action research, historical and narrative studies, conceptual analysis, hermeneutics, comparison and content analysis. (See table 6 for a summary of the meanings of these categories.)

However, the variable "research methods" is only one of several variables or criteria for assessing the quality of Public Administration research. This article regards good quality Public Administration research as research which is able to address difficult-to-solve problems (criterion of purpose) within the core field of Public Administration (criterion of topic) by utilising appropriate data sources (criterion of unit of observation) with applicable methods (criterion of research methods) (Wessels, 2010). Good quality research is thus supposed to be characterised by associations between research topic and research purpose, research purpose and unit of observation, and unit of observation and research methods. A study on the relevance of South African Public Administration research reported on at a conference in March 2010, finds that thesis research is indeed methodologically consistent while articles lack methodological consistency, as there is a lack of association between the topics of articles and the methods applied (Wessels, 2010). This finding implies that the most applicable research methods are not always used for the selected research topics.

RESEARCH DESIGN

For the purpose of this article it is assumed that a researcher's choice of research method is determined by a specific research paradigm (Mouton, 1993:57; *A dictionary of philosophy* 1984:261 –*paradigm*) or research method best known to him or her. Consequently, the following hypothesis has been set for this article: the methodological preference of the authors of the selected Public Administration articles and theses is determined by an association between the variable "research method" and the variable "institutional affiliation".

In order to find support for this hypothesis, this article reports on the analyses of two data sets, namely the one based on a survey of the research methods of 54 completed South African doctoral theses in Public Administration from 2000 to 2005 (Thani, 2009), and another one based on a survey of 236 articles published in three South African peer-reviewed Public Administration journals from 2000 to 2005. A brief description of the research design will be given in the next section, followed by a summary of the relevant data, an analysis and interpretation of the data and the final conclusions of this article.

The unit of analysis for this research is South African Public Administration research output. Doctoral theses and peer-reviewed articles are used as a proxy for South African Public Administration research output. The units of observation are doctoral theses and articles (published in *Administratio Publica*, *Politeia* and the *Journal of Public Administration*). The time frame for this study is a six-year period starting in 2000 and ending in 2005. The demarcation of the period is mainly the result of the unavailability of especially reliable data regarding doctoral theses for the years after 2005. Although the

results of this study are valid for this period only, they give a fair indication of the current state of research in South African Public Administration.

The abovementioned datasets contain data on inter alia the institutional affiliation of the researcher, the research topic, unit of analysis, unit of observation, research methods, research purpose and research design. The research design and methods followed to compile the dataset on the doctoral theses are described in detail in the particular dissertation (Thani, 2009:2–12). The data for the doctoral theses has been generated as part of a master's study conducted by Xolile Thani under the supervision of the author of this article. The data on scholarly articles has been generated by the author of this article, following the same research design that has been followed in the survey of doctoral theses (Wessels, 2010). Each thesis and article was scrutinised by both researchers individually while they also assessed each other's assessment afterwards. Differences were discussed to ensure reliability of the data. The results of the survey of the doctoral theses were described and concluded on in the master's dissertation by Thani (2009:53–83) and as part of a conference paper on postgraduate supervision (Wessels, 2009).

In order to determine whether the variables (research topic, research purpose, unit of observation and research methods) are methodologically consistent, a chi-square test was done on the two data sets and the results were reported in another paper in March 2010 (Wessels, 2010). For the purpose of this article an additional chi-square test has been done to determine the possible association between these variables (research topic, research purpose, unit of observation and research methods) and the institutional affiliation of the respective researcher.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA

In order to follow the discussion regarding the association between research topic and research method, the two datasets as reported extensively in earlier publications and papers (Wessels, 2008; Thani, 2009; Wessels, 2010) are described comparatively below. This summary describes the main characteristics of scholarly research in Public Administration in terms of the following variables: higher education institution, research topic, research purpose, unit of observation, research methods and institutional affiliation of the researcher.

Higher Education Institution

Table 1 shows that the distribution of theses and scholarly articles among the higher education institutions in South Africa differs remarkably. No less than 70,4% of the doctoral theses in the period of analysis have been produced by only four universities, namely the University of Pretoria (27,8%), the University of KwaZulu Natal (18,5%), Stellenbosch University (13%) and the University of the Free State (11,1%), while the same universities produced only 40% of the scholarly articles in the three journals of analysis. The data in table 1 has been sorted according to the distribution of theses among the higher education institutions.

Table 1: Scholarly articles and doctoral thesis according to higher education institutions

	Articles %	Theses %
University of Pretoria (UP)	18,2	27,8
University of KwaZulu Natal (UKZN)	3,8	18,5
Stellenbosch University (SU)	13,6	13,0
University of the Free State (UFS)	5,1	11,1
University of South Africa (UNISA)	15,7	9,3
University of Cape Town (UCT)	0,8	7,4
University of the Witwatersrand (WITS)	1,3	3,6
Authors from abroad	4,2	0,0
Other	37,3	9,3
Total	100,00	100,0

Research topic

The variable "research topic" is of key importance for this research as its possible association with the variables "research method" and "institutional affiliation" was used to make a conclusion about the methodological consistency of Public Administration research (Wessels, 2010). This variable is also widely regarded as important in the relevance discourse (Box, 1992:69; Cleary, 1992:61; Buckley, 1998:4; Bolton & Stolcis, 2003:627; Baehler *et al.*, 2005:44). While a variety of classifications of research topics exist, the survey of theses and articles have been done according to a taxonomy for topics which was used in earlier South African research (Wessels, 2005; 2008; Wessels, Pauw & Thani, 2009) and can be regarded as a safe middle ground for academics and practitioners in South Africa (Wessels, 2010). Table 2 shows that the scholarly articles are more equally spread amongst the various categories of topics than theses. The four most popular categories of research topics for scholarly articles are:

- Human Resources Management
- Managing Public Service Delivery
- Public Administration and Management History, Theory, Research and Learning
- Public Organisational Development and Management

The data analysis confirms that the majority of topics that were researched fall in the same categories of priorities for new knowledge identified by the South African government (Wessels, 2008:279). This serves as confirmation of the relevance of South African Public Administration research.

Table 2: Topics of scholarly articles and doctoral thesis

	Articles %	Theses %
Public Organisational Development and Management	9,7	22,22
Human Resources Management	16,9	20,37
Managing Public Service Delivery	14,8	16,67
Policy Analysis and Management	8,1	9,26
Inter-governmental Relations	3,4	7,41
Public Administration and Management History, Theory, Research and Learning	11,4	5,56
Development Management	3,8	3,70
Financial Management and Procurement	5,5	3,70
Public Management Ethics	7,6	3,70
Information, Knowledge, Communication and Technology Management	5,9	1,85
Disaster Studies	0,4	1,85
Public Participation	5,9	1,85
Other	3,8	1,85
Not Public Administration	2,5	0,00
Total	100,0	100,00

Source: Wessels 2010

Research purpose

Research purpose is regarded as a significant indicator of the relevance of a research project (Wessels, 2010). Although various categories of research purposes can be applied in the assessment of research output (Cameron & McLaverty, 2008:84–85; Thani, 2009:55; Wessels, 2010), a specific taxonomy of research purposes has been developed for the purpose of this study making provision for the following possible research purposes: exploration, description, explanation (Babbie & Mouton, 2001:79–81), empowering/improving/healing (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:55), reflection (Pauw, 1999:466), understanding (De Beer, 1999:436–437), and the developing or improving of administrative technology (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003:626–630).

Table 3: Research purpose of scholarly articles and doctoral thesis

	Articles %	Theses %
Exploration	8,50	0,00
Description	49,60	50,00
Explanation	0,00	0,00
Empowering/improving/healing	0,00	0,00
Understanding	13,10	14,81
Reflecting	11,40	5,56
Developing/improving administrative technology	17,40	29,63
Total	100,00	100,00

Source: Wessels 2010

Table 4: A classification system for units of observation

Individuals: This category includes individuals' verbal (including written responses to questions posed by a researcher) and observable behaviour and characteristics (Mouton, 1996:142).
Groups and collectives: This category includes the observation of groups of people within organisations and institutions, e.g. focus groups.
Scholarly literature: This category includes the use of scholarly articles and books as primary source.
Official documents: This category includes all official documents such as Acts, policies, yearbooks and archival files.
Secondary data and statistics collections: This category includes data not collected by the researcher him- or herself, such as statistical yearbooks and textual data.
Decision-support technology: This category includes inter alia the observation of computer software packages, such as electronic decision-support software.
Constructs: This category includes all the so-called World 2 sources or material, which are used in the research process, although they are not directly or indirectly observed in the empirical sense of the word.
Other texts: This category has been created to include all texts that cannot be classified as scholarly, official or secondary data sets and includes speeches, newspaper reports and Internet blogs

Source: Wessels, Pauw & Thani 2009:12-13

Table 3 summarises the results regarding the research purposes of doctoral theses and scholarly articles (Wessels, 2010). Notable is the absence of the empowering and especially the explanatory research purpose – the latter which is supposed to indicate causality between variables or events (Babbie & Mouton, 2001:81). Approximately 50% of the research has been shown to be of a descriptive nature, while the second largest group of articles and theses aimed at the development or improvement of administrative technology. The latter purpose can be regarded as an indication of an attempt of researchers to be relevant to the needs of public administration practice (Wessels, 2010).

Units of observation

“Units of observation” as a variable refer to the material or data sources utilised by the particular researcher (Babbie & Mouton, 2001:174) and is to be distinguished from the unit of analysis, namely the “what” of a study (Babbie & Mouton, 2001:84). Eight categories of units of observation have been included in the classification system (see table 4; Wessels, Pauw & Thani, 2009:12–13; Wessels, 2010).

Table 5 shows a considerable difference between articles and theses with regard to the units of observation consulted. The majority (53,70%) of doctoral theses are shown to use individuals as their main source of data, while only 11,4% of the articles were based on the study of individuals. The majority of articles (71,6%) were based on the study of texts, namely scholarly literature (41,1%) and official documents (30,5%). The data on the articles also show that 75% of the 49,6% of the articles with a descriptive purpose, use texts such as scholarly literature (38,1%) and official sources (37,2%) as their unit of observation. This confirms conclusions by Cameron and McLaverty (2008:69–96) that

Table 5: Unit of observation of scholarly articles and doctoral thesis

	Articles %	Theses %
Individuals	11,40	53,70
Official documents (Acts, policies and yearbooks)	30,50	25,93
Scholarly literature	41,10	14,81
Decision-support technology	2,10	1,85
Constructs	0,00	6,80
Groups & collectives	2,10	3,70
Other texts	0,00	3,00
Secondary data & statistics	3,00	0,00
Total	100,00	100,00

Source: Wessels 2010

Table 6: A classification system for research methods

<p>Quantitative1: The primary characteristic of methods falling in this category is that they are used to do quantitative studies of people and their behaviour by means of inter alia surveys, interviews, experiments and field experiments (cf. Mouton, 2001:152–153, 155–158). This category includes Perry and Kraemer’s (1990:370) category “recollected experience: descriptive”.</p>
<p>Quantitative2: Where the methods in the previous category are used to study people directly in a quantitative way, methods in this category are used to study people indirectly by using (often sophisticated) statistical modelling and computer simulation studies (Mouton, 2001:163) or secondary data analysis (Mouton, 2001:164). This category includes Perry and Kraemer’s (1990:370) category “heuristic analogy (e.g. simulation)”.</p>
<p>Qualitative1: This methodological category is characterised by research methods used to study people and their behaviour in a non-quantitative way by means of inter alia participant observation studies (Mouton, 2001:148–149), case studies (Mouton, 2001:149–150; Perry & Kraemer, 1990:370) and unstructured interviews (also Perry and Kraemer’s [1990:370] “recollected experience: anthropology”).</p>
<p>Qualitative2: Methods in this category include implementation and outcome evaluation research (Mouton 2001:158–160), programme evaluation and policy analysis.</p>
<p>Participatory action research: The main feature of this research method is that these studies involve the subjects of the research as an integral part of the design (Mouton, 2001:150).</p>
<p>Historical/narrative studies: Methods in this category attempt to reconstruct the past and the chronology of events, and include historical case studies, narrative studies, event history analysis and life history analysis (Perry & Kraemer, 1990:370; Craig, 1999:417–435; Mouton, 2001:170–173). The narrative method as an interpretive approach resonates with the “constructionist epistemology” that suggests that knowledge of the world is socially constructed (Dodge, Ospina & Foldy, 2005:289).</p>
<p>Conceptual analysis: This category includes methods used for the analysis of the meaning of words or concepts through the clarification and elaboration of the different dimensions of meaning and use. It also includes philosophical studies aimed at analysing arguments in favour of or against a particular position (Pauw, 1999:464–473; Mouton, 2001:175–176).</p>
<p>Hermeneutics: This category includes methods such as hermeneutics, discourse analysis, literature review, ideological critical analysis, deconstructive research and critical reflexivity (Perry & Kraemer, 1990:370; De Beer, 1999:436–463; Mouton, 2001:179–180; Cunliffe & Jun, 2005:230–236).</p>

Comparison: Comparative studies focus on the similarities and differences between groups of units of analysis such as individual institutions, countries, public services, and individuals (Mouton, 2001:154–155). Perry and Kraemer (1990:370) refer in this regard to “cross-sectional, correlational analysis”.

Content analysis: These studies analyse the content of documents (such as policy documents, annual reports and legislation) for any meanings, pictures, symbols, themes or messages that can be communicated (Mouton, 2001:165).

Source: Wessels, Pauw & Thani 2009:14–15

South African scholarly articles in Public Administration are to a large extent based on desktop research.

Research methods

A wide variety of research methods and taxonomies of research methods are used internationally in the field of Public Administration (Perry & Kraemer, 1986:216–220; Perry & Kraemer, 1990:370; Stallings & Ferris, 1988:581; Cresswell, 2003:153–208; Cameron & McLaverty, 2008:69–96). For the purpose of this research the taxonomies of research methods have been standardised to ten distinct categories (Wessels, Pauw & Thani, 2009:14–16). See table 5 for a full discussion of these categories.

Table 7 shows that at least 81% of the articles were primarily based on the application of reading as method (hermeneutics, conceptual analysis, historical analysis, qualitative2)

Table 7: Method of scholarly articles and doctoral thesis

	Articles %	Theses %
Quantitative1	7,60	38,89
Hermeneutics	30,90	33,33
Qualitative1	5,90	16,67
Qualitative2	30,9	11,11
Quantitative2	3,00	0,00
Participatory action	0,40	0,00
Historical/narrative	3,80	0,00
Conceptual	16,50	0,00
Total	100,00	100,00

Source: Wessels 2010

while at least 44% of the theses primarily used reading as a method (hermeneutics, conceptual analysis).

Analysis and interpretation of data

The above account of the research data provided a picture of South African Public Administration research addressing mainly descriptive problems in the core field of Public Administration by applying primarily reading methods on mostly textual material as units of observation. The appropriate question to be answered is therefore whether the variables "research topic", "research purpose", "unit of observation" and "research method" are methodologically consistent. The methodological consistency has been determined by means of a chi-square test to establish the possible existence of associations between the different variables (see table 8 for the results). The results of the chi-square test contribute to the following conclusion regarding the methodological consistency of South African Public Administration research (Wessels, 2010):

It confirms that there are significant associations between all the variables, except for 'research topic' and 'research methods' of the evaluated articles. Furthermore, the association between the variables 'research topic' and 'unit of observation' in the case of the evaluated articles is not as strong compared to the other ... While thesis research seems to be methodologically consistent and meeting the relevancy requirements set in this article, article research has been shown to be methodologically inconsistent in terms of research topic, research purpose, units of observation and research methods, and not meeting these requirements.

Bearing in mind the hypothesis set for this article namely that "the methodological inconsistency of article research as indicated by the lack of association between research topic and research method, is caused by the methodological preference of the particular researchers as illustrated by an association between the variable 'research method' and

Table 8: Associations between variables excluding institutional affiliation

Variables	Pearson chi-square probability articles	Pearson chi-square probability theses
Research topic vs research purpose	0,008	0,000
Research topic vs unit of observation	0,046	0,000
Research topic vs research method	0,896	0,003
Research purpose vs unit of observation	0,000	0,000
Research purpose vs research method	0,000	0,000
Unit of observation vs research method	0,000	0,000

Source: Wessels 2010

Table 9: Associations between the variable “institutional affiliation” and other variables

Variables	Pearson chi-square probability articles	Pearson chi-square probability theses
Institutional affiliation and research topic	0,322	0,507
Institutional affiliation and research purpose	0,171	0,660
Institutional affiliation and unit of observation	0,123	0,720
Institutional affiliation and research method	0,000	0,080

the variable ‘institutional affiliation’ of the selected Public Administration articles and theses”, a chi-square test has been used to determine the possible association between the variable “institutional association” and the variables “research topic”, “research purpose”, “unit of observation” and “research method”.

The chi-square test (see table 9) has shown that there is no association between the variable “institutional affiliation” and any one of the variables “research topic”, “research purpose” and “unit of observation” of articles and theses. However, the test has shown a strong association between “institutional affiliation” and “research method” of scholarly articles and a relatively weaker association in the case of doctoral theses (see table 9). Bearing in mind that it has already been concluded that scholarly articles are methodologically inconsistent due to the absence of association between the variables “research topic” and “research method” (Wessels, 2010) the association between the variables “institutional affiliation” and “research method” (table 9) is noteworthy as it shows that the reason for the choice of research method may be related or associated with the institutional affiliation of the researchers. Bearing in mind that doctoral research has shown to be methodologically consistent (Wessels, 2010), it is noteworthy that table 9 shows that the association between institutional affiliation and research methods in the case of doctoral research is weaker than in the case of article research. Therefore this research supports the hypothesis set for this article namely that institutional affiliation does have an influence on article researchers’ choice of research methods.

The effect of the influence of institutional affiliation on researchers’ choice of research methods can be best illustrated by comparing the articles from the top three publishing institutions with each other and with those articles written by authors from abroad (table 10). Table 10 shows that the most distinctive difference is indeed between authors from abroad publishing in the three journals and the local authors. Authors from abroad tend to publish more articles based on quantitative methods collecting new data (20% versus a total average of 7,6%), qualitative research doing programme and policy evaluation (50% versus a total average of 34,7%), and comparative studies (10% versus a total average of

Table 10: Institutional methodological preference of top three publishing HEIs and authors from abroad

Higher education institution	% of total articles in sample	Methodological preference						
		Quant1	Quant2	Qual1	Qual2	Conc	Herm	Comp
University of Pretoria	18,2%	4,70	4,70	0,00	41,90	4,70	41,90	2,30
University of South Africa	15,7%	2,70	2,70	2,70	37,80	18,90	35,10	0,00
Stellenbosch University	13,6%	6,30	0,00	6,30	28,10	25,00	34,40	0,00
Authors from abroad	4,2%	20,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	0,00	20,00	10,00
Total:	100%	7,60	3,00	6,40	34,70	16,50	30,90	0,80

0,8%) than authors from local universities. It also shows that authors from abroad tend to publish less articles based on quantitative studies doing statistical modelling and computer simulation studies of existing databases (0% versus a total average of 3%), qualitative studies such as participant observation and field studies (0% versus a total average of 6,4%), conceptual studies (0% versus a total average of 16,5%) and hermeneutical studies (20% versus a total average of 30,9%).

CONCLUSION

It is expected from Public Administration research to be methodologically consistent by addressing problems that are difficult to solve within the core field of Public Administration through utilising appropriate data sources with applicable methods. However, research has shown that articles published in South African peer-reviewed journals for Public Administration overall lack methodological consistency – mainly due to a lack of association between the topics of articles and the methods applied. The implication of this finding is that valid research methods are not always used for the selected research topics, leading to irrelevant research results.

This article tries to determine the reasons for the selection of non-applicable research methods by authors of scholarly articles. Therefore the hypothesis is set that the methodological preferences of researchers are determined by their institutional affiliation. By doing a chi-square test on the data obtained from the analyses of peer-

reviewed articles in three different South African Public Administration journals as well as doctoral theses over a period of six years, this article has shown that there is indeed an association between the institutional affiliation of authors and the research methods applied by them, while there is no association between research methods and research topic. It also has shown that although the three South African institutions that have produced the most articles over the period of six years differ amongst each other with regard to methodological preferences, the most noteworthy difference is between articles published by authors affiliated to institutions from abroad and articles by authors from the local institutions.

As this research has shown that an association exists between the variables “research methods” and “institutions of higher education”, and as the research has also shown that there is no association between research methods and research topic, one can conclude that the selection of research methods by the authors of the selected scholarly articles was determined more by their institution than the research topic.

While this article contributes to an ongoing discourse on the quality and relevancy of research in Public Administration, it makes a unique contribution within the South African context by applying an association test to identify the reason for the seemingly inconsistent methodological choice. This article has thus confirmed that, even though South African research in Public Administration focuses on topics which are relevant to practice, research results published as articles in peer-reviewed journals may not be relevant due to the selection of inappropriate research methods determined by the authors’ institutional affiliation. A more in-depth study on the methodological content of the curricula of the various institutions of higher education seems to be necessary to get further insight into the methodological preferences of authors of scholarly articles in South African peer-reviewed journals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A dictionary of philosophy*. 1979. London: Pan Books in association with The Macmillan Press.
- Adams, G.B. and White, J.D. 1994. Dissertation research in Public Administration and cognate fields: an assessment of methods and quality. *Public Administration Review*, 54(6):565–576.
- Babbie, E. and Mouton, J. 2001. *The practice of social research* (South African edition). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Baehler, K, Callister, P., Gregory, B., Hawke, G., Ladley, A., Ryan, B., Stephans, B., Walker, A. and Wolf, A. 2005. Surveying research on New Zealand government: what next? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(1):43–61.
- Bless, C. and Higson-Smith, C. 1995. *Fundamentals of social research methods: an African perspective*. 2nd edition. Kenwyn: Juta.
- Bolton, M.J. and Stolcis, G.B. 2003. Ties that do not bind: musings on the specious relevance of academic research. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5):626–630.
- Box, R.C. 1992. An examination of the debate over research in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 52(1):62–69.

- Buckley, M.R. 1998. The disconnect between the science and practice of management. *Business Horizons*, March/April:1–10.
- Cameron, R. and McLaverty, L. 2008. Public Administration Research in South Africa: an assessment of journal publications, 1994–2006. *Administratio Publica*, 15(2):69–96.
- Clapper, V.A. 2005. Developing the multi-discipline of public administration: propositions for South African and continental agenda setting. *Journal of Public Administration*, 40(3.1):182–193.
- Cleary, R.E. 1992. Revisiting the doctoral dissertation in Public Administration: an examination of the dissertations of 1990. *Public Administration Review*, 52(1):55–61.
- Craig, A.P. 1999. Narrative as method. In Wessels, J.S. and Pauw, J.C. (ed.) *Reflective Public Administration: views from the South*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Cresswell, J.W. 2003. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Cunliffe, A.L. and Jun, J.S. 2005. The need for reflexivity in Public Administration. *Administratioin and society*, 37(2):225–242.
- De Beer, C.S. 1999. Reading texts and understanding meaning. In Wessels, J.S. and Pauw, J.C. (eds.) *Reflective Public Administration: views from the South*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Dodge, J., Ospina, S.M. and Foldy, E.G. 2005. Integrating rigor and relevance in Public Administration scholarship: the contribution of narrative inquiry. *Public Administration Review*, 65(3):286–300.
- Edwards, M. 2005. Social science research and public policy: narrowing the divide. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(1):68–74.
- Houston, D.J. and Delevan, S.M. 1990. Public Administration research: an assessment of journal publications. *Public Administration Review*, 50 (6):674–681.
- Hubbell, L. 1992. A lack of heterodoxy: political correctness in South African Public Administration. *Administration Publica*, 4(1):1–17.
- Khalo, T. 2006. Improving public management research: methodological analysis. *Journal of Public Administration*, 41(3):557–569.
- Kraemer, K.L. and Perry, J.L. 1989. Institutional requirements for academic research in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 49(1):9–16.
- Lan, Z. and Anders, K.K. 2000. A paradigmatic view of contemporary Public Administration research: an empirical test. *Administration and Society*, 32(2):138–165.
- Mabin, A. 2004. The role of research and training in the transformation of the public service. *Administration Publica*, 12(2):50–69.
- McLaverty, L. 2007. Public administration research in South Africa: an assessment of journal articles in *Journal of Public Administration* and *Administratio Publica* from 1994–2006. MSocSc dissertation in Public Administration (examination copy). Cape Town, University of Cape Town.
- McCurdy, H.E. and Cleary, R.E. 1984. Why can't we resolve the research issue in Public Administration? *Public Administration Review*, 44(1):49–56.
- McNabb, D.E. 2002. *Research methods in Public Administration and nonprofit management: quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Armonk: ME Sharpe.

- Mouton, J. 1993. Thomas S. Kuhn. In Snyman, J. (ed.) *Concepts of social inquiry*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Mouton, J. 1996. *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Academic.
- Mouton, J. 2001. *How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies: a South African guide and resource book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Pauw, J.C. 1999. Philosophy as method. In Wessels, J.S. and Pauw, J.C. (eds.) *Reflective Public Administration: views from the South*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J.L. and Kraemer, K.L. 1986. Research methodology in the *Public Administration Review*, 1975–1984. *Public Administration Review*, 46(3):215–226.
- Perry, J.L. and Kraemer, K.L. 1990. Research methodology in Public Administration: issues and patterns. In Lynn, N.B. and Wildavsky, A. *Public Administration: the state of the discipline*. Chatham: Chatham House Publishers.
- Stallings, R.A. 1986. Doctoral programs in Public Administration: an outsider's perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 46(3):235–240.
- Stallings, R.A. and Ferris, J.M. 1988. Public administration research: work in PAR, 1940–1984. *Public Administration Review*, 48(1):580–587.
- Thani, X.C. 2009. The research methods of completed South African doctoral research output in Public Administration from 2000 to 2005. MA Dissertation. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- University of KwaZulu-Natal. 2010. *Faculty of Management Studies: handbook for 2010*. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Wamsley, G.L. 1996. A public philosophy and ontological disclosure as the basis for normative grounded theorizing in Public Administration. In Wamsley, G.L. and Wolf, J.F. (eds.) *Refounding democratic Public Administration: modern paradoxes, postmodern challenges*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wessels, J.S. 1999a. Research in Public Administration. In Wessels, J.S. and Pauw, J.C. (eds.) *Reflective Public Administration: views from the South*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Wessels, J.S. 1999b. Social science methods in Public Administration. In Wessels, J.S. and Pauw, J.C. (eds.) *Reflective Public Administration: views from the South*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Wessels, J.S. 2004. Public Administration research: a South African masquerade. *Journal of Public Administration*, 39 (1):168–184.
- Wessels, J.S. 2005. The challenges of knowledge production by researchers in Public Administration, a South African perspective. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 19 (Special Issue): 1499–1515.
- Wessels, J.S. 2008. South African trends in master's and doctoral research in Public Administration. *Administration Publica*, 15(2):97–120.
- Wessels, J.S. 2009. Methodological challenges for postgraduate research supervision: a Public Administration case study. *Postgraduate supervision conference: research and practice*. 27–30 April, Stellenbosch, South Africa. Organised by the Centre for Higher and Adult Education, University of Stellenbosch.

- Wessels, J.S., Pauw, J. and Thani, X.C. 2009. Taxonomies for the analysis of research designs in Public Administration. *Administration Publica*, 17(2):7–19.
- Wessels, J.S. 2010. Relevant scholarly research for added citizen value. Paper read at the 12th *International Winelands Conference on Leadership for Added Citizen Value*, Stellenbosch, South Africa, 17–19 March.