

# Review of: "Using concepts related to research design while writing thesis and dissertation at universities: questioning the status quo"

Kambidima Wotela<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Witwatersrand

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an important discussion to share with students the differences between these concepts across time and contexts to avert confusion. We also have a Section in our article

([https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321489582\\_Towards\\_an\\_Outcomes-Based\\_Approach\\_to\\_a\\_'Research\\_Strategy\\_Design\\_Procedure\\_and\\_Methods'\\_Chapter\\_for\\_Business\\_and\\_Public\\_Administration\\_Research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321489582_Towards_an_Outcomes-Based_Approach_to_a_'Research_Strategy_Design_Procedure_and_Methods'_Chapter_for_Business_and_Public_Administration_Research)) that addresses the 'The name 'research methodology' describes the module but certainly not the chapter in a research report'. However, this statement, '... I argue that the concepts must be used consistently worldwide by understanding their differences and similarities' is an impossible task because these concepts have evolved time and continue to evolve. Had the author attempted to follow one author (for example Creswell) who has published on this topic over time to see how and why their use of terminology has evolved, they would appreciate.

Rather than force in this statement, 'Master and doctoral students' supervisors at different universities and departments force their students to use headings for a research design chapter without clearly conceptualizing different concepts and their relationships', the author should use compel. Besides it is not all supervisors it is some.

The Section on 'Method of the literature review' adds little value to the discussion and should be integrated as one or two sentences in the introduction. Even better, the author should have considered using thematic analysis pointing out the similarities and then differences amongst the different sources before reconciling what they are actually trying to communicate. Such as approach, would enrich the discussion in the Section that discuss (actually more like points out) 'The concepts of research methodology, research design, and research method'. In its current format, this Section adds to the problem rather than rectify.

The reference material misses the dated yet key text that have the fundamentals to discussion under study and the latest material for us to share contemporary thinking. I do agree with the author that, 'Research methodology should not be included in a specific study if its meaning is related to the science and philosophy of all research approaches' In fact my own conclusion that research methodology, like other psychology, geology is a module (not a section/chapter in a research report) whose tuition includes research philosophy. Although it does include how to actualise these, this is not the main aim of any module including research methodology.

This conclusion, 'Therefore, I can argue that if research design is a plan that included a paradigm, a specific strategy, and

methods, no need of using the concept research methodology, as it is included under a design as a specific strategy' is certainly less informed theoretically and practically. A design is a gate way to actualising a plan or strategy tied to a specific strategy (which in its self is related to a particular paradigm) and, therefore, the paradigm hardly contributes much to describing a research design. Lastly, the article limits itself by discussing the whole without considering the parts. So yes, 'the research method is part of the research design' but any research does not depend on one method but rather on several methods.

In our article, we did discussion a Section of the topic under review and we conclude that, "... it is fundamentally incorrect to call this chapter 'research methodology. We propose that this chapter[section] should be called [what it contains, that is] 'research strategy, design, procedure and methods. One can shorten it to 'research orientation, procedure and methods' since the strategy and design fundamentally provides us with the research position or direction. This is certainly important that we keep this debate alive and I commend the author for taking it on.