

Descriptive data (Borg & Gall, 1989) and will be covered in further detail in Chapter 10, which focuses on quantitative research. The following are examples of descriptive and comparative questions.

EXAMPLE 1. Descriptive: In what ways has the integration of the Internet into the high school curriculum changed students' self-directed learning skills?

EXAMPLE 2. Causal comparative: Does the integration of the Internet into the high school curriculum lead to increased self-directed learning skills when compared with curriculum that does not integrate the Internet?

When developing your research questions, make sure it does not require a value judgement.

1. Avoid asking questions that can be answered in any absolute way (i.e., "yes" or "no") or seem to imply universality over large domains or fields of study.
2. Match the language to the method of the study (quantitative versus qualitative).
3. Pay attention to the wording of published research studies to identify the perspective, methodology, or research paradigm from the problem statement.
4. Consider how the Net may influence responses to your research questions.
5. Be sure that the research questions guide your use of the Net rather than letting the Net guide the research questions.

SUMMARY

The choice an e-researcher makes between a qualitative or quantitative approach will essentially depend on the kind of research question being asked and their own world views of how knowledge is best generated. In the most basic sense, when the purpose of research is to generate theory, qualitative research is more appropriate.

Regardless of type of method used, the Net can be an efficient and effective tool in the research process.

However, those adopting the Net as a research tool currently do so with little guidance, especially with respect to what kind of research data is most appropriately collected online.

The remainder of this book provides guidance in using the Internet as a tool in the research process.

Borg, W.R., Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational research. An introduction (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman

Chandler, D. (1996). Engagement with media: Shaping and being shaped. [Online]. Available: <http://users.aber.ac.uk/dge/determines.html>.

Clark, R. (1983). Reconsidering research on learning from media. Review of Educational Research, 53(4), 445-459

Cresswell, J.W. (1994). Research design. Qualitative and quantitative approaches.

London:Sage.

Eisner, E.(1981). On the differences between scientific and artistic approaches to quantitative and qualitative research.

Educational Researcher, 10(4),5-9.

Firestone, W.A.(1987). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research.

Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E. (2000). How to design and evaluate research in education (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Glesne, C., Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers. An introduction. New York: Longman.

Guba, E.G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness for naturalistic inquiries. ERIC/ECT7f Annual Review Paper, 29(2), 75-91.

Guba, E.G., Lincoln, Y.S. (1988). Do inquiry paradigms imply inquiry methodologies? In D.M. Fetterman (Ed.), Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education (pp. 89-115). New York: Praeger.

Jonassen, D.H. (1996). Computers in classroom: Mindtools for critical thinking. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kulik, J.A. (1984). Evaluating the effects of teaching with computers. In G. Campbell and G. Fein (Eds.), Microcomputers in early education. Reston, VA: Reston.

Kulik, J.A., Kulik, C., Cohen, P. (1980). Effectiveness of computer-based college teaching: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 2(2), 525-544.

Kulik, J.A., Kulik, C., Schwab, B. (1986). The effectiveness of computer-based adult education: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Computing, 2(2), 235-252.

Lincoln, Y.S., Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCracken, G. (1988). The long interview. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mcluhan, M. (1964). Understanding media: The extensions of man. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McMillan, J., Schumacher, S. (2001). Research in education (5th ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (1988). Paradigms and pragmatism. In D.M. Fetterman (Ed.), Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education (pp. 89-115). New York: Praeger.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Reeves, T.C. (2000, April). Enhancing the worth of instructional technology research through "design experiments" and other development research strategies.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Werner, O., Schoepfle, G. (1987). Systematic fieldwork: Vol. I, Foundations of Ethnography and interviewing, I. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Chapter 1

THE LITERATURE REVIEW PROCESS IN E-RESEARCH

A few months spent in field research can frequently save a few in the library. Anonymous A quality research project benefits from and builds on the accumulated research knowledge of others and is further informed by the ongoing dialogue with those engaged in related research.

E-research does not change this basic tenant of quality research, but it does provide new tools and techniques to increase ways in which gathering and compiling an effective review of the existing literature in completing this ask. We begin by reviewing the goals or objectives of the literature review process.

WHY DO A LITERATURE REVIEW?

The purpose of a literature review is to report published material on existing conceptual frameworks, theories, and previous research related to the topic under investigation.

The most important contribution of a literature review is to identify why some of the literature is noteworthy and which literature has made important theoretical contributions to the field being studied. The literature review component of an effective e-research project is both a process and a product. As a process, the literature review serves to familiarize and educate the researcher—not only with the results but also with the theories, techniques, processes, styles, and instruments of other researchers.

Because the e-researcher may be challenged by problems similar to those encountered in prior research, the results of a literature review can save time as well as effect a greater contribution to the knowledge base through building on existing information.