

Janelle Scott
Student Number: 2115760
Assignment: Module Two - Undertaking Research in Workplaces
Module Code: BMPF7005

Critically evaluate a selected range of methodological approaches appropriate for research in work-based settings, with due consideration to research ethics and insider research issues.

Introduction

This essay will provide an overview of paradigms and the building blocks of research design that allow for the comprehensive collection of data contributing to credible research projects, specifically within work-based research conducted within social contexts. First, I will provide a brief overview of ontology and epistemology. I will then discuss paradigms and how they form the theoretical framework for selecting methodologies, before outlining various methods conducive to conducting research and several research designs. I will mention ethical considerations in conducting social research in the workplace, before considering which paradigm suits my current worldview perspective and which research design is compatible with my future research goals.

Ontology

Ontology addresses the fundamental question of “what is reality?” (Morgan, 2007). Individual views on reality will directly impact a research-practitioner’s research design and choice of paradigm (Gray, 2004). Ontology is dependent on the scope of practice and the researcher’s personal perception on truth as an absolute reality or a changing reality (Mackenzie, Knipe 2006). Multiple positions have emerged within ontology, each with a different outlook on reality and its many forms (Gray, 2004). Three common ontological positions are objectivism, subjectivism, and relativism.

An objectivist ontology mandates that a singular truth about an object cannot be denied, and its existence is not based on human knowledge (Morgan, 2007). There is an existence of “objective reality” (Gray, 2004). Subjectivism is another ontological stance, in which a person believes that their perceived truth is as real as an objective truth (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006). Relativism acknowledges that no single truth exists; rather, individuals identify their own truths (Costley, Elliott et al., 2010; Easterby-Smith, et al., 2018).

Within a singing studio context, an example of objectivism would be when a voice teacher assumes that the physical sensations that they feel within their singing experience will be

identical to their students' physical realities. Certain teachers believe that the only way gauge if a student is singing with balanced resonance is if the student experiences the sensation of singing "in the masque" (Miller, 2004). If this assumption informs the instruction of their students, there is a single apparent reality, or objectivist ontology, present in their pedagogical approach (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006).

As a voice teacher, I often encounter situations in which a relativist ontology is applicable. In many teaching scenarios, students' perceptions of how they experience the physical sensation of resonance within their bodies is unique to them. The resonant vibrations they will feel while singing are unpredictable to me and different from my own experience, which reflects an ever-changing reality, or relativist ontology (Costley, Elliott et al., 2010).

Epistemology

Epistemology answers the question "how can I know reality?" (Morgan, 2007). While a researcher's ontology embodies their philosophical opinion, their epistemology validates their ontological perspective by interpreting reality (Gray, 2004). Ontology informs epistemology because it determines how reality can be legitimized and measured (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006).

Epistemological realism stems from objectivism, and this position states that knowledge exists independent from the workings of the human mind (Niiniluoto, 2002). When singers experiencing vocal pathologies visit a speech-language pathologist and have their vocal folds scoped, this is an example of a realist epistemology, as a singer's vocal output can be measured using an auditory tool (Albert, Brundage et al., 2020; Kwak, Stasney et al., 2014).

Within my own voice studio, I embrace the perspective that, while each vocal style has a framework of ideal stylistic aims, singers are free to make interpretive and technical musical choices based on their individual preferences and discernment. My teaching epistemology, therefore, is more subjectivist in nature as I believe that each student will bring their own perspective to their musical choices (Hanly, 2014).

Costley, Elliott et al. state that when starting a research project, one must begin with a clearly defined ontology and epistemology, and then allow the philosophical position to inform the research methodology (2010). In future, I aim to discover if correlation exists between singing multiple styles of music and finding increased creative freedom through doing so, and if this helps singers release harmful perfectionist tendencies. This research interest reflects a relativist ontology and a subjectivist epistemology because each singer's experience will be distinctive to

their individual journeys as musicians, and their responses to external and internal stimuli will differ from my own (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006).

Paradigms

A paradigm is the theoretical framework through which a researcher views the world, a “deeper philosophical position relating to the nature of social phenomena and social structures” (Feilzer, 2010, p.7). The ontology, epistemology, and axiology (or study of values) informing a researcher’s worldview forms their paradigm, which in turn influences the methods and methodologies used to undertake investigative research (Kawulich, Wagner et al., 2012; Morgan, 2007). Due to the limited scope of this paper, I will be examining two paradigms: the pragmatic paradigm and the constructivist paradigm. These two frameworks of systematic data investigation appeal to me because they appear conducive to work-based learning, allow for the researcher to remain open-minded as they make discoveries, and acknowledge that each person’s truth is unique to them (Kawulich, Wagner et al., 2012; Feilzer, 2010).

Pragmatic Paradigm

The pragmatic paradigm avoids declaring whether there exist multiple truths or a singular truth, and instead looks to the reality of each situation with an open mindset, choosing to focus on the practical rather than the philosophical (Feilzer, 2010). Pragmatism is a popular paradigm for work-based learning, as its framework allows the researcher flexibility to investigate new information while building upon their current knowledge (Lester, Costley, 2010). In research, qualitative or mixed methods is the most common approach to gathering data within the pragmatic paradigm (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006).

A study conducted in Houston, Texas among a cohort of singers, entitled *Knowledge, Experience, and Anxieties of Young Classical Singers in Training*, exemplifies research within the pragmatic paradigm (Kwak, Stasney et al., 2014). In this study, accomplished young Classical singers from Conservatories and Young Artists Programs answered questionnaires and were interviewed to determine how confident they were in their knowledge of vocal pedagogy, and how vocal pathologies and anxieties impacted them (Kwak, Stasney et al., 2014). The goal of the study was to aid in the future development of beneficial curricula for young singing students, and the practical nature of this study, combined with its recognition that each singer will respond with different truths, fit well within the framework of the pragmatic paradigm (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006; Kwak, Stasney et al., 2014).

Constructivist Paradigm

In a constructivist paradigm, which emerged out of the study of phenomenology (the study of human experiences) and hermeneutics (the interpretation of literary works), there is no single definitive truth; rather, social groups experience multiple truths unique to their own situations (Kawulich, Wagner et al., 2012; Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006; Winter, 2020). The constructivist paradigm investigates and seeks to describe various issues and phenomena within social settings, and the researcher is not limited by a specific philosophy (Kawulich, Wagner et al., 2012; Winter, 2020). Qualitative methods are commonly used, although quantitative methods can also be utilized (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006). While quantitative research is respected for its straightforward capacity to gather and analyze data numerically, qualitative research allows for theories to be gradually developed over time and presented at the end of the project (Berg, 2000; Creswell, 2013). This paradigm appeals to practitioner-researchers as it allows “practice-based problems to remain at the core of the research design,” which is akin to the pragmatic paradigm (Winter, 2020).

In an instructional situation, constructivism could take the form of teachers encouraging students to construct and understand reality using knowledge they already possess (Liu, Chen, 2010). Students are permitted to take ownership of learning and to form opinions based on their own reflections and observations, with guidance from the instructor throughout the discovery process (Liu, Chen, 2010). An example in the voice studio would be asking students to consider what techniques allow them to sing long, smooth phrases. I ask leading questions guiding the contemplation, such as “what sensations are you experiencing in your body right now?” and “what power source is carrying you through the phrase?” As singers begin making useful connections associated with breathing, I affirm their observations, which is a constructivist approach to education (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006).

Methodology

Methodology is the intersection of a researcher’s philosophical values and beliefs, their conceptual plans for the research along with their theoretical perspective, and their strategy for how to move the project forward using various research methods (Costley, Elliott et al., 2010; Kawulich, Wagner et al., 2012). The methodological approach a researcher selects is informed by whether they uphold a deductive approach, in which they form a hypothetical theory prior to beginning research, or an inductive approach, in which they allow emerging data to dictate the methodology (Gray, 2004; Feilzer, 2010).

Two main methodologies can be used to collect data and test theories: quantitative and qualitative research (Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). Mixed methods is another approach to research, and combines aspects of both quantitative and qualitative research (Creswell, 2013). When beginning a research project, the researcher must consider their goals and desired outcomes and then select which methodology will be the most suitable for pursuing these research aims within their chosen paradigm (Feilzer, 2010).

Qualitative Research

At its essence, qualitative research examines people or communities within social contexts and answers specific questions within these contexts (Berg, 2000; Creswell, 2013). “Qualitative researchers, then, are most interested in how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how inhabitants of these settings make sense of their surroundings through symbols, rituals, social structures, social roles, and so forth” (Berg, 2010, p. 7). Qualitative researchers work directly in the field where social situations take place, rather than in a laboratory, which can make this style of research an appealing choice for work-based research (Creswell, 2013). Often, qualitative research relies on multiple sources of data collection through what Feilzer refers to as “soft,” or socially sourced, research (2010). This research includes various forms of verbal data (Creswell, 2013). While qualitative research begins with a general topic in mind, themes ideally emerge as data is collected in an inductive process, leading to the formation of a hypothesis (Creswell, 2013; Sarma, 2015). In qualitative research, the researcher is personally involved in every step of gathering and analyzing information before interpreting the data (Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). They must be aware of how their personal experiences and lens may interfere with the accuracy of interpreting data and put safeguards in place to protect the credibility of the research (Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008; Creswell, 2013).

Due to its subjective nature, qualitative research has occasionally been accused of lacking in scientific rigor (Sarma, 2015). Safeguards such as triangulation, using multiple methods to gather data, may be put in place to protect the validity of the data and can help overcome this limitation (Berg, 2000; Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). Another argument against qualitative research is that it often examines a very small cross-section of the population, and discovered knowledge cannot be assumed to be true of the population at large (Sarma, 2015).

Berg proposes that qualitative research is not suitable for small-scale social science projects due to its complex and time-consuming nature and argues for quantitative research in such scenarios (Berg, 2000). Denscombe purports that small scale projects are those consisting of

less than 100 participants (2021). “After all, qualitative research takes much longer, requires greater clarity of goals during design stages, and cannot be analyzed by running computer programs” (Berg, 2000, p. 2). I disagree with this claim, as the number of people participating in a qualitative study does not need to be massive for the findings to be impactful; rather, it is more important that the broader and more complex the research topic, the broader the sample size should be (Bashir, Afzal et al. 2008; Bell, 2010). In a small project, therefore, the scope of research should not be unproportionate to the number of people participating in the study.

Quantitative Research

Quantitative research is considered a scientific, systematic approach to research and relies on tools which objectively measures statistics using mathematics (Sarma, 2015; Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). A researcher familiarizes themselves with a topic, forms a hypothesis, and conducts research to test the hypothesis (Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). This research is often conducted in a laboratory and is primarily deductive in nature, with the researcher testing a hypothesis and utilizing statistical modelling (Creswell, 2013; Sarma, 2015). Variables can be measured and categorized in an organized fashion, and the result is measured in statistical data points (Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008).

Validity of quantitative research can be statistically proven by yielding consistent results over time, making it an appealing methodology for producing reliable results (Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). This is a well-structured and organized approach to research and uses deductive reasoning by investigating hypotheses after they are formed (Gray, 2004).

A potential downside of quantitative research is that it may have a narrow scope of focus, with participants not truly reflecting an accurate depiction of a larger demographic (Berg, 2000). If a researcher only pursues a single method to gain insight, their perspective will be limited, whereas combining several “lines of sight” (Berg, 2000) allows for a more comprehensive collection of data (Bashir, Afzal et al. 2008).

Mixed Methods

Mixed methods combine aspects of both quantitative and qualitative research to investigate a topic, allowing for very comprehensive data mining (Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). It can be challenging to work with mixed methods within a conventional research framework, as traditionally different paradigms have conflicting epistemological worldviews which renders them incompatible (Feilzer, 2010; Morgan, 2007). There are several frameworks which allow for the

integration of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies within a comprehensive paradigm, such as the transformative paradigm, which addresses social justice issues (Mertens, 2007). A paradigm particularly well suited to mixed methods is pragmatism, due to its proclivity for work-based research within social contexts (Feilzer, 2010).

Research Methods

Research methods are the practical tools implemented within a research methodology to gather data for a research project (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006). “Decisions have to be made about which methods are best for particular purposes and then data collection instruments must be designed to do the job” (Bell, 2010, p. 147). Often multimodal research methods are necessary to capture the vast range of cultural data gathered throughout the project (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007). For the scope of this paper, I have decided to focus on questionnaires and interviews as likely methods I will use in forthcoming research. This disallows for other methods including focus groups, observations, gathering field notes, and case studies (Denscombe, 2021; Winter, 2020).

Utilizing questionnaires is a popular way to test a hypothesis while gathering data, particularly with quantitative research (Teddlie, Yu, 2007). According to Feilzer, questionnaires appeal to researchers “employing primarily quantitative research methods because it provides data that are precise and, arguably, unambiguous” (2010, p. 11). One unfortunate aspect of the questionnaire is that, when asking for anonymous or ‘cold’ participation, the uptake is usually quite low, around 20% (Denscombe, 2021). This would mean that the data may not be complete enough to render any accurate conclusions. The higher the response rate, the greater likelihood that the data is accurate (VanderStoep, Johnston, 2009).

Conducting interviews is particularly useful for gathering specific information in areas of social research and gaining deeper knowledge within specialized fields (Denscombe, 2021). Within structured interviews, participants are asked the same series of carefully worded questions (Winter, 2020). Questions are worded plainly to avoid any misconstruction of intent and avoid confusion which might skew responses (Berg, 2000). Unstructured interviews have a loose framework of questions established, but the researcher is free to pursue additional questions and attempt to elicit detailed responses from participants (Berg, 2000). While both structured and unstructured interviews can harvest a wealth of information and insights, care must be given to both the clarity of questions and the accuracy of recording responses to avoid misinterpretation of data (Denscombe, 2021; Winter, 2020). Semi-structured interviews allow for the flexible combination of both interview approaches (Berg, 2000).

Qualitative Research Designs

A research design is the framework by which a research practitioner defines how to answer a specific research problem, and this framework specifies the methodology and specific research methods by which the researcher will gather data (Mackenzie, Knipe, 2006). The research philosophy a researcher upholds will dictate which research methodologies and methods will be most impactful in investigating hypothesis and data within a specific paradigm (Feilzer, 2010).

Three key research designs within qualitative research which could be effective for work-based research are grounded theory, ethnography, and phenomenology. Each of these designs are types of naturalistic inquiry, in which the researcher seeks to address the characteristics, causes, and consequences of a social phenomenon (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007). Qualitative research is applicable to my research interests within the context of work-based vocal pedagogy, and therefore I will explore qualitative research designs in greater depth than quantitative research designs.

Grounded theory asks a broad question about a topic, but with no presumption about which conclusion will be drawn from the gathered data (Creswell, 2013). In vocal pedagogy, an example of a broad question is, “Are all singers’ voices impacted by nervousness during their voice lessons?” A hypothesis is not established until after the participants are questioned, thereby utilizing an inductive approach to research (Gray, 2004). Data is gathered through a variety of methods such as questionnaires and interviews (Gray, 2004). Through analyzing responses in the initial data set, a hypothesis can be formed, and then further exploration of existing literature can further clarify or confirm the hypothesis (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007). The researcher looks for a pattern of responses within the gathered data, and if one is found, the researcher can then develop a theory to explain any similarities between the coded data (research discoveries organized by themes) to help explain whatever conclusion is drawn (Creswell, 2013). It can be very challenging to navigate grounded theory research effectively, and the researcher must approach the research process with an open mind, willing to follow wherever the data leads (Bell, 2010).

Ethnography involves the researcher immersing themselves in a community, where the researcher both observes interactions within the community and communicates with the community, interpreting cultural themes (Creswell, 2013; Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008; Hoey, 2014). A theory is formed, and research is conducted which “provides a lens that shapes what is looked at and the questions asked” (Creswell, 2013, p. 83). Ethnography allows for an in-depth

study of human behaviour within a community or organization, but participants may not interact normally with the researcher until trust and a high level of comfort is established, which can take years to build (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007; Hoey, 2014). The downside, therefore, is that this style of qualitative research is time consuming for the researcher and the interactions and behaviours observed are not guaranteed to be authentic (Bell, 2010).

A key element of ethnography is that the researcher lives within the community and uses their personal experience to explain the cultural constructs observed, using methods such as interviews and participant observation to gather data (Hoey, 2014). Geography can limit the possibilities of such fieldwork, in which the researcher becomes both a participant and an observer of cultural norms within a community (Bell, 2010; Hoey, 2014).

While a wealth of information can be analyzed through this research design, a negative possibility is that the researcher's personal lens may skew their perception of reality because they are imposing their own interpretation of events on the community (Bell, 2010; Hoey, 2014). Recording vividly detailed field notes can help mitigate bias (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007; Winter, 2020). When utilized with careful planning over time, however, observing individuals interacting in their natural communities can uncover information that could otherwise be difficult to glean (Bell, 2010; Bashir, Afzal et al., 2008). Ethnography could be an invaluable way to observe natural interactions in a voice studio. Through watching the teacher-student dynamic, observations could become a training tool for inexperienced teachers-in-training to receive feedback and improve their teaching skills.

Phenomenology is a research design that studies phenomena that occur in the human experience, and how the consequences of these phenomena affect the human experience (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007; Wojnar, Swanson, 2007). In essence, phenomenology is philosophical rather than technical in nature, and is "oriented to practice – the practice of living" (van Manen, 2007, p. 13). This research design requires the researcher to discover connections between human existence and experiences, and thoughtfully pondering and reflecting upon everyday moments and their impact on humans (Lester, Costley, 2010; Wojnar, Swanson, 2007; van Manen, 2007).

Phenomenology uses methods such as interviews and participant observation, and often informs research within the constructivist paradigm (Kawulich, Wagner et al., 2012; van Manen, 2007). Therefore, given the fact that the researcher interprets their observations of phenomena through their own personal worldview, it stands to reason that the research would contain some

level of personal bias, making the validity of the results questionable (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007).

Using a process known as bracketing, in which the researcher separates themselves from the research situation and views the data from an unbiased distance, descriptive phenomenology asks researchers to remain neutral in their observations, which might be possible to a limited extent (Wojnar, Swanson, 2007; van Manen, 2007). Although phenomenology can be somewhat subjective, this methodology does allow for in-depth study of individual phenomena, resulting in a rich culmination of data interpreted from different angles through a unique perspective (van Manen, 2007).

Quantitative Research Designs

Although I recognize the value of quantitative research and appreciate that there are many impactful designs such as experimental research and correlational research, for the limited scope of this paper I will be focusing on two research designs which could be effective in work-based settings: descriptive research and survey research (Eisenhardt, 1989).

Descriptive research collects data and examines it, without altering the variables. In descriptive research analyzing the habits contributing to vocal hoarseness among singers, for example, a researcher may collect data contributing to each singer's vocal wellness habits. In such a study, variables may include use of a nebulizer, use of an inhaler, inhalation of smoke, quantity of water consumed, etc. Conclusions are drawn through observing variables (VanderStoep, Johnston, 2009). Often, descriptive characteristics include standard deviation, mean value, or frequencies to describe the sample, and diagrams are frequently used to visualize results (Denscombe, 2021). Within descriptive research, observations and surveys are common methods used (Teddlie, Yu, 2007). Although any data collection utilizing a survey will be inevitably quantitative, this form of gathering information may also contain qualitative elements (Bell, 2010).

Survey research is popular for its ability to collect data from a wide audience, especially using online questionnaires which allow surveys to be disseminated to a large demographic of people (Denscombe, 2021). Survey research utilizes questionnaires to gather data, and survey analytics software is available which makes analyzing data and creating visual graphs and charts convenient. (VanderStoep, Johnston, 2009). Feilzer observed that while survey research collects quantitative data, some of the captured information is qualitative (2010). Survey

research also allows for qualitative research to be quantified, rendering it a highly useful tool for social research projects (Feilzer, 2010).

Ethical Considerations

Judith Bell defined research ethics as “the guiding principles that help an individual or group to decide what is right or wrong” (Bell, 2010, p. 74). Although in-depth knowledge of colleagues, clients, and workplace systems can lay an excellent foundation for informed research projects, several issues with ethical implications may arise from work-based research. These issues include the following: tension among coworkers caused by perceived criticism from the research-practitioner within the workplace, ongoing knowledge of information provided in confidential interviews which may impact the researcher’s relationship with colleagues, and access to data which, even if not formally included within research, may skew the researcher’s outlook on the study being conducted (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007). As noted by Costley, Elliott et. al, often conflicts of interest arise between the workplace or community organization and the workplace professional conducting the research, so it is necessary to be aware of both the obligation to fulfill accurate research and adopt an unimposing approach to conducting research within the workplace (2010).

One limitation of observing people within their workplace as a research-practitioner is that colleagues are not necessarily aware that they are being observed for the purpose of research, which does not necessarily respect their privacy as individuals (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007). To protect confidentiality and avoid breaches of privacy against colleagues, confidentiality of research participants must be protected, as well as anonymity when requested (Creswell, 2013; Cohen, Manion et al., 2007; Denscombe, 2021). It is common for researchers and their research participants to agree upon and sign a *statement of confidentiality*, laying out the terms of how data will be protected (Berg, 2000). Along the same lines, it is important that confidential data must be treated with discretion and stored securely, in a location where it cannot be freely accessed by others (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007; Berg, 2000).

Another negative implication in practitioner-led research could be social pressure in which contemporaries in the workplace feel they have no choice but to participate in the research project if their manager has approved it (Berg, 2000; Costley, Elliott et al., 2010; Cohen, Manion et al., 2007). The researcher must be sensitive to who might be interested in participating in the research project, as people may feel obligated to participate because of their professional relationship or friendship with the researcher (Costley, Elliott et al., 2010). Similarly, if the

researcher is in a position of authoritative power, subjects such as students may feel obligated or pressured into participating (Berg, 2000; Cohen, Manion et al., 2007). It therefore remains critical important to grant fair consideration to the personal boundaries of all participants involved (VanderStoep, Johnston, 2009).

When conducting work-based research, researchers must consider the ethical obligations and boundaries of the community of practice, the university, themselves as a research-practitioner, and the country in which they are conducting research (Armsby, Costley, 2000). When conducting my own work-based research in the field of vocal pedagogy, I must be aware of any potentially invasive scientific procedures related to the voice and obtain permission from the research ethics board of Health Canada before proceeding (VanderStoep, Johnston, 2009). Having participants sign statements of confidentiality, obtaining parental permission for the participation of minors, and clarifying whether results will remain anonymous will be important (Berg, 2000). I must also declare my research intent to the University of Wales and receive permission to proceed (Armsby, Costley, 2000).

Research Goals and Considerations

As pragmatism utilizes multiple methods to gather data, it is likely that I will conduct research with a mixed methods approach. Testing the hypothesis that *cross-training in multiple singing styles helps singers increase their creative freedom by releasing perfectionist tendencies*, I will make predictions based on research variables such as participation in non-classical singing and use of contemporary commercial warmups during voice lessons. I will then implement investigative tools such as questionnaires and interviews to seek to confirm or deny these predictions (Creswell, 2013).

In small scale research projects, a minimum of 30 participants is recommended for accurate results (Denscombe, 2021). As this will be a short-term, small scale research project, I must avoid drawing grandiose or generalized conclusions from a small amount of data (Bell, 2010). In addition, when utilizing research methods to collect data, I must examine my conclusions to ensure that they are substantiated by the research (Bell, 2010).

Pragmatists converge qualitative and quantitative research while interpreting data with an open mindset based on the practical reality in front of them (Denscombe, 2021; Feilzer, 2010). This real-world approach to research appeals to me, as the flexible mindset and practical application are useful for work-based investigations (Lester, Costley 2010). Within the pragmatic paradigm, I uphold a relativist ontology and subjectivist epistemology, as I believe each singer's

professional and personal experiences are unique and relative to their own circumstances (Gray, 2004). As I am both a singer and voice teacher, I appreciate the allowance within pragmatism for both objectivity and subjectivity to influence the gathering and interpretation of data (Feilzer, 2010).

References

- Albert, K., Brundage, J.S., Sweet, P. and Vandenberghe, F., 2020. Towards a critical realist epistemology? *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, **50**(3), pp. 357-372.
- Armsby, P. and Costley, C., 2000. *Work Based Learning and the University: New Perspectives and Practices*. London: The Staff and Educational Development Association.
- Bashir, M., Afzal, M.T. and Azeem, M., 2008. Reliability and Validity of Qualitative and Operational Research Paradigm. *Pakistan journal of statistics and operation research*, **4**(1), pp. 35.
- Bell, J., 2010. *Doing your research project*. 5 edn. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Berg, B.L., 2000. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. 4th edn. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, Keith, 2007. *Research methods in education*. 6 edn. London: Routledge.
- Costley, C., Elliott, G. and Gibbs, P., 2010. *Doing work based research: approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Creswell, J.W., 2013. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 4th edn. United States of America: Sage Publications.
- Denscombe, M., 2021. *The good research guide: research methods for small-scale social research projects*. London: Open University Press.
- Easterby-smith, M., Thorpe, R., Jackson, P., and Jaspersen, L.J., 2018. *Management & business research*. 6 edn. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Eisenhardt, K.M., 1989. Building Theories from Case Study Research. *The Academy of Management review*, **14**(4), pp. 532-550.
- Feilzer, Y. M., 2010. Doing Mixed Methods Research Pragmatically: Implications for the Rediscovery of Pragmatism as a Research Paradigm. *Journal of mixed methods research*, **4**(1), pp. 6-16.
- Gray, D.E., 2004. *Doing research in the real world*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hanly, C., 2014. Skeptical Reflection on Subjectivist Epistemologies. *The Psychoanalytic quarterly; The Psychoanalytic quarterly*, **83**(4), pp. 949-968.
- Hoey, B.A., 2014. A Simple Introduction to the Practice of Ethnography and Guide to Ethnographic Fieldnotes. *Marshall Digital Scholar*, pp. 1-10.
- Kawulich, B., Wagner, C. and Garner, M., 2012. *Doing Social Research: A global context*. Europe: McGraw-Hill.
- Kwak, P.E., Stasney, C.R., Hathway, J., Minard, C.G. and Ongkasuwan, J., 2014. Knowledge, Experience, and Anxieties of Young Classical Singers in Training. *Journal of voice; J Voice*, **28**(2), pp. 191-195.
- Lester, S. and Costley, C., 2010. Work-based learning at higher education level: value, practice and critique. *Studies in higher education (Dorchester-on-Thames)*, **35**(5), pp. 561-575.

Liu, C.C. and Chen, I.J., 2010. Evolution Of Constructivism. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, **3**(4), pp. 63-66.

Mackenzie, N. and Knipe, S., 2006. Research dilemmas: paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in educational research*, **16**(2), pp. 193-205.

Mertens, D.M., 2007. Transformative Paradigm: Mixed Methods and Social Justice. *Journal of mixed methods research*, **1**(3), pp. 212-225.

Miller, R., 2004. *Solutions for Singers: Tools for Performers and Teachers*. United States of America: Oxford University Press.

Morgan, D.L., 2007. Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, **1**(1), pp. 48-76.

Niiniluoto, I., 2002. Realism in Epistemology. In: I. Niiniluoto, ed, *Critical Scientific Realism*. Oxford University Press, pp. 21-100.

Nottingham, P., 2016. The use of work-based learning pedagogical perspectives to inform flexible practice within higher education. *Teaching in higher education*, **21**(7), pp. 790-806.

Sarma, S.K., 2015. Qualitative Research: Examining the Misconceptions. *South Asian journal of management*, **22**(3), pp. 176.

Teddlie, C. and Yu, F., 2007. Mixed Methods Sampling: A Typology with Examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, **1**(1), pp. 77-100.

Van Manen, M., 2007. Phenomenology of Practice. *Phenomenology & Practice*, **1**, pp. 11-30.

Vanderstoep, S.W. and Johnston, D.D., 2009. *Research methods for everyday life: blending qualitative and quantitative approaches*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Walliman, N., 2005. *Your research project: a step-by-step guide for the first-time researcher*. 2 edn. London: SAGE.

Winter, D., 2020. *Understanding Research Methods: From Singing Teacher to Practitioner Research*.

Wojnar, D.M. and Swanson, K.M., 2007. Phenomenology: An Exploration. *Journal of holistic nursing*, **25**(3), pp. 172-180.