CHAPTER 9

Academics’ ways of understanding success in research activities

John Bowden, Pam Green, Robyn Barnacle, Nita Cherry and Robin Usher

Introduction

The purposes of this ‘researching the researchers’ project were to examine the range of ways that RMIT researchers saw their research activities and to feed the results back into training activities for researchers and research supervisors. The particular aspect of the project reported here is the analysis of what the recipients saw as success in research. What constituted a successful research project? (In each interview the question was framed as follows: ‘Firstly, I would ask you to tell me about some research that you have been engaged in that you view as being successful in some way’. Interviewees were also asked by the interviewer ‘to tell me about some research that you have been engaged in that you view as being unsuccessful in some way’.)

In earlier chapters, the personal stories of members of the research team described various aspects of the research process. The chapter on phenomenographic research methodology by Gerlese Åkerlind has provided a critical and comprehensive analysis of the method used in this study. In this chapter we will provide a brief summary of the research processes and then a detailed description of the research outcomes.

Research processes

First of all, we were a research team. Two of us collaborated in planning the interview schedule and one of us undertook all of the interviews, which were audio-taped and later transcribed. All subsequent analysis by the research team used those interview transcripts as the only data to be considered.
The normal procedure for team meetings was for one of us to have read the transcripts in detail and to have provided a summary of the aspect under investigation. In the first instance this summary was of a tentative draft of possible categories of description evident in the transcripts. On most other occasions, the summary was a re-writing of one or two categories according to the changes that earlier discussion by the research team had suggested. The task of the other members of the research team was also to read the transcripts, but with a view to playing the devil's advocate role – to search for deficiencies in the proposed statement, using the transcripts as evidence. Aspects of the statement not able to be substantiated by the evidence of the transcripts would be modified and relevant aspects evident in the transcripts but not incorporated in the revised statement would be added. The roles rotated among members of the team from meeting to meeting.

The purpose at every stage was to move towards a set of categories of description that encompassed all of the transcripts, that had coherence within each category and that differentiated between categories.

Our way of working was that each of us would read transcripts and take notes according to whether we had the lead role or a role of devil's advocate at the next meeting. We agreed to meet weekly for about two hours but, in order to preserve continuity of discussion, we abandoned meetings when one of us was unable to attend. On average, we probably met for a couple of hours three times a month during the analysis reported in this chapter. What went on in those meetings, our way of working, is best addressed by reading the four individual accounts in earlier chapters.

**Key findings**

After an exhaustive (and exhausting) six months of analysis, the team reached its final (eighth) version of the categories of description. There were five categories and they are elaborated below. Before moving to the categories, however, it is worthwhile commenting on the context of the study. This will help interpretation of the findings.

The 24 academics interviewed were all members of staff of RMIT University. RMIT was a former Institute of Technology and it traces its history back to the Melbourne Workingman’s College of the nineteenth century. This link to the workplace remains today and RMIT has styled itself in recent years as a 'University of the Real World'. One might expect therefore that either by attracting staff with similar val-
ues or through an absorption of those values upon arrival, the RMIT culture might be seen in academic staff ideas about teaching and research.

Another likely impact on RMIT academics’ views of research is the fact that university status was achieved in the early 1990s. Subsequently, new appointments played greater attention to research experience than had been so in the past and long-serving RMIT academics have experienced a good deal of encouragement over the past decade to engage successfully in research activities. One might expect different effects on attitudes to research between long-serving and recently-appointed academics.

Finally, while RMIT is a University of Technology, it has within it a fair range of disciplines. At the time the research reported here was undertaken, the faculties were Applied Science, Art Design & Communication, Biomedical & Health Sciences, Business, Constructed Environment, Education Language & Community Services, and Engineering. It was an open question as to whether views of success in research would reflect discipline variation.

Categories of description for success in research

The five categories of success in research are elaborated in turn below. Their short labels are Satisfaction, Management, Development, Publication and Usefulness. Note that all of these categories are from the analysis of the responses of the 24 academics when asked to give examples of successful research they had undertaken and some that was not so successful. They were all asked why they chose those examples. The first category (short label ‘satisfaction’ category) is as follows:

’Satisfaction’ category. Research is successful if the researcher finds it satisfying or exciting to do. This may be because of the inherent interest of the activity and the various feelings of being thrilled, challenged or exhilarated by successfully tackling complex issues. The satisfaction or the excitement may be linked to a number of achievements, including being able to meet clients’ needs, being able to confirm one’s own prior hypotheses, and participating in the act of discovery. The researchers may feel proud of what has been produced and excited by the attention they receive.

This is very much an internalised perspective on success. Its central premise is that success depends on whether or not the experience was satisfying or exciting. If it was satisfying, then it was successful. For example:
’… one thing that made it successful for me personally was what I found interesting … it was complex, there were lots of twists in it, there were lots of different categories, people make interesting decisions, so it’s inherently intellectually stimulating.’ (transcript 5)

‘… very excited. The best thing about it is that all the pieces … into place, there were no funny bits that stick out … it all fell into place exactly which is relatively rare.’ (transcript 6)

‘I really enjoy research, it’s a joyful thing to do.’ (transcript 7)

‘I do this job largely because, amidst all the other things we do, you do find some level of intellectual gratification. Those processes of exploration and discovery, I think, are really exhilarating; I really enjoy that.’ (transcript 22)

The satisfaction or excitement may come not just from the activity itself, but from the interest the research engenders in others. But again, the interest of others is internalised. For example:

‘I loved it, it’s fantastic … you had people who were hanging on it, we had embargos and it’s really quite thrilling. People actually paid attention to your findings … people wanted to know what you were researching and they were eagerly awaiting the results. So there was actually a demand for it …’ (transcript 13)

‘It was very satisfying to be able to show that – a lot of ego comes into it, it’s fun to be able to show that your hypothesis was right to what had previously been thought of was – let’s say not wrong but not so right.’ (transcript 16)

‘It was rated as cutting edge research, that was very exciting, and I won an award for it as well, so it was all very encouraging, very exciting.’ (transcript 19)

The next category has a focus on managing the research process effectively as a measure of research success (short label ‘management’ category).
There are many excerpts that illustrate this category, as follows:

‘That’s the difference between them … there’s a sense of completion, a sense of arriving at some point.’ (transcript 2)

‘It’s also successful because I’ve got it done … we came almost down to the line because … there were constraints from getting the designer and the printing done to get it over to Madrid in time.’ (transcript 3)

‘…I’ve considered something that has happened this year that got finished and clean and vroom, and a team of people working on it and it’s over … and this other one that seems to have been going on forever.’ (transcript 9)

‘I think that’s a relatively successful one in terms of its integrity … it started, it had a middle and we finished it. So, integrity in the sense of being complete.’ (transcript 10)

‘Well, the successful ones are the ones that we have been funded because they’ve enabled us to do the full project that we put up.’ (transcript 12)

The third category can be seen to be consistent with an organisation newly created as a university. Success in this category is focused on the development of the organisation and its members (short label ‘development’ category).

‘Development’ category. Research is successful if it results in the development of the researchers and their organisations. This may be by pushing back boundaries and learning new techniques and methods, inducting novices into the research process, assisting new researchers to complete higher degrees, developing constructive links with stakeholders, feeding outcomes back into teaching and increasing the capability of the organisation through all or any of the above. Satisfaction may also derive from the further research and career opportunities that are created. It may be that, as often happens, the researcher learns something from the experience even if in every other respect the research is regarded as unsuccessful; such a researcher may still see the research as successful.

This development can be seen to occur in a number of different ways:

‘So I guess what it taught me about research was that doing the research in a rigorous way was in one sense only part of the process. You have to do the research so that your audience for the research actually owns the research and is part of the
process; it’s not just the participants of the research. We’d never really had that successful participation from the people who commissioned the research before … I feel actually quite good about it. As I said, it stretched me. … I’ve done more academic … research before … instead of talking about technology all the time we have to see how the story changes when the user within his or her social cultural context is based at the centre of it.’ (transcript 1)

‘It’s positive … in that it’s feeding back into our teaching, which is nice if that can all be tied in together … It’s also successful because we’ve got a good post-doc who’s working on it, … a student that’s now doing a PhD in the area, we’ve got another student who’s interested in starting a PhD. So that kind of building of critical mass, I guess is one thing that makes it successful.’ (transcript 4)

‘It’s deemed successful. Why? Well, you can judge it from a number of different outcomes; one of course was that there was a PhD on the end of it for one of the students who completed this work … So that was an outcome. There are also some other pieces of research which haven’t quite come to completion yet because there’s another student who is extending some of this work … She, I hope, will finish her PhD within the coming year or so. So there has been several spin-offs from it … This will potentially lead to further contracts for further development and so forth, and new issues, new algorithms and methods that would come back to RMIT. So that’s the pay off and you see my premise is that the best problems are often the ones that come from industry. (transcript 11)

‘That project has been a success, not so much in terms of the research that has been done, although that has been good, but it enabled us to bring in someone who is a good, young, bright potential future researcher who, in this case, wouldn’t have contemplated leaving (another university) to come to RMIT but for that particular project. So I mean there are two stories of things I think that have been successful for reasons other than the project; they’ve been successful from being able to get other people involved … So I sort of felt being here and having a little bit more research experience of people that this was an opportunity to sort of take people through the research process and to say to them – look, it’s actually hard yes, but it’s actually not really as hard as you think and it’s not actually going to be as difficult as you think and so here’s what we need to do.’ (transcript 12)
The next category sees success in a traditional way – research success linked to publication (short label ‘publication’ category).

| ‘Publication’ category. Research is successful if it results in some form of publication, such as a book, a journal article or a conference paper. Within journal articles there is another quality measure related to the prestige with which the journal is held within its field and, overlapping with that, whether the journal is refereed or not. The number of publications is also a measure of success, as are invitations to speak at conferences or to write reviews of fields of research. This focus on publication as a criterion of success may be expressed as an internalised ‘self-evident’ belief or as explicit recognition of external expectations. |

The examples of aspects of this category from the transcripts would be recognisable to most academics.

‘Well. I see the ultimate aim of doing research is to get it published. If you don’t ever get it published then it is unsuccessful. If you’ve done a halfway decent job you should get it published somewhere … I would define unsuccessful as a failure to get something published.’ (transcript 6)

‘… it will have finally succeeded when we actually write the book and we’re writing the book now… So that will, I guess, be the final marker of that being a successful project. … Well, there is (another) project I was working on a few years ago which didn’t really come to anything concrete in terms of actually publishing good stuff from it … (Yet another project) didn’t get off the ground in the sense that we didn’t turn that into – you know, you can’t publish a filing cabinet drawer, you have to turn it into something, you have to write it into something and that’s what we didn’t do. We wrote just a couple of small articles and that’s all.’ (transcript 7)

‘… that has got to be one sort of continual success story….we’ve continued to publish in very good journals … more recently we’ve been asked to write review articles for some of the major journals … I do things like organise international symposia.’ (transcript 16)

‘… as far as your career’s concerned you’re sort of judged by how much you publish … getting publication is very important … you look back at 18 months of effort and just nothing out of it … and again people look back at your career and say ‘oh well, there’s a two-year gap … where you haven’t had any publications … (transcript 17)
‘... she’s got publications out of it with me and it’s been altogether a very positive experience … and then I was invited to give the … annual memorial lecture … and this will make me write the next … and I’m very pleased I did it and they’ve had a great impact.’ (transcript 18)

‘... that turned out to be quite successful and it was very well received when I submitted it to conferences … it was all very encouraging, very exciting … to be able to publish a paper in Nature, which is one of the prestigious journals, is a big deal … and we felt this particular study … was on the level of Nature publication.’ (transcript 19)

‘... in terms of defining success I guess for an academic that is to produce something … in most cases it’s a refereed journal article which is disseminated to the community of researchers and your peers … I guess the contrast really is in terms of the strategies you deploy to get an effective outcome, in terms of publication.’ (transcript 22)

The final category sees research success focused on its effect on the world. Is it useful? (short label ‘usefulness’ category)

‘Usefulness’ category. Research is successful if it makes a difference to the world either by affecting other people’s lives or by producing something new. Research outcomes should be useful and, preferably, put to actual use. One form of utility is finding solutions to problems experienced by people. Another form, often achieved by appropriate scholarly publication, is enriching the body of knowledge either in a global sense or, on a more individual level, increasing other people’s awareness and helping them understand better than before. Outcomes may be in one of these two forms independently or with the two forms integrated together. The integrated perspective seeks useful but theoretically grounded outcomes.

It is clear that it includes some aspects of other categories (e.g., publication) but goes beyond them (more will be said of the relation between the categories in the next section). Some examples of relevant excerpts from the transcripts are as follows:

‘... it’s something that will be really useful, as well as being publishable.’ (transcript 4)

‘Intellectually for me the interesting part was that it hadn’t been done before. ... The other side of what made it successful is the issue of usefulness. If I didn’t think that we could come up with something useful, that could somehow – to use
a terrible term, improve people’s lot or at least increase awareness, then the fact that it was inherently interesting probably wouldn’t have been enough for me to spend time doing it. Like, it has to be a real life problem and the research has to be aimed to actually helping people understand the issue and then hopefully being able to recommend some actions that either individuals or organisations can take to make things better in some way.’ (transcript 5)

‘… it’s a fundamental contribution to the ways in which we imagine ourselves as citizens … as well as being a contribution to understanding of social problems and social conditions. … When it all comes together and it feels successful … it’s a really enjoyable exercise …’ (transcript 7)

‘… it’s a fairly strong expectation to be writing an article here or an article there that is coming out of some of your research. … it was just adding another little brick to this body of knowledge … that was a positive thing from my perspective.’ (transcript 8)

‘I think my benchmark is always, did the research that we do get used? … this will potentially lead to further contracts for further development and so forth and new issues, new algorithms and methods that would come back to RMIT.’ (transcript 11)

‘It’s really quite a thrill that people are actually using your work.’ (transcript 13)

‘Because basically I’m a research creature, I like creating new things. I like creating things that are better than they are now … So from a research point of view I’m just thrilled that, you know, we can do something positively, practically and it’s good, it has got benefits.’ (transcript 14)

‘… there must be a higher conception of research which is to make a difference to yourself, to the world, to others … doing something that could add meaning to people and … help in a way. So useful research, applied research, but very theoretically grounded.’ (transcript 20)

‘It’s something we can now do that we couldn’t do before. We were the first to be able to do it … So in a sense it’s a scientific advance. It’s an advance for the industry as well.’ (transcript 21)

‘We wrote a number of papers, journals papers, sometimes conference papers … We created a lot of new knowledge at the centre and we did apply in an industry situation.’ (transcript 23)
The development of the categories of description across time

The five categories of description were developed through an exhaustive process over many months. At various stages in the analysis, one of us produced a new version of the categories of description as a representation of our progress to that stage. In all, there are eight versions that were developed progressively, with the eighth version being the one that has been described in the previous section of this chapter. We thought that it may be of interest to readers to look at the progress that was made from the beginning of the process to the end.

Appendix A shows the eight versions. They won’t be reproduced here, but readers might like to go to the Appendix from time to time to check the detail. Table 9.1 below depicts the relation between the first three versions and the final version.

Table 9.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim category</th>
<th>Version 1</th>
<th>Version 2</th>
<th>Version 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘usefulness’ category</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘usefulness’ category</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘usefulness’ category, but with the notion of ‘publication’ added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘satisfaction’ category, but with some aspects of the ‘management’ category</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘satisfaction’ category, but with some aspects of the ‘management’ category</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘satisfaction’ category, but with aspects of the ‘management’ category removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘development’ category</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘development’ category</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘development’ category, but with ‘results in learning’ added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘publication’ category</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘publication’ category, but with a second part linked to ‘usefulness’</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘publication’ category, but without the explicit link to ‘usefulness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Attention from others – higher profile</td>
<td>Attention from others – higher profile</td>
<td>Early version of the ‘management’ category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Results in learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements of all five final categories of description were evident in
the early versions, but there are three distinctive differences:

1. the differentiation between categories was less distinctive in
the earlier versions
2. the coherence of any one category, even if essentially the same
theme remained throughout the analysis, was less in the ear-
lier versions
3. not all of the elements are present in the earliest versions.

The evidence for the first two of these, differentiation between
and coherence within categories, is found in:

- the mixing of the ‘satisfaction’ category and the ‘management’
category in versions 1 and 2 and their later separation from
version 3 onwards
- the separation in versions 1 and 2 of the ‘publications’ cate-
gory from what was later to become a part of that category, the
gaining of attention from others
- the presence in version 2 of a category representing success as
being linked to learning, an aspect that became part of the
‘development’ category in version 3
- the differentiation within the ‘publications’ category in ver-
sion 2 between publication for its own sake and publication
as leading to application, with the latter becoming part of the
‘usefulness’ category in version 3.

Evidence for the third can be found through a detailed reading
of the various versions 1–8 in Appendix A. The major analytical work
from version 4 to version 8 involved an incremental increase in the
coherence within categories as well as consequential differentiation
between categories as the various elements characteristic of the cate-
gories became more refined.

Relations between the categories of description

So how are the categories related to each other? Are they completely
separate and unrelated or can we see some links between them? Given
that the categories represent different ways of seeing the same phe-
nomenon, links are to be expected. In fact, readers will have already
seen from the excerpts used to illustrate the last category (‘usefulness’)
that there are aspects related to other categories such as ‘publication’
(e.g., excerpts from transcripts 8 and 23 above) and ‘satisfaction’ (e.g., excerpts from transcripts 13 and 14 above). This is an example of nesting or a hierarchical arrangement of categories. When categories are nested, each is subsumed in the others in one direction, but not vice versa. In this case, the last category contains elements of the previous one. That is, the ‘usefulness’ category also includes aspects that are characteristic of the ‘publications’ category. It also includes aspects of the ‘satisfaction’ category. Similarly, the ‘publications’ category includes aspects of the ‘satisfaction’ category. So, at least these three categories are related hierarchically in some way. However, a further test of whether they form a nested hierarchy is to search for characteristics of the ‘usefulness’ category in the ‘publications’ category and the ‘satisfaction’ category. They are not present. So these three categories do form a nested hierarchy.

The analysis of the relationships between the categories was not done in the same way as the primary analysis from which the categories were derived. Rather, one of us (John Bowden) undertook an independent analysis of the relationships, gained feedback from another member of the team (Pam Green) and then got independent feedback from outside the team (from Gerlese Åkerlind). The result was then brought back to the whole research team for discussion and confirmation.

What we did was to analyse the transcripts again, searching for evidence of any hierarchical relationships. We developed a list of themes of expanding awareness among the categories (we use Åkerlind’s term ‘theme of expanding awareness’ [see chapter 8] because the alternative ‘dimension of variation’ is now used ambiguously in the literature). That is, we asked the question: On what aspects of the phenomenon ‘success in research’ do we get variation across the five categories? What are the major common issues that have different meaning across the categories and in what ways do they become more inclusive? We concluded that, in this study, one significant theme of expanding awareness is as follows:

- The focus of the category of description in terms of what constitutes success

What does this mean? Well, this first theme of expanding awareness is in fact the rather obvious one – the short labels for each category of description give an indication. It would be expected that a key theme is the focus of the category in terms of what constitutes success. This was the driving force of the primary analysis and produced the five categories. However, the relationship that we found was not a
straightforward hierarchy. In fact, while we found that the ‘usefulness’, ‘publications’ and ‘satisfaction’ categories formed a nested set as already described, the remaining two categories of description did not fit into that particular hierarchy. Rather, the remaining two formed a separate nested set with the ‘usefulness’ category, so that the ‘usefulness’ category also includes aspects that are characteristic of the ‘development’ category (e.g., see excerpt from transcript 11 above). As well, it includes aspects of the ‘management’ category (e.g., see excerpt from transcript 7 above). Similarly, the ‘development’ category includes aspects of the ‘management’ category (e.g., see excerpt from transcript 12 above). Again, the test of whether they form a nested hierarchy was applied by searching for characteristics of the ‘usefulness’ category in the ‘development’ category and the ‘management’ category. They were not present.

So, on the basis of that one theme of expanding awareness, a branched hierarchical structure is suggested as shown in Figure 9.1 below.

Figure 9.1: Relationship frame for ‘success in research’ categories (based on first theme of expanding awareness)

Another theme that was common to the five categories, but was treated differently in different categories is as follows:

- Who it is who makes the judgement about success

Clearly the ‘satisfaction category’ involves the researcher in making that judgement alone. ‘Did I enjoy it?’ is the reflective question that
enables the researcher to judge whether or not the research was successful, according to this category of description. On the other hand, the ‘usefulness’ category of description would seem to demand some external judgement as well, as to the usefulness of the research. Similarly, publication outcomes involve judgements by others beyond the researcher. So this seemed a useful theme to explore in more detail.

A third theme common to the five categories of description, but exhibiting variation in meaning across them was the following:

- What the source of satisfaction or enjoyment is

There clearly is variation on this theme from the satisfaction through simply experiencing an activity (‘satisfaction’ category) through the excitement of the effects of its product on other people (‘usefulness’ category). This theme too seemed worthwhile exploring.

For convenience, we are representing this relational analysis in two parts – treating Branch A and Branch B depicted in Figure 1 separately. Table 9.2 shows the outcome of that analysis for Branch A. The columns represent the three categories concerned and they are headed with simple statements showing the focus of the meaning of success in research (i.e., the meanings across the first theme of expanding awareness described earlier) as follows:

- the research solves real problems or adds to knowledge
- the research results in publication
- the researcher finds research enjoyable to do.

Then a matrix is formed by crossing that theme of expanding awareness with the categories of description. The theme ‘Success focus for research’ has already been explored in the opening paragraph of this section. For the ‘Who judges research success?’ theme of expanding awareness, the answer in the ‘satisfaction’ category is the researcher. For the ‘publication’ category, it is the peer group that judges the research success by agreeing to publish the outcome or not, but of course the researcher has a role in deciding whether and what to publish. In the ‘usefulness’ category, the researcher’s perception of the usefulness of the research is relevant but is only one part of the necessary acceptance by a wider community – wider than the immediate peer group.

For the ‘focus of satisfaction’ theme of expanding awareness, the emphasis in the ‘satisfaction’ category is on the direct experience of the research activity itself. In the ‘publication’ category, the focus goes
beyond that direct experience and includes satisfaction with the result of peer group judgement, viz., publication, and also the associated attention that it produces. The focus of satisfaction for the ‘usefulness’ category goes beyond the internalised feeling, but still includes it. There is a joy in making discoveries, but the feeling of satisfaction is affected too by the impact of the work on other people. This has a broader sweep than the publication category because it goes beyond mere approval by other people of the researcher’s work (still a self-reflective perspective), but involves the relation between other people and the research outcomes that are externalised.

Table 9.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch A</th>
<th>Research is successful if</th>
<th>‘Usefulness’ category</th>
<th>‘Publication’ category</th>
<th>‘Satisfaction’ category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themes of expanding awareness</td>
<td>it solves real problems or adds to knowledge</td>
<td>External change as a consequence of research outcome</td>
<td>Research product made public in traditional form</td>
<td>Intrinsic joy and satisfaction from participating in the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success focus for research</td>
<td>it results in publication</td>
<td>Wider community</td>
<td>Peer group</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who judges research success?</td>
<td>the researcher finds research enjoyable to do</td>
<td>The joy of discovery and doing something useful for other people</td>
<td>Getting something published and the associated attention received</td>
<td>Experiencing the research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can see from the previous paragraphs that, on all three themes of expanding awareness, the relationship between the three categories in Branch A is hierarchical.

For Branch B (see Table 9.3), a matrix was formed by crossing those same themes of expanding awareness in a similar way. In this case, the three categories are ‘usefulness’, ‘development’ and ‘management’, and their focus in terms of success in research is as follows:

- the research solves real problems or adds to knowledge
- the researcher and/or the organisation is/are developed
- the researcher feels satisfaction in getting the research steps completed.
Table 9.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch B</th>
<th>‘Usefulness’ category</th>
<th>‘Development’ category</th>
<th>‘Management’ category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Themes of expanding awareness</strong></td>
<td>It solves real problems or adds to knowledge</td>
<td>the researcher and/or the organisation is/are developed</td>
<td>the researcher feels satisfied in getting the research steps completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success focus for research</td>
<td>External change as a consequence of research outcome</td>
<td>Local change as a consequence of the research process</td>
<td>Intrinsic satisfaction with completing steps in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who judges research success?</td>
<td>Wider community</td>
<td>Researcher and local organisation</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of satisfaction</td>
<td>Doing something useful for other people</td>
<td>Own learning and/or improved organisational capacity</td>
<td>Getting the job done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the ‘success focus for the research’ theme of expanding awareness, the ‘management’ category is focused simply on getting the job done. The ‘development’ category is concerned with this, but also is focused on change at the local level that results; the ‘usefulness’ category again is concerned with change at an external level. These three form an ever-broadening focus for the research.

For the ‘Who judges research success?’ theme of expanding awareness, the answer in the ‘management’ category is the researcher. As before, it is the researcher who feels satisfied with the completion of the project and that is the criterion advanced to gauge success in this category. In the ‘development’ category, the researcher plays a role in making the judgement about whether or not the research has contributed to development in the organisation involved, but this can’t be simply an internal reflection. The local organisation is involved either implicitly or explicitly and, as before, the wider community is involved in judging success in the ‘usefulness’ category.

As to the focus of satisfaction, it is on getting the job done in the ‘management’ category, on the researcher’s own learning and improved organisational capacity (which necessarily includes getting the job done) in the ‘development’ category and, as before, impacting
on a much wider community in the ‘usefulness’ category. Again, a hierarchical structure can be seen in Branch B as in Branch A.

So, the final structure can be depicted as shown in Figure 9.2.

Figure 9.2: Final relational structure for the five categories of description of success in research