



[The Palgrave Handbook of Media and Communication Research in Africa](#) pp 369-383 | [Cite as](#)

## Mono-Method Research Approach and Scholar–Policy Disengagement in Nigerian Communication Research

- [Authors](#)
- [Authors and affiliations](#)
- Ayobami Ojebode
- Babatunde Raphael Ojebuyi
- Oyewole Adekunle Oladapo
- Obasanjo Joseph Oyedele

Chapter  
**First Online:** 23 March 2018

### Abstract

Current thinking in social science research prioritises designing research to solve specific social problems. Besides, robust research findings that proffer practical solutions to specific social problems stand a better chance of appealing to policymakers and actors. Communication research in Nigeria has a history of policy relevance that has aligned with this trend. However, at present the field is characterised by the twin problem of a mono-method approach to research and scholar–policy disengagement. While mono-method research is often weak in providing comprehensive solutions to social problems, scholar–policy disengagement disconnects the research focus from urgent, real-life policy issues. These problems question the social relevance of communication research in today’s Nigeria. This chapter, therefore, contributes to the

scholarly conversation in this regard by exploring methodological orientation and policy engagement of current communication research in Nigeria. To reaffirm the place of communication research in Nigeria, scholars need to reinvent the practice of identifying policy gaps and of designing their research to fill the gaps. A mixed-method research approach offers multiple and more reliable sources of evidence, which leverage the strengths of quantitative and qualitative research paradigms in finding answers to social problems. It has been found to produce broad-based empirical evidence that is more appealing to policymakers. Communication researchers in Nigeria should maximise this core potential of the design, as its increased adoption will enable them to produce research evidence that is not only appealing to policymakers but is also comprehensive enough to address the country's myriad policy problems.

This is a preview of subscription content, [log in](#) to check access

## References

1. Aluwihare-Samaranayake, D. (2012). Ethics in qualitative research: A view of the participants' and researchers' world from a critical standpoint. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 11(2), 64–81. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
2. Baron, N. (2010). *Escape from the Ivory Tower*. Washington, DC: Island Press. [Google Scholar](#)
3. Brannen, J. (1992). *Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches: An overview*. Aldershot: Avebury. [Google Scholar](#)
4. Brunson, C. (2016). Quantitative methods I: Reproducible research and quantitative geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(5), 687–696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515599625> [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
5. Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Google Scholar](#)
6. Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [Google Scholar](#)
7. Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124–131. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
8. Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage. [Google Scholar](#)
9. Doyle, L., Brady, A., & Byrne, G. (2016). An overview of mixed methods research—Revisited. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 21(8), 623–635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987116674257> [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
10. Feilzer, M. Y. (2010). Doing mixed methods research pragmatically: Implications for the rediscovery of pragmatism as a research paradigm. *Journal of Mixed*

- Methods Research*, 4(1), 6–
16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689809349691>CrossRefGoogle Scholar
  11. Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6), 2134–2156.[CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
  12. Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. London: Sage.[Google Scholar](#)
  13. Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*. University of Toronto, Ontario.[Google Scholar](#)
  14. Guest, G. (2012). Describing mixed methods research: An alternative to typologies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(2), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812461179>CrossRefGoogle Scholar
  15. Guo, S. (2015). Shaping social work science: What should quantitative researchers do? *Research on Social Work Practice*, 25(3), 370–381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731514527517>CrossRefGoogle Scholar
  16. Hesse-Biber, S. (2015). Mixed methods research: The “thing-ness” problem. *Qualitative Health Research*, 25(6), 775–788. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315580558>CrossRefGoogle Scholar
  17. Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 14–26.[CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
  18. Kaplan, B., & Duchon, D. (1988). Combining qualitative and quantitative methods in information system research: A case study. *MIS Quarterly*, 12(4), 571–586.[CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
  19. Kingdon, J. W. (1994). *Agendas, “The policy window and joining the streams” alternatives and public policy* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.[Google Scholar](#)
  20. Kisely, S., & Kendall, E. (2011). Critically appraising qualitative research: A guide for clinicians more familiar with quantitative techniques. *Australasian Psychiatry*, 19(4), 364–367.[CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
  21. Kristine, L., & Florczak, R. N. (2014). Purists need not apply: The case for pragmatism in mixed methods research. *Nursing Science Quarterly*, 27(4), 278–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894318414546419>CrossRefGoogle Scholar
  22. Maxwell, D. (1998, January). Can qualitative and quantitative methods serve complementary purposes for policy research? Evidence from Accra. A Food Consumption and Nutrition Division (FCND) Discussion Paper, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC.[Google Scholar](#)

23. May, T. (Ed.). (2002). *Qualitative research in action*. London: Sage. [Google Scholar](#)
24. Mukhopadhyay, S., & Gupta, R. K. (2014). Survey of qualitative research methodology in strategy research and implication for Indian researchers. *Vision*, 18(2), 109–123. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
25. ODI. (2009). *Helping researchers become policy entrepreneurs: How to develop engagement strategies for evidence-based policy-making*. ODI Briefing Paper 53. [Google Scholar](#)
26. Ojebode, A., & Akingbulu, A. (2009). Community radio advocacy in democratic Nigeria: Lessons for theory and practice. *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies*, 30(2), 204–218. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
27. Ojebuyi, B. R., & Ojebode, A. (2011). Moving beyond numerals: A meta-analysis of research methods and theoretical application in media gatekeeping studies. *Journal of Arts and Education*, 5(1), 165–181. [Google Scholar](#)
28. Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2005). Taking the “Q” out of research: Teaching research methodology courses without the divide between quantitative and qualitative paradigms. *Quality & Quantity*, 39, 267–296. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
29. Pielke, A. R. (2007). *The honest broker: Making sense of science in policy and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
30. Say for Development. (2016). Engaging communities during development research: A conversation with Dr. Ayobami Ojebode. Retrieved from <http://www.sayfordevelopment.net/engaging-communities-during-development-research-a-conversation-with-dr-ayobami-ojebode/>
31. Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage. [Google Scholar](#)
32. Smith, M. L., & Kleine, P. L. (1986). Qualitative research and evaluation: Triangulation and multi-methods reconsidered. In D. D. Williams (Ed.), *Naturalistic evaluation (New directions for program evaluation)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. [Google Scholar](#)
33. Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). The past and future of mixed methods research: From Data triangulation to mixed model designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research* (pp. 671–701). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [Google Scholar](#)
34. Thurmond, A. V. (2001). The point of triangulation. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33(3), 253–258. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)

35. UNDP. (2016). *National Human Development Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.ng.undp.org/content/nigeria/en/home/library/poverty/national-human-development-report-2016.html>
36. Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2011). *Mass media research: An introduction* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. [Google Scholar](#)
37. Young, R. (2005). Research, policy and practice: Why developing countries are different. *Journal of International Development*, 17, 727–734. [CrossRef](#) [Google Scholar](#)

## Copyright information

© The Author(s) 2018

## About this chapter

### Cite this chapter as:

Ojebode A., **Ojebuyi B.R.**, Oladapo O.A., Oyedele O.J. (2018) Mono-Method Research Approach and Scholar–Policy Disengagement in Nigerian Communication Research. In: Mutsvairo B. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Media and Communication Research in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham

- **DOI:** [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70443-2\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70443-2_20)
- **Publisher Name:** Palgrave Macmillan, Cham
- **Print ISBN:** 978-3-319-70442-5
- **Online ISBN:** 978-3-319-70443-2