Culturally Responsive Research Design as Complement to Hegemonic Paradigms in the Comparative, International, Development Educational Context

María M. San Cristóbal G.[1]

[1] MA – Med, Faculty of Sciences of Education, University of Talca, Linares, Chile

Correspondence: María M. San Cristóbal G., MA – Med, Faculty of Sciences of Education, University of Talca, Linares, Chile. E-mail: msancristobal@utalca.cl

Received: October13, 2020 Accepted: July 18, 2022 Online Published: July 20, 2022

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v11n4p220 URL: https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v11n4p220

Abstract

Despite profuse research on the matter, the widely acknowledged gap between educational research and teaching/learning practices suggests that considering the cultural cannons of participants under research remains an issue -among others- when addressing the legitimization of knowledge production in Comparative, International, Developing, Educational (CIDE) contexts. Such premise acquires further relevance for initiatives conducted with research participants whose voices are commonly marginalized in the process of designing research instruments, including the youth and children. The present paper aims at analyzing the importance of conducting CIDE research from a culturally responsive approach, and to illustrate that research strategies which bridge the either hegemonic or alternative research dichotomy contribute the legitimacy of knowledge production in contexts including underage subjects. A small-scale pilot research was internationally implemented with two teenage students and two educational researchers from developed and undeveloped contexts to use their epistemologies as input for the design of a data-collection method. Results suggest that omitting the views of participants in the process of research design can risk the legitimacy of knowledge production, and that complementary approaches contribute better the validity of studies conducted in the field of Social Sciences.

Keywords: educational research, legitimacy, marginalized, epistemologies

1. Introduction

The problem of legitimization of knowledge that is exclusively produced from a hegemonic perspective (e.g., Westernized), in Comparative, International, and Development Educational (CIDE) contexts has been widely discussed the last decades. For instance, Smith (2005) emphasizes that a unitary system supporting knowledge production cannot be hegemonized but only certain guidelines, because:

Some knowledges are actively in competition with each other, and some can only be formed in association with others. Whilst there may not be a unitary system, there are 'rules' which help make sense of what is contained within the archive and enable 'knowledge' to be recognized. (…) academic debate in the West takes place within these rules. (pp. 2-3)

Despite the acknowledgement of this problem, CIDE research has been commonly addressed by hegemonic powers in binary opposites such as the "self/other, colonizer/colonized, center/ periphery, developed/developing, north/south, first world/third world" (Bagele, 2012:75), which is said to risk the value of epistemological nuances of individuals and communities, by "essentializing, universalizing and even homogenizing differences of members in a specific category" (Dube, 2002 cit. in Bagele: 75), and by regarding cultures themselves as "fixed and homogenous" (Raveaud, 2016:244). Accordingly, considering the worldviews and cultural cannons of the individuals and/or communities under research can be pivotal to discuss the problem of legitimization of knowledge production in CIDE contexts, as we will explore in the present paper.

The need to address this problem finds ground in different approximations related to educational research. First, within the field of Social Sciences, the broad scope of the concept of Culture demands any research practice to be conducted as contextualized as possible. However, such understanding may not always find coherent implementation.

As Raveaud (2016) explains, addressing the concept of Culture in research can many times be based anthropologically rather than ethnographically. The latter representing a more contextualized practice as it "highlights the degree of coherence that characterizes (…) practices and representations in a given cultural context" (Raveaud, 2016: 244). Secondly, bearing that highly specialized skills are required to conduct research projects, there is a potential risk that educational research mostly relies on hegemonic approaches, including the design of methods and instruments that research participants will interact with. In other words, their voices may not be considered in the development of mechanisms that they will be subjected to, unless there is particular care to do so. Not considering the individual epistemologies of research participants in the design of projects could potentially be understood as an open door for bias and contamination of resulting data, as we will explore as well. Thirdly, even though common knowledge may seem obvious (e.g., the need for research paradigms that dialogue with the epistemologies of participants under study), experience has evidenced that applying such common knowledge has not yet been possible to reach thoroughly the field of education, which is illustrated by the widely acknowledged gap between educational research and practice. For instance, concepts such as constructivism and student-centered learning have been studied for nearly a hundred years, yet many classrooms do not seem to foster it neither in developed nor undeveloped school settings, unless specific teaching strategies applicable to different disciplines are discussed. Hence the relevance for exploring approaches that bridge the either hegemonic or alternative research dichotomy in the specific stages of the process that research participants will interact with, so that researchers are able to explore epistemologies that could greatly vary from theirs, as in the case of teenage school students; just in a similar manner in which very little about how students learn in the reality of the classroom was understood by researchers until "educational psychologists emerged from the laboratory and started using second-order research methods based on the perspective of actual students and teachers", and only then researchers could make "real progress in understanding the processes of learning in Western classrooms" (Watkins, 2007: 312). Likewise, Ball (2007) highlights the need for showing the "connection between what (…) research is doing and what's inside (of classrooms)" in order to contribute practices that are "culturally responsive" as well. Therefore, any light shed on the legitimacy of knowledge production in the field of Social Science may contribute to expand the understanding of educational research itself. Within this scope, this paper aims at analyzing the importance of conducting CIDE research from a culturally responsive approach, and to illustrate that research strategies which bridge the either hegemonic or alternative research dichotomy contribute the legitimacy of knowledge production in contexts including underage subjects.

2. Literature Review

Even though the legitimacy of hegemonic knowledge has been taken for granted for the past centuries, today many post-colonial scholars have challenged it. We will review such shift applied to CIDE research contexts as it follows: 1) Current approaches to hegemonic knowledge production and dissemination as a form of colonialism; 2) Legitimacy of knowledge production; and 3) Concepts and a concrete example that highlights the need for conducting educational research which dialogues with the perspectives of the individuals and communities under study.

2.1 Current Approaches to the Hegemonic Knowledge Production and Dissemination

Madina Tlostanova (2015) approaches social sciences in the "global configuration of knowledge" as an area still "marked by omnipresent coloniality" (p.38). She posits the concept Coloniality of knowledge, as acquainted by Mignolo and Escobar (2009. Cit. in Tlostanova, 2015:39), to illustrate that specific ontologies and models of cognition originated in the Western modernity of the 16th century have universally ruled over other ones:

Coloniality of knowledge is a typically modern syndrome, consisting in the fact that all models of cognition and thinking, seeing, and interpreting the world and the people, the subject-object relations, the organization of disciplinary divisions, entirely depend on the norms and rules created and imposed by Western modernity since the 16th century, and offered to humankind as universal, delocalized, and disembodied. (p.39)

This idea contrasts the historical notion of Colonialism in which "deconstruction of epistemic and discursive grounds of the modern/colonial project", and the "depths of the philosophy of science" are not necessarily addressed to manifest "its dominant colonialist roots" (Idem, p.40). In addition, she uses Castro Gomez (2005)'s idea of "The hubris of the zero-point" to explain why Western epistemologies have imposed over other ones:

Hiding the interconnection of geo-historical location and epistemology and body-racial and gendered epistemic configurations is also a viewpoint grounded in certain languages and categories of thought automatically eliminating anyone who writes and thinks in a different language or uses categories and concepts unknown to the West. (…) in the post-enlightenment world this zero-point epistemology shifted its source and authority from God to Reason (and

from theodicea to ratiodicea) making it possible for specific groups to assume such a secure and undisputed locus of enunciation. (p.41)

Similarly, Alatas (2006) deconstructs the idea of Academic Dependency (from the Dependency theory developed in mid- 20th century), to suggest hegemonic knowledge production and dissemination as a form of colonialism in the field of Social Sciences, or as he calls it, "a form of neo-colonialism":

If in the colonial past, academic imperialism was maintained via colonial power, today academic neo-colonialism is maintained via the condition of academic dependency. The West's monopolistic control and influence over much of Third World social sciences is not determined by colonial power only but rather by the dependence of Third world scholars and intellectuals on Western social science in a variety of ways. (p.61)

One of the ways he mentions is later related to the cultural "consciousness, ideology, norms and values" (pp. 61-62) of a particular social group being imposed to another one when producing knowledge that is to be acknowledged as legitimate in the field of social sciences. In this context, minorities are excluded from important decisions in the research process, including the design of data-collection methodologies. For instance: "Third world social science communities are seen to be dependent to the extent that the definition of problem areas, methods and standards of excellence come from another social science community" (Lumay, 1976, cit. in Alatas, 2006: 62).

2.2 Legitimization of Knowledge

According to Whitehead & McNiff (2006), research validity and legitimacy are two different but interrelated concepts. Whereas validity is about "establishing the truth value, or trustworthiness, of a claim to knowledge", legitimacy regards the "authority of the person who is making the claim to knowledge" (p.97). In this sense, legitimacy also involves questioning "the authority of the regime of truth that can influence what is permitted to count as knowledge within a particular social context" (p.98). Accordingly, they explain that power-constituted contexts have serious implications for the legitimacy of research discourses about and/or performed by minority groups. They illustrate:

In South Africa … whites were deemed superior, and white forms of discourses and logics came to be internalized by non-white communities, and so became the accepted cultural norm. Indigenous knowledge was colonized and subjugated. The same principles underpin research discourses. The social sciences continue to inform the future of educational research, colonizing and subjugating the indigenous knowledge of practitioners. (p.100)

Similarly, Smith (2005) identifies power relations and cultural contexts as pivotal for legitimizing the production of knowledge because research paradigms are not actually real, but socially constructed:

What makes ideas 'real' is the system of knowledge, the formations of culture, and the relations of power in which these concepts are located. What an individual is … is based on centuries of philosophical debate, principles of debate and systems for organizing whole societies predicated on these ideas. These ideas constitute reality (p. 11).

Consequently, it seems relevant to consider the worldviews, cultural paradigms and epistemologies of participants informing research, when thinking about contributing to the legitimacy of knowledge production in the field of Social Sciences. For instance, Hoppers quotes Mohan to explain that understanding a discourse is not only about decoding written and/or oral symbols but that the research semiotics may broaden its scope to the "set of capabilities and socio-cultural resources used by people in the construction of meaning about their world and their activities" (Mohan, 1994, p. 529, cit in Hoppers, 2000:285).

2.3 Need for Research Paradigms That Dialogue with the Epistemologies of Participants under Study

In response to academic neo-colonialism, many have suggested the need for using CIDE research approaches that validate non-hegemonic means of knowledge production and dissemination about and/or done by minority groups, who are not necessarily indigenous ones. Some of these references include concepts like: "Cultural and contextual sensitivity" (Crossley & Watson, 2003), "Culturally centered research" (Vanessa & Christopher, 2013:2190), "Ecology of knowledges" (Santos, 2014), "Epistemologies of the plurality of scientific practices" (Idem, p. 193-194), "Counterhegemonic knowledge" (Idem, p.189), "Dialogic articulation" (Idem, p. 201); and "Placed-based knowledges" (Huaman, 2019: 174). Despite the many differences among these conceptualizations, two major commonalities can be withdrawn. First, all of them advocate for an ideal of Social Justice that looks for "ways in which the voices of the researched communities can be heard" (Bagele, 2012:74). This stance not only concerns an ethical aspect, but also a matter of productivity. For instance, Bagele (2012) illustrates the case of researchers investigating perceptions about AIDS in Botswana, who used Western-homogenizing research methodologies with them. As a result, this approach blocked any connection with the participants' own ontologies, which endangered the

results of the research itself:

The research on HIV-AIDS simply works within the colonially established framework of homogeneity in the search for answers and solutions to the HIV-AIDS pandemic. This leaves out the voices of the researched colonized Other…. The questionnaire survey is a top-down method of collecting data that mirrors the worldview of the researchers or their perception of the topic to be covered (Mukherjee, 1997), blocking any continuity with the researched people's worldview. The questionnaire serves the dominant statistical language and is conceived within the positivist paradigm with its claim of rationality, objectivity, and knowledge as absolute truth… failure to work with the framework and language of the researched means that life and death matters are either not understood or take a long time before they are understood. (pp. 78-80)

Similarly, Hooper (2000) scrutinizes the construction, legitimization, and dissemination of knowledge "in the light of intensifying North-South disparities" (p.284) to claim that it should be understood as "non-neutral", given that two important referents in this analysis are "power and hegemony" (p.285). Accordingly, it is essential for him to acknowledge which different "lenses" (Idem) can operate in its construction to diminish such impact:

To discern the actors in the knowledge dissemination field, and to identify who controls the direction and quality in the knowledge traffic, who controls the traffic lights, and most of all, to what extent the technologies layer new inequalities upon the old. (Kenway, 1996, cit. in Hooper: 285).

This issue draws attention to the second commonality among the conceptualizations listed above: they all serve the purpose of legitimacy in the production of knowledge in Social Studies, including the CIDE research contexts because they all seek "conceptual equivalence" (Watkins, 2007: 313), which has been claimed as necessary to validly "compare the processes of learning across cultures" (Idem).

3. Hypotheses

Understanding and using a particular research paradigm has been considered controversial in the field of educational research (Kivunja and Bawa, 2017). One of the major aspects that contributes to such confusion is that features of different paradigms may overlap to one another:

To think about a paradigm as a worldview or epistemological stance does not preclude the cross-over of ideas. Thus, no matter the position we start from, how we know and go about knowing is linked, or overlaps and affects how we conceive and explain paradigms. This is a major contributor to the confusion in the social sciences that HDR students and early career researchers experience in trying to articulate what constitutes the research paradigm for their projects. (p.29).

Just in the way that research paradigms may overlap, this paper suggests that knowledge production could be both at the same time: hegemonic and alternative. Such complementary approach relies on the idea that acknowledging the different lenses operating in a particular research project can contribute to its legitimacy. From this position, this paper aims at analyzing the importance of conducting CIDE research from a culturally responsive approach, and to illustrate the following hypothesis:

Research strategies which bridge the either hegemonic or alternative research dichotomy contribute the legitimacy of knowledge production in contexts including underage subjects.

According to Preston (1997), there are no strict recipes to follow in the selection of a specific research paradigm, and its components (e.g., methodologies) as this can be a "question of preference" (p.50). Similarly, we do know that every step in the decision-making of a research project advocates for particular ideologies to the production of knowledge, whether researchers are aware of it or not. Based on the epistemological proposal of this paper, it seems sensible to conduct research considering participant's own views. Particularly the cultural cannons that informants of research have in producing and sharing information will be considered. Due to the scope of this work, a culturally responsive data-collection instrument has been piloted to illustrate that complementary (rather than exclusive) research approaches, can be conducted.

The draft design of the instrument has been based on Kivunja and Bawa's (2017) question to identify desired methodologies to address a specific paradigm: "How shall I go about obtaining the desired data, knowledge and understandings that will enable me to answer my research question and thus make a contribution to knowledge?" (p.28). From a culturally responsive approach, the answer to the former entails asking participants themselves. Their answers (which may be considered alternative) have been complemented with the views of researchers, whose voices can be considered as hegemonic ones. The following section will detail the steps developed to design, implement, and analyze the results of this initiative.

4. Method

To pilot a culturally responsive educational research design, the following procedure was used:

4.1 Two draft questionnaires to collect data were designed, including one for the young high-school participants and another similar one for the educational researchers. The questionnaires included an item for participants to state their positionalities thus providing a contextual approach to their personal and cultural views. Three questions were included to know the research methodology preference of participants, based on the one suggested by Kivunja and Bawa (2017). These questions were used to scaffold participants' thinking (instead of only one as suggested by the authors) because they may not be familiar with the research topic.

4.2 Validation of the questionnaires was performed by an educational researcher who has worked with high-school students in CIDE research contexts. The specialist recommended three key points:

a) Define what you mean by education research and design mechanisms – I do not feel this language is inclusive or helpful for High School students who may have no contact with the world of education research let alone know how to contextualize the terminology used in this survey to answer the questions adequately and honestly.

b) Make the language more accessible, simplify it and keep in mind the audience being asked.

c) Ask why people wish to be contacted in the ways they indicate, that in and of itself may give you information on your audience

Based on these suggestions, the questionnaires were adapted, and a new question was included (see Appendices A-B for complete proof of the final validated questionnaires).

4.3 Inferences: Before asking participants for their input, inferences for possible outcomes were that -due to cultural differences, answers 2-5 of the questionnaires would differ as it follows:

a. One difference between the answers of the high-school students.

b. One difference between the answers of the educational researchers.

c. One difference between the answers of the students and the researchers

Each of these will be addressed in section 5. Results.

4.4 Obtaining permissions: Interview code of ethics and informed consents were used to explain the context and outcome of this research, inform participants about their rights to anonymity, confidentiality, and comment, and to inform them about the use of the final report resulting from the interview, as well as the procedures to be used during their participation. In the case of the underage participants, the consent of one of their parents was necessary to proceed.

4.5 Collecting data: the educational researchers and teenage school students from both, developed and undeveloped contexts, answered the validated questionnaires, in written form. Codes were assigned to identify them and maintain their anonymity, as it follows:

a. 01: High-school student from a developed context

b. 02: High-school student from an undeveloped context

c. 03: Educational Researcher from a developed context

d. 04: Educational Researcher from an undeveloped context

(See Appendice C, table C.1 for complete proof of the tabulated answers).

3. Results

Differences and commonalities in the answers of the participants were identified. Each of the inferences stated in section 4.3 will be addressed below:

Inference a: One difference between the answers of the high-school students.

-For questions two and three their choices were alike.

-Answers for question four differed in that the student from the developed context expressed concerns about possible scenarios when collecting information e.g.: *"If people have follow up questions they can ask and I might need clarification on a question",* whereas the student from the undeveloped context articulated his answer around analyzing his personal traits e.g.: *"The reason of my choice is my way of thinking and personality because I am a*

person who likes to be addressed directly".

-Answers for question five also differed in that the student of the developed context concerns about respecting participants' views and experiences when informing research, whereas the student of the undeveloped context concerns more about fostering dialogic scenarios when collecting information. In addition, the latter student makes a judgement by saying that if dialogic scenarios where omitted, interviewers would remain *"ignorant".*

In summary, the two differences identified validate the first inference stated.

Inference b: One difference between the answers of the educational researchers.

-For question two their choices were alike.

-For question three, their answers were partially similar. The researcher from a developed context chose all the options available when thinking about the best way to share information if asked, whereas the researcher from the undeveloped context only chose *"to speak to the person who asks."*

-Answers for question four differ greatly in that the researcher from the developed context offered a relative perspective in which choosing a specific mechanism to share information depends on several aspects, such as: keeping participants safe in terms of how they feel (e.g., *"comfortable"*); the aim of the research and nature of questions; institutional protocols, and *"potential problems"*. In contrast, the researcher from the undeveloped context concerns about time-management.

-Even though the researcher from the developed context addresses more aspects to consider when asking for information before asking (e.g., cultural awareness, *"outcome of the research", "possible disruptions",* and adaptability of research methodologies selected), answers for this question (five) find two commonalities: a special care not to bias the results of research, and a respectfully approach to participants, so that they feel comfortable.

Overall, answers for questions three and five illustrate that both researchers share many views when selecting appropriate data-collection methodologies. However, the answer to question four, combined with the partial differences in answers three and five, clearly validate inference b).

Inference c: One difference between the answers of the students and the researchers

-For question two there is a clear difference between what the students and researchers think. The two students agree that the best way to approach high schoolers to obtain information from them is by having an informal conversation with the participant before. However, both researchers agree that the best way is to speak to the person who asks.

-In question three are almost no differences because all participants agree that the best way to ask for information is by talking to the person directly. Only the researcher from the developed context includes other possible answers, depending on the circumstances of the research and participants.

-Answers for question four greatly vary among all participants as all of them provide their own open-ended reasons for the previous answer (to question three).

-The only visible similarity in the answers for question five implies that awareness of the participants' perspectives and wellbeing is important when retrieving information from them (e.g., cultural contexts and making research participants feel comfortable). Other than that, the answers of participants 02, 03 and 04 differ in that they suggest the need for a dialogic encounter (participant 02), preventing biases (participants 03 and 04), and considering the *"outcome of the research", "possible disruptions"*, and adaptability of research methodologies selected (participant 03).

Thus, all these differences in the answers of students and researchers validate the third inference presented.

4. Discussion

The implications of what has been described as Colonialism of knowledge (Tlostanova, 2015) have been clarified as determining in the discussion about the legitimacy of knowledge production. In this type of colonialism, hegemonic views are imposed over non-hegemonic ones due to power interactions that do not always follow the guidelines of reason and logics, but rather political or economic influences. Advocating for such dynamics can be particularly concerning in Educational Research as this field addresses the study of human interactions, which are clearly influenced by individuals' own cultural paradigms and epistemologies. The results of the minor-scale pilot intervention presented in this paper illustrates how omitting the worldviews of participants, when deciding on the design of methodologies for data-collection, can risk the legitimacy of research; particularly in CIDE research contexts. Especial importance to acknowledging such particularities emerges as necessary if we consider the impact of CIDE research, which informs decision-making in teaching, learning & curriculum policies, at national and

international scales, thus affecting the life and educational development of participants and communities under research themselves. Consequently, a complementary approach to the production of knowledge is suggested not only to honor Social Justice ideals, but also to contribute the validity of studies conducted in the field of Social Sciences. Canonical research could be used in synergy with those called alternative ones to narrow the bridge between epistemological dichotomies, such as Developed/Undeveloped contexts, Theory/Practice or Researchers/Research Participants, among others; to better inform knowledge production and, ultimately, contribute its quality.

References

Alatas, S. F. (2006). Alternative discourses in Asian social science: Responses to Eurocentrism. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Bagele, Ch. (2012). Whose Reality Counts, Research Methods in Question, in Indigenous Research Methodologies, pp. 73-95. Los Angeles, London, New Dheli, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE publications.

Ball, D. L. (2007). The Case for Ed Schools, and the Challenge. American Educational Research Association. Annual meeting. Chicago, Il. Retrieved from http://www.cmcgc.com/Media/Synch/270409/20/default.htm.

Preston, R. (1997). Integrating paradigms in educational research, Issues of quantity and quality in poor countries, in Crossley, M., & Vulliamy, G., Qualitative educational research in developing countries: Issues and experience. pp. 31-64. New York: Routledge.

Crossley, M. & Watson, K. (2003). *Changing research agendas: Issues and priorities, in Comparative and International Research in Education: Globalization, context and difference*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.

Hoppers, C. (2000) The center and periphery in knowledge production in the twenty-first century. *British Association for International and Comparative Education, 30*(3), pp. 283-291. https://doi.org/10.1080/713657471

Huaman, E. (2019). Comparative Indigenous Education Research (CIER): Indigenous Epistemologies and Comparative Education Methodologies. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(12), 2185-2192. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Kivunja & Bawa. (2017). Understanding and Applying Research Paradigms in Educational Contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education, 6*(5), 26-41. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26

Raveaud, M. (2016). Sharing Insights: How culture constructs and constricts knowledge, in Crossley, M., Arthur, L., McNess, E. Revisiting the insider-outsider research in comparative and international education. pp. 241-258. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Santos, B. (2014). Ecologies of Knowledges, in Epistemologies of the South. ?: Routledge. pp.188-211.

Smith, L. T. (2005). Decolonizing methodologies. Research and indigenous peoples. London & New York: Zed Books.

Tlostanova, M. (2015). Can the Post-Soviet Think? On Coloniality of Knowledge, External Imperial and Double Colonial Difference. *Intersections: East European Journal of Society and Politics*, *1*(2), 38–58. https://doi.org/10.17356/ieejsp.v1i2.38

Vanessa, W., & Christopher, S. (2013). Adapting Western Research Methods to Indigenous Ways of Knowing. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(12), 2185-2192. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.301157

Watkins, D. (2007). Comparing Ways of Learning, in Bray, Mark, Bob Adamson, and Mark Mason, eds. 2007. *Comparative Education Research*, 299-313. Springer: Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6189-9_13

Whitehead, J. & McNiff, J. (2006). *Action Research Living Theory*. California, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208536

Appendix A

Questionnaire for Research Participants

1. **Personal context**

a. Age:
b. Gender:
c. Cities and/or countries where you have lived before:
d. City and country where you live know:
e. Total years of schooling:
f. Current school grade:
g. Another relevant aspect that you wish to include (optional):

2. **If a researcher wants to retrieve information from you, what is the best way to approach you?**

a. ___ by having an informal conversation with me before
b. ___ a formal letter or email
c. ___ another person should ask me so that I remain anonymous in case I want to say no.
d. Other (s):

3. **For you, what is the best way to share information if somebody asks?**

a. ___ to speak to the person who asks
b. ___ by discussing with others as in a group
c. ___ To write my answers in paper, laptop or other (specify which one below)
d. ___ To use digital media (specify which one below)
e. ___ To have some days to think about the answers first and then share my answers (if you choose this option, you can also select another one)
f. Other (s):

4. **What is the reason for your previous answer?**

5. **In your opinion, what is important that people who want to ask for information consider before they ask?**

Appendix B

Questionnaire for Educational Researchers

1. **Describe your personal context**

a. Age:

b. Gender:

c. Cities and/or countries where you have lived before:

d. City and country where you live know:

e. Total years of Education:

f. Total years as educational researcher:

g. Current occupation:

h. Another relevant aspect that you wish to include (optional):

2. **If a researcher wants to retrieve information from high-school students, what is the best way to approach them?**

a. ___ by having an informal conversation with them before

b. ___ a formal letter or email

c. ___ another person should ask them so that they remain anonymous in case they want to say no.

d. Other (s):

3. **For you, what is the best way for high schoolers to share information if researchers ask?**

a. ___ to speak to the person who asks

b. ___ by discussing with others as in a group

c. ___ To write their answers in paper, laptop or other (specify which one below)

d. ___ To use digital media (specify which one below)

e. ___ To have some days to think about the answers first and then share their answers (if you choose this option, you can also select another one)

f. Other (s):

4. **What is the reason for your previous answer?**

5. **In your opinion, what is important that people who want to ask for information consider before they ask?**

Appendix C

Table C.1 Tabulation of Answers

Participants/ Questions	**High School Student Developed Context**	**High School Student Undeveloped Context**	**Educational Researcher Developed Context**	**Educational Researcher Undeveloped Context**
1	16 years old Female Has lived and lives now in Toronto-Ontario (Canada) 13 years of schooling Current grade: 10th	17 years old Male Has lived in Talca and Cauquenes (Chile) Now lives in Cauquenes Current grade: 11th grade	Prefers not to provide age Female Has lived in Montreal-Winnipeg (Canada) Now lives in Toronto-Ontario (Canada) Approx. 20 years of education Current occupation: Research Funding Officer, University of Toronto Another relevant aspect that you wish to include (optional): First course in a master's program	33 years old Female Has lived in Talca and Concepción, in Chile Now lives in Toronto, Canada Approx. 23,5 years of education Current occupation: Graduate student in the Master of Education, Curriculum and Pedagogy, university of Toronto Another relevant aspect that you wish to include (optional): I've been a teacher for 10 years
2	By having an informal conversation with me before	By having an informal conversation with me before	Another person should ask them so that they remain anonymous in case they want to say no	Another person should ask them so that they remain anonymous in case they want to say no
3	To speak to the person who asks	To speak to the person who asks	To speak to the person who asks By discussing with others as in a group To write my answers in paper, laptop or other To use digital media To have some days to think about the answers first and then share my answers	To speak to the person who asks
4	If people have follow up questions they can ask and I might need clarification on a question	The reason is that is my way of thinking and personality because I am a person who likes to be addressed directly	I chose many options because there could be many variables. Some students might not feel comfortable discussing topics in a group. What are the exact research questions? Perhaps the interaction should be	For me it's better in terms of the use of my time

			more anonymous, so you use online surveys, or maybe you are also studying their reactions so one-on-one would be appropriate. But always, the researcher needs to reach out to the school first to gain knowledge of any protocols, and potential problems.	
5	That I will answer your question from my perspective, my thoughts and possibly from my own experiences	Yes, because if this person talks without knowing can be regarded as ignorant. In contrast, if (the person) asks he or she could clarify several doubts that may have.	Not in any order: 1) To have some idea of the history and current situations; 2) Know their own limits, bias (reflexivity); 3) Be aware of their own culture, educational background in comparison to the subject (positionality); 4) What are the outcomes to be for this research? Do you have a contingency plan for any possible disruptions?; 5) Consider whether you need time to enmesh yourself more in the culture you may be studying; 6) Think of which methodology is the most appropriate, but be prepared that the research may need to be approached differently once you begin; 7) See if you can work with other researchers from different backgrounds, and work with researchers from different disciplines if possible and; 8) Be respectful, always.	How I feel more comfortable. Also, that my answers are not biased by the relationship that I may have with who is asking.