

# **Sustaining and transforming collaborative research: Principles and practices**

**Catherine H. Arden, Patrick Alan Danaher, Linda De George-Walker, Robyn Henderson, Warren Midgley, Karen Noble  
& Mark A. Tyler**

*It is much easier to talk and write rhetorically about the benefits of collaborative research than it is to enact those benefits in the actions and outcomes of a sustainable research team. This is hardly surprising: all manner of obstacles confront those seeking to conduct and publish research in contemporary Australian universities. Some of these obstacles are institutional and systemic, such as academic work intensification and heightened accountability and surveillance. Perhaps even more significant are the challenges related to the conceptual, ideological and phenomenological dimensions of research teams. Yet these obstacles and challenges must be confronted if genuinely sustainable and potentially transformative research teams are to occur. This chapter distils several selected principles and suggests associated practices of sustainable and transformative collaborative research, which in turn constitute a framework for interrogating the examples of collaborative research outlined in the remaining chapters in the book.*

## **Introduction**

*Sustaining Synergies: Collaborative Research and Researching Collaboration* explores several contemporary expectations and experiences of collaboration in research and research about collaboration. At a time when the Excellence in Research for Australia initiative is framing research actions and outcomes in Australian universities, with the equivalent Research Assessment Exercise and the Performance Based Research Funding scheme operating respectively in the United Kingdom and New Zealand, it is crucial to examine some of the current challenges and opportunities attending education researchers in order to elicit strategies that have proved to be effective in generating collaborative and sustainable research endeavours.

This book fulfils this need by focusing on the activities and achievements of a single research team in a Faculty of Education in an Australian university. The team members exhibit a wide diversity of disciplines, paradigms, methods and research interests, ranging from early childhood education to primary and secondary schooling to vocational education and training to university learning and teaching. At the same time, we demonstrate the strengths of multiple and expanding collaborations with one another in designing, conducting and publishing research directed at engaging with several contemporary educational and sociocultural issues.

In particular, the research team encapsulates both the difficulties and the opportunities attached to the operations of academics working in contemporary Australian universities. The team is composed of smaller groups of highly productive individuals who have coalesced into a larger entity for the purposes of economies of scale and capacity-building and with the encouragement of faculty administrators. The book charts some of the uncertainty felt by team members about the team's eventual success as well as a number of specific strategies deployed to maximise the prospect of that success. The book is therefore in part the story of our development as a sustainable and sustaining research team.

The chapters in the book address three key questions that derive from focusing on team-based education research and publishing in contemporary Australian universities:

- What are the different forms that can be taken by effective, efficient and ethical collaborative research?
- What does researching collaboration demonstrate about the character and effectiveness of that collaboration?
- How can collaborative research and researching collaboration generate sustaining synergies for Australian university researchers?

In addressing these questions, the book presents a set of accounts by Australian education researchers that have wider relevance and significance. In particular, they elicit and demonstrate a set of practical strategies, underpinned by philosophical and methodological principles that it is hoped will be useful to university research teams in Australia and internationally in generating substantial outcomes and in sustaining research synergies.

### **Background**

Collaborative research is a growing phenomenon in several disciplines, including health (Moffitt, Mordoch, Wells, Martin Misener, McDonagh, & Edge, 2009; Wan, 2010; Poole, Egan, & Iqbal, 2009), library studies (Zhang, 2008), nursing (Engelke & Marshburn, 2006; Priest, Segrott, Green, & Rout, 2007), political science (McDermott & Hatemi, 2010), science (Wray, 2006), social work (Lewis, DiNitto, McRoy, Shorkey, Spence, & White, 2008), sociology (Hunter & Leahey, 2008) and teacher education (Christie & Menter, 2009), as well as on an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary basis (Ryser, Halseth, & Thien, 2009; Stokols, 2006; Stokols, Harvey, Gress, Fuqua, & Phillips, 2005). Likewise, collaborative research has been interrogated from numerous theoretical perspectives, including critical theory (Atweh & Bland, 2007), ethics (NIMH Collaborative HIV/STD Prevention Trial Group, 2007; Roth, 2007) and feminism (Scantlebury, 2007).

This increased emphasis on collaborative research across such a wide range of disciplines and perspectives contains possible multiple benefits and seeds of potential discord alike. Whether the outcome is one or the other or a combination of the two is not readily predicted but instead depends on a range of intricate and situated factors that are simultaneously individual, institutional, systemic, national and global. Many of these factors are related to the continuing complexity and the ongoing intensification of the work and identities of university academics and researchers (Deem & Lucas, 2007), which have been variously depicted as a “messy experience” (Malcolm & Zukas, 2009, p. 495), an “academic identity schism” (Winter, 2009, p. 121), “a general increase in and diversification of the forms of control exercised over academics” (Musselin, 2007, p. 5), “a simultaneous blurring of boundaries” (Krause, 2009, p. 413), “constituting the academic performer” and thereby representing “the spectre of superficiality and stagnation in academia” (Gendron, 2008, p. 97), an uneven conflict between “the entrepreneurial orientation” and “the academic calling” in contemporary universities (Hakala, 2009, p. 173) and being akin to a game of “ring a ring o’ roses” that requires “a Tinkerbell Solution” to decide whether or not the game is “worth playing” (Kam, 2007, p. 640).

These possibilities and problems certainly exercise the members of the research team who have written the chapters in this book – the Capacity-Building, Pedagogy and Social Justice Research Team in the Faculty of Education at the Toowoomba campus of the University of Southern Queensland, Australia. As noted above, and as the successive chapters demonstrate, we have arrived at the common staging-post of forming the team and writing the book from widely divergent disciplinary, methodological and theoretical backgrounds. Despite that diversity, we share several features, including a mutual regard, a commitment to understanding and enacting collaborative research, a desire for our research to connect with

multiple stakeholders and contribute to current educational and sociocultural debates, and a consciousness of the politicised character of contemporary research teams in general and ours specifically.

In this first chapter in the book, we begin to explore the notion of sustaining synergies that forms the book's central focus. After a necessarily selective literature review about research teams and collaboration, we elicit some principles and suggest some practices that we consider vital to the important process of sustaining and transforming collaborative research. We conclude by explaining how those principles and practices are taken up in the remaining chapters and by providing an overview of the book's structure.

### **Literature review**

There is widespread consensus that collaboration is essential for research (see Ritchie & Rigano, 2007a, 2007b; Smith, 2001). What, however, is collaborative research? Kezar (2005) drew on the literature in organisational studies to highlight three key aspects of most definitions of the term *collaboration*. Firstly, there are people, both researchers and other stakeholders, who are involved in a project. Secondly, there is a common purpose, sometimes expressed in a set of shared rules, for the project. Thirdly, collaboration involves the pooling of resources, which might include such items as finances, skills and time. These might be summarised as the *who*, the *why* and the *what* of collaborative research. Kezar added to this by seeking to identify the *how*. She argued that collaboration was an interactive process that occurred over time.

Even if we accept this definition of collaboration, the question still remains as to what constitutes *collaborative research*. There are many research papers published on research about collaboration. For example, Angelides, Stylianou and Leigh (2007) reported on research into the effectiveness of collaborative networks amongst pre-service teacher trainees. Bhavnagri and Bielat (2005) published their research into the effectiveness of collaboration between lecturers and librarians. Similar studies have been produced by Stevenson, Duran, Barrett and Colarulli (2005) on collaboration among faculty teaching staff; Wang, Dannenhoffer, Davidson and Spector (2005) on cross-institutional collaboration; and Crow, Smith and Keenan (2006) on collaboration between university- and hospital-based teaching staff.

Another body of research investigates the concept of collaboration between researchers and the researched. For example, Bowl (2008) argued against practices that exclude the researched from the research process. Haig-Brown (2001) investigated ethical issues relating to collaboration between universities and communities. In a similar vein, Zigo (2001) suggested reciprocity in research as a means of narrowing the power gaps that might emerge between researcher and participants.

The focus of this book is not just research *about* collaboration, but more specifically research *as* a collaborative endeavour. The literature about this narrower field is less extensive. One aspect that has been investigated includes issues relating to the management and organisation of collaborative research. Kezar (2005) noted eight core elements of establishing and implementing successful collaborative research at an institutional level: mission, integrating structures, campus networks, rewards, a sense of priority from senior leaders, external pressure, values and learning. These all have an impact upon management decisions. According to Smith (2001), there are at least three different kinds of research collaboration to be considered from an organisational perspective: inter-personal, team to team and corporate partnerships. These all need to be managed differently. There are a number of inherent tensions involved in the process of collaborating at these levels and therefore management of collaborative research is problematic. The evidence suggests that collaborative research does not respond well to top-down policy drivers (Smith, 2001).

The published research that aligns most closely with the approach of this book includes case studies of attempts at collaborative research, and the reflections of participants upon those processes and their outcomes. There are several key themes that can be drawn from this literature. One theme that is evident in many of these works is the importance of developing positive and supporting relationships. An effective collaborative research team creates a “caring environment” (Tynan & Garbett, 2007, p. 420) that “encourages creativity and risk-taking” (Ritchie & Rigano, 2007a, p. 129). It develops “a space of belonging where all team members are accepted and welcomed” (McGinn, Shields, Manley-Casimir, Grundy & Fenton, 2005, p. 551). Sometimes it may involve “previously established affective bonds” (Blumer, Green, Murphy, & Palmanteer, 2007, p. 44). The literature strongly suggests that these kinds of affective factors are important dimensions of effective collaborative research.

Affective factors are not the only aspect of relationships that are mentioned in the literature. Blumer et al. (2007) highlighted the importance of considering team members’ strengths and vulnerabilities. They also noted the complexity of maintaining multiple relational roles and levels within the team. McGinn et al. (2005) developed a comprehensive statement of principles to capture a common understanding and agreement on the terms of relating within their group. Seeking to build what they called *solidarity through collaborative research*, Ritchie and Rigano (2007a) suggested that, as well as the affective dimension of shared emotional experiences, successful collaborative research teams establish and maintain bodily co-presence (or group assembly), barriers to outsiders and a mutual focus of attention.

Factors that negatively affect collaborative research are also noted in the literature. Failed attempts at achieving this kind of solidarity can result in an outright rejection of all future attempts to collaborate (Ritchie & Rigano, 2007a). Some cultural norms and beliefs about social relationships might impinge on developing effective horizontal relationships of solidarity also. Despite the best of intentions, authorship rights over collaborative works can still be an issue in teams and partnerships (Tynan & Garbett, 2007; Wray, 2006). Other negative influencing factors noted include the pressure to perform, the lack of finances (Tynan & Garbett, 2007) and the inability of some team members to agree to a team’s basic principles for working together (McGinn et al., 2005).

In the chapters that follow, some of these positive and negative aspects are explored in more depth, in the context of a team of education researchers who decided to collaborate on a project investigating the concept of collaborative research. We turn now to elaborate some of the principles and practices that can frame such research and help to maximise its beneficial outcomes.

### **Principles and practices of collaborative research**

We begin this elaboration of selected principles and practices of collaborative research by referring to the useful list of criteria for such research compiled by Ritchie (2007) as part of his project of theorising research collaborations. He contended that what “set [this collection of contributions] apart from other major publications on collaboration” was “an emphasis on solidarity and emotional energy, as well as considering particular dialectical approaches to understanding collaboration” (p. 1). He argued that “Partners in [a] ... collaboration can experience a profound sense of bonding or *solidarity* during the creation of a new vision through successful interactions. Solidarity is a feeling of membership or belonging to a group of interlocutors ...” (p. 4; *emphasis in original*). Furthermore, “Generally, successful interactions between participants lead to the production of positive emotional energy ... in individuals and collective effervescence from the group” (p. 5). Moreover:

At the individual level, interactions are stratified in terms of member involvement, and the outcomes of emotional energy and solidarity .... This means the outcomes from

interactions are likely to be different for individuals within large groups or research teams. (p. 5)

Ritchie (2007) exemplified some of these differences by reference to a four-member research team to which he belonged and to which members contributed according to their previous relationships with one or two (but not all three) of their fellow team members and their current circumstances (such as their physical proximity to one another). He summarised his preliminary theorisation of research collaboration as follows:

Within collaborative research teams, researchers' intersubjectivities are made available to the collective for possible subsequent actions as practices are produced and reproduced. During successful face-to-face interactions within teams, researchers experience positive emotional energy and build solidarity that could be stratified according to the interactive patterns within the research team. (p. 7)

We have devoted this level of attention to Ritchie's (2007) account for two reasons: his edited collection of chapters is the closest that we have encountered to this book in terms of focus and purpose; and we find considerable resonance between his preliminary theorisation and our proposed principles and practices of collaborative research. From that perspective, we are pleased to include *solidarity*, *emotional energy* and *stratified interactions* among those principles and practices. In addition, we have selected the following as preliminary candidates for inclusion, on the basis that they provide credible grounds for facilitating collaborative research that is also sustainable and transformative.

- Collaborative research needs to be *ethical*, by which we mean that team members' interactions with one another and the other participants and stakeholders in their research must be clearly and demonstrably based on ideals of mutual respect, beneficence and facilitation.
- Collaborative research needs to be *reflexive*, by which we mean that team members must be willing and able to submit their interactions and relationships to ongoing scrutiny to monitor the impact and effectiveness of their collaboration.
- Collaborative research needs to be *scholarly*, by which we mean that team members must be committed to engaging in and publishing research about their interactions and relationships, in order to share their experiences and reflections with interested others.
- Collaborative research needs to be *sustainable*, by which we mean that the benefits and outcomes of such research must exceed the labour and other inputs required to undertake and publish the research.
- Collaborative research needs to be *synergistic*, by which we mean that insights and understandings gleaned from the activities of the research must be genuinely collective and unattainable by individuals or dyads.
- Collaborative research needs to be *transformative*, by which we mean that team members must be committed to positive and productive change within the team as well as in their interactions with multiple others.

We acknowledge that in this list we have made no explicit distinction between principles and practices. Indeed, we see each of these principles aligning with specific practices arising from particular circumstances and contexts, rather than our being able – or wishing – to prescribe them. On the other hand, each of the subsequent chapters takes up one or more of these principles and demonstrates its or their operation in situated practice. Furthermore, our synthesis of the principles above begins to address the three questions posed in the introduction to this chapter – questions to which we return in the final chapter.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has distilled several selected principles and mooted associated practices of sustainable and transformative collaborative research. We see those principles and practices

as helping to constitute a framework for interrogating the examples of collaborative research outlined in the remaining chapters in the book. That is, with varying degrees of explicitness the principles and practices elaborated here underpin the multiple conceptual and methodological resources and the empirical examples encountered in the following chapters. They are also revisited in the final chapter in connection with the three questions introduced earlier in this opening chapter.

In Chapter 2, Robyn and Karen employ contemporary Mandala theory to examine their own research relationship and to consider a process for mapping constraints and enablers in the construction of a research community. Warren and Patrick use Chapter 3 to explore various conceptualisations of capacity-building vis-à-vis notions of risk that have a varying impact on the likely success – or otherwise – of individual research teams. Chapter 4 is the vehicle for Karen, Robyn and Patrick to unpack the intended nexus between research collaborations and social action through reference to the concept of collective mindfulness.

In Chapter 5, Mark and Linda present findings from their analysis of a collaborative concept map created by the research team members to highlight some of the less tangible and immediately evident aspects of their interactions. Catherine, Mark and Patrick reflect in Chapter 6 on their first exercise in authorial collaboration and evaluate its utility at the time and its continued relevance to their collaboration. Chapter 7 enables Warren, Robyn and Patrick to consider their recent relationship as doctoral student and supervisors from the perspective of superaddressees.

In Chapter 8, Robyn and Warren pose a number of questions related to the ethics of collaborative research, particularly connected with relational ethics. At least some of those questions are taken up in Chapter 9 by Linda, Catherine and Patrick, who explicate their responses to the statements “To me, good research is ...”; “My research benefits ...”; and “Ethical collaborative research involves ...” Finally, all of us reassemble in Chapter 10 to reflect on the intervening issues in writing a collaborative research book and what that might mean for sustaining a synergistic research team; we also revisit the three questions and the proposed principles and practices outlined in this chapter.

Each chapter, including this one, concludes with some suggested strategies for sustaining synergies as well as with some further reading. The strategies are intended to facilitate focused discussion and to highlight differences as well as similarities between the readers’ research teams and this one. This is in the spirit of ongoing conversation and dialogue. We would be delighted to learn how your research teams operate and the principles and practices that you find useful in animating and enacting them, just as we have found it useful – and at times challenging – to examine our collaborative research and our efforts to research collaboration, thereby helping to sustain our and others’ synergies.

## References

- Angelides, P., Stylianou, T., & Leigh, J. (2007). The efficacy of collaborative networks in preparing teachers. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(2), 135-149.
- Atweh, B. & Bland, D. (2007). A critical theory perspective on research collaboration. In S. M. Ritchie (Ed.), *Research collaboration: Relationships and praxis* (pp. 189-202). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Bhavnagri, N. P. & Bielat, V. (2005). Faculty–librarian collaboration to teach research skills: Electronic symbiosis. *The Reference Librarian*, 43(89), 121-138.
- Blumer, M. L. C., Green, M. S., Murphy, M. J., & Palmanteer, D. (2007). Creating a collaborative research team. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 19(1), 41-55.
- Bowl, M. (2008). Working for change in higher education: The possibilities for collaborative research. *Critical Studies in Education*, 49(2), 185-198.

- Christie, D. & Menter, I. (2009, November). Research capacity building in teacher education: Scottish collaborative approaches. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 35(4), 337-354.
- Crow, J., Smith, L., & Keenan, I. (2006). Journeying between the Education and Hospital Zones in a collaborative action research project. *Educational Action Research*, 14(2), 287-306.
- Deem, R. & Lucas, L. (2007, July). Research and teaching culture in two contrasting UK policy contexts: Academic life in education departments in five English and Scottish universities. *Higher Education*, 54(1), 114-133.
- Engelke, M. K. & Marshburn, D. M. (2006, March). Collaborative strategies to enhance research and evidence-based practice. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 36(3), 131-135.
- Gendron, Y. (2008, May). Constituting the academic performer: The spectre of superficiality and stagnation in academia. *European Accounting Review*, 17(1), 97-127.
- Haig-Brown, C. (2001). Continuing collaborative knowledge production: Knowing when, where, how and why. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22(1), 19-32.
- Hakala, J. (2009, February). The future of the academic calling? Junior researchers in the entrepreneurial university. *Higher Education*, 57(2), 173-190.
- Hunter, L. & Leahey, E. (2008, December). Collaborative research in sociology: Trends and contributing factors. *The American Sociologist*, 39(4), 290-306.
- Kam, J. (2007, June). Ring a ring o' roses: Quality journals and gamesmanship in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(4), 640-655.
- Kezar, A. (2005). Redesigning for collaboration within higher education institutions: An exploration into the developmental process. *Research In Higher Education*, 46(7), 831-860.
- Krause, K.-L. (2009). Interpreting changing academic roles and identities in higher education. In M. Tight, K. H. Mok, J. Huisman & C. C. Morphey (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of higher education* (pp. 413-426). New York: London.
- Lewis, C. M., DiNitto, D., McRoy, R. G., Shorkey, C., Spence, R., & White, B. (2008, December). Impact of a NIDA research development program in a school of social work. *Social Work Research*, 32(4), 269-274.
- Malcolm, J. & Zukas, M. (2009, October). Making a mess of academic work: Experience, purpose and identity. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(5), 495-506.
- McDermott, R. & Hatemi, P. K. (2010). Emerging models of collaboration in political science: Changes, benefits, and challenges. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 43(1), 49-58.
- McGinn, M. K., Shields, C., Manley-Casimir, M., Grundy, A. L., & Fenton, N. (2005). Living ethics: A narrative of collaboration and belonging in a research team. *Reflective Practice*, 6(4), 551-567.
- Moffitt, P. M., Mordoch, E., Wells, C., Martin Misener, R., McDonagh, M. K., & Edge, D. S. (2009, April-June). From sea to shining sea: Making collaborative rural research work. *Rural and Remote Health*, 9(2), 1156-1166.
- Musselin, C. (2007). *The transformation of academic work: Facts and analysis*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California Berkeley.
- NIMH Collaborative HIV/STD Prevention Trial Group. (2007, April). Ethical issues in the NIMH collaborative HIV/STD prevention trial. *AIDS*, 21, 569-580.
- Poole, G., Egan, J. P., & Iqbal, I. (2009, March). Innovation in collaborative health research training: The role of active learning. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 23(2), 148-155.
- Priest, H., Segrott, J., Green, B., & Rout, A. (2007). Harnessing collaboration to build nursing research capacity: A research team journey. *Nurse Education Today*, 27(6), 577-587.

- Ritchie, S. M. (2007). Studying research collaborations. In S. M. Ritchie (Ed.), *Research collaboration: Relationships and praxis* (pp. 1-11). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Ritchie, S. M. & Rigano, D. L. (2007a). Solidarity through collaborative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(2), 129-150.
- Ritchie, S. M. & Rigano, D. L. (2007b). The emergence of solidarity in collaborative research. In S. M. Ritchie (Ed.), *Research collaboration: Relationships and praxis* (pp. 13-25). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Roth, W.-M. (2007). Solidarity and the ethics of collaborative research. In S. M. Ritchie (Ed.), *Research collaboration: Relationships and praxis* (pp. 27-42). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Ryser, L., Halseth, G., & Thien, D. (2009, May). Strategies and intervening factors influencing student social interaction and experiential learning in an interdisciplinary research team. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(3), 248-267.
- Scantlebury, K. (2007). Pushed back to strength: Maintaining a feminist research agenda in multiple, collaborative teaching/research settings. In S. M. Ritchie (Ed.), *Research collaboration: Relationships and praxis* (pp. 123-132). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Smith, D. (2001). Collaborative research: Policy and the management of knowledge creation in UK universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 55(2), 131-157.
- Stevenson, C. B., Duran, R. L., Barrett, K. A., & Colarulli, G. C. (2005). Fostering faculty collaboration in learning communities: A developmental approach. *Innovative Higher Education*, 30(1), 23-35.
- Stokols, D. (2006, September). Toward a science of transdisciplinary action research. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(1-2), 63-77.
- Stokols, D., Harvey, R., Gress, J., Fuqua, J., & Phillips, K. (2005). In vivo studies of transdisciplinary scientific collaboration: Lessons learned and implications for active living research. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 28(2), 202-213.
- Tynan, B. R. & Garbett, D. L. (2007). Negotiating the university research culture: Collaborative voices of new academics. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(4), 411-424.
- Wan, T. T. H. (2010). Global health research strategies. *International Journal of Public Policy*, 5(2-3), 104-120.
- Wang, X., Dannenhoffer, J. F., Davidson, B. D., & Spector, J. M. (2005). Design issues in a cross-institutional collaboration on a distance education course. *Distance Education*, 26(3), 405-423.
- Winter, R. (2009, May). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31(2), 121-131.
- Wray, K. B. (2006, September). Scientific authorship in the age of collaborative research. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 37(3), 505-514.
- Zhang, W. (2008, August). Is there a role for the library in a student-faculty collaborative research program? *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 15(3), 341-356.
- Zigo, D. (2001). Rethinking reciprocity: Collaboration in labor as a path toward equalizing power in classroom research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(3), 351-365.

### Strategies for sustaining synergies

- Brainstorm and then research multiple definitions of “collaboration” and “collaborative research”; list those definitions most closely related to your research team and reflect on why that is so.



- Discuss your preliminary answers to the three questions outlined here as framing the book.
- Locate your fellow team members and yourself on the academic research and identity landscape depicted in the chapter and consider what that location means for the challenges and opportunities facing your research.
- Elaborate your own set of principles and practices of collaborative research and compare them with the ones listed here.
- Topic for debate: “The proposition that the research team is greater than the sum of its parts is rhetorical rather than realistic.”

### **Further reading**

Adams, S. M., Carter, N. C., Hadlock, C. R., Haughton, D. M., & Sirbu, G. (2008, May).

Proactive encouragement of interdisciplinary research teams in a business school environment: Strategy and results. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 30(2), 153-164.

Anderson, M. S. & Steneck, N. J. (Eds.) (2010, in press). *International research collaborations: Much to be gained, many ways to get in trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Paulus, T., Woodside, M., & Ziegler, M. (2008, June). Extending the conversation: Qualitative research as dialogic collaborative process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(2), 226-243.

Ritchie, S. M. (Ed.) (2007). *Research collaboration: Relationships and praxis*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Wilson, A., Rimpiläinen, S., Skinner, D., Cassidy, C., Christie, D., Coutts, N., & Sinclair, C. (2007, October). Using a Virtual Research Environment to support new models of collaborative and participative research in Scottish education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 16(3), 289-304.