



A Phenomenological Case Study of a Lecturer's Understanding of Himself as an Assessor

by Rose Grant

Abstract

Based on the findings of research conducted as part of a doctoral study aimed at obtaining an understanding of what it means to be an assessor in higher education, this paper outlines the experience of an individual lecturer at a South African university and describes the meaning he makes of his practice as an assessor within the context of a changing understanding of the nature and purpose of higher education. Making a case for personal agency and innovation as critical qualities in the assessment endeavour, the researcher suggests that, in contrast to a view of education increasingly focused on standardization, accountability and outcomes, student assessment is essentially a human encounter in which the humanity and emotions of both lecturer and student need to be acknowledged.

Introduction

The phenomenon of understanding lies at the heart of the qualitative enquiry enterprise. (Schwandt, 1999, p. 451)

It has been argued that qualitative enquiry aims at understanding what others are doing and saying (Schwandt, 1999, p. 451). In contrast to the verb “to know”, which signals that one has engaged in conscious deliberation and can prove or support a claim, “to understand” is literally to “stand under”: to grasp, to hear, get, catch or comprehend the meaning of something (ibid., p. 452).

In keeping with this tradition, phenomenology – the study of the lifeworld as we immediately experience it, rather than as we conceptualise, categorise or reflect upon it – “aims at gaining a deeper *understanding* of the nature of everyday experience” (van Manen, 1997, p. 9). Since there is no such thing as “objective” truth for the phenomenologist, for

whom to do research is rather to question the way we experience the world (ibid.), the phenomenological method attempts “to discover and account for the presence of meanings in the stream of consciousness” (Giorgi, 1985, p. 6).

This paper is based on the findings of research conducted as part of a doctoral study in which the researcher set out to obtain an understanding of what it means to be an assessor in higher education. In a field in which much of the educational literature seeks improved assessment through increasingly sophisticated strategies and techniques (Rowntree, 1987, p. 2), a phenomenological investigation offered a unique way of understanding the *meaning* assessors make of their practice. While the study as a whole synthesised data from five in-depth interviews with lecturers at a South African university into a consistent description of the essential nature of the experience of being an assessor, for the purposes of this paper I have chosen to present only one of these cases.

The *IPJP* is a joint project of [Rhodes University](http://www.rhodes.ac.za) in South Africa and [Edith Cowan University](http://www.edithcowan.edu.au) in Australia. This document is subject to copyright and may not be reproduced in whole or in part via any medium (print, electronic or otherwise) without the express permission of the publishers.

The *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology (IPJP)* can be found at www.ipjp.org.

Background to the Study and Statement of the Problem

Student assessment, considered a key indicator of the health of teaching and learning in higher education (Council on Higher Education, 2003, p. 59), is a complex and contentious issue. This results inter alia from the fact that, historically, assessment has its roots in psychometric testing with its controversial debate surrounding the hereditary versus environmental nature of intelligence and the myth of the “IQ” score as a fixed and valid indicator of a person’s potential to succeed.

Whereas traditional examinations have been used primarily to select, sort and classify (Gipps, 1996, p. 4), assessment is now required to achieve a wider range of purposes than was the case twenty years ago, including: providing information about pupils, teachers and schools; acting as a certifying and selecting device as well as an accountability procedure; and, importantly in terms of this study, enabling teachers to use their assessment practices as a vantage point from which to reflect critically and holistically on their effectiveness as educators and curriculum developers while celebrating individual differences between students rather than regarding these as problematic (Brown, 1999, p. 12). These changes in understanding reflect a deeper paradigm shift taking place in our understanding of assessment from that of “testing and examinations” to what Gipps (1994, p. 1) has referred to as an “assessment culture” in which assessment is considered integral to meaningful curriculum development and, indeed, educational practice.

It was against this background that I set out to understand how the educator interprets his or her lived world as an assessor or, stated differently, what meaning he or she makes of his or her assessment practice. It appeared to me, in my role as a staff developer at a South African university, that staff who showed a particular enthusiasm for assessment in turn seemed to be dedicated and effective educators with an inclination towards reflective practice. With this hypothesis in mind, I began to enquire informally whether staff with whom I came into contact in my day-to-day work perceived a significant relationship between their practice as assessors and other areas of their teaching. What was the meaning of being an assessor in higher education for these individuals? As lecturers began to share their stories, I became increasingly fascinated by what seemed to be the essentially human character of assessment. The act of assessing, more so than a list of techniques or

behaviours, seemed to embody a way of *being* or an act of *caring* on the part of the assessors which could not be divorced from the individuals involved in the assessment process.

The questions around which I constructed my interviews included asking lecturers to explain what assessment practices they made use of, and whether – and, if so, in what ways – they considered the choice and implementation of these practices to be significant in terms of other areas of their practice as lecturers or teachers. I also asked lecturers to consider whether – and, if so, in what ways – their choice and implementation of their assessment practices impacted on their understanding of themselves as professional educators.

While the first question required a more factual response, both the second and third questions, in keeping with Polkinghorne’s (1989, p. 47) suggestion that phenomenological questions focus on “what it was like for you” observations, focused more specifically on the interviewees’ *understanding* of the phenomenon under investigation. The questions, centred on the concrete world or lived experience of the participants, gave me direct access to the feelings, opinions and interpretations of the individuals in my study. Where appropriate, I made use of empathy and sensitive probing for the purpose of evoking a more in-depth exploration of the phenomenon.

Data Gathering and Sampling

The preferred method of gathering descriptions from subjects is the interview, which allows the researcher to assist the subject in moving towards non-theoretical descriptions that accurately reflect the experience (Polkinghorne, 1989, p. 47). The phenomenological researcher acts in a personal manner with people who are not viewed as experimental “objects” but as human subjects (*ibid.*).

The purpose of selecting participants in phenomenological research is to generate as full a range as possible of elements and relationships that can be used in determining the essential structure of the phenomenon. To achieve this, Stones (1988, p. 150) suggests that the kinds of individuals who are pre-eminently suitable for participating in this kind of research are those who have had experiences relating to the phenomenon to be researched, are verbally fluent and able to communicate their thoughts, feelings and perceptions in relation to the researched phenomenon, have the same home language as the researcher, since this will enable the subtle nuances to be understood, and express a willingness to be open to the researcher.

The *IPJP* is a joint project of [Rhodes University](http://www.rhodes.ac.za) in South Africa and [Edith Cowan University](http://www.edithcowan.edu.au) in Australia. This document is subject to copyright and may not be reproduced in whole or in part via any medium (print, electronic or otherwise) without the express permission of the publishers.

The selection of participants, correspondingly, evolved directly from my daily work with lecturers at the university who approached me as a consultant for guidance and as a “sounding board” for their own assessment practices. It was within the context of what Austin (1998) has termed “collegial conversations” that I was able to establish trusting, caring relationships which served as an opening for my approaching staff to ascertain whether they would be willing to engage in in-depth interviews regarding my research topic. The majority of participants seemed to welcome the opportunity to examine issues related to their assessment practices more deeply.

The phenomenological interview, conceived as a “conversation” or an interpersonal engagement in which subjects are encouraged to share with a researcher the details of their experience (Polkinghorne, 1989, p. 49), was therefore an appropriate development coming out of the relationship I already had, to some extent, enjoyed with selected colleagues. The focus of the interview, in keeping with the aims of phenomenological research, was theme related rather than person related. In other words, the interview sought to understand and describe the meaning of the central themes of the experience. Descriptions of the experience without theoretical explanation were sought (ibid.).

Data Analysis

The primary endeavour of the phenomenologist is to translate naïve perception into more considered conceptual knowledge. The implicit and obscure perception of a complex phenomenon of behaviour changes by this process into an explicit formulation of its foundational behaviour (van Kaam, 1966, p. 259). In keeping with this ideal, a number of ways of conducting a phenomenological analysis of data have been developed (see, for example, Colaizzi, 1978; Giorgi, 1985; van Kaam, 1966). In the words of Giorgi (1985), “many variations within a fundamental methodological concept are possible” (p. 4). Having given due consideration to the different procedures, it seemed appropriate to base my analysis on a framework presented by Giorgi (1985), further articulated by Stones (1988), in which five essential steps within the phenomenological method are delineated.

After an initial reading of the transcript, in the process of which the main challenge for the reader is to bracket personal preconceptions and judgments and to the fullest extent remain true to the data, the protocols are broken down into naturally occurring units, each of these conveying a particular meaning emerging spontaneously from the reading. Having delineated

the natural meaning units, the researcher tries to express in an explicit way the implicit psychological or educational aspects of the meaning unit and then writes out a sentence or two expressing that discovery. These transformations, stated in the third person, retain the situated character of the subject’s initial description and are the equivalents of the previously identified meaning units expressed in the subject’s own words.

Once the meaning units have been transformed, the researcher proceeds to synthesise them into a descriptive statement of essential, non-redundant psychological meanings. The situated description, “which communicates the unique structure of a particular phenomenon in a particular context” (Stones, 1988, p. 154), continues to include the concreteness and specifics of the situation in which the individual understands the question. In the final step of the analysis, the researcher reads through the situated structural descriptions to formulate a general description of the structure underlying the variations in meaning, the purpose being to synthesise and integrate the insights contained in the transformed meaning units into a consistent description of the psychological or educational structure of the event. Ideally, all meanings contained in the transformed meaning units should at least be implicitly contained in the general description (Giorgi, 1985, p. 19).

The Human Lifeworld or *Lebenswelt*: A Framework for Interpreting the Data

Van Manen (1997, p. 101) points out that all phenomenological human science research efforts are really explorations into the structure of the human lived world or *Lebenswelt* as experienced in everyday situations and relations. He further points out that we can speak of the multiple and different lived worlds that belong to different human beings and realities, and so, for example, speak of the lived world of the teacher, the parent, the administrator and, in this instance, the assessor or educator. Fundamental existentialist themes or “existentials” (van Manen, 1997, p. 101), four of which have proved especially helpful as guides for reflection in the research process, have been characteristically employed to extend the phenomenological method in its analysis of existence, namely, *lived space* (spatiality), *lived body* (corporeality), *lived time* (temporality) and *lived human relations* (relationality or communality).

I chose to make sense of the data by drawing on the above existentials along with Binswanger’s identification of three dimensions of an individual’s *lebenswelt* – *Umwelt*, *Mitwelt*, and *Eigenwelt* – and van Deurzen-Smith’s subsequent addition of the

Überwelt (Spinelli, 1989) to clarify the meaning individuals make of their lived experiences. *Lived space* is felt space, while *lived body* refers to the fact that we are always bodily in the world. These categorisations correspond with what Binswanger calls the *Umwelt*, described as the natural world with its physical, biological dimension (van Deurzen-Smith, 1988, p. 69, cited in Spinelli, 1989, p. 128). Although each of us is limited by innate biological invariants, we still provide unique meanings and interpretations of the physical world we inhabit. *Lived other*, the lived relation we maintain with others in the interpersonal space we share with them, corresponds with Binswanger's *Mitwelt* and *Eigenwelt* dimensions, which focus on the everyday social relations each of us has with others as well as the private and intimate relationships in our lives, while also emphasising our relationship with ourselves.

Van Deurzen-Smith (1988) has suggested a fourth dimension in understanding the individual's lifeworld, and that is the category of the *Überwelt*, which refers to "a person's connection to the abstract and absolute aspect of living" (1988, p. 97, cited in Spinelli, 1989, p. 129) and incorporates one's ideological outlook on life, or those beliefs one holds about life, death and existence. Although van Manen (1997) does briefly mention the relationship of the human being to the Absolute Other, God, when discussing the existential of *lived other* (relationality), van Deurzen-Smith's explanation more fully elucidates the meaning of this dimension.

Data Presentation: Billy as an Assessor

For the purposes of this paper, I have chosen to present one of the five cases which formed part of the original study, that of *Billy*, Professor of Pharmacy Administration and Practice (PAP) at the university. Billy, in addition to being qualified in his academic field, recently completed a postgraduate qualification in higher education theory and practice. He has lectured in the field of Pharmacy Management for almost twenty years¹.

To some extent, it would be valid to say that Billy's understanding of himself as an assessor was shaped by the "range of assessment practices" he has made use of (*Umwelt*). He classifies these as, on the one hand, "traditional types of things ... such as the traditional examination ... and multiple choice questions", in contrast to what he calls "other

opportunities for assessment such as projects and debates".

It was his introduction to the "concept of the portfolio and reflective practice" that gave him a perspective on the importance of assessing specific outcomes he had not considered important before. To quote Billy directly:

And then I linked up with the ADC [Academic Development Centre] and was introduced to the concept of the portfolio and reflective practice. This put everything into perspective, because all the assignments that I had been giving students could now be integrated into the portfolio with assessment based on specific outcomes I hadn't considered to be important before. I had a gut feeling they were important – for example, could they write a letter or give a debate or could they see both sides of the story ... or were they able to give a presentation in public?

The portfolio validated Billy's deeply felt sense that there were specific outcomes which students should be able to demonstrate, such as writing a letter or participating in debate, skills that had been neglected in a more traditional approach towards assessment. The portfolio, with its emphasis on reflective practice, was the obvious vehicle to assess those skills, but it also embodied what for Billy was to symbolise a deeper understanding of the relationship between assessment and student learning:

I use as many practices as I can find, and when I find a new one I try and integrate it, because assessment is so integrated into the whole process of learning. It's the formative side – you become informed that you have learned only when assessment takes place. And that's why there are different assessment practices – because it may help a student to know he or she is informed.

The word "informed", which is defined by the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* as "finding out all that one needs to know" (1989, p. 641), suggests that the purpose of using different assessment practices lies in their potential to establish what a student knows, and, by implication, what he or she still needs to find out. If the function of different assessment practices is to "help a student to know he or she is informed", then what of Billy's *sense* of his role as an assessor (*Eigenwelt*)? He attempts to answer this:

I am no longer the "bearer of knowledge" and the student the "empty vessel". The

¹ The participant has elected not to use a pseudonym. Full permission has been granted that he be directly named and situated for the purpose of this paper.

student comes with a lot of knowledge and experience and I see myself as having two roles. To give them the confidence to know that they have valuable knowledge, and to create a learning environment in which they can use their knowledge plus the criteria to integrate and use it.

Billy does not understand his role as an assessor – or, more broadly, as an educator – primarily in terms of being there to impart knowledge. His role, as he interprets it, is one of building the confidence of his students. It is instructive to examine Billy's own experience of being a student, which suggests that his past is experientially present (*temporality*) as he works on defining his role as an assessor and educator:

My challenge is to encourage debate and discussion. I know how difficult it is to talk in class. In my three years of undergraduate study I didn't ask a single question or comment. I wander up and down lecture halls. I'll fall and break my neck, I'm sure.

It is interesting, here, to note too how Billy describes his presence in the lecture hall in very physical terms. In order to encourage discussion he *physically* moves about. The image of him "falling and breaking his neck" suggests an intensity and commitment beyond what can be reasonably expected. At a later point in the interview, he speaks of his realisation of the importance of committing oneself to the student:

In terms of teaching, I would say I always had a bit of a role dilemma because I wasn't sure how I fitted in. One felt one needed to do more in the sense of committing oneself to the student not just in an administrative role but in a mentoring role. A mentor didn't sound like a lecturer and yet there seemed to be a role as a mentor. And I suppose it's only in the last few years that the concept of mentoring and assisting, being a facilitator of learning, began to make sense.

The word "commitment" implies an affective component. The *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* speaks of a commitment as a "pledge or undertaking; something one has promised to do" (1989, p. 231). In relation to this, Billy speaks about his "professional responsibility" towards the student as well as his "commitment" or "accountability" in respect of the learning outcomes:

And as a teacher I have a professional

responsibility towards the student. As a professional you are committed to the outcomes. You are accountable to the outcomes. When you take on a student you expect to make a reasonable judgment that he or she will be able to complete your course. You are responsible to provide them with learning opportunities and are given the authority to choose those learning opportunities. The student places a lot of trust in you because he or she perceives you to be a professional.

That the student "perceives" one to be a professional is crucial in how Billy understands his role (*Mitwelt*). Changes in Billy's assessment practices have, thus, been representative of a deeper change in his sense of responsibility towards his students and his own sense of purpose as an educator (*Überwelt*). What started out as an exploration of alternative assessment strategies resulted ultimately in an almost complete transformation of his understanding of himself and his role as a professional educator:

I now see myself as trying to gain professional status as an educator rather than as a lecturer in that particular field. So I now feel much more self-actualised because I am growing in my profession. And my profession is as an educator not as a lecturer in a particular field. I feel part of a body of university educators rather than a particular faculty in which I have a particular skill and in which I have a particular task.

Discussion

Education, characterised by, among other things, a shift towards a mass higher education and training system and the emergence of new forms of knowledge production (see Kraak, 2000), is seen to be in a state of radical transition, at both national and international level. In the words of Morley (2003, p. 5), there is a "powerful discourse of crisis, loss, contamination and decay in higher education". Massification, industrialisation, and the more overt linkage of higher education with the needs of commerce and industry, are seen to have "polluted the purity of elite organisations of knowledge production" (ibid.). The academy, which used to connote safety, has become a site for social anxiety where the construct of trustworthiness is being replaced with an ethos of standardisation, competence, continuity and reliability. Accountability, defined as "a common sense term that over-simplifies power relations", moreover appears to

be a “type of penance that is now being paid for former autonomy” (ibid., p. 53).

What then, can be considered the value of a phenomenological study with its focus on the meaning individuals make of their assessment practices? More specifically, what significance can a case study such as that of Billy have for us as academics and, indeed, staff developers involved in negotiating the “storm of change” (Light & Cox, 2001, p. 11) sweeping through our institutions? The power of Billy’s perspective, I would suggest, lies in its being *his interpretation* of the situation; *his* story which, in turn, represents a firsthand view of *how* he, an experienced lecturer, has negotiated the many changes accompanying the paradigm shift taking place in assessment and the changing understanding of the nature and purpose of higher education.

Martin Trow (1988, cited in Trowler, 1997, p. 302) has suggested that academics are caught in what he calls the “Robbins trap” due to the paradox presented by a simultaneous and incompatible commitment to both higher education expansion and a model of higher education founded on elitist principles. While the implication of the “trap” metaphor is clearly that of the powerlessness of those caught in it, Billy, in reality, speaks of feeling “much more self actualised” because he sees himself to be “growing in his profession as an educator” as a result of having to confront massive shifts in what is considered to be the nature and purpose of higher education. While teachers who take on a learner-centred approach admittedly take on an additional workload, Genishi (1997, p. 47) suggests that they also “take on authority and power that have not traditionally been theirs”. Billy affirms this perspective in declaring that he now feels that he is “part of a body of university educators rather than a particular faculty in which I have a particular skill”. He reflects, furthermore, that “in terms of my whole paradigm ... it’s changed”.

The challenge of professionalism, according to Light and Cox (2001, p. 11), includes a call towards “a new way of thinking about learning and teaching”. This “new way” includes educators who ignore neither the challenge of student-based learning associated with competency-based education, nor the significance of traditional values that require a student to submit herself to, and master, certain kinds of discipline including contextual understanding and orderly expression of professional competence (Barnett, 1992, p. 59). In the words of Ramsden (1992, p. 9), teachers who embody professionalism in higher education “possess a broad range of specialist teaching skills; they never lose sight of the primacy of their goals for student learning; they listen and learn

from their students; they constantly evaluate their own performance”.

Is this not an impossibly high call on educators? Case studies such as that of Billy demonstrate that, indeed, for this lecturer, deep shifts in his understanding of his role and identity as an educator have had to take place to accommodate what, at first glance, might seem to be merely a change in some of his methods of teaching and assessment. In contrast to a more instrumentalist approach to assessment, where a relationship between the assessor and assessed is considered inappropriate, Billy embraces the notion of both himself and his students as “active thinkers who play a major role in the process of reforming assessment” (Genishi, 1997, p. 37). Indeed, throughout the interview, he emphasises that he is going through a “major action learning cycle ... an enormous learning curve on words and theory” in terms of his understanding of curriculum and teaching.

While Billy makes use of a “range of assessment practices”, it is significant not only in terms of providing evidence that students have met the outcomes for a course, but to accommodate and support individual students “with widely varying backgrounds and needs” (Genishi, 1997, p. 162). Billy understands his use of assessment practices and, indeed, classroom techniques within the context of, among other things, helping students “know that they have valuable knowledge”, “encouraging debate and discussion” and assisting students in “knowing that they are informed”. It is interesting that it is his use of innovative assessment methods that has helped define the change in his understanding of assessment from something which is “done to students” (Lambert & Lines, 2000, p. 141) to a process in which students are “actively involved” in their own learning.

Billy has a problem with “ranking students”, but realises that our current system requires grades and believes that, when students are competent, they should be “proud of themselves rather than feeling someone else can do it better because he/she got higher marks”. Arguing for a comprehensive and flexible view of assessment, Genishi (1997, p. 37) asserts that the reason traditional measurement, including standardised testing, has been a persistent feature of the educational experience, is largely because it is seen as objective, the assumption being that students take a standardised test under virtually the same conditions and that their responses are scored in identical ways. Equitable assessment, she claims, implies a different view of the human being from that associated with traditional approaches to testing. The teacher plays multiple roles with respect

to learners whose lives are entwined with that of the teacher. He or she, unlike the objective assessor, lives in the same educational space as the person being observed and assessed, and is not a passive observer but an active participant. For many teachers, regardless of the age of the student, the individual's needs come consistently to the foreground, and, therefore, objective tests that compare an individual to an abstract group norm have little relevance (Genishi, 1997, p. 46).

Madaus, Raczek and Clark (1997, p. 22) caution that, while new assessment methods may point in a more fruitful direction, "the idea that any testing technique can reform our schools is the height of technological arrogance". Billy's observation that "assessment is so integrated into the whole process of learning" makes us aware that it is not the portfolio in itself that has transformed Billy's practice, but his understanding of the role of this task as a catalyst for learning. While we undoubtedly need to be innovative in respect of the range of assessment approaches or methods as well as the tasks we make use of (see especially Luckett & Sutherland, 2000), improving our assessment practices is "not sufficient to ensure that assessment will be used to enhance learning" (Shepard, 2000, p. 1).

Rowntree (1987, p. 132) observes, with regard to continuous assessment, that it should be an opportunity not only for students to adjust their learning, but for lecturers or teachers to continually adjust their teaching and curricula in terms of what the assessment results reveal about possible gaps in their students' learning and understanding that need to be addressed. In relation to this, Billy reflects that the student places a lot of trust in the lecturer "because he or she perceives you to be a professional". Perhaps it is the term "professionalism" which most aptly summarises Billy's approach as an assessor and, indeed, his responsiveness as an educator.

Concluding Thoughts

At the outset of this paper, it was suggested that the phenomenon of understanding lies at the heart of the qualitative enquiry enterprise (Schwandt, 1999, p. 451). The distinction was made between knowing, which indicates that one can prove or support a claim, and understanding, which suggests that one has comprehended the *meaning* of something (ibid.). It is the latter with which phenomenology concerns itself.

What, then, empirical scientists may ask, is the value of phenomenology if it does not allow for "generalisations or the production of law-like statements about reality" (van Manen, 1997, p. 22)?

The phenomenological method, described by Giorgi (1985, p. 6) as the "discipline that tries to discover and account for the presence of meanings in the stream of consciousness", is perfectly situated to ask what he calls "how" and "why" questions, and in this way is uniquely placed to assist human beings in the "process of making judgments of how to act rationally and morally" (Grundy, 1987, p. 14).

It is in this sense that phenomenological human science is seen to promote a certain progress in human science. It is the progress of what van Manen (1997, p. 20) has called "humanising human life and humanising human institutions to help human beings to become increasingly thoughtful and thus better prepared to act tactfully in situations".

While it is obvious that phenomenology is not the same project as poetry, van Manen (1997, p. 114) points out that, like poetry, phenomenological research and writing requires a high level of reflectivity as well as an attunement to the lived experience and a certain patience or true commitment. Rather than offering us the possibility of effective theory with which we can explain or control the world, phenomenology offers us the possibility of plausible insights that bring us into direct contact with the world. In the words of van den Berg, as translated by van Manen (1997, p. 41):

Phenomena have something to say to us – this is common knowledge among poets and painters. Therefore, poets and painters are born phenomenologists, or rather, we are all born phenomenologists; the poets and painters among us, however, understand very well their task of sharing, by means of word and image, their insights with others – an artfulness that is also laboriously practised by professional phenomenologists.

While it has been argued that educational research needs to do more than offer understanding or insight about human experience, this paper endorses the view that the "feelings, emotions and humanity of people play a central part in the educational or staff development encounter" (Webb, 1996, p. 36). In the words of Ratner (n.d., p. 6), phenomenology seeks to "restore the active, creative individuality of the human subject in detailed qualitative accounts". In a situation in which academics are experiencing the stresses associated with massive changes in the nature and purpose of higher education, Billy's story represents the triumph of an individual not losing himself "in the anonymous mass" but becoming "a truly independent self" (Kruger, 1988, p. 31). The

perspective of individuals such as Billy cannot be ignored if educational research is to be responsive to

the challenges associated with a transforming society.

About the Author



Dr Rose Grant has worked at Rhodes University in Grahamstown, South Africa, for over twenty years. In addition to a Master's Degree in Psychology, she earned a PhD in Education with her dissertation focused on student assessment in higher education. She is currently involved in a number of projects, including the design and coordination of two mentoring programmes at Rhodes University. Along with providing a professional service equipping learners with appropriate life and study skills, Dr Grant is also involved in the facilitation of courses which prepare higher educators as assessors.

References

- Austin, A. E. (1998). Collegial conversation as metaphor and strategy for academic staff development. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 12, 12–18.
- Barnett, R. (1992). *Improving higher education: Total quality care*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Brown, S. (1999). Institutional strategies for assessment. In S. Brown & A. Glasner (Eds.), *Assessment matters in higher education* (pp. 1–13). Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Colaizzi, P. F. (1978). Psychological research as the phenomenologist views it. In R. S. Valle & M. King (Eds.), *Existential phenomenological alternatives for psychology* (pp. 48–71). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2003). *Improving teaching & learning resource: Draft for 2003 workshops*. Pretoria: CHE.
- Cowie, A. P. (Ed.). (1989). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Genishi, C. (1997). Assessing against the grain: A conceptual framework for alternative assessments. In A. Lin Goodwin (Ed.), *Assessment for equity and inclusion: Embracing all our children* (pp. 35–50). New York: Routledge.
- Giorgi, A. (1985). Sketch of a psychological phenomenological method. In A. Giorgi (Ed.), *Phenomenology and psychological research* (pp. 1–7). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Gipps, C. (1994). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Gipps, C. (1996). *Assessment for the millennium: Form, function and feedback*. Inaugural Lecture. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Groenewald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1), 1–26 [Electronic version]. Retrieved November 11, 2004, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_1/pdf/groenewald/pdf
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Kraak, A. (2000). Changing modes: A brief overview of the Mode 2 Knowledge debate and its impact on South African policy formulation. In A. Kraak (Ed.), *Changing modes: New knowledge production and its implications*

The *IPJP* is a joint project of [Rhodes University](http://www.rhodes.ac.za) in South Africa and [Edith Cowan University](http://www.edithcowan.edu.au) in Australia. This document is subject to copyright and may not be reproduced in whole or in part via any medium (print, electronic or otherwise) without the express permission of the publishers.

for higher education in South Africa (pp. 1–37). Pretoria: HSRC.

Kruger, D. (1988). *An introduction to phenomenological psychology*. Cape Town: Juta & Co.

Lambert, D., & Lines, D. (2000). *Understanding assessment: Purposes, perceptions, practices*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Light, G., & Cox, R. (2000). *Learning and teaching in higher education: The reflective professional*. London: Sage.

Luckett, K., & Sutherland, L. (2000). Assessment practices that improve teaching and learning. In S. Makoni (Ed.), *Teaching and learning in higher education: A handbook for Southern Africa* (pp. 98–130). Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Madaus, G. F., Raczek, A. E., & Clarke, M. M. (1997). The historical and policy foundations of the assessment movement. In A. Lin Goodwin (Ed.), *Assessment for equity and inclusion: Embracing all our children* (pp. 1–34). New York: Routledge.

Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in higher education*. Berkshire: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential phenomenological perspectives in psychology: Exploring the breadth of human experience* (pp. 41–61). New York: Plenum Press.

Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge.

Ratner, C. (n.d.). Contributions of sociohistorical psychology and phenomenology to research methodology. Retrieved July 1, 2005, from <http://humboldt1.com/~cr2/ratner1.htm>

Rowntree, D. (1987). *Assessing students: How shall we know them?* London: Routledge Falmer.

Schwandt, T. A. (1999). On understanding understanding. *Qualitative Enquiry*, 5, 451–464.

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29, 4–14.

Spinelli, E. (1989). *The interpreted world: An introduction to phenomenological psychology*. London: Sage Publications.

Stones, C. R. (1988). Research: Towards a phenomenological praxis. In D. Kruger, *An introduction to phenomenological psychology* (pp. 141–152). Cape Town: Juta & Co.

Taras, M. (2002). Using assessment for learning and learning from assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27, 501–510.

Trowler, P. (1997). Beyond the Robbins trap: Reconceptualising academic responses to change in higher education (or ... Quiet flows the Don?). *Studies in Higher Education*, 22, 301–319.

Van der Mescht, H. (2004). Phenomenology in education: A case study in education leadership. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology* 4(1), 1–20. Retrieved July 7, 2004, from <http://www.ipjp.org>

Van Kaam, A. (1966). *Existential foundations of psychology*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, Ontario, Canada: Althouse Press.

The *IPJP* is a joint project of [Rhodes University](#) in South Africa and [Edith Cowan University](#) in Australia. This document is subject to copyright and may not be reproduced in whole or in part via any medium (print, electronic or otherwise) without the express permission of the publishers.

The *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology (IPJP)* can be found at www.ipjp.org.

- Walker, M. (2002). Higher education and a democratic learning society: Professionalism, identities and educational action research. In M. Mostert & A. Dison (Eds.), *Academic development: Changes and challenges* (pp. 1–16). Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Webb, G. (1996). *Understanding staff development*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
-