The Importance of Research Methodology To Research Study In the field of Management Sciences;A Case Study of Kogi State University,Anyigba.

Author Detail:Hassan, Olanrewaju Makinde-Department Of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,Kogi State University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

The use of research methodology in modern research study by different fields of study today cannot be over emphasised. This study looks at its to the field of management sciences. The study made use of primary data sourced from 220 research students of Management sciences faculty in Kogi State University, Anyigba through administering of questionnaire. Their responses were tested using appropriate statistical tools like the simple percentage and the Chi-square research techniques; our study revealed that research methodology is relevant to researches done in the Management sciences in order to come up with quality researches. Therefore, the study recommended that the teaching of research methodology be greatly encouraged amongst the students and also constant training and retraining be conducted among the lecturers to enhance proper teaching of the course as well.

Keywords: Importance, Research Methodology, Management sciences

1.1 Introduction

The use of research methodology in contemporary research studies cannot be over emphasized. Given the fact that everyone now craves to use one methodology or the other in the course of their research studies as it applies to the nature of study. The field of management sciences is not lagging behind in this trend. As a matter of fact, the interactions between the scientific domain and information systems have paved the way for interdisciplinary research, which refers to most of the management sciences. Probably the most water shed moment for the interdisciplinary research was when the management sciences came into inception. In early 90s management sciences gained their autonomy and became hotcakes in the universities of the world.

IT technology of course has played a pivot role in the development of management sciences and hence interdisciplinary research while the dynamic growth of computer capability allowed complexities to be solved (Orlokowski & Baroudi, 1991).

1.2 Statement of problem

The charismatic trend attributed in the domain of interdisciplinary research and management sciences has resulted in the notable increase of research activities in these fields. Most times these research activities make use of different research methodologies to aid and boost their research findings. It is almost becoming impossible to do a research without accompanying it with one methodology or the other to improve the quality of presentations.
It has however been observed that some researchers in a bid to keep up with this trend, tends to make use of different research methodologies whether it suits their research studies or not. This has generated controversies as to whether these methodologies are truly relevant.
As a result, our focus here is to find out the importance of research methodology to research studies done in the field of Management sciences.

1.3 Objectives of study

The objective of this study is to find out the importance of research methodology to researches done in the field of management sciences given the modern trend that have characterized modern research studies in our world today.

1.4 Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses that shall guide this study are as stated below:

Null Hypothesis: Research methodologies are not relevant to the field of Management sciences.

Alternative Hypothesis: Research methodologies are relevant to the field of Management sciences.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Meaning of research

Research in common parlance refers to a search for knowledge. One can also define research as a scientific and systematic search for pertinent information on a specific topic. In fact, research is an art of scientific investigation. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (1952) lays down the meaning of research as "a careful investigation or inquiry especially through search for new facts in any branch of knowledge". Redman and Mory (1923) define research as a "systematized effort to gain new knowledge". Some people consider research as a movement, a movement from the known to the

unknown. It is actually a voyage of discovery. We all possess the vital instinct of inquisitiveness for, when the unknown confronts us, we wonder and our inquisitiveness makes us probe and attain full and fuller understanding of the unknown. This inquisitiveness is the mother of all knowledge and the method, which man employs for obtaining the knowledge of whatever the unknown, can be termed as research. Research is an academic activity and as such the term should be used in a technical sense.

According to Clifford Woody research comprises defining and redefining problems, formulating hypothesis or suggested solutions; collecting, organising and evaluating data; making deductions and reaching conclusions; and at last carefully testing the conclusions to determine whether they fit the formulating hypothesis. D. Slesinger and M. Stephenson (1930) in the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences define research as "the manipulation of things, concepts or symbols for the purpose of generalising to extend, correct or verify knowledge, whether that knowledge aids in construction of theory or in the practice of an art". Research is, thus, an original contribution to the existing stock of knowledge making for its advancement. It is the pursuit of truth with the help of study, observation, comparison and experiment. In short, the search for knowledge through objective and systematic method of finding solution to a problem is research. The systematic approach concerning generalisation and the formulation of a theory is also research. As such the

term 'research' refers to the systematic method consisting of enunciating the problem, formulating a hypothesis, collecting the facts or data, analysing the facts and reaching certain conclusions either in the form of solutions(s) towards the concerned problem or in certain generalisations for some theoretical formulation.

Research methods versus Research methodology
It seems appropriate at this juncture to explain the difference between research methods and research methodology.
Research methods may be understood as all those methods/techniques that are used for conduction of research. *Research methods or techniques*, *thus*, *refer to the methods the researchers use in performing research operations. In other words, all those methods which are used by the researcher during the course of studying his research problem are termed as research methods.*

At times, a distinction is also made between research techniques and research methods. *Research techniques* refer to the behaviour and instruments we use in performing research operations such as making observations, recording data, techniques of processing data and the like. *Research methods* refer to the behaviour and instruments used in selecting and constructing research technique. For instance, the difference between methods and techniques of data collection can better be understood from the details given in the following chart—

S/n	Type	Methods	Technics
1.	Library Research	1. Analysis of Historical Records 2. Analysis of Document	1.Recording of notes, Content analysis, Tape and Film listening and Analysis 2. Statistical compilations and manipulations, reference and abstract guides, contents analysis
2.	Field research	1.Non-participant observation	Observational behavioural scales, use of score cards, etc.
		2.Participant observation	Interactional recording, possible use of tape recorders, photo graphic techniques.
		3.Mass observation	Recording mass behaviour, interview using independent observers in public places.

			4.Mail Questionnaire	Identification of social and economic background of respondents.
			5.Opinionnaire	Use of attitude scales, projective techniques, use of socio-metric scales.
			6.Personal interview	Interviewer uses a detailed schedule with open and closed questions.
			7.Focused interview	Interviewer focuses attention upon a given experience and its effects.
			8.Group interview	Small groups of respondents are interviewed simultaneously.
			9.Telephone interview	Used as a survey technique for information and for discerning opinion; may also be used as a follow up of questionnaire.
			10.Case study and life history	Cross sectional collection of data for intensive analysis, longitudinal collection of data of intensive character
3.	Laboratory research	Small group study of random behaviour, play and role analysis	Use of audio-visual recording devices, use of observers, etc.	

From what has been stated above, we can say that methods are more general. It is the methods that generate techniques. However, in practice, the two terms are taken as interchangeable and when we talk of research methods we do, by implication, include research techniques within their compass.

Since the object of research, particularly the applied research, it to arrive at a solution for a given problem, the available data and the unknown aspects of the problem have to be related to each other to make a solution possible. Keeping this in view, research methods can be put into the following three groups:
1. In the first group we include those methods which are concerned with the collection of data. These methods will be used where the data already available are not sufficient to arrive at the required solution;
2. The second group consists of those statistical techniques which are used for establishing relationships between the data and the unknowns;
3. The third group consists of those methods which are used to evaluate the accuracy of the results obtained. Research methods falling in the above stated last two groups are generally taken as the analytical tools of research.

Research methodology is a way to systematically solve the research problem. It may be understood as a science of studying how research is done scientifically. In it we study the various steps that are generally adopted by a researcher in studying his research problem along with the logic behind them. It is necessary for the researcher to know not only the research methods/techniques but also the methodology. Researchers not only need to know how to develop certain indices or tests, how to calculate the mean, the mode, the median or the standard deviation or chi-square, how to apply particular research techniques, but they also need to know which of these methods or techniques, are relevant and which are not, and what would they mean and indicate and why. Researchers also need to understand the assumptions underlying various techniques and they need to know the criteria by which they can decide that certain techniques and procedures will be applicable to certain problems and others will not. All this means that it is necessary for the researcher to design his methodology for his problem as the same may differ from problem to problem. For example, an architect, who designs a building, has to consciously evaluate the basis of his

decisions, i.e., he has to evaluate why and on what basis he selects particular size, number and location of doors, windows and ventilators, uses particular materials and not others and the like. Similarly, in research the scientist has to expose the research decisions to evaluation before they are implemented. He has to specify very clearly and precisely what decisions he selects and why he selects them so that they can be evaluated by others also.

From what has been stated above, we can say that research methodology has many dimensions and research methods do constitute a part of the research methodology. The scope of research methodology is wider than that of research methods. *Thus, when we talk of research methodology we not only talk of the research methods but also consider the logic behind the methods we use in the context of our research study and explain why we are using a particular method or technique and why we are not using others so that research results are capable of being evaluated either by the researcher himself or by others*. Why a research study has been undertaken, how the research problem has been defined, in what way and why the hypothesis has been formulated, what data have been collected and what particular method has been adopted, why particular technique of analysing data has been used and a host of similar other questions are usually answered when we talk of research methodology concerning a research problem or study.

2.1   Review of Previous study

Various authors have concluded and given various opinions about the possible research classifications in context to variety of methodologies used in the subject of management sciences. Cecez-Kecmanovic (2007) concluded that there are the numerous methods of empirical research, which encompasses the positivistic, interpretive and critical approaches. They further identified the three distinguished lines of methodology: the first being able to choose from a variety of critical questions; the second applications method which is evaluated on the basis of epistemological assumptions, while the third possible method harmonizes the process and principles of building scientific knowledge. Chua (1986) also identified the three categories of research classifications i.e. positivistic, interpretive and critical perspectives. In the domain of management sciences the purpose of positivistic approach is to investigate and test the theories and causal realities that predict the phenomenon which impact an organization. This methodology relies on hypotheses/ hypothesis testing on the basis upon population sample (Myers, 2004). In the interpretative approach, unlike the positivistic research, researchers combined the results of their own subjective opinion, considering the reality as a social product that cannot be understood independently of

social actors (including researchers), who are also "builders" and who influenced the design of the subject of studies (Klein & Myers, 1999).

Cecez-Kecmanovic (2007) believed that instead of formulating conclusions as the established facts, interpretative research provides interpretational analysis on the subject. On the other hand, critical research aims to lift the critiques on organizations, societies and systems for the efficiency reasons, rationality, progress and development (Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2007). He also believed that the critical research methodology is compound of four interrelated components which includes:

a) Detailed and intensive examination of local situations and problems that affect real people, working conditions and organizations,

b) Critical explanation and comparative structural generalization

c) Open discourse and transformative redefinition or action, and

d) Reflexive dialectic orientation.

Scandura and Williams (2000) examined research trends in management by comparing all articles published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, and the *Journal of Management* during a three year period in the 1980s to articles written during a comparable three-year period in the 1990s. They used McGrath's taxonomy of research strategies as an approach to classifying 347 articles that employed some mixture of "theory/literature reviews and/or empirical data" (p. 1254).

Scandura and Williams found that field studies dominated in both time periods and that there were significant changes for sample surveys, laboratory experiments, and field studies employing secondary data (p. 1256). They concluded that the shifts that had taken place were potentially of a negative nature and involved compromises to triangulation and validity.

Schultze and Leidner 2002) examined ninety-four articles related to information systems research from six journals selected to "review academic research that represents a diversity of epistemological assumptions" (p. 218). Their analysis focused on the congruence between the content of the articles and Deetz's taxonomy of discourses in organization science, which divides research into four areas of discourse: dialogic, critical, interpretive, and normative.

They found that a distinct majority of the articles were reflective of the normative discourse model, that a

meaningful number of articles were characterizable as interpretive discourse, and that only three articles fell into the combined dialogic discourse/critical discourse domain (p. 220). Schultze and Leidner concluded that knowledge management literature, as represented in the sample examined, is biased toward optimistic, consensus oriented research approaches and that "the negative consequences of information technologies on organizational learning, namely its disciplining and dominating effects, are left largely unexamined" (p. 230). Schultze and Stabell (2004) attempted to build a theoretical model that would extend their explanation of Deetz's model and expand the role of the concept of discourse by reframing the four discourse areas as neo-functionalist, constructivist, critical, and dialogic discourse (566).

Karami, Rowley, and Analoui (2006) described the historical development of research methods in management studies as having its origins in the positivist mode, with an early emphasis on case studies, a later transition to primarily empirical explorations, and a much more recent and somewhat tentative infusion of phenomenological and qualitative methods (pp. 44-46). Their study of 120 articles in twenty leading management journals examined twenty three very broadly defined factors associated with choice of research methodology. Many of these factors, such as "simple random sampling" and "used means, standard deviations or similar," cannot really be considered to be methods so much as tools. With those tools eliminated, they found the most frequently used methodological areas to be questionnaire-based descriptive research (69 per cent of the articles studied), "grand theory" (50 per cent), case study (40 per cent), interview (38 per cent), and "participatory or action research" (20 per cent). Some articles used more than one methodological area, resulting in a total substantially greater than 100 per cent.

Kane, Ragsdell, and Oppenheim (2006), in an article that conforms to the provisional methodology termed an analytical literature review in the present study, commented that "It would appear that researchers may explicitly or implicitly state their methodological stance but subsequently appear to have difficulty in implementing the methodology in their primary research. Secondly, the methodological stance is not always evident, which may result in criticism that the research position is ambiguous and, therefore, problematic for others in the research community to construct a possible stance by piecing together aspects of the data collection and analysis in an effort to 'assemble' a possible methodology" (p. 143).

Kane, Ragsdell, and Oppenheim offered a number of examples of the use of various research methodologies in knowledge management, but made no attempt to quantify or assess the relative importance of the methodologies identified.

Bjørnson and Singsøyr (2008) examined sixty-eight articles focused on the intersection of knowledge and software engineering. They found that twenty-nine articles (43 per cent) were reports of empirical research projects, while thirty-nine (57 percent) were reports of "lessons learned" (p. 1059). Their results revealed no clear pattern over time that defines the balance of empirical and lessons learned approaches, although there was some indication of growth in the numbers of empirical articles between 2003 and 2006, the final year for which articles were studied (p. 1060).

Guo and Sheffield (2008) set about "to examine the KM theoretical perspectives, research paradigms, and research methods reported in influential journals in order to see what they tell us about KM research as a whole" with a specific goal of determining whether "KM research in information systems and/or management journals employs paradigms and methods that are broad enough to capture the full range of theoretical perspectives — utility, human agency, and power relations" (pp. 674-675). They developed a systematic approach to categorizing knowledge management research articles, which they applied to 160 articles drawn from ten "first-tier" journals (p. 680). Their findings revealed that about 75 per cent of the articles were empirical in nature and that 77 per cent conformed to the positivist paradigm (p. 681). They indicated that "analysis of all articles (empirical and non-empirical) by research method shows that sample survey occurs most frequently, followed by field study, theory building, and literature review" (p. 682).

3.0   Research Methodology

3.1   The Research Design

The approach adopted in the execution of the study was a survey design. The researcher chose survey design as it is one method where a group of people is studied by collecting information from them. Moreso, this type of design specified how the researcher's data were collected and analysed. So, the design was specified to use questionnaire and oral interview. This survey was used by the researcher to source for his primary data.

3.4   Research Sample and Sampling Techniques

The researcher sampled a total of one hundred and fifty (150) persons for the distribution of the research questionnaire, with a total of 80 Post graduate students of the Management faculty and a total of seventy (70) undergraduate students of the faculty of management. This faculty comprise of accounting, business

administration, banking and finance, public administration and management departments of Kogi State University, Anyigba. Our focus was to seek their opinions on how relevant research methodology is to the field of Management sciences.

In the choice of the sample population for this study, the researcher used simple random sampling technique. The technique provided each member of the entire target population equal and independent chance of being selected or included in the sample. Another reason why the researcher chose the technique is that it is a simple and easy probability sampling technique in terms of conceptualization and application. The researcher shared the questionnaire in the students classrooms, likewise the oral interview.

Sources of Data

The researcher collected data for this study from primary sources. The researcher used questionnaire and oral interview to collect the primary data.

Data Analysis

In all, a total of 170 questionnaire were administered, we however got a total of 125 questionnaire duly filled and returned. 72 returned by the postgraduate students

and 53 from the undergraduate students alike. All the data collected from primary source through questionnaires and oral interview were statistically presented and analysed. Frequency and tabular percentage forms were used for data presentation while Chi-square t–test was used to test and analyse some selected hypotheses as not all were analysed due to time constraints.

4.0   Presentation and analysis of data

4.1   Presentation of data

In all, a total of 150 questionnaire were administered, we however got a total of 125 questionnaire duly filled and returned. All the data collected from primary source through questionnaires and oral interview were statistically presented and analysed. Frequency and tabular percentage forms were used for data presentation while Chi-square t–test was used to test and analyse some selected hypotheses as not all were analysed due to time constraints.

The data for this study is hereby presented and analyzed below using the Simple Percentage and the Chi-Square statistical technique for test of Hypotheses as appropriate.

Table 4.1.1: Sex Distribution of the Respondents

Gender	No of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Post graduates	72	57.6%
Undergraduates	53	42.4%
Total	**125**	**100**

Source: Field Work 2012

Table 4.1.1 above shows that 72 respondents representing 57.6 % of the total respondents were postgraduate students while 53 respondents were undergraduate students representing 42.4 %.

Table 4.1.2: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age Distribution	No of Respondents	Percentage (%)
18-25	40	32%
25-30	35	28%
31-40	30	24%
41-50	10	8%
50 and above	10	8%
Total	**125**	**100**

Source: Field work 2012

Table 4.1.2 above show that 40 respondents representing 32% of the total respondents are between 18-25 years, 35 respondents representing 28% of the total respondents are between 26-30 years, 30 respondents representing 24% of the total respondents are between 31-40 years, 10 respondents representing 8% of the total respondents are between 41-50 years while 10 respondents representing 8% of the total respondents are 50 and above.

Table 4.1.5: Respondents' responses on whether they agree that research methodology is relevant to the field of management sciences.

Option	Respondents		Total	Percentage (%)
	Postgrad	**Undergrad**		
Strongly Agree	34	21	55	44%
Agree	29	14	43	34%
Strongly disagree	5	9	14	11%
Disagree	2	3	5	4%
Undecided	2	6	8	7%
Total	**72**	**53**	**125**	**100**

Source: Field Work 2012

From table 4.1.5 above, it shows that 55 respondents representing 44% strongly agreed that research methodology is very relevant to the field of management sciences, 43 respondents implying 34% agreed to that as well; but 14 respondents representing 11% strongly disagreed, 5 respondents representing 4% merely disagreed while 8 respondents representing 7% were undecided.

Table 4.1.6: On whether they agree that the use of research methodology have improved research study in the field of Management.

Option	Respondents		Total	Percentage (%)
	Postgrad	**Undergrad**		
Strongly Agree	26	22	48	38%
Agree	21	15	36	29%
Strongly disagree	12	10	22	18%
Disagree	7	3	10	8%
Undecided	6	3	9	7%
Total	**72**	**53**	**125**	**100**

Source: Field Work 2012

The result in table 4.1.6 above indicates that 48 respondents strongly agreed that the use of research methodology have improved research study in the field of Management representing 38%, 36 responses from respondents merely agreed which amount to 29%, 22 respondents strongly disagreed which indicated 18%, 10 respondents representing 8% disagreed while 9 respondents representing 7% were undecided.

Table 4.1.7: On whether they agree that there is a relationship between quality of research and the type of research methodology employed.

Responses	Respondents		Total	Percentage (%)
	Postgrad	**Undergrad**		
Strongly Agree	40	30	70	56%
Agree	13	10	23	18%
Strongly disagree	8	5	13	10%
Disagree	4	3	7	6%
Undecided	7	5	12	10%
Total	**72**	**53**	**125**	100

Source: Field Work 2012

From the table 4.1.7 above, it shows that 70 respondents indicating 56% strongly agree that there is a relationship between quality of research and the type of research methodology employed, 46 respondents representing 20% agreed to this as well. 17 respondents representing 8% strongly disagree to it while 10 respondents representing 5% disagree and 6% representing 12 respondents were undecided.

Table 4.1.8: On to what extent do they think that research methodology have influenced research study in the field of management sciences.

Option	Respondents	Total	Percentage (%)

	Postgrad	Undergrad		
Very High extent	13	6	19	15%
High extent	35	27	62	62%
Low extent	13	12	23	18%
Very low extent	7	6	13	10%
Not at all	4	2	6	5%
Total	**72**	**53**	**125**	**100**

Source: Field Work 2012

Table 4.1.8 above indicates that 19 respondents representing 15% strongly agree that research methodology have influenced research study in the field of management sciences to a very high extent, 62 respondents representing 62% says to a high extent while respondents 23 indicating 18% says it is to a low extent, 13 respondents representing 10% disagree and 6 respondents amount to 5% were undecided.

Table 4.1.9: On the rating of the use of research methodology in the field of management.

Option	Respondents		Total	Percentage (%)
	Postgrad	Undergrad		
Excellent	5	7	12	10%
Very good	56	35	91	72%
Good	6	4	10	8%
Bad	2	3	5	4%
Poor	3	4	7	6%
Total	**72**	**53**	**125**	**100**

Source: Field Work, 2012

The result in table 4.1.9 Above shows that 12 respondents which is representing 10% are of excellent rating, 91 responses from the respondents with an average of 72% syas it is very good, 10 respondents strongly disagree which constitute 7% agrees with good, 5 respondents which represent 4% disagree and feels it has been bad, while 7 respondents with 6% says it is poor.

4.2 Analysis of data

In analysing our data, we shall recall our statement of hypotheses one and two, and also sought out presented tables that have direct bearing on stated objectives and hypotheses.

Recall statement of hypothesis one

Hypothesis to be tested

Null Hypothesis: Research methodologies are not relevant to the field of Management sciences.

Alternative Hypothesis: Research methodologies are relevant to the field of Management sciences.

.

With reference to table 4.1.5 presented as thus,

Table 4.1.5: Respondents' responses on whether they agree that research methodology is relevant to the field of management sciences.

Option	Respondents		Total	Percentage (%)
	Postgrad	Undergrad		
Strongly Agree	34	21	55	50%
Agree	29	14	43	26%
Strongly disagree	5	9	14	10%
Disagree	2	3	5	6%
Undecided	2	6	8	7%
Total	72	53	**125**	**100**

Source: Field Work 2012

From table 4.1.5 above, it shows that 55 respondents representing 44% strongly agreed that research methodology is very relevant to the field of management sciences, 43 respondents implying 34% agreed to that as well; but 14 respondents representing 11% strongly disagreed, 5 respondents representing 4% merely disagreed while 8 respondents representing 7% were undecided.

Note: Based on the respondents' responses we can infer that, research methodology is relevant to the field of management sciences. The implication is that the use of research methodology to researchers in the field of management science has been deemed very important and acceptable in most research study.

Furthermore, using the Chi-Square research technique formula to test our stated hypotheses with the content of table 4.1.5 as well, we have:

From table 4.1.5

Category	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided	Total
Postgrad	34	29	9	2	2	**72**
Undergrad	21	14	5	3	6	**53**
Total	**55**	**43**	**14**	**5**	**8**	**125**

. The formula for the computation of Chi-square (x^2) is given below:

The Chi-square method denoted by; $X^2 = \frac{\sum(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$

Computed result is presented in a tabular form as below:

VARIABLES	N	T Cal.	T Crit.	df	Prob.	Remark
Postgraduates	72					
Undergraduates	53	9.09	7.78	4	0.5	Reject H_o
Total	275					

Source: Researcher's X^2 Calculation, 2011

Decision making: from the chi-square research technique, we observed that the calculated result is greater than the table result at the 10% level of significance i.e. 9.09 > 7.78. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis that research methodologies are not relevant to the field of Management sciences and accept the alternative that research methodologies are relevant to the field of Management sciences. This result corroborated with that obtained in table 4.1.5 above using the simple percentages.

Conclusion

This study is on finding out the relevance of research methodology to the field of management sciences. Our study reveals that research methodology is relevant to research studies done in the management sciences. That is, there exist a significant relationship between research metheodology and reasearches done in the management sciences. In the study we attempted to distinguish between research methodology and research methods. Also through the administered questionnaire, we were able to sample research students' opinion. Majority of their responses were quite interesting and enlightening, however, the consensus opinion is that research methodology is a

very important aspect of management researches and that it has in any improved the quality of researches that are been carried out in the management sciences. It is in the wake of this that we make the following recommendations.

Recommendations

Based on the fact that our study have shown that research methodology is relevant to researches done in the management sciences, we want to recommend that;

- Effort should be geared towards conducting more researches in this regard so as to enhance the quality and proper teaching of the subject of research methodology in the tertiary institutions.
- Research students should be encouraged to make use relevant research technique in their study to boost the quality of their research, findings and inferences.
- The beauty of the ivory towers should be the quality of researches that are been carried out by them, therefore an attempt should be made at revamping this in our instutions of higher learnings especially with the advent of information technology. As a result, research base centers should be developed in our institutions of higher learnnings to cater for the training of students on how to use the computers in estimating and computations of some notable research techniques.

References

Banker, R., & Kaufman, R. (2004).The evolution of research on information systems: a fiftieth year survey of the literature in management science, *Management Science*, 50(3):281-298.

Beged-Dov, G. A., & Klein, A. T. (1970). Research Methodology in the Management Sciences: Formalism or Empiricism. *Operational Research Quarterly*, 21(3): 311- 326.

Chua, W. F. (1986). Radical Developments in Accounting Thought. *The Accounting Review*, 61:601-632.

Dreiling, A. (2007). On the impact of the 'linguistic turn' on research in information systems ECIS Endnote Libraries for ECIS conferences. Retrieved September 02, 2011, from http://is2.lse.ac.uk/asp/aspecies/default.htm.

Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2007). What's Critical in Critical Information Systems Research Methodology? *Critical Management Studies 5*, 11-13 July, Manchester: UK.

Galliers, R. D., & Whitley, E., A. (2002). An Anatomy of European Information Systems Research ECIS 1993-ECIS 2002: some initial findings. *In 10th European Conference on Information systems.* Gdansk: Poland.

Klein, H. K., & Myers, M. (1999). A Set of Principles for Conducting and Evaluating Interpretive Field Studies in Information. *MIS Quarterly, Special Issue on Intensive Research* 23(1), 67-93.

L.V. Redman and A.V.H. Mory (1923) *The Romance of Research*, p.10.

Myers, M. D. (2004). Qualitative Research in Information Systems. *MIS Quarterly,*21(2),:241242.Retrievedfromhttp://www.misq.org/discovery/MISQD_iswo rld/.

Orlokowski, W. J., & Baroudi, J. J. (1991). Studying Information Technology in Organizations: Research Approaches and Assumptions. *Information Systems Research,* 2:1-28.

The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (1952) Oxford, p. 1069.

The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences (1930), Vol. IX, MacMillan.