Erratum To: Philosophical and methodological beliefs of instructional design faculty and professionals

Michael D. Sheehan · R. Burke Johnson

Published online: 17 December 2011

© Association for Educational Communications and Technology 2011

Erratum to: Education Tech Research Dev DOI 10.1007/s11423-011-9220-7

On page 16, Table 3 represents a summary of 20 ANOVAs. When the data were thus compiled, the primary author, Michael D. Sheehan, made several errors transposing the data. The corrected table and associated analysis can be found below.

Table 3 Philosophical belief differences by method preference

Philosophical belief	Method preference in descending order	<i>M</i>	Significantly different pairs of means
Physicalism	Quantitative	2.82	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	2.43	Mixed vs. quantitative
	Qualitative	2.23	
Idealism	Qualitative	3.78	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.51	
	Quantitative	3.21	
Ontological realism	ns		
Ontological relativism	Qualitative	4.11	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.69	
	Quantitative	3.22	

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s11423-011-9220-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-011-9220-7).

M. D. Sheehan (✉) · R. B. Johnson
University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL, USA
e-mail: msheehan@usouthal.edu

Table 3 continued

Philosophical belief	Method preference in descending order	<i>M</i>	Significantly different pairs of means
Epistemological relativism	Qualitative	3.98	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.74	
	Quantitative	3.45	
Fallibilism	ns		
Epistemological objectivity	Quantitative	3.38	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.03	Mixed vs. qualitative
	Qualitative	2.61	
Rationalism	ns		
Empiricism	ns		
Ethical realism	ns		
Ethical relativism	ns		
Value neutrality	Quantitative	3.63	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.28	Mixed vs. qualitative
	Qualitative	2.79	
Nomothetic methods	Quantitative	4.04	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.77	Mixed vs. qualitative
	qualitative	3.15	
Idiographic methods	Qualitative	4.30	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.93	Mixed vs. quantitative
	Quantitative	3.24	
Critical methods	ns		
Scientific naturalism	Quantitative	3.57	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.12	Mixed vs. qualitative
	Qualitative	2.65	Mixed vs. quantitative
Humanism	Qualitative	4.03	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.67	
	Quantitative	3.49	
Quantitative methods	Quantitative	4.07	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	3.21	Mixed vs. quantitative
	Qualitative	2.26	Mixed vs. qualitative
Qualitative methods	Qualitative	4.82	Qualitative vs. quantitative
	Mixed	4.27	Mixed vs. qualitative
	Quantitative	3.87	Mixed vs. quantitative
Mixed methods	Mixed	5.35	Mixed vs. qualitative
	Quantitative	4.79	Mixed vs. quantitative
	Qualitative	4.57	

Note. ns is used when the methodological group means are not significantly different at alpha .05

On page 15, replace the second paragraph with the following text:

Overall, the research paradigm characterizations found in the literature are empirically supported by our data with just a few exceptions. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods researchers do have different belief profiles, and they are as commonly described.

However, the data associated with axiological beliefs (ethical realism and ethical relativism) were more nuanced and did not support the theoretical literature. There were also several beliefs on which the research methods groups did not statistically differ. Finally, the data suggest that quantitative researchers valued qualitative methods more than what might be expected (the mean score assigned to qualitative methods by quantitative researchers was 3.87). Qualitative researchers, on the other hand, less valued quantitative methods (the mean score assigned to quantitative methods by qualitative researchers was 2.26).