

College of Education •
School of Educational Policy & Leadership
EdP&L 800
Introduction to Qualitative Research in Education
AU09 • Section 0020 #9705 • Tuesdays 4:30-6:48 • • 03credits, McPherson Lab 1035

Patti Lather, Instructor
101C Ramseyer Hall • 688.3044 • lather.1@osu.edu
Office Hours Tuesday 2-4 and by Appointment

Course Description

This course concentrates on postpositivist educational research with a focus on the design of such studies and the issues faced by researchers using qualitative methods. Central objectives include formulating criteria by which to evaluate postpositivist research in the human sciences and gaining an understanding of the socio-intellectual context within which such research is conducted. While the readings can be dense at times, students might heed French philosopher/psychoanalyst, Jacques Lacan's advice: "...to read does not obligate one to understand. First it is necessary to read ... avoid understanding too quickly" (quoted in Gregory Ulmer, *Applied Grammatology*, John Hopkins Press, 1985, p 196). One might also heed Roland Barthes' advice on rereading:

Rereading, an operation contrary to the commercial and ideological habits of our society, which would have us "throw away" the story once it has been consumed (or "devoured"), so that we can then move on to another story, buy another book, and which is tolerated only in certain marginal categories of readers (children, old people, and professors), rereading is here suggested at the outset, for it alone saves the text from repetition (those who fail to reread are obliged to read the same story everywhere). (*S/Z*, 1974, pp. 15-16.)

Readings Required

- Reading packet available at Tuttle. To purchase on-line: www.copez.org
- Becoming Qualitative Researchers by Corrine Glesne. Third edition, Longman, 2006.

*An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research, Ellen Condliffe Lagemann. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

*Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research, National Science Foundation, 2004. Available at <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/start.htm>. This is a 147 page document that we will be reading most of, including selections from the appendix.

OR

At Cop-Ez, Tuttle. This includes ONLY parts we will be reading.

and one of the following:

Troubling the Angels: Women Living With HIV/AIDS by Patti Lather and Chris Smithies, Boulder CO: Westview/HarperCollins, 1997.

or

The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children by Gloria Ladson Billings, San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1994.

or

Decolonizing Methodology: Research and Indigenous Peoples, Linda Tuhiwai Smith. London: Zed Books, 1999.

or

Elusive Culture: Schooling, Race, and Identity in Global Times, Daniel Yon. Albany: SUNY Press, 2000.

Recommended

• Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry, third edition, by Thomas Schwandt, Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2007.

Negotiating the Complexities of Qualitative Research in Higher Education: Fundamental Elements and Issues, Susan Jones, Vasti Torres and Jan Arminio. New York: Routledge, 2006.

• Multiple and Intersecting Identities in Qualitative Research, edited by Betty M. Merchant and Arlette Ingram Willis. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.

• Poststructuralism and Educational Research, Michael Peters and N. Burbules, Rowman and Littlefield, 2004.

• The Methodological Dilemma: Creative, Critical and Collaborative Approaches to Qualitative Research, Kathleen Gallagher, ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

Scientific Research in Education, Richard Shavelson and Lisa Towne, eds. Washington DC: National Academy Press, 2002.

Engaging Crystallization in Qualitative Research, Laura L. Ellingson. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2009.

NSF 2005 Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research, Report prepared by Michele Lamont and Patricia White, 2009. Available on NSF website. Deals with cultural anthropology, law and social science, political science and sociology.

Requirements

• Attendance and participation in class discussion (pass/fail).

• Midterm (20 points possible) and final (40 points possible) take home essay exams.

- Participation in interactive evaluation format (5 possible points at midterm and at final).

Interactive Evaluation: This entails written midterm and final self evaluations regarding contributions to: 1.) class discussion, 2.) internal partnering process, if relevant, 3.) midterm and final exams, and 4.) evaluation of course and instructor, oral at midterm, written at end of course, for which more detailed instructions as the course progresses will be provided.

- Written work to be typed and printed with dark ribbons and reasonable margins. This includes journal.

Options

- In standard bibliographic form, generate a bibliography of readings that you hope to follow up on as a result of this course, with a one-sentence rationale for why you want to read each. Divide bibliography into: 1.) oft-cited classics, 2.) recent work that might help you grasp the issues, and 3.) whatever meets your particular substantive interests. Include a minimum of four to six citations in each section, but don't go overboard on this. (10 possible points.)
- Submit a listing of journals in your area that publish qualitative research. For most of you, that will mean education as well as your more specialized area within education. Include a short paragraph on the sort of qualitative work each journal publishes (e.g., methodological, empirical etc). **This will entail reading editorial statement of journal purpose.** For those of you with few journals (less than 5), write a more detailed description. (10 possible points.)
- Write two to three-page review of one of the recommended books or one of the required exemplars that you do NOT read for final. Briefly summarize main points of the book and evaluate its usefulness to you in understanding the issues raised by the course. I am open to your doing this with a book from outside the class, but check with me first.

If you do this as a more formal book review and include documentation that you have researched possible publication outlets and their book review format, I will add 5 points. The key here is to become familiar with qualitative journals and their book review formats. If you include documentation that you have actually sent the book review off to a journal, I will add another 5 points. (10-20 possible points.)

- Journaling: For each class, write two to four-page reactions to readings and issues raised in class discussion. Journal is due at midterm and end of term. (30 possible points.)
- Conduct a mini-study that uses both interview and observation methods. Write-up should be 3-4 pages long and include, 1.) brief description of context and focus, 2.) main learnings in terms of methods, 3.) brief overview of what you learned about your focus (remember, I am interested in what you learned methodologically, not substantively), and 4.) personal learnings from this in terms of self as researcher. Include some appropriate citations from reading. (15 possible points)

•Working in internal partner (IP) groups, do one of the following:

•A•In a group of two to four, pick either the Lather/Smithies/Ladson-Billings/Tuhiwai Smith or Yon text and do the following: 1.) one-page description of researcher’s paradigmatic assumptions. 2.) Generate a SHORT bibliography of two to four key annotated readings that the exemplar makes you want to follow up on. Items 1 and 2 are to be handed out to each class member. 3.) Discussion of how exemplar illuminates and/or fleshes out issues raised in class. PRESENTATION WILL LAST NO MORE THAN 20 MINUTES. Include a short self-evaluation of your contributions to the group with your final work. (30 possible points which includes work with internal partner group.)

•B•For those NOT doing presentation, but doing internal partnering: write up a two to three page analysis of the impact of internal partnering on your learning for this class. Include both cognitive and affective outcomes (15 possible points).

Internal partnering includes: 1.) weekly meeting, 2.) either collective work on midterm OR exchange of midterms, 3.) if relevant, working together on •A• or •B• above, and 4.) sharing copies of one another’s final exams. **NOTE: final exam is to be written as an independent project.**

Grading

Using the following point system, you will earn a grade based on your fulfillment of course requirements (must total at least 60 for an •A•, 48 for a •B•, regardless of how many optional points you earn) and optional learning experiences. Each student is to get a folder with pockets, put name on outside right corner, put grade sheet in right side pocket, and submit written work in the left side pocket.

A	97-100	C	74-76
A-	94-96	C-	70-73
B +	90-93	D+	67-69
B	84-89	D	64-66
B-	80-83	D-	60-63
C+	77-79	E	59 and below

Policies and Procedures

Absences: You are expected to attend each class session. If this is impossible, it is your responsibility to contact the instructor in order to arrange make-up work.

Incomplete: Written request no later than last week of November which includes phone number and e.mail. Include time-line for getting work done within next quarter.

Incompletes are evaluated with higher expectations (given additional time to do work), and receive minimal feedback.

Late Work: Late work will be docked one point per day and will receive sketchy comments.

Class Schedule

- 9.29 Intro to class and one another. Go over syllabus. Background lecture. Educational Research and the Uneasy Social Sciences. Go over handouts.
- 10.6 The Troubling History of Education Research. [Lagemann, Part I, preface plus 1-97; readings 1-5] Set up for internal partners.
- 10.13 Paradigm Talk in Educational Research. [Lagemann, Part II, 99-157; Glesne ch. 1; readings 6-10].
- 10.20 Ethics & Politics. [Lagemann, Part III, 159-246; Glesne ch. 5, 6 and 10; readings 11-14].
- 10.27 Fieldwork Experience. Research Design, and Methods. [Glesne ch. 2, 3&4 plus appendix] Readings 15-18. NSF: 9-19, 59-69, 101-104, 121-125, 127-132, 137-140.
- 11.03 Midterm work due: Journal 1, midterm, including written self-evaluation. Midterm course evaluation.
- 11.10 Data Analysis and writing the text. [Glesne ch. 7, 8&9] Reading 19. NSF: 45-47, 49-51, 95-99, 133-136.
- 11.17 Questions of Validity. Readings 20-24. NSF: 39-43, 55-57, 83-90, 91-93. Critiquing Postpositivist Exemplars: Collaborative synthesis work on generating criteria for evaluation of postpositivist research.
- 11.24 Post-Paradigmatic Futures. NSF 141-144 and 145-148. Readings 25 & 26. Questions regarding final exam.
- 12.1 Student presentation groups. In-class oral course evaluation.

December 8: All written work due, including final self and course evaluations. Turn into box in Ramseyer 122 by 4 PM.

EdP&L 800: Reading Booklet

Assorted jokes and charts on research paradigms. Guidelines for small group discussion.

1. Science wars handouts.
2. Norman Denzin. 2008. The new paradigm dialogs and qualitative inquiry. Qualitative Studies in Education, 21(4), 315-325.
3. Kenneth R. Howe (2004). A critique of experimentalism. Qualitative Inquiry, 10(1), 42-61.
4. Lawrence Sipe and Susan Constable, 1999. A Chart of Four Contemporary Research Paradigms: Metaphors for the Modes of Inquiry. Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education, 1, 153-163.
5. Jan Nespore, 2006. Morphologies of inquiry: The uses and spaces of paradigm proliferation. Journal of Qualitative Research in Education, 19(1), 115-128.
6. Patti Lather, 2006. Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. Qualitative Studies in Education, 19(1), 35-57.
7. Patti Lather and Pamela Moss. 2005. Introduction: Implications of the Scientific Research in Education Report for Qualitative Research. Teachers College Record, 107(1), 1-3.
8. Jill Green and Susan Stinson, 1999, Postpositivist Research in Dance. Pp. 91-123 of Researching Dance: Evolving Modes of Inquiry, Sondra H. Fraleigh and Penelope Hanstein, eds. University of Pittsburgh Press.
9. Bryan McKinley Brayboy and Donna Deyhle. 2000. Insider-outsider: Researcher in American Indian Communities. Theory Into Practice, 39(3), 163-169.
10. Patti Lather, Critical Inquiry in Qualitative Research: Feminist and Poststructural Perspectives "After Truth." Pp. 203-215 of Foundations for Research: Methods of Inquiry in Education and the Social Sciences, Kathleen deMarrais and Stephen D. Lapan, eds. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Pub, 2004.
11. Patti Lather, 1986. Research as Praxis. Harvard Educational Review, 56:3, 257-277.
12. Sandra Harding, 1993. Introduction: Eurocentric Scientific Illiteracy – A Challenge for the World Community. In The "Racial" Economy of Science, S. Harding, editor. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1-22.
13. Peter Demerath. 2006. The science of context: Modes of response for qualitative researchers in education. Journal of Qualitative Research in Education. 19(1), 97-113.
14. Tuskegee handouts and human subjects review guidelines and materials PLUS "Rumble in the Jungle: A Bitter Scientific Dispute Erupts Around the Yanomami Indians," Bruce Bower. Science News, Vol. 159, January 27, 2001, 58-60.

15. Michele Tracy Berger. 2004. Capturing the research journey/Listening to women's lives. Chapter 3 of Workable Sisterhood: The Political Journey of Stigmatized Women with HIV/AIDS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 68-86.

16. Assorted handouts on research design and data analysis, including AIDS research handouts PLUS "Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science in AERA Publications." Educational Researcher, 35(6), 33-40.

17. Julia Brannen, 2004. Working qualitatively and quantitatively. Pp. 312-326 of Qualitative Research Practice, Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber Gubrium and David Silverman, eds. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

18. Antoinette Errante, 2000. But Sometimes You're Not Part of the Story: Oral Histories and Ways of Remembering and Telling. Educational Researcher, 29(2), 16-27.

19. QSE data, "We're Spoused to be a Support Group."

20. Yvonna Lincoln, 1995, Emerging Criteria for Quality in Qualitative and Interpretive Research. Qualitative Inquiry, 1(3), 275-289. Plus chart of 1985 criteria and pp. 130+ of RER article that demonstrates validity talk.

21. Patti Lather, 1986. Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and a Hard Place. Interchange, 17:4, 63-84.

22. Jim Scheurich, 1996. The Masks of Validity: A Deconstructive Investigation. Qualitative Studies in Education, 9:1, 49-60.

23. Patti Lather, 2007. Validity, Qualitative. The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology, George Ritzer, ed. Oxford: Blackwell Pub.

24. Bent Flyvbjerg, 2006. Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research. Qualitative Inquiry, 12(2), 219-245.

25. Rick Voithofer. 2005. Designing new media education research: The materiality of data, representation, and dissemination. Educational Researcher, 34(9), 3-14.

26. Course evaluation form

27. Two book reviews (Lagemann and Hess policy book)

EdP&L 800: Introduction to Qualitative Research in Education
Take-Home Midterm and Final

Evaluation criteria for exams: degree to which responses 1.) concisely synthesize central ideas from reading and class discussion, and 2.) demonstrate some hard thought and creativity on your part in regards to wrestling with questions that have no definitive answers. Ph.D. students are expected, while still writing concisely, to do more theoretical grounding that draws on more sources in a more detailed manner. APA guidelines are to be followed. Midterms can be a bit informal in terms of citations, bibliographies, etc., as you are not expected to read much beyond the course readings. For doctoral students, finals are expected to be both concise and scholarly in terms of citations and synthesis and evaluative commentary. Closed reserve readings are recommended for all, but especially doctoral students. Choose your way through them.

I am looking for a demonstration of your ability to negotiate various discourses about postpositivist inquiry in a way that doesn't reify or monolithize paradigms but instead recognizes paradigms as a conceptual frame within which are continuums of practice and beliefs.

MIDTERM

Two to three typed, double-spaced pages, if done individually, four to six pages if done with internal partner.

Based on our survey of the many ways of conceptualizing postpositivist research in the human sciences, develop a graphic display of the differences in research traditions (you may use the positivist, interpretivist, and critical categories or develop other categories that you feel better capture the differences) and their assumptions, methodologies and purposes. Append to your display a rationale for why you feel it captures your thinking.

FINAL

Everyone must do #1. Then choose two others (one for masters students). Answers should each be two to three double spaced typewritten pages long. Each answer is worth 13 points (20 for master students).

Criteria: Concise, clear arguments that synthesize across array of course readings and include proper APA formatting for citations.

Must do one of the following:

- 1A. Discuss the criteria traditionally used to evaluate research in the human sciences and how effectively these criteria have worked in terms of producing "truthful" and useful findings. What criteria can we use to evaluate postpositivist research in the human sciences? Using these evaluative criteria, critique Lather/Smithies, Ladson-Billings, Tuhawai Smith or Yon as an exemplar of qualitative research.
- 1B. In terms of the ethics and politics of qualitative research, list and discuss four to six pressing issues in your present thinking about the doing of qualitative research. Draw on Lather and Smithies/Ladson-Billings, Tuhiwai Smith or Yon particularly, as

well as any fieldwork experience of your own that might be brought to bear on these ethical and political dilemmas of inquiry. Finally, link these dilemmas to the argument that validity and ethics are increasingly blurred discourses in contemporary qualitative research.

May do either of the following:

2. In terms of epistemology and philosophies of inquiry, how has the course worked to help you learn to analyze the discourses available to you, the ones you are particularly invested in? How are you inscribed by the dominant, how are you outside it/other than the dominant? How would you, in this moment, describe your always partial, temporary, situated, contradictory location in terms of your own non-innocence, both how you sustain the “givens” of traditional science AND the ways you are invested in being a “science outlaw” working at the edges of intelligibility? Finally, what hopes and concerns do you have about doing research in the human sciences within such a framework?
3. In terms of situated methodology and the problems of scientism, to what extent does method privilege findings? What is the place of procedures in the claim to validity? What does it mean to recognize the limits of exactitude and certainty, but still to have respect for empirical work? What is the special status and purpose of scientific knowledge, say in relation to journalism? Where do you presently locate yourself paradigmatically and methodologically in terms of your own investments in “knowledge projects we call science” (to quote Sandra Harding)? For example, what are the possibilities and limits of mixing quantitative and qualitative methods? Of mixing paradigms?

May do any one of the following:

4. What is science? Who decides? What insights does Lagemann shed on this question? What might a postpositivist science look like? What “turns you on” about this reformulation of science? What worries you? Why is it or is it not important to extend the definition of science to postpositivist work, anyway?
5. What is scientific objectivity? What insights does Lagemann shed on this question? How has it advanced the growth of knowledge in the human sciences? Hindered it? Do you see it as a goal within postpositivist research and why or why not?
6. Make an argument for the acceptance of a “non-traditional” research project to a group (e.g., thesis or dissertation committee) with a severe case of “physics envy.” This entails addressing many aspects of questions 4 and 5. Be sure to call on Lagemann in your response.

7. Within the concept of situated methodology, identify and discuss six to ten key elements of a successful research design for a qualitative study, from preliminary

fieldwork through interpretive and textual decisions. Be sure to draw on NSF readings for this response.