TE WHARE WĀNANGA O TE ŪPOKO O TE IKA A MĀUI

VICTORIA
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

GOVT 601
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY
(30 Points)

Trimester One 2012

COURSE OUTLINE

Course Coordinator: **Dr Amanda Wolf**
Room RH 804, Level 8, Rutherford House, Pipitea Campus
Telephone: (04) 463 5712
Email: amanda.wolf@vuw.ac.nz

Programme Administrator: **Dawn Yeabsley**
Room RH 802, Level 8, Rutherford House, Pipitea Campus
Telephone: (04) 463 6966
Fax: (04) 463 5454
Email: dawn.yeabsley@vuw.ac.nz

Trimester Dates: From Monday 5 March to Friday 22 June (inclusive)

Withdrawal from Course
The standard last date for withdrawal from this course is 14 May. After this date, students forced to withdraw by circumstances beyond their control must apply for permission on an *Application for Associate Dean's Permission to Withdraw Late* form and include supporting documentation. The application form is available from the Faculty's Student Customer Service Desks.

Class Times and Room Numbers
Classes will meet in RH 819 Tuesdays 4 to 6 and Thursdays 8 to 10.

Course Content
The main topics are the foundations and principles for research design and methodology, the selection of appropriate methods and research ethics. As the first course in Part 1 of the DGov, GOVT 601 provides a first opportunity for candidates to inhabit their 'doctoral' identity, combining working professionally with working 'scientifically' and to ensure requisite foundational skills are in place. Consistent with the level of study and the distinctive focus of the DGov, candidates will also begin to begin to delineate the goals for their personal course of study.

Course Learning Objectives
Active participation in this course will provide candidates with a sophisticated understanding of the fundamentals of research designs in applied, interdisciplinary contexts, from the philosophical underpinnings, to the personal, professional and scholarly orientations involved, the specific matter of 'methods' and the associated ethical parameters.

Candidates bring existing research knowledge and experience to this course. The course will emphasise working effectively with that knowledge so that they add to, eliminate, change and adapt parts of that knowledge base in ways that accommodate new learning about the means, purposes and practices of research. Candidates will grasp research as a tool for public-sector work and as a process and product for a doctorate. They will understand research as an activity involving judgement and the effective use of scholarly conventions.

Those who successfully complete GOVT 601 should be able to:

1. *Discuss and debate the philosophical concepts, issues and problems concerning the design, conduct and use of research in applied government practice*
2. *Read research in a thoughtful, credible and critical manner*
3. *Design research that is appropriate for different research objectives*
4. *Understand and apply appropriate research methods*
5. *Design and conduct research according to ethical principles and requirements*

Course Delivery
The course will be delivered in seminars.

Expected Workload
The total workload associated with this course is approximately 275-300 hours, which includes individual work contributing to each candidate's doctoral programme.

Readings
Required readings are listed on the detailed course outline below. The readings will be provided on a cd and via Blackboard. Candidates are not required to purchase any texts, although recommendations will be made from time-to-time. In addition, candidates will need to identify, read and summarise additional readings. Additional readings and (some) summaries and student work will be posted on Blackboard.

Assessment Overview

Assignment	Weight	Due Date	Objectives covered
Essays on research design	40%	7 May	1 and 3 primarily
Topic reports	40%	18 June	2, 4, and 5 primarily
Seminar contribution	20%	N/A	All
Research statement	0%	2 July	–

Assessment Detail
1: Essays on research design

You need to prepare **four essays** on topics of your choosing, which relate to material covered in the first part of the course (through 26 April). Each essay should identify and justify the importance of one or two discrete themes. You should focus on what you have learned, rather than on summarising or repackaging readings or seminar discussions. Each essay should include 'critical reflection'. *Critical* refers to thinking that probes beneath the surface; thinking that seeks out, queries, and suggests possible answers to interesting or challenging questions, assumptions, controversies, links different ideas together in insightful ways, and so on. It is *reflective* when

you adopt a stance 'at one remove' from the surface matter, and draw on your own experiences, ideas, intuitions, or ideals. Essays may be submitted at any time prior to the deadline.

2: Topic reports

You need to nominate **two topics** from those starred in the course outline (subject to no single topic having more than three nominators). These topics include:

> Qualitative methods, generally
> Case study
> Grounded theory
> Quantitative methods, generally
> Mixed methods

For each of your nominated topics, you should write a report for your cohort colleagues (and other readers like them) that introduces them to the topic, orients them to the main strands, debates and so on, and thoughtfully comments on selected issues in applied research for public-sector practice. You are encouraged to prepare a short, annotated bibliography for further reading. Your reader (and you) should gain sufficient understanding of the topic to be able to think critically about the matters you raise when they read other research reports and design and conduct their own research.

Assessment for assignments 1 and 2 covers *content* (selection, understanding, presentation, scope), *argument* (the ability to make effective claims) and *writing* (structure, style, clarity, conciseness, referencing).

3: Seminar contribution

To pass this component, you must:
- actively participate in most seminar discussions by contributing relevant critical, observational and experiential comments; and
- demonstrate skill and effectiveness in preparing and leading discussions on days when your two nominated topics (see assignment 2) are treated. You may provide 'homework' or additional readings/questions for your colleagues as they prepare for your seminar

To help determine whether a pass is merited, you will prepare a brief self-assessment and confidential reports on others' individual contribution to your learning.

All assessment items will be graded on a pass-fail basis. Criteria for 'pass' are set for each assignment at a level to ensure doctoral-level competency and achievement. Passing standards will be more-or-less equivalent to a B+ at Honours level. All assignments must be passed to achieve an overall pass in the course.

Your assessed work may also be used for quality assurance purposes, such as to assess the level of achievement of learning objectives as required for accreditation and audit purposes. The findings may be used to inform changes aimed at improving the quality of programmes. All material used for such processes will be treated as confidential, and the outcome will not affect your grade for the course.

4. Research statement

The purpose of the research statement is to provide the GOVT 602 coordinator with knowledge of the research interests of the cohort. The statement should run to about 200 to 400 words, and may use the 'summary statement' format discussed in class.

A note on preparation and attendance

All candidates are expected to prepare appropriately for course sessions, to attend each session and to take responsibility for leading discussions as assigned. Reading and preparation is essential in seminar-style learning. Not all the material will appeal equally to you, and what appeals to you may not appeal to another. You are also encouraged to search out and use other materials, and to share these references with the cohort.

Most readings (except for full books) will be available on a cd-rom (provided) and on Blackboard. Printing is available in the School. Preparation notes will sometimes to posted to Blackboard, or discussed in class.

You are encouraged to look at library copies of methodology texts, and perhaps purchase one that appeals to you, as you may want to have such a text on hand.

One recommendation (which you are strongly encouraged to read, if not own) is:

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.

Other suggestions are:

Blaikie, N. (2007). *Approaches to social inquiry* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity.

O'Leary, Z. (2010). *The essential guide to doing your research*. Sage.

If you must miss a seminar, please alert the cohort members and presenter in advance. Sessions can be audio-recorded for you.

Course communications
Blackboard's announcement feature will be used. Blackboard uses your student id, so you may wish to set up an automatic forwarding function.

In addition members of the cohort will select an email address to be used among members and between members and DGov staff.

Detailed Course Outline
(Note: readings within topics are in alphabetical order)

Date	Topic	Readings
1 Mar	Introductions; The traveller and the journey	Costley, C., Elliott, G., & Gibbs, P. (2010). *Doing work based research: Approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*. London: Sage. (pp. 36–47). Radin, B. (2010). Brenda Boyle: There is nothing more practical than a good theory. *Public Administration Review, 70*(2), 289–294. Shea, J. (2011). Taking nonprofit intermediaries seriously: A middle-range theory for implementation research. *Public Administration Review, 71*(1), 57–66.
6 Mar	Orientation	DGov Policy and Procedures; Orientation checklist
13 Mar	The library and databases	
15 Mar	Knowledge management	Endnote software
20 Mar 22 Mar	Research, scholarship, knowledge in practice	Brew, A. (2001). *The nature of research: Inquiry in academic contexts*. London: Routledge. (pp. 21–25; 36–39; 45–47; 64–65) Miller, M., & Mansilla, V. B. (2004). Thinking Across Perspectives and Disciplines. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Education. Manzi, J. (2010). What social science does—and doesn't—know. *City Journal, 20*(3). http://www.city-journal.org/2010/20_3_social-science.html Schmidt, M. R. (1993). Grout: Alternative kinds of knowledge and why they are ignored. *Public Administration Review, 53*(6), 525–530. Starbuck, W. H. (2006). *The production of knowledge: The challenge of social science research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (pp. 142–169).
27 Mar 29 Mar	Philosophical foundations and assumptions	Biesta, G. (2010). Pragmatism and the philosophical foundations of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 95–118). Los Angeles: Sage. Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (2003). Competing traditions. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding* (2nd ed., pp. 23–38). Auckland: Pearson Educational. Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., & Jackson, P. R. (2008). *Management research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage. (pp. 73–77). Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social enquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

3 April 5 April	Methodology and theory	Alvessen, M., & Karreman, D. (2007). Constructing mystery: Empirical matters in theory development. *Academy of Managment Review, 32*(4), 1265–1291. Blaikie, N. (2007). *Approaches to social enquiry: Advancing knowledge* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press. (pp. 5–29). Gioia, D. A., & Pitre, E. (1990). Multiparadign perspectives on theory building. *Academy of Managment Review, 15*(4), 584–602. Moses, J. W., & Knutsen, T. (2007). *Ways of knowing: Competing methodologies in social and political research*. Hampshire (UK) and New York: Palgrave Macmillan. van Maanen, J., Sorensen, J. B., & Mitchell, T. R. (2007). The interplay between theory and method. *Academy of Managment Review, 32*(4), 1145–1154.
24 April 26 April	Research strategies	Cunliffe, A. L. (2011). Crafting qualitative research: Morgan and Smircich 30 years on. *Organizational Research Methods, 14*: 647–673. Fearon, J. D. (1991). Counterfactuals and hypothesis testing in political science. *World Politics, 43*, 169–195. Ospina, S. M., & Dodge, J. (2005). Narrative inquiry and the search for connectedness: Practitioners and academics developing public administration scholarship. *Public Administration Review, 65*(4), 409–423. Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (pp. 37–73). Paulos, J. A. (2010, October 26). Stories vs statistics. (New York Times, The Stone weblog). van Eeten, M. J. G. (2007). Narrative policy analysis. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis: theory, politics, and methods* (pp. 251–269): Taylor and Francis: CRC Press.
1 May	Introduction to research ethics	Victoria University of Wellington, Human Ethics Committee, information for applicants and application form.
3 May	The intersection of research and practitioner ethics	Dixon-Woods, M., & Bosk, C. L. (2011). Defending rights or defending privileges? *Public Management Review, 13*(2): 257–272. Fisher, C. B., & Anushko, A. E. (2008). Research ethics in social science. In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman & J. Brannen (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social research methods* (pp. 95–109). Los Angeles: Sage. O'Leary, Z. (2010). Striving for integrity in the research process. Ch 3 in *The essential guide to doing your research*. Sage.
8 May	Research Proposal	Blaikie, N. (2000). *Designing social research: The logic of anticipation*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (pp. 128–182). Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.

		Gerring, J. (2001). *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (pp. 35–64).
		Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2007). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertation and grant proposals* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
10 May	Literature Review	Innovation in public services: Literature review. IDeA Knowledge 09/05. http://www.idea.gov.uk.idk/aio/1118552
		Knopf, J. W. (2006). Doing a literature review. *PS Political Science and Politics, 39*(9), 1127–1132.
		Locke, K., & Golden-Biddle, K. (1997). Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and 'problematizing' in organizatonal studies. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(5), 1023–1062.
		Ridley, D. (2008). *The literature review: A step-by-step guide for students*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishers.
15 May	Writing and referencing	American Psychological Association (APA). (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
		Becker, H. S. (2007). *Writing for social scientists* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
17 May	**Qualitative methods	Outhwaite, W., & Turner, S.P. (Eds.). (2007). *The Sage handbook of social science methodology*. London: Sage. (Section introductions).
		Hall, R. (2009). Qualitative research methods. In G. Argyrous (Ed.), *Evidence for policy and decision-making: A practical guide* (pp. 218–239). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
22 May 24 May	**Case study	Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(1), 25–32.
		Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 12*(2), 219–245.
		Siggelkow, N. (2007). Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(1), 20–24.
		Thomas, G. (2010). Doing case study: Abduction not induction, phronesis not theory. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(7): 575–582.
		Weick, K. E. (2007). The generative properties of richness. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(1), 14–19.
29 May	Argument	Dunn, W. N. (2008). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. (pp. 377–398).
31 May	**'Grounded' theory	Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2010). *Grounded theory: A practical guide*. London: Sage. (pp. 1–14).
		Charmaz, K. (2008). Reconstructing grounded theory. In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman & J. Brannen (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social research methods* (pp. 461–478). London: Sage.

		Dick, B. (2005). Grounded theory: A thumbnail sketch. http://www.scu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/grounded.html.
5 June	**Quantitative methods, including survey	Callister, P., Didham, R., Newell, J., & Potter, D. (2007). "Family ethnicity": knitting a jumper using two woolly concepts. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, 32*, 32–48. Dunn, W. N. (2008). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. (pp. 128–200). Muhkerjee, C., & Wuyts, M. (2007). Thinking with quantitative data. In A. Thomas & G. Mohan (Eds.), *Research skills for policy and development: How to find out fast* (pp. 231–253.). London: Sage.
7 June	**Mixed methods	Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2010). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage. (pp. 53–106). Johnson, R. B., & Onwuengbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*, 14–26. doi: 10.3102/0013189X033007014 Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2010). Overview of contemporary issues in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 1–41). Los Angeles: Sage.
12 June	Wrap-up	

Penalties

No penalties will apply. Candidates who cannot meet assessment deadlines must negotiate an alternative arrangement with the course coordinator.

Mandatory Course Requirements

To pass the course, a candidate is required to pass each assessment item.

Use of Turnitin

Work provided for assessment in this course may be checked for academic integrity by the electronic search engine http://www.turnitin.com Turnitin is an on-line plagiarism prevention tool which compares submitted work with a very large database of existing material. At the discretion of the Head of School, handwritten work may be copy-typed by the School and subject to checking by Turnitin. Turnitin will retain a copy of submitted materials on behalf of the University for detection of future plagiarism, but access to the full text of submissions will not be made available to any other party.

For the following important information follow the links provided:

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism
http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/plagiarism.aspx

General University Policies and Statutes
Find key dates, explanations of grades and other useful information at
www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study.
Find out about academic progress and restricted enrolment at
www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/academic-progress.
The University's statutes and policies are available at www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/policy,
except qualification statutes, which are available via the Calendar webpage at
www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/calendar (See Section C).
Further information about the University's academic processes can be found on the website of the
Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic) at
www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about_victoria/avcacademic/default.aspx

**AVC (Academic) Website: information including: Conduct, Academic Grievances,
Students with Impairments, Student Support**
http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about_victoria/avcacademic/Publications.aspx

Faculty of Commerce and Administration Offices
http://www.victoria.ac.nz/fca/studenthelp/

Manaaki Pihipihinga Programme
http://www.victoria.ac.nz/st_services/mentoring/