TE WHARE WĀNANGA O TE ŪPOKO O TE IKA A MĀUI

VICTORIA
UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

School of Information Management

MMIM552 RESEARCH METHODS
Trimester 2, 2014

COURSE OUTLINE

Names and Contact Details

Course Coordinator	**Programme Administrator**
David Mason	Usha Varatharaju
RH501 Rutherford House	RH521 Rutherford House
463 7435 029 773 4400	463 5309
david.mason@vuw.ac.nz	mim-info@vuw.ac.nz

Lectures	Tuesday evenings, starting 15 July 2014
	One two-hour class each week
Times	Tuesday 5:40 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
Venue	RWW311

Teaching Period   Monday 14th July – Friday 17th October

Workload

This course is worth 15 points, which equates to 150 hours of study.

Lectures	2 hours per week
Private study and preparation	6 – 8 hours weekly throughout the trimester.

Assessment Requirements

There is no exam for this course; all assessment is by course work.

WK 2/3	Presentation of Research Topic	5%	8 hours
WK 6	Philosophy of Research Essay	20%	40 hours
WK 8	Summary of Interview Results	30%	20 hours
WK 10	Presentation of literature critique	5%	8 hours
WK11	Research Proposal	40%	60 hours

Course Content

The course is intended to prepare students for MMIM592 Research Project. The course will cover the philosophy of research, research techniques, the essentials of qualitative and quantitative methods, and basic approaches to case studies and research projects. The major deliverable is a finished MMIM592 Project Proposal, ready to be implemented.

Course Progression

This course does not assume any prior knowledge of research. It is a prerequisite for MMIM592 and is designed to ensure that students can enter MMIM592 with an almost-ready-to-go project proposal. Students will be encouraged to identify publication outputs for their research.

Learning Schedule

	Lecture	
Week1	Introduction to research methods Discussion of Research topic design	
Week 2	**Presentation of individual research topics.** Paradigms and the Philosophy of Research.	5%
Week 3	**Presentation of individual research topics.** Designing Qualitative Research	
Week 4	Qualitative Data Collection	
Week 5	Analysis of Qualitative Data	
Week 6	**Philosophy of Research Essay hand-in** Questionnaire based research	20%
	Mid Trimester Break 25 August-5 September	
Week 7	The Normal distribution, Correlation	
Week 8	**Interview and Content analysis hand in** Presentation of Interview Analyses	30%
Week 9	**HEC form hand in** Regression, multiple regression	
Week 10	**Brief class presentation analysing relevant literature.** Analysis of variance. ANOVA	5%
Week 11	**Research Proposal Hand-in** Factor analysis. SEM	40%
Week 12	Research Proposal Feedback	

This schedule is subject to change.

Course Delivery

Weekly lectures. There are no separate tutorials or lab sessions. Students are expected to prepare by reading the assigned texts, to participate actively in the discussion sessions of each lecture and present the results of their research findings. Key dates as shown below.

Course Learning Objectives

On completion of this course the student will be able to
Communication
> Publish a research proposal for a research project.
> Create a Human Ethics Committee application.
> Present the results of their research findings in an academic format.

Creative and Critical Thinking
> Outline quantitative research techniques for appropriate situations.
> Outline qualitative research techniques for appropriate situations.
> Design a questionnaire to support a hypothesis.

Leadership
> Discourse on research philosophies and strategies.
> Design and conduct research interviews.

Due date	Assessment	
Week 2 or Week 3	**Presentation of your research topic.** You may use no more than three ppt slides, and a summary sheet to hand out. The summary sheet will list three journal articles relevant to your topic. Make enough copies of the summary so that you can give one to the other students as well. Check the SIM Research directory to identify staff you could approach as a supervisor. 8 hours	5% *Communication MA1*
Week 5	**Philosophy of Research Essay** Topic: Justify the pedagogical and philosophical approach you will bring to your research topic, and outline any problems inherent in that approach. 1000-1200 words, properly APA referenced. 40 hours	20% *Critical Thinking Leadership MA3*
Week 7	**Presentation of your Interview results** **Report: Combination of Interviews and Content Analysis.** Treat this as a practice project, with sections as you would use in the final project proposal. Not more than 2000 words. You can use excerpts and direct quotations 20 hours	30% *Leadership Communication MA2*
Week 8	**HEC Project Proposal** Use the SIM form, not the BCA version. You must include your proposed interview questions, or the survey you intend to use. These do not have to be final, but must give a good idea of the final questions. 8 hours	5% *Critical Thinking MA1*
Week 11	**Final Proposal** Examples of the required format will be given out earlier in the course. 60 hours	40% *Critical Thinking Communication MA1*
Week 12	**Proposal Feedback** Discussion and feedback on the project proposals.	

Full details of each course work item/assignment will be given out in class and/or published on Blackboard.

Assessment
From Trimester 1, 2014, a revised Assessment Handbook will apply to all VUW courses: see http://www.victoria.ac.nz/documents/policy/staff-policy/assessment-handbook.pdf.
In particular, there will be a new grade scheme, in which the A+ range will be 90-100% and 50-54% will be a C-.

If you cannot complete an assignment or sit a test or examination, refer to
www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/exams-and-assessments/aegrotat

Student Feedback
Student feedback on University courses may be found at
www.cad.vuw.ac.nz/feedback/feedback_display.php

RUBRICS

MARKING RUBRIC for Philosophies of Research assignment.

Academic Essay
Justify the pedagogical and philosophical approach you will use to research your research topic, and outline any problems inherent in that approach.
1000-1200 words, properly APA referenced.

20%

	A	B	C
Justification of philosophical approach used	Clearly articulated	Some coverage but lacks depth	Minimal justification
Reflective evaluation applied to topic	Shows true insight	Some understanding	Minimal appreciation shown
Paradigms & Philosophies discussed	Multiple	Two	One
Breadth of reading and refs	Comprehensive	Adequate	Few
Understanding of Philosophies	Shows clear understanding	Some appreciation	Surface use only
Actively engaged with	Excellent use	Good discussion	Some understanding
Knows how to apply	Shows clear understanding	Some appreciation	Surface use only
Originality	Shows independent thought	some new ideas	derivative
Argument	Logical Flow	Understandable	Hit and miss
Use of sources	Excellent	Good	OK
Focus	All content to the point & relevant	a little extraneous material	noticeable irrelevant material

Presentation			
APA citation	Exact	Minor Inconsistencies	Incorrect formatting
Essay Format	Structured	Bit wandering	confused
Word Count	As required		outside the specification

	What was delivered:	
A	A quality of learning and understanding that is the best that could reasonably be expected in this course.	Shows insight, has reflected on their research, understands the implications of using a particular philosophy, has critically evaluated their proposed research methods via the philosophy. Has justified their personal approach to their topic.
B	Highly satisfactory but lacks the flair that distinguishes A	Has described the philosophies, how they are used, has shown some understanding of the philosophical issues and their justification, but not to the level for an A.
C	Quite satisfactory but not of the same standard as a B.	Has made good attempt at the assignment, but has not demonstrated real insight of the consequences or problems of using a particular philosophy. Justification may not be explicitly shown.
D	Minimally Acceptable. at the lower end of what is acceptable from a Masters student.	May have described some philosophies but not shown that they know how to apply them. Little or no reflection on how knowledge of philosophies might affect their approach to their own research topic.
F	Less than acceptable.	Below the standard expected from a Masters student.

COMMENTS

YOUR GRADE:

	A	B	C	D
Uses Research Project format	Follows the required format	Mostly conforms	Poorly organised	Not in research project format
Scholarship	Comprehensive reading and refs	Adequate reading	Needs more	Minimal/ None
Introduction / Objectives	Puts work into context	could be clearer	Inadequate for the reader	None
Interviews				
Interview Questions	Clearly focused	in the right area	poorly thought out	Not mentioned
Interview Methodology	Excellent description	Adequate for this assignment	skimpy, serious omissions	Not shown
analysis of Interview data	Shows true insight	Adequate for this assignment	Superficial, lacks rigor	None
Interview Model	Clear and understandable	Acceptable	Not good	Not done
Content Analysis				
CA methodology	Excellent description	Adequate for this assignment	Skimpy, Serious omissions	Not Shown
CA analysis	Shows true insight	Adequate for this assignment	Superficial, lacks rigor	None
CA model	Clear and understandable	Acceptable	Not good	Not done
Argument				
Comparison of the models	Excellent use	Good discussion	Not enough depth	No real understanding
Developing Arg	Logical Flow	Understandable	Hit and miss	Confused
Essay structure	Structured	Could be improved	Confusing	Messy
Originality	Shows independent thought	some new ideas	derivative	copied
Focus	All content to the point & relevant	some extraneous material	noticeable irrelevant material	Didn't answer the question
Conclusion	Excellent, to the point	OK	does not sum up the findings	Missing

Presentation	These elements are expected, can detract from grade			
Use of refs in text	Excellent	Good	OK	Poor
APA citation format	Exact	Minor Inconsistencies	Incorrect formatting	Not used
Word Count	As required	Not Shown	outside the specification	much too short or too long

COMMENTS

Most important thing to change

Report: Results of Interviews 30%

Compare the outcome of your interviews with the outcome of the content analysis and present the results as a report. Treat this as a mini project with sections laid out as you would use then in your final project proposal.

Not more than 2000 words, properly APA referenced.

	What was delivered:	
A	A quality of learning and understanding that is the best that could reasonably be expected in this course.	Used a project layout, has reflected on the research methods, justified the research methods used. Has justified how they arrived at the models, has analysed and discussed how the models are different..
B	Highly satisfactory but lacks the flair that distinguishes A	Has outlined the methodologies but not in detail, has shown some understanding of the issues associated with different methodologies, has justified their analysis and the models, but not to the level for an A.
C	Quite satisfactory but not of the same standard as a B.	Has made good attempt at the assignment, has done the interview and CA adequately, but not tried to justify their models or their analysis. Models not adequately contrasted. Lacks rigor, not an academic approach.
D	Minimally Acceptable. at the lower end of what is acceptable from a Masters student.	May have described some aspects of the data analysis but not shown that they understand what is wanted. Little or no justification of either method or analysis, too much unsupported statements, lacking the level of academic rigour required.
F	Less than acceptable.	Below the standard expected from a Masters student.

Project Proposal – Planning Outline

This is not a marking scheme - it shows what things you need to do, and approximately where to put your effort.

Criteria	Weight	Assignment
Clear Goals Outlines a scholarly, significant, elegant and ethical project to carry out at a later date. Requirements: Addresses a significant issue or problem Is publishable Identifies the target journal The research is actually wanted by someone Has support of identifiable research subjects Is not simply an issue arising from bad management Is about some aspect of ICT Has an accessible body of knowledge to work from Can be done in the time available Outlines how the results will be shared beyond MIM	25%	Presentation of your research topic
Adequate Preparation Is well-grounded in key theories and research findings related to IS generally Shows evidence of having engaged with the literature in the academic discipline	20%	Presentation of relevant literature
Appropriate Methods Demonstrates research design and research methods appropriate for the project proposed	20%	Practical data collection and analysis
Significant Results What the outcome will be and how it will help some organization or industry The contribution to knowledge	15%	Presentation of your research topic
Reflective Critique Anticipates any ethical issues that the research might raise Identifies the limits and potential weaknesses in the design	10%	Philosophy of research
Effective Presentation Presents the research in a clearly structured and coherently written research proposal format	10%	
Adheres to the conventions of scholarly writing, including full and correct referencing	Mandatory	
	100%	

MARKING RUBRIC for Research Proposal

	A	B	C	D
Research Proposal				
Introduction	explains work in context	needs to be more focussed	Inadequate for the reader	None
Research Question	Concisely stated	OK	unclear or ambiguous	Missing
Aims & Objectives	Clear & unambiguous	could be more specific	Inadequate for the reader	None
analysis of the problem	Shows true insight	Adequate for this assignment	Superficial, lacks rigor	None
Literature Review	Comprehensive refs, used well	Adequate reading	Needs more refs / more structure	Minimal/ None
Theoretical Model	Excellent	Good	Not clear	None shown
Hypotheses	Exact, relevant	Undefined	Implied	None
Philosophical justification	Clearly stated, understands	Shows appreciation	Minimal consideration	Not shown
Methodology				
Research Design	Excellent description	Adequate for this assignment	partial, serious omissions	Not shown
Feasibility of research	Optimal	possible problems	poorly thought out	Unlikely to succeed
Data collection methods	Clear and appropriate	Suitable in general	Not a good choice / fit	Not shown
Data analysis methods	Excellent description	Adequate for this assignment	unclear, Serious omissions	Not Shown
Questions	Complete	Outlined	Too brief	Missing
Format				
Report Layout	Follows the required format	Mostly conforms	Poorly organised	Not acceptable format
Logic	Structured	Does not flow	Confusing	Messy
Focus	To the point & relevant	some extraneous material	lot of irrelevant material	Didn't answer the question
Conclusion	Excellent, to the point	OK	does not sum up the proposal	Missing

Presentation	Precision is assumed, bad referencing can detract from the grade			
in-text citation	Excellent	Good, minor	systemic misuse	Poor
APA reference formatting	Exact	Minor Inconsistencies	Incorrect formatting	Not used
Word Count	As required	Not Shown	outside the specification	much too short or too long

COMMENTS

Most important thing to change

YOUR GRADE:

Research Proposal 40%

The proposal is being marked on its presentation, structure, completeness and conforming to design requirements. It is not principally being graded in the quality of the idea.

	What was delivered:	
A	A quality of proposal and understanding of research design that is the best that could reasonably be expected in this course.	Concise research question. Clear aims and objectives. Clear and understandable research design, conforms to a standard layout, has justified the research methods, and analysis methods. Puts the research into context by citing appropriate reference sources.
B	Covers all the requirements but lacks the flair that distinguishes A	Has outlined the research proposed but not in complete detail, has shown some understanding of the issues associated with the proposed research, has justified the analysis and the models, but not to the level for an A.
C	Quite satisfactory but not of the same standard as a B.	Has made good attempt at the proposal, has covered all the areas adequately, possibly not justified methods or analysis. Lacks rigor, not an academic approach.
D	Minimally Acceptable. at the lower end of what is expected from a Masters student.	May have described most but not all aspects of the research proposed, but not shown understanding of what is wanted. Little or no justification of either method or analysis, lacking the level of academic rigor required.
F	Less than acceptable.	Not up to the standard required from a Masters student.

Readings
The **required text** for this course is:
Sekaran, U & Bougie, R. (2009). Research methods for business: a skill building approach. Wiley. ISBN 9780470744796.

Reading List for Qualitative Methods

Punch, K. F., *Introduction to Social Research – Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches* (2ed.), Sage, 2005; ISBN 0761944168;
Chapters from the recommended text may be read/copied in the library (the text is on 3 day loan). This book is suggested reading, not a requirement.

A good starting point for the philosophy of research assignment is
http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/philosophy.php

The following journal articles will be provided on Blackboard.

Angrosino, M.V. and Mays de Pérez, K.A. (2000) Rethinking Observation: From method to Context. In Denzin, N.K and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research (3ed),* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, p673-703.

Denzin, N.K. (2000) Methods of Collecting and Analysing Empirical Materials. In Denzin, N.K and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research (3ed),* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, p632-644.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989) Building Theories from Case Study Research. The Academy of Management Review. Vol 14, No 4, pp. 532-550.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J.H. (2000) The Interview: From Structured Questions to Negotiated Text. In Denzin, N.K and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research (3ed),* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, p645-672.

Gregor, S. (2006) The Nature of Theory in Information Systems. MIS Quarterly, Vol 30, No 3, Sept 2006, pp. 611-642

Klein, H. K. and Myers, M. D. (1999) A Set of Principles for Conducting and Evaluating Interpretive Field Studies in Information Systems. MIS Quarterly. Vol 23, No 1, pp 67-94.

Lehmann, H.P. (2008) Why Are There Not More Grounded Theories of Information Systems? Pre-Publication Manuscript: Under Review with *MIS Quarterly.*

Lehmann, H.P., Gallupe, R.B. (2005) Information Systems for Multinational Enterprises – Some Factors at Work in their Design and Implementation, *Journal of International Management* Vol. 11, Nr. 2, 163-186.

Orlikowski, W. J. (1993) CASE Tools as Organizational Change: Investigating Incremental and Radical Changes in Systems Development. MIS Quarterly. Dec 1993, pp. 309-340.

Weber, R. (2004) The Rhetoric of Positivism vs. Interpretivism: A Personal View. MIS Quarterly. Vol 28, No 1, pp. iii-xii.

Webster, J. and Watson, R. T. (2002) Analysing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. MIS Quarterly. Vol 26, No 2, pp. xiii-xxiii.

Reading List for Quantitative Methods

The following journal articles will be provided on Blackboard**.**

Banker, R. & Kauffman, 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.

Couper, M. (2000).Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 64*, 464–94

Couper M.P. & Miller, P.V. (2009). Web Survey Methods: Introduction. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72* (5), 831 - 835.

Denscombe, M. (2006) Web-Based Questionnaires and the Mode Effect. *Social Science Computer Review, 24* (2), 246-254 DOI 10.1177/0894439305284522

Hotz, R.L. Most science studies appear to be tainted by sloppy analysis. *The Wall Street Journal Online.* Sept 14, 2007. http://online.wsj.com/public

Ioannnidis, J. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine, 2* (8) www.plosmedicine.org DOI 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020134

Malhotra, N. (2008). Completion time and response order effects in web surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72* (5),   914–934.

Treat, T.A. & Weersing, V.R. (undated). Five Classes of Research Questions in Clinical Psychology. Extract from *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*.   Pages 1-12. Wiley & Sons. ISBN: 0-470-86080-4.

Penalties

In keeping with standards of professionalism appropriate to this programme, it is expected that deadlines will be honoured. In fairness to students who complete work on time, work submitted after the due date/ time will incur penalties for lateness. However, unusual or unforeseeable circumstances (e.g. serious illness, family bereavement, or other aegrotat requiring incidents) may lead to a waiver of these penalties but need to be discussed with the paper coordinator as soon as possible.

Materials and Equipment

No special materials or equipment are required for this course.

Group work

There is no group work component to this course.

Communication of Additional Information

Additional information will be notified to students via email and announcements on the MMIM552 Blackboard site, which will also carry general information and resources for the course.

Mandatory Course Requirements

There are no mandatory course requirements for MMIM552.

Withdrawal from Course

1. Your fees will be refunded if you withdraw from this course on or before Friday 25 July 2014.
2. The standard last date for withdrawal from this course is Friday 26th September 2014. 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*' including supporting documentation. The application form is available from either of the Faculty's Student Customer Service Desks.

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/plagiarism.aspx

Student 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.

Note to Students

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 FCA programmes. All material used for such processes will be treated as confidential, and the outcome will not affect your grade for the course.

Link to general information

For general information about course-related matters, go to
http://www.victoria.ac.nz/vbs/studenthelp/general-course-information

****