

**WAGNER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE  
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY**

**Doctoral Research Seminar  
Qualitative Research Methods – PHD-GP 5905-001  
Spring 2017**

Professor Sonia Ospina,  
Puck, 3075; Ext. 87478  
e-mail address: [sonia.ospina@nyu.edu](mailto:sonia.ospina@nyu.edu)

**Course Description:**

This course offers a hands-on opportunity for doctoral and advanced masters students to experience the practice of qualitative research. We will address the nature of qualitative research in the administrative and policy sciences, with ample opportunities to discuss the implications of the choices made in designing, implementing and reporting the findings of a “mock” project which we will determine in class, with your input. The course will require a considerable investment of time, with intensive reading and writing, recurrent team discussions based on assignments, and individual fieldwork (with journal writing before, during and after site visits).

**Course pre-requisite:** Doctoral Research Seminar: Research Methods (or equivalent, approved by instructor).

**Course objectives:**

By appreciating the complexities and opportunities associated with doing rigorous and credible qualitative research, at the end of the course, students will:

- Recognize the uniqueness and distinctiveness of qualitative research in public management and policy areas, particularly in comparison to the positivist and post-positivist qualitative research cultures.
- Distinguish qualitative methodological approaches –from interpretive to positivist–as well as traditions of qualitative inquiry—ethnography, case study, narrative inquiry, phenomenology, grounded theory, action research, etc –and appreciate their advantages and limitations for research in public service.
- Discuss competently selected problems and issues associated with theory, design, implementation, reporting and publication of qualitative research in public service (while concentrating primarily on interview projects embedded within a given tradition).
- Advance and deepen skills in managing selected design, data collection, analysis and writing strategies of qualitative research, via exercises and some field experience.

- Become acquainted with published research articles modeling theoretical, methodological and empirical decisions in the qualitative study of public problems and issues of importance to public service.

**Required texts** (*be sure to get the latest editions*):

Booth, W, G Colomb & J Williams. *The Craft of Research*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008 ***available electronically from the library***

Maxwell, Joseph. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. 3<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2013

Miles, M., M Huberman & J. Saldaña. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2014.

**Recommended texts:** (highly recommended if you plan to do qualitative research in the future, and will be on reserve – we will read pieces of each)

Basic textbooks:

Saldaña Johnny. 2016. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Thousand Oaks, Sage

Creswell, John. *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing among 5 Approaches*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2012

Patton, Q.M. 2005. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 3d edition. M. Thousand Oaks, Sage

Advanced discussions about the craft:

Brady, H. & D. Collier (Ed). 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Yanow, D. & Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. 2014. *Interpretation and Method. Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New York: M.E. Sharpe

Please find additional required readings from selected sources in the schedule of assignments. Students should be prepared to put a fairly large amount of time doing the readings and exercises associated with them.

## Course requirements:

Students will apply readings and written assignments to a “mock” research project chosen within a constrained set of options, from topics proposed by course participants. We will spend class time debriefing on the experience of "doing" research. Forming groups to work on 3-4 projects will ensure ample room for discussion and collective reflection – inside and outside of the classroom – of the decisions made along the way. Class time will be spent reviewing challenges and issues as the projects advance, and connecting these to the readings.

Students are responsible for doing some **fieldwork** out side of class time. They should create a schedule of entry into the field to ensure **each student doing a minimum of two interviews and two field observations**, to be used for class exercises and assignments. Students will keep **individual journals** with field notes and personal reflections of the mock project as it develops over time, writing **analytical memos** as needed.

Students will be expected to complete a series of **10 short assignments and 3 long assignments** throughout the course. The assignments are opportunities to practice skills of design, collection, analysis, interpretation and reporting. Experience doing these will ground class discussions. (Assignments are described in more detail in the syllabus under the “Schedule of Classes”).

Even though pairs or teams of students will implement the mock project, **each student will present a final individual Portfolio** with materials based on the work for the mock project. It will include some group products but also some independent writing from each student, including some journal entries and interview and observation memos developed over time per instructions in the syllabus.

## Grading

***No late assignments will be accepted for grading, unless agreed upon in advance with the professor.***

Course grade will be distributed as follows:

Assignment	Points	%	Due date
12 short assignments	<b>2.5x10</b>	<b>30%</b>	<i>See dates in schedule of assignments</i>
3 long assignments:			
1. Researcher ID memo	<b>10</b>	<b>10%</b>	<i>Tuesday February 28</i>
2. Research proposal	<b>20</b>	<b>20%</b>	<i>Tuesday March 7</i>
3. Portfolio			
- Progress report	<b>15</b>		
- Journal entries	<b>10</b>		
- Findings segment	<b>15</b>		
Total Portfolio		<b>40%</b>	<i>Friday May 12</i>
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	

## COURSE OVERVIEW

### I. INTRODUCTION TO QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

1. Introduction: The nature of qualitative research - January 27
2. Research designs and multiple traditions of qualitative inquiry- February 3
3. Choosing topics, exploring questions (and closing the intro) – February 10

### II. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN

4. Designing the study: frameworks, questions, problems, goals - February 17
5. Bounding the territory: cases, sites, sampling and other issues- February 24  
*Researcher identity memo due on Tuesday February 28*
6. Preparing for the field: methods; relationships; fieldwork; the ethics of qualitative research – March 3  
*Research proposal due Tuesday, March 7*
7. The art and craft of interviewing – March 10

**March 13-19 Spring Recess – [If possible, go to the field]**

### III. INTERLUDE: FROM THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE TO THE RESEARCH CRAFT *Note: we will leave 20 minutes of classes 8 and 9 to trouble shoot and discuss your fieldwork preparation and experience*

8. Multiple modes of inquiry: linking worldviews, paradigms, theoretical perspectives and methodological tools - March 24
9. Applications and illustrations – March 31

### IV. IN THE FIELD AND BEYOND: ACCESSING AND INTERPRETING DATA

*Note: field notes and interview transcripts needed for assignments on week 10*

10. Data Collection/Analysis (1): Documenting and describing - April 7
11. Collection/Analysis (2): Explaining and theorizing - April 14

### V. MAKING SENSE: FINDING MEANING, WRITING AND SHARING INSIGHTS

12. Drawing and verifying conclusions; standards of quality - April 21
13. Developing a credible story: theorizing & constructing credible arguments – April 28
14. Sharing the findings: in conversation with the literature AND Conclusions: the craft of qualitative research – May 5 (**Will propose that class meets until 3 pm**)

*Portfolios and progress reports due on Friday May 12*

## Course outline and schedule of assignments

### I. THE NATURE OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

#### **Week 1 (January 27): Introduction – The nature of qualitative research**

##### **Goals:**

- Gain a holistic understanding of the qualitative research process and the nature of qualitative data
- Develop mutual expectations for the course
- Conduct an inventory of participant experiences with qualitative research and potential ideas for mock projects

##### **Reading assignment:**

- Booth et al: Prologue, Ch 1 and 2
- Patton, Q.M. 2005. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 3d edition. M. Thousand Oaks, Sage. Chapter 1 (3-29).
- Hunt, M. 2010. "Active Waiting": Habits and the practice of conducting qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 9(1):69-76
- Meyer, I. et al. 2011. "We'd Be Free": Narratives of Life Without Homophobia, Racism, or Sexism. *Sex Res Social Policy*. 8(3): 204–214.

##### **Assignment (1):**

(Individual) Please complete the following exercise BEFORE our first class (Friday, Jan 27): Go to a restaurant or coffee shop of your choice and purchase something to eat. For 30 minutes (please time them) do a systematic observation of what is going on. You should take notes during this observation. Consider the following questions: What is going on? How is it going on? What does the researcher feel about this observation?

After leaving the site, sit down in a quiet place, read your notes, complete them and write a few questions that come to mind about "being in the field". Please bring to class the notes and questions to share with the group (I will collect them too).

#### **Week 2 (February 3): Research designs and multiple traditions of qualitative inquiry**

##### **Goals:**

- Distinguish the various qualitative research traditions and their differences
- Become familiar with research design variations vis a vis the various approaches to qualitative research
- Discuss mock project and form teams

### Reading assignment:

- Cresswell, J. 2013. Chapters 4 and 5 (69-128)
- *Because Cresswell does not include Action Research in his traditions, the following two readings complement Cresswell's reading:*
  - Ospina, S. & G. Anderson. (2014). "The Action Turn". In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Action Research*. London: Sage Pu. PP. 18-21
  - Example: Burns, D. 2012. "Participatory Systemic Inquiry". *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 43 Num. 3, May 2012 (pp. 88-100).
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 8-10 (Genres... & Analytic Methods...) and 10-14 (The Nature...& Our View...)
- Atkinson, P. 2005. Qualitative Research—Unity and Diversity. In *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 6(3): Art. 26

### Recommended:

- Guijt, I. (2014) *Participatory Approaches*. Methodological Briefs, Impact Evaluation No. 5. Florence, Italy: Unicef Office of Research, pp. 1-19

### Assignment (2):

(Individual) a) In bullet form, indicate which two approaches from the readings appealed to you most and why (include *Action Research* as an alternative approach, per Ospina & Anderson description); react briefly to the examples for those approaches provided in Creswell's Chapter 5 and appendix, (and consider Burns as an example for action research): did they work for you? b) for the approach that appeals the most to you, do a search in google scholar and find a contemporary article that uses that particular approach explicitly; report on the outcome of trying to find the defining features of that approach in the study (please no more than two pages for this entire assignment, and less is better!)

### **ATTENTION: Follow instructions in this box to be ready to do Assignment 8 (See Week 9, March 31).**

→ You must participate in a Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) training offered by Data Services at the NYU Libraries and ITS unit. You will have the option to go to one of three possible classes between Weeks 8 (March 20-24) and 9 (March 27-31) so that you are ready to write a brief report on Week 9. Classes are offered on March 22, 28 and 29. You may register for a library class 3 weeks in advance. For example, to take the March 29 class, you can register for it on March 8, but not before.

Registration link: <http://nyu.libcal.com/>

Since these classes are open only on Tuesday and Wednesday, if you have a schedule conflict, you can make an appointment with a Data Services consultant for personalized help here <http://guides.nyu.edu/appointment> (least preferred option)

**Do not do this training before March 10, as you won't be able to absorb it.**

On Week 9' class you will report on this introductory training; while not required you may decide to request further training beyond this intro, as this student service is free.

### **Week 3 (February 10): Choosing topics, exploring questions (team work and other follow-up conceptual issues ref. the nature of qualitative research)**

#### **Goals:**

- Deepen understanding of the nature of QR, its differences from quantitative approaches, its multiple traditions and research design concepts
- Locate qualitative research methods in the context of the public administration field
- Practice developing research topic and initiating team projects

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Maxwell, Chapters 1 and 2
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 18-20 (Introduction and Tight versus...)
- Haverland, M. and D. Yanow. 2012. A Hitchhiker's Guide to the Public Administration Research Universe: Surviving Conversations on Methodologies and Methods. *Public Administration Research* 72(3): 401-408.
- Piore, MJ. 2006. Qualitative Research: does it fit in economics? *European Management Review*. 3: 17-23

#### **Recommended:**

- Mahoney, J. & G. Goertz. 2006. A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research. *Political Analysis*. 14:227-249.

**In preparation for our discussion of the mock project:** Meet with your partner(s) and discuss more in depth the mock project you would like to conduct. No need to be concerned yet about specific approach to inquiry, unless you already have selected one. Discuss and get a general agreement on: what is your topic and your tentative research question? Why do you think it is important? Be prepared to share in class. You may want to jot these ideas down but I will not be collecting them (until next week).

*Hint: in the context of this course, to ensure efficiency in your learning process, choose a topic in which at least one of you (and even better, both) has some familiarity with the literature, rather than one where you would have to start from scratch.*

## **II. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN**

### **Week 4 (February 17): Designing the study: frameworks, questions, problems, goals**

#### **Goals:**

- Practice framing research questions and developing theoretical frameworks as a function of study goals and purposes

### **Reading assignment:**

- Maxwell, Chapters 3 and Ch 4
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 20-28 (Building a Conceptual.. & Formulating Research...)
- Booth et al: Part 2 –Ch 3 and 4
- Rey, L. et al. 2014. Managing Tensions Between Evaluation and Research: Illustrative Cases of Developmental Evaluation in the Context of Research *American Journal of Evaluation* Vol. 35(1) 45-6

### **Recommended:**

- Booth et al: Ch 5 and 6 (*for issues associated with literature review*)
- Alvesson, M. and D. Kärreman. 2007. Constructing Mystery: Empirical matters in theory development. *Academy of Management Review*. 32(4): 1265-1281.
- Alvesson, M. & J. Sandberg. 2011. Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*. 36(2): 247-271

### **Assignment (3):**

(Team) As a team, write and bring to class a tentative research question and a tentative flow diagram (graph) of your conceptual framework. **Frame the question using the format proposed by Booth et al on pages 48 and 61** (48 gives you the basic structure, 61 a further elaboration of the same format for academic applied research projects). For the flow diagram specify the critical elements of a preliminary conceptual framework to address the question, **as proposed by Maxwell in Ch 3** (Miles, Huberman and Saldaña will also help but use Maxwell's format). Attach a short list of references that provide insights into your proposed question (i.e. start reading about the topic).

**NOTE:** This week seems deceptively light in readings. Please make sure you leave time to process and do the assignments. They require lots of thinking.

### **Week 5 (February 24): Bounding the territory: cases, sites, sampling and other issues**

#### **Goals:**

- Develop an understand different conceptual meanings of “the case”
- Practice “bounding” the research study: making decisions about case and site selection, units of analysis, and sampling

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 28-37 (Defining...& Sampling...)



- Ragin, C. 1992. Introduction: “Cases of What is a Case” (p. 1-17) and Chapter 10: “ ‘Casing’ and the process of Social Inquiry” (p. 217-226) in Ragin, C. and H. Becker (ed). *What is a Case: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Shively, W.P. 2006. Case Selection: Insights from Rethinking Social Inquiry. Symposium on Rethinking Social Inquiry. *Political Analysis*. 14: 344-347.

**Recommended:**

- Gibbert, M. & L.B. Nair. 2013. Towards Rigorous Case Study Research: How replication logic enhances internal and external validity. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. 2013:1 (8 pages).

**Assignment (4):**

(Team) Re-frame your research question and flow diagram based on your early incursions into your literature review to ground your project. Further clarify your unit of analysis and, using the new question, construct a matrix specifying tentatively your sampling frame (see hand-out from Marshal and Rossman to be distributed in class). Please turn in the new question, flow diagram and sampling frame.

***Researcher identity memo due on Tuesday February 28-*** Follow instructions on page 34 (EXERCISE 2.1) in Maxwell (see discussion and examples on pages 34-38 and 46-47). The memo should address questions 1 and 2 posed in the exercise (but feel free to be creative in their exposition). Memo should not be longer than 3 pages.

**Week 6 (March 3): Preparing for the field: methods; relationships; fieldwork; the ethics of qualitative research** [please note that there are team and individual assignments due this week].

**Goals:**

- Develop an understanding of data collection instruments and techniques (the mechanics of fieldwork, interviewing and questionnaires, the management of tools, equipment, field notes, data, etc).
- Develop an understanding of the relational dimensions of qualitative data collection
- Explore ethical issues in qualitative research and gain sensitivity toward vulnerable populations

**NOTE:** By this time you must be getting ready to enter the field, have started to make contacts and develop relationships, as well as learning all you can about the context of your site and case. By week 7 you should be in the field starting to access data by way of interviews, formal documents, and if possible, observations.

### Reading assignment:

- Maxwell, Chapter 5
- Yanow, D. and P.Schwartz-Shea. 2012. Seeing with an Ethnographic Sensibility (Chapter 10). In Yanow, D. and P.Schwartz-Shea (ed). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharp. Pp. 194-208.
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 37-42 (Instrumentation); 45(bottom)-52 (Management issues...) and 55-68 (Ethical Issues in Analysis)
- See box (next page) Quinn Patton's Chapter 6 (critical for your fieldwork, but won't discuss in class).

### Recommended:

- Gullemin, M., and Gilliam L. 2004. "Ethics, Reflexivity, and 'Ethically Important Moments' in Research," *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(2): 261-280.
- Schnarch, B. (2005). *Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) or Self-Determination Applied to Research*. Ottawa: National Aboriginal Health Organization.  
[http://www.naho.ca/documents/fnc/english/FNC\\_OCAPCriticalAnalysis.pdf](http://www.naho.ca/documents/fnc/english/FNC_OCAPCriticalAnalysis.pdf)

### Assignment (5):

(Team) Using *the next iteration* of your research question and conceptual framework, follow instructions for Exercise 5.2 in Maxwell, (p. 119-120) to develop a Questions and Methods Matrix (see example on pages 117-19). (Please include the next iteration of your research question and conceptual framework so I can understand the Matrix)

### Assignment (6):

(Individual) Go to the web page of NYU's Review Committee on Research with Human Subjects, and review the first five chapters of the tutorial, doing the mini tests at the end of each. DO NOT DO THE FULL TEST AND DO NOT SEND A TEST TO THE COMMITTEE. Look for model letters of informed consent and think about how they could apply to your mock project. Hand in short write up (a paragraph) about what surprised you of the exercise. Be prepared to talk about this assignment in class.

**PLEASE READ CAREFULLY THE BOXES IN THE NEXT PAGE NOW, AS YOU ARE REQUIRED TO PLAN AHEAD**

**ATTENTION: Research proposal is due on Tuesday, March 7th** - As you work on your research proposal you will find helpful reading Maxwell: Ch 6, 7 and one of the two Appendixes. In Ch 6, Maxwell discusses issues of validity. We will come back to issues of quality (including validity) in a future class, but in order to consider some of these issues in your proposal, it is good to anticipate that discussion at this point. **Ch 7 and the Appendixes should be very helpful, as they address directly issues associated with writing a research proposal and two possible examples of one.** See instructions in separate document in NYUClasses.

Start thinking about questions for your interview protocol. The Question and Methods Matrix will help a lot. You do not need to have the full interview protocol for the research proposal but you must discuss the broad categories within which you will locate the specific questions.

**Looking ahead:** Getting an early overview of what you will be doing when you enter the field will help you view the work of the next weeks in a more realistic light. Doing qualitative research is an iterative process, but teaching qualitative research can only happen in a linear fashion. In that spirit, consider starting to work on the following readings, which will be helpful as you enter the field.

**Required: Chapter 6 of Quinn Patton (on reserve) will be very helpful for your fieldwork preparation and actual activities:** Fieldwork strategies and observation methods (pp. 259-332).

**Recommended:**

ON FIELDNOTES: Emerson, R. R. Fretz and L. Shaw. 1995. Selected excerpts from *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Pages: 4-16, 17-35; 39-42; 49-52; 63-65;

ON ANALYTICAL DISPLAYS: Copeland, A.J & Agosto, D.E. (2012) Diagrams and Relational Maps. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 11(5): 513-533.

**If you have no experience doing qualitative research I recommend** Ely et al. (1991). Chapter 3: "Doing". In Ely et al (ed). *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles within Circles*. New York: The Falmer Press, pp. 41-105. [If you cannot read the entire piece, skim and read more carefully pages 69-80 on logs].

## **Week 7 (March 10): The art and craft of interviewing**

### **Goals:**

- Develop (or deepen) your sensibility around interviewing, understood as “a conversational encounter”
- Consider the different types of interviews (and targets) that can be used during qualitative research
- Practice writing questions and asking questions in the context of interviewing

### **Reading assignment:**

- Quinn Patton, Chapter 7: Qualitative interviewing (pp. 339-427)
- Beuthin, R. 2014. Breathing in the Mud: Tensions in Narrative Interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 13: 122-134

### **Recommended:**

- Morgan, D, et al. 2016. Dyadic interviews as a tool for qualitative evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 37(1): 109-117
- Shinebourne, P. 2009. Using Q Method in Qualitative Research. *International Journal Of Qualitative Methods*, 8(1): 93-97

If you have not done interviews, I **strongly recommend** that you complement your readings with these very simple but powerful “brief” on Interviewing:

- McDonal, B. & P. Rogers. (2014) *Interviewing*. Methodological Briefs, Impact Evaluation No. 12. Florence, Italy: Unicef Office of Research, pp. 1-11

### **Assignment (7):**

(Team) Interview protocol draft.

**March 13-19 Spring Recess – [If possible, go to the field; also there is a lot of reading for the next class, you might want to start doing it during the break]**

***REMINDER: YOU WILL NEED INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS AND/OR NOTES BY WEEK 10. This means you must plan to do your observations and interviews during the next two weeks (if you have not already started)! AS WE MOVE FORWARD WE WILL LEAVE 20 MINUTES OF CLASSES IN WEEKS 8 AND 9 TO TROUBLE SHOOT AND DISCUSS YOUR DATA COLLECTION EXPERIENCE, AS WELL AS TO EXPLORE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE DISCUSSIONS DURING THE INTERLUDE.***

### III. INTERLUDE: FROM THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE TO THE RESEARCH CRAFT

#### **Week 8 (March 24): Multiple modes of inquiry: linking worldviews, paradigms, theoretical perspectives and methodological tools**

*NOTE: The next two classes represent a parenthesis from the discussion of the knots and bolts of doing qualitative research. We will engage in a conversation already introduced briefly by several readings earlier in the course. While we do this, you will continue to work outside class preparing for and doing fieldwork. You should begin to gather documents about your site(s) and case(s). It is a good time to remember that you should be journaling, especially about ethical issues and entering the field.*

#### **Goals:**

- Explore and become conversant on the philosophical debates about scientific inquiry
- Distinguish the philosophical assumptions behind different approaches to research and the implications for research design and implementation
- Explore your own positioning within these debates

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Ospina, S. & M. Uhl-Bien. 2012. Mapping the Terrain (Introduction, pp.xix-xxxiv only) AND Exploring the Competing Basis for Legitimacy (Chapter 1, pp. 1-40). In Uhl-Bien, M. and S. Ospina (Eds.). (2012) *Advancing relational leadership research*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Yanow, D. and P.Schwartz-Shea. 2014. Wherefore “Interpretive”: An Introduction (READ ONLY pp. xiii-xxi) In Yanow, D. and P.Schwartz-Shea (ed). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharp.
- Shwartz-Shea, P. & D. Yanow. 2012. “Ways of Knowing: Research questions and Logics of Inquiry” (Chapter 2, pp 25-43) AND “Starting from Meaning: Contextuality and its implications”(Chapter 3, pp. 44-53). In *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge [e-book accessible at NYU Library]. Pp 25-43
- Raadschelders, J.C. (2011). The future of the study of Public Administration: Embedding research object and methodology in epistemology and ontology. *Public Administration Review*. 71(6): p. 916-924.
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 6 (bottom)-7 (our Orientation)

#### **Recommended:**

- Riccucci, N.M. (2010). Introduction and Chapter 1. In N.M. Riccucci. *Public Administration: Traditions of Inquiry and Philosophies of Knowledge*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

## **Week 9 (March 31): Applications and illustrations**

### **Goals:**

- Practice making logical connections between paradigms, theories, methods and practice
- Apply philosophy of science concepts to the problem of the split between qualitative and quantitative approaches to research, and between philosophical paradigms

### **Reading assignment:**

- Shwartz-Shea, P. & D. Yanow. 2012. “Speaking Across Epistemic Communities” (Chapter 8, pp. 130-139) In *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge [e-book accessible at NYU Library].
- Lin, A. 1998. “Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist approaches to Qualitative Methods” in *Policy Studies Journal*, Spring, 26(1): 162-180.
- Burton-Jones A., E. McLean & E. Monod. 2014. Theoretical perspectives in IS research: from variance and process to conceptual latitude and conceptual fit. *European Journal of Information Systems*. 00:1-16 Read pp. 1-8 and 12-13
- Greene, J, L. Benjamin & L. Goodyear. (2001) The Merits of Mixing Methods in Evaluation. *Evaluation*. 7(1): 25-44.
- Cullen, A. et al., 2011. The Politics and Consequences of Including Stakeholders in International Development Evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 32(3): 345-361

### **Recommended:**

- Tarrow, S. 2010. “Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide”. In Brady, H. and D. Collier (eds) *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Pu, pp. 101-110.
- There are several short papers on combining qualitative-quantitative research in Appendix 3 of: Charles Ragin, Joane Nagel and Patricia White, *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research* (2004) [ <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219.pdf> ]
- I’ve included in the recommended NYUClasses file a packet of critiques of an article on Narrative Policy Studies, for those interested in better seeing the debate in action. Highly recommended!!! The original article criticized is called:
  - Jones, M.D & C. M. Randaelli. (2015) The Narrative Policy Framework: Child or Monster? *Critical Policy Studies*, 9(3): 339-355

### **Assignment (8):**

(Individual) After having taken the training on software programs for qualitative research with Data Services (NYU Libraries and ITS – see instructions of Week 2 of this

syllabus), please write a short memo (no more than one page) describing your key learning and observations about the use of this type of software. Which program did you like best, why, and how helpful do you think it will be for this course? If you decide not to use it, still explain why not, and how helpful is the knowledge for future reference.

#### **IV. IN THE FIELD AND BEYOND: ACCESSING AND INTERPRETING DATA**

***ATTENTION:** the readings from weeks 10 through 14 seem deceptively short: we will read lots from Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, which is dense and requires much time to process. Please make sure you leave sufficient time to do them.*

#### **Week 10 (April 7): Data Collection/Analysis (1): Documenting and describing**

##### **Goals:**

- Understand and practice the early steps of analysis: documentation; codes and coding; exploring and describing; the role of memos, analytic texts and visual displays

##### **Reading assignment:**

- Patton, MQ. (2005). Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods. Chapter 8, ONLY 452-466.
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Read Chapters 4 and 5 carefully. Then scan Chapters 6-8 (read the introduction and the introduction to each section and choose a few specific methods to study, searching for what you think can be helpful for your own project).

##### **Choose 1:**

- Coslovsky, S. 2014. Economic Development without Pre-requisites. *World Development*. 54: 32-45
- Perez, J.L and A. Yerena. 2016. Evaluating the Policy–Practice Gap in a Transitional Housing Program: An Innovation in Process Evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 0: 1-19

##### **Recommended reading:**

- Booth et al: Ch 15 (excellent, though basic, overview of the use of visual displays, mostly focusing on numbers and statistics)

##### **Assignment (9):**

(Team) Develop a tentative coding scheme of your project and use the transcripts of your interviews to apply and refine it. Write a memo of what you learned from doing this

exercise. Include as an appendix of the memo the original coding scheme with brief definitions of the codes and the next iteration produced by the analysis. Be prepared to discuss how your coding evolved.

## **Week 11 (April 14): Collection/Analysis (2): Explaining and theorizing**

### **Goals:**

- Develop an understanding of and practice causal analysis and explanation

### **Reading assignment:**

- Patton, MQ. (2005). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Chapter 8, ONLY pages 478- end of 481.
- Byrne, D. (2013) *Evaluating Complex Social Interventions in a Complex World. Evaluation*. 19(3): 217-228
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Chapter 9 (see instructions for group assignment before reading, and read selectively if needed)

### **Choose 1:**

- Greene, D., P. et al. 2011. I used to Cry Every Day: A Model of the Family Process of Managing Displacement. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*. 88(3):403-416.
- Saz-Carranza, A. & S. Ospina. (2011). The behavioral dimension of governing inter-organizational goal-directed networks: Managing the unity / diversity tension. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 21(2): 327-365.

### **Recommended:**

- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Chapter 10
- Riccucci, N.M. (2010). Theory building through qualitative approaches. In N.M. Riccucci. *Public Administration: Traditions of Inquiry and Philosophies of Knowledge*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press (pp. 65-96).
- Eisenhardt, K. & Graebner, M., (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(1): 25-32.

### **Assignment (10):**

(Team) Create an explanatory effects matrix (p. 228 in MH&S), or a causal network (pp. 234-253) with the accompanying analytical memo that makes a claim inferred from your data. Bring copies of the matrix for all. Be prepared to discuss how Lin's article and Patton's insights helped inform your analysis.



## V. MAKING SENSE: FINDING MEANING, WRITING AND SHARING INSIGHTS

### Week 12 (April 21): Drawing and verifying conclusions; standards of quality

#### **Goals:**

- Develop an understanding of and practice of tactics to draw and verify conclusions
- Developing an understanding of quality criteria and qualitative research; practice applying these criteria to evaluate good qualitative research

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Chapter 11. Concentrate on last two sections (Standards for... and Analytic documentation), but see assignment for other sections.
- Lub, Vasco. 2015. Validity in Qualitative Evaluation: Linking Purposes, Paradigms and Perspectives. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 2015: 1- 8
- Schwartz-Shea, P. (2014) Judging Quality: Evaluative Criteria and Epistemic Communities. In Yanow, D. and P. Schwartz-Shea (ed). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharp. Pp. 120-146.

#### **Choose 1:**

- Jennings, J. (2010) School Choice or School's Choice? Managing in an Era of Accountability. *Sociology of Education* 83(3):227-247
- Dias, J.J & S. Maynard-Moody. (2006) For profit welfare: contracts, conflicts and the performance paradox. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17: 189-211.

#### **Recommended:**

- Dodge, J., S. Ospina, and E. Foldy. "Integrating Rigor and Relevance in Public Administration Scholarship: The Contribution of Narrative Inquiry", *Public Administration Review*, May/June 2005, Vol 65, No. 3, pp. 286-300.
- Gibbert, M. W. Ruigrok & B. Wicki. 2008. What passes as rigorous case study? *Strategic Management Journal*. 29(13): 1465-1474

#### **Assignment (11):**

(Team) After skimming sections on Tactics in MHS Chapter 11, choose ONE tactic from either of the two sections to discuss in class. In addition, write a bulleted memo identifying the key standards that guarantee good quality of your project and explain why you chose those and how you have tried to attain them. Be prepared to discuss.

### **Week 13 (April 28): Developing a credible story: theorizing & constructing credible arguments**

#### **Goals:**

- Understand the challenges of writing and reporting research findings
- Learn to identify approaches to writing in public policy, public administration, and public management

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Creswell, J.W. (2013) Ch 9.
- Wilkinson, C. (2014) On not just finding what you (thought you) were looking for: Reflections on Fieldwork Data and Theory. In Yanow, D. and P.Schwartz-Shea (ed). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharp. Pp 387-405

#### **Choose 1:**

- Iskander, N., N. Lowe & C. Riordan. (2010). The rise and fall of a micro-learning region: Mexican immigrants and construction in center-south Philadelphia. *Environment and Planning A*. 42: 1595 -1612.
- Foldy, E., L. Goldman & S. Ospina (2008). Sense giving and the role of cognitive shifts in the work of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 19: 514-529.

#### **Recommended:**

- Booth et al: Part 3 on developing a good case for your claim [This reading requires concentration. The good news is that it is helpful not just for this class but in general, for any scholarly writing].

### **Week 14 (May 5): Sharing the findings: in conversation with the literature**

#### **Goals:**

- Continue to gain exposure to ways of presenting findings and identifying ways to connect to broader field conversations
- Explore insights about own approaches and preferences in qualitative research
- Give closure to the course

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Pratt, M. (2009). From the Editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal* 52(5):856-862.

- Ospina, S. et al. 2016. Assessing Qualitative Studies in Public Management Research. Under Review at *Public Administration Research (cont. next page)*  
**Choose 1:**
- Instead of reading a new article, you will return to the one you chose in Class 2, please re-read it and see individual assignment below.

### **Assignment (12):**

(Individual): Go back to the original article you googled for the assignment in Class 2. ***Please bring copies of the abstract for all other class members*** so we have it with us while discussing it. Jot down a few bullets around the following questions (to be collected), and be prepared to discuss in class:

- 1) What is your overall evaluation of the quality of this article, after the past 13 classes? What's primarily missing, and what works well? How did you read it differently and why?
- 2) Using the criteria discussed by Ospina et al., to what extent does the article work as a model piece of qualitative research (or not- if too much is missing). You can choose to focus on particular criteria, of course.

### **Recommended:**

- Tong, A., P. Sainsbury & J. Craig. (2007) Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREG): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*: 19(6): 349-357.
- Ragin, C., J. Nagel and P. White. 2004. *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Washington DC: NSF - (read pp. 3-18 and then choose and read two short papers from Appendix 3).  
<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/nsf04219.pdf> ]
- Lamont, M. & P. White (2009). *Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research*. Washington DC: NSF (read pp. 3-19 and then choose and read two short papers from Appendixes 3, 4, 5 **or** 6).
- Becker, H. (2009) How to find out how to do qualitative research (a critique of the two reports above)

**(Will propose that this final class meets until 3 pm)**

<p><b>ATTENTION: Portfolios (including team progress reports) due on Friday May 12<sup>th</sup></b></p>
---