



NYU

**ROBERT F. WAGNER GRADUATE
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

PHD-GP 5905-001

**Doctoral Research Seminar:
Qualitative Research Methods, Spring 2021**

Instructor Information

- Sonia Ospina
- Email: sonia.ospina@nyu.edu
- Office Hours: Tuesdays 4:00-5:30 pm or by appointment.

Course Information

- Class Meeting Times: Fridays, 12:30-2:30 pm; Class Location: Remote
- Course Prerequisites: Doctoral Research Seminar; Research Methods (or equivalent, approved by instructor).

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 student 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 practicing skills toward building the final project). The course will include information and discussion of the challenges and opportunities of doing research during times of social distancing.

Course and Learning Objectives

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

1. Recognize the uniqueness and distinctiveness of qualitative research in public management and policy areas, particularly in contrast to the positivist and neo-positivist research cultures.
2. 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 benefits and limitations for research in public service.
3. Discuss competently selected problems and issues associated with theory, design, methodology, reporting and publication of qualitative research in public service (while concentrating primarily on interview projects embedded within a given tradition).
 4. Advance and deepen skills in managing selected design, data collection, analysis and writing strategies of qualitative research, via exercises and some field experience.
 5. Become acquainted with published research articles modeling theoretical, methodological and empirical decisions in the qualitative study of public problems and issues in public service.

Required texts

- Maxwell, Joseph. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2013 (first used in week 3).
- Miles, M., M Huberman & J. Saldaña. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2014 (first used in week 3).

Recommended texts: (highly recommended if you plan to do qualitative research in the future—we may read pieces)

- Booth, W, G Colomb & J Williams, J Bizup & W Fitzgerald. *The Craft of Research*. 4th ed Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016

Basic qualitative textbooks:

- Saldaña Johnny. 2016. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, Sage
- Creswell, John W. and Cheryl Poth. 2018. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 4th ed. Sage.
- Patton, Q.M. 2014. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 4th edition. M. Sage

Advanced discussions about the qualitative craft:

- Yanow, D. and P. Schwartz-Shea. 2014. *Interpretation and Method. Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. 2nd Edition. New York: M.E. Sharpe
- Blatter, J.K, M., M. Haverland and M.v. Hulst (2016) *Qualitative Research in Political Science*, Volume I-IV, Sage.

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 of interest to participants. Class time includes debriefing on the experience of “doing” research. Pairs working on 2 projects will ensure ample room for collective reflection – inside and outside of the classroom – of the decisions made along the way. Class discussions afford reviewing challenges and issues as projects advance, and connecting these to the readings.

Students are responsible for **fieldwork** outside of class time (more about this to be discussed in class given pandemic restrictions). They should attend to scheduling fieldwork early on to ensure that **each student does a minimum of two interviews and two field observations or alternative replacements per emerging practices for distance grounded data collection**, 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 (samples of these will be included in the final portfolio, per instructions of the final assignment).

Students will be expected to complete a series of **14 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 under the “Schedule of Classes”).

Even though pairs of students will implement the mock project, **each student will present an individual final 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 memos developed over time per instructions in the syllabus.

Short Assignments

- Please see instructions for the assignments under Course Outline and Schedule of Assignments below.

Researcher ID memo

- 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. See grading criteria in NYU Classes (Resources tab)

Research Proposal

- Please see instructions under Course Outline and Schedule of Assignments below.
- See Grading Criteria for Research Proposals in NYU Classes (Resources tab)

Portfolio

- See instructions in NYU Classes (Resources tab)

No late assignments will be accepted for grading, unless agreed upon in advance. Please see end of syllabus for information on how letter grades are assigned.

Summary of Assignments, Credit and Associated Learning Objectives

Assignment	Credit	Due Date	Course Objective Covered
14 short assignments	20%	See dates in schedule of assignments	#1, #2, # 4, #5
3 long assignments:			
1. Researcher ID memo	15%	Tuesday March 2	#3, #4
2. Research proposal	20%	Tuesday March 9	#2, #3, #4
3. Portfolio: Progress report; journal entries; analytical memos; findings segment	35%	Friday May 14	All
In class participation and assigned presentations	10%	Through out and per assigned presentations	All
Total	100%		

Absenteeism, Punctuality, and In-class conduct

You are expected to attend all classes, and arrive on time. Missing more than two sessions will have a negative impact on your grade unless previously discussed with the professor. The same applies to repeated lateness or early departure. **Missing more than three sessions is grounds for course failure.** Systematic tardiness, disruptive behavior (including unrelated side conversations, leaving zoom without explanation) are unacceptable and will also negatively impact your grade. Please inform the professor appropriately when planned or unexpected issues arise that require being absent from class.

Academic Integrity. I expect strict adherence to University guidelines for academic integrity. You are responsible to know these guidelines and to understand what constitutes plagiarism. Plagiarism is very likely to result in a failing grade for the course. All students enrolled in this class are required to read and abide by [Wagner's Academic Code](#). All Wagner students have already read and signed the [Wagner Academic Oath](#).

Henry and Lucy Moses Center for Students with Disabilities at NYU: Academic accommodations are available for students with disabilities. Please visit the [Moses Center for Students with Disabilities \(CSD\) website](#) and click the "Get Started" button. You can also call or email CSD (212-998-4980 or mosescsd@nyu.edu) for information. Students who are requesting academic accommodations are strongly advised to reach out to the Moses Center as early as possible in the semester for assistance.

NYU's Calendar Policy on Religious Holidays: [NYU's Calendar Policy on Religious Holidays](#) states that members of any religious group may, without penalty, absent themselves from classes when required in compliance with their religious obligations. Please notify me in advance of religious holidays that might coincide with exams to schedule mutually acceptable alternatives.

COURSE OVERVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION TO QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

1. Introduction: The nature of qualitative research - January 29
2. Research designs and multiple traditions of qualitative inquiry- February 5
3. Choosing topics, exploring questions (and closing the intro) – February 12

II. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN

4. Designing the study: frameworks, questions, problems, goals - February 19
5. Bounding the territory: cases, sites, sampling and other issues- February 26
* Researcher identity memo due on Tuesday March 2
6. Preparing for the field: methods; relationships; fieldwork; ethics– March 5
* Research proposal due Tuesday, March 9
7. The art and craft of interviewing – March 12

– **March 19: NO CLASS (long weekend # 1)** –

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 26
9. Applications and illustrations – April 2

IV. IN THE FIELD AND BEYOND: ACCESSING AND INTEPRETING DATA

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

10. Data Collection/Analysis (1): Documenting and describing - April 9
11. Collection/Analysis (2): Explaining and theorizing - April 16

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

12. Drawing and verifying conclusions; standards of quality - April 23
13. Developing a credible story: theorizing & constructing credible arguments – April 30
14. Sharing the findings: in conversation with the literature AND Conclusions: the craft of qualitative research – May 7

* Portfolios and progress reports due on Friday May 14

COURSE OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS

I. THE NATURE OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Week 1 (January 29): 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:

- Patton, Q.M. 2005. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 3d edition. M. Thousand Oaks, Sage. Chapter 1 (3-29).
- Read and be prepared to discuss:
 - 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.
- Please find READING GUIDE in NYUClasses, Week 1

Assignment (1):

(Individual) Please complete the following exercise BEFORE our first class (Friday, Jan 29): Choose a “site” (that is, a place from within which you will do an observation). Please keep in mind the list of possible sites to choose from, per my first communication, but feel free to choose any other that you prefer, these are just examples). Whichever site you choose, pretend that you are a participant in the site, doing what most others are doing too. 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 5): Research designs and multiple traditions of qualitative inquiry

Goals:

- Continue deepening the conversation about the nature of qualitative research
- Distinguish the various qualitative research traditions and their differences
- Become familiar with research design variations per different approaches to qualitative

research

- Discuss mock project and form teams (if time allows)

Reading assignment:

- Hunt, M. 2010. "Active Waiting": Habits and the practice of conducting qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 9(1):69-76
- Creswell, J. 2013. Chapters 4 and 5 (69-128)
 - Because Creswell does not include Action Research in his traditions, the following REQUIRED reading complements Creswell'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).
- Atkinson, P. 2005. Qualitative Research—Unity and Diversity. In *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 6(3): Art. 26

Recommended:

- Bradbury, Hilary H. 2010. What is good Action Research? *Action Research Journal*. Vol 8(1): 93-109
- Bergold, J. & S. Thomas. 2012. Participatory Research Methods: A Methodological Approach in Motion. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol 13, No 1.

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 assigned Chapters 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!)

Week 3 (February 12): 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 8-10 (Genres... & Analytic Methods...); 10-14 (The Nature...& Our View...) and Pages 18-20 (Introduction and Tight versus...)
- Piore, MJ. 2006. Qualitative Research: does it fit in economics? *European Management Review*. 3: 17-23
- Lupton, D. (editor) (2020) Doing fieldwork in a pandemic (crowd-sourced document). Available in [NYUClasses](#)

In preparation for our discussion of the mock project: Meet outside of class 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.

Assignment (3):

(Individual) Review the first 17 pages of the word- document “Doing Field Work in a Pandemic.” Go as deep as you want or can afford with your time, but get a good overview of the possible alternative, creative ways described to collect data. Identify FIVE methods/tools/activities that appeal to you because you believe you might be able to use some of them to supplement or complement the (on-line) traditional face-to-face interviews that you will do. Be prepared to discuss your reactions to the document, and why you chose the five tools you did.

II. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN

Week 4 (February 19): 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, Chapters 3 and 4
- **Exemplar:** Rivera, Lauren A. 2017. “When two bodies are (not) a problem: Gender and relationship status discrimination in academic hiring.” *American Sociological Review* 82 (6): 1111–1138.

Recommended:

- 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 (4):

(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.

Attention: Check Handout for Class 5, posted in Week 4 NYUClasses site. We will devote 5 minutes of class 4 to explain it so you can do the assignment for Class 5.

Week 5 (February 26): 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...)
- Maxwell: pp. 96-100 (site and participant selection)
- Ragin, C. 1992. Introduction: “Cases of What is a Case” (**only** p. 1-11; read relatively quickly to focus on next chapter) 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 (5):

(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 posted in Class 4 of NYUClasses (from Marshal and Rossman). Please turn in the new question, flow diagram and sampling frame.

Researcher identity memo due on Tuesday March 2

Week 6 (March 5): 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, and other creative ways due to social distancing, formal documents, and if possible, observations.

Reading assignment:

- Maxwell, Chapter 5, only Pages 87-96; 100-104; 115-120 (no need to read the data analysis part....)
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 37-42 (Instrumentation); 45(bottom)-52 (Management issues...) and 55-68 (Ethical Issues in Analysis)
- Gullemin, M., and Gilliam L. 2004. “Ethics, Reflexivity, and ‘Ethically Important Moments’ in Research,” *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(2): 261-280.
- **Exemplar:** Bundle of short readings ref. Lin, Ann C. (2000). *Reform in the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison*. Princeton: Princeton U. Press.

- See box (next page) Quinn Patton’s Chapter 6 (critical for your fieldwork, but won’t discuss in class).

Recommended:

- Legewie., N. & a. Nassauer. 2018. YouTube, Google, Facebook: 21st Century Online Video Research and Research Ethics. Forum: Qualitative Social Research. Vol 19 (3) Art 32.

Assignment (6):

(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 (7):

(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 BELOW, AS YOU ARE REQUIRED TO PLAN AHEAD

ATTENTION: Research proposal is due on Tuesday, March 9 - 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 grading criteria in the Resources tap 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 (located in Week 7, Chapter 6) 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 12): 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
- Lupton, D. (editor) (2020) Doing fieldwork in a pandemic (crowd-sourced document). Available in [NYUClasses](#)

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 (8):

(Team) Interview protocol draft.

Assignment (9):

(Team) Review the second half of the word- document “Doing Field Work in a Pandemic.” Go as deep as you want or can afford with your time, but get a good overview of the possible alternative, creative ways described to collect data. Identify FIVE methods/tools/activities that appeal to you because you believe you might be able to use some of them to supplement or complement the (on-line) traditional face-to-face interviews that you will do. Be prepared to discuss your reactions to the document, and why you chose the five you did.

ATTENTION: Follow instructions in this box to be ready to do Assignment 10 (See Week 9, April 2).

→ Unless you have experience using ATLAS TI or InVivo, you must participate in a Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) training offered by Data Services at the NYU Libraries and ITS unit. We will organize a group training (out of class - date to be determined together) so that you are ready to write a brief report on Week 9. We will talk more about this in class.

If you have a schedule conflict, you can make an appointment with a Data Services consultant for personalized help [here](#) (least preferred option)

Do not do this training before Week 8 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.

March 19 – No class due to NYU Weekend Break

REMINDER: YOU WILL NEED INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS AND/OR NOTES BY WEEK 10. This means you must plan to have completed a good portion of your data collection 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.

[There are a lot of readings for the next class,
you might want to start early and pace yourself]

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

Week 8 (March 26): 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 the experience of 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. In Uhl-Bien, M. and S. Ospina (Eds.). (2012) *Advancing relational leadership research*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age. (selected pages)
 - “Mapping the Terrain” (Introduction, pp.xix-xxvii only) AND
 - “Exploring the Competing Basis for Legitimacy” (Chapter 1, pp. 1-4 and then jump to 12-32).
- Yanow, D. and P.Schwartz-Shea. 2006. Wherefore “Interpretive”: An Introduction In Yanow, D. and P.Schwartz-Shea (ed). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: M.E. Sharp.
 - **READ ONLY** pp. xiii-xxi
 - Note: There is a new 2014 edition, but we are using the older for this reading
- Shwartz-Shea, P. & D. Yanow. 2014. “Ways of Knowing: Research questions and Logics of Inquiry” In *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge [e-book accessible at NYU Library]. p 25-43
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 6 (bottom)-7 (our Orientation); (Chapter 2, pp 25-43) **AND** “Starting from Meaning: Contextuality and its implications”(Chapter 3, pp. 44-53).

Recommended:

- Reichertz, J. (2014) "Induction, Deduction, Abduction." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. Access Date: March 24, 2019. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n9>
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 (April 2): Applications and illustrations

Goals:

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

Reading assignment:

- Shwartz-Shea, P. & D. Yanow. 2014. "Speaking Across Epistemic Communities" In *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge [e-book accessible at NYU Library].
 - Read Chapter 8, pp. 130-139
- Lin, A. 1998. "Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist approaches to Qualitative Methods" in *Policy Studies Journal*, Spring, 26(1): 162-180.
 - READ pp. 162-169 (mid page) AND 174-177
- Vogl, S, E. Schmidt & Ul. Zartler. 2019. "Triangulating perspectives: ontology and epistemology in the analysis of qualitative multiple perspective interviews. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 22:6, 611-624.
- **Exemplar:** (explanatory mixed methods study) McKim, C.A. (2017) The Value of Mixed Methods Research: A Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. Vol 11(2) 2020-222.

Recommended:

- Jones, M.D & C. M. Randanelli. (2015) The Narrative Policy Framework: Child or Monster? *Critical Policy Studies*, 9(3): 339-35. **Also**, see Critiques of Jones and Randanelli in NYUClasses
- 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 - Of particular interest are pp. 1-8 and 12-13

Assignment (10):

(Individual) After having taken the training on software programs for qualitative research with Data Services (NYU Libraries and ITS – see instructions of Week 7 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 9): 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 452-467.
- 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 – see assignment for more details on criteria to choose).
- Ospina, S. and A. Yaroni. (2003) *Understanding Cooperative Behavior in Labor Management Cooperation: A Theory-Building Exercise*. *Public Administration Review* Vol 63(4) 455-471
- **Exemplar:** Coslovsky, S. 2014. *Economic Development without Pre-requisites*. *World Development*. 54: 32-45

Assignment (11):

(Team) Develop a tentative coding scheme of your project and use the transcripts of your interviews (and other strategies used to collect data) to apply and refine it (Chapter 4). Write a memo of what you learned from doing this exercise, which includes a matrix or a network display (Chapter 5) that helps you either document (Ch 6), describe (Ch 7) or order (Ch 8) your data around an important dimension emerging from the coding for future analytical work. 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 as well as to share your display.

Week 11 (April 16): 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 477- end of 481.
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Chapter 9 (see instructions for group assignment before reading, and read selectively if needed)
- **Exemplar:** Johnson Dias, 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:

- Another exemplar: 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.
- 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).

Assignment (12):

(Team) Create either an explanatory effects matrix or a case dynamic matrix (pages 228-234 in MH&S), or a (within case) causal network (pp. 236-247); which ever you choose to create, write an analytical memo that makes a claim inferred from your data as presented in the matrix or network. Bring copies of the display for all.

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

Week 12 (April 23): 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 for 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 – pp. 310-21), but see assignment for other sections.
- Nowell, B. and K. Albretch. (2019) A Reviewer’s Guide to Qualitative Rigor. *Journal of Public Administration Research And Theory*, 348–363 doi:10.1093/jopart/muy052
- Lub, V. 2015. Validity in Qualitative Evaluation: Linking Purposes, Paradigms and Perspectives. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 2015: 1- 8
- **Exemplar:** 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:

- Dodge, J., S. Ospina, and E. Foldy. (2005) “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
- Schwartz-Shea, P. (2006) 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.

Assignment (13):

(Team) After skimming sections on Tactics in MHS Chapter 11, choose ONE tactic from either of the two sections (Tactics for generating meaning or Tactics for testing or confirming findings) 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 30): Developing a credible story: theorizing & constructing credible arguments**Goals:**

- Understand the challenges of writing and reporting research findings
- Identify approaches to writing in public service and applied fields

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
- **Exemplar:** 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.

Recommended:

- Another exemplar: 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.
- MH&S, Chapter 12

Week 14 (May 7): 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., M. Esteve & S. Lee. (2017). Assessing Qualitative Studies in Public Administration Research. *Public Administration Research* DOI: 10.1111/puar.12837
- **Exemplar?:** Instead of reading a new article, please use the article you chose to do the assignment in Class 2, please re-read it and see individual assignment below.

Assignment (14):

(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 readings:

- 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.
- Lamont, M. & P. White (2009). Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research. Washington DC: NSF

ATTENTION: Portfolios (including team progress reports) due on Friday May 14

- End of Schedule of Assignments -

Explanation of Letter Grades and Criteria

Letter grades for the entire course will be assigned as follows:

Letter Grade	Points
A	4.0 points
A-	3.7 points
B+	3.3 points
B	3.0 points
B-	2.7 points
C+	2.3 points
C	2.0 points

Letter Grade	Points
C-	1.7 points
F	0.0 points

Student grades will be assigned according to the following criteria:

- (A) Excellent: Exceptional work for a graduate student. Work at this level is unusually thorough, well-reasoned, creative, methodologically sophisticated, and well written. Work is of exceptional, professional quality.
- (A-) Very good: Very strong work for a graduate student. Work at this level shows signs of creativity, is thorough and well-reasoned, indicates strong understanding of appropriate methodological or analytical approaches, and meets professional standards.
- (B+) Good: Sound work for a graduate student; well-reasoned and thorough, methodologically sound. This is the graduate student grade that indicates the student has fully accomplished the basic objectives of the course.
- (B) Adequate: Competent work for a graduate student even though some weaknesses are evident. Demonstrates competency in the key course objectives but shows some indication that understanding of some important issues is less than complete. Methodological or analytical approaches used are adequate but student has not been thorough or has shown other weaknesses or limitations.
- (B-) Borderline: Weak work for a graduate student; meets the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. Understanding of salient issues is somewhat incomplete. Methodological or analytical work performed in the course is minimally adequate. Overall performance, if consistent in graduate courses, would not suffice to sustain graduate status in “good standing.”
- (C/-/+) Deficient: Inadequate work for a graduate student; does not meet the minimal expectations for a graduate student in the course. Work is inadequately developed or flawed by numerous errors and misunderstanding of important issues. Methodological or analytical work performed is weak and fails to demonstrate knowledge or technical competence expected of graduate students.
- (F) Fail: Work fails to meet even minimal expectations for course credit for a graduate student. Performance has been consistently weak in methodology and understanding, with serious limits in many areas. Weaknesses or limits are pervasive.

Revised: 01/27/2021