



**NYU**

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

**PHD-GP 5905-001**

**Doctoral Research Seminar:  
Qualitative Research Methods, Spring 2022**

### **Instructor Information**

- Sonia Ospina, Ph.D. (she/her) <sonia.ospina@nyu.edu>
- Office Hours: Tuesdays 4 to 6 pm, or by appointment.

### **TA Information**

- Riley Sandel, MPA (they/them) Wagner doctoral student <rms3933@nyu.edu>

### **Course Information**

- Meeting Time: Friday, 12:30p-2:30 pm; Location: 60 5th Ave, Room CO3, Washington Square
- Prerequisites: Doctoral Research Seminar; Research Methods (or equivalent); or, 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 on 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 site visits).

### **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.

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*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2013. (First used in week 3)
- Miles, M., M Huberman & J. Saldaña. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2019. (First used in week 3)

### Recommended texts:

- Great for anyone interested in research:
  - Booth, W, G Colomb & J Williams, J Bizup & W Fitzgerald. *The Craft of Research*. 4<sup>th</sup> 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.
- If interested in Participatory Research and Inquiry:
  - Burns, D., J. Howard & S.M. Ospina (Eds). 2021. *The SAGE Handbook of Participatory Research and Inquiry, Volumes 1 and 2*.

Please find additional required readings from selected sources in the Course Outline.

### Course Requirements

Students will apply readings and 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 projects will ensure ample room for collective reflection – inside & 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 distanced 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 **12 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. While pairs or trios of students will do the mock project, **each student will submit an individual final Portfolio**. It will include some group products, but also some independent writing from each student (including some journal entries and memos developed over time).

**Please see instructions for assignments (short and long) under Course Outline below and in the Contents section via NYU Brightspace. No late assignments will be accepted for grading, unless agreed upon in advance.**

Summary of Assignments, Credit and Associated Learning Objectives			
ASSIGNMENT	CREDIT	DUE DATE	COURSE OBJECTIVE
12 short assignments	20%	See dates in schedule of assignments	1; 2; 4; 5
Research ID memo	15%	Tuesday, March 1	3; 4
Research Proposal	20%	Tuesday, March 8	2; 3; 4
Mock Project Portfolio	35%	Friday, May 13	1-5
Participation; Debriefings	10%	n/a	1-5

### **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 (212-998-4980 or <[mosescsd@nyu.edu](mailto:mosescsd@nyu.edu)>). 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.

See Overview of course contents and Schedule of assignments below.

## **SPRING 2022: COURSE OVERVIEW**

### **I. INTRODUCTION TO QUALITATIVE RESEARCH**

1. Introduction: The nature of qualitative research – January 28
2. Research designs and multiple traditions of qualitative inquiry – February 4
3. Choosing topics, exploring questions; Closing the Intro – February 11

### **II. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN**

4. Designing the study: frameworks, questions, problems, goals – February 18
5. Bounding the territory: cases, sites, sampling and other issues – February 25
  - Researcher identity memo due on Tuesday, March 1
6. Preparing for the field: methods; relationships; fieldwork; ethics – March 4
  - Research proposal due Tuesday, March 8
7. The art and craft of interviewing – March 11

### **NYU Spring Break - March 18 - no class**

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

8. Multiple modes of inquiry: linking worldviews, paradigms, theoretical perspectives, and methodological tools (20 minutes to discuss your fieldwork) – March 25
9. Applications and illustrations. Guest Speaker: Prof. Valentina Mele, Bocconi University – April 1

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

10. Data Collection/Analysis (1): Documenting and describing – April 8
  - Field notes and interview transcripts needed for week 10
11. Collection/Analysis (2): Explaining and theorizing – April 15

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

12. Drawing and verifying conclusions; Standards of quality – April 22

- 13. Developing a credible story: theorizing & constructing credible arguments – April 29
- 14. Sharing the findings: in conversation with the literature; Conclusions: the craft of qualitative research – May 6
  - Portfolios due on Friday, May 13

## **COURSE OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS**

### **I. INTRODUCTION TO QUALITATIVE RESEARCH**

**Week 1 (January 28)** Introduction: The nature of qualitative research

**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.

**Recommended:** (especially if you are NEW to qualitative research):

- View SAGE Publishing’s 2013 video, featuring Dr. Creswell, titled: “Telling a Complete Story with Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research”. The video can be found on YouTube and via this [link](#). Come to class with questions. Content Warning: the video contains a first-hand interview with a survivor of the Holocaust

**Assignment 1** (individual):

Please complete the following exercise BEFORE our first class (Friday, Jan. 28).

Choose a “site” (a place you will do an observation). 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 and consider the following questions: (i) What is going on?; (ii) How is it going on?; and (iii) What do you (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. Submit a scanned copy or images of the notes and questions to Assignment 1 in NYU Brightspace.

**Week 2 (February 4)** Research designs and multiple traditions of qualitative inquiry

**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) (does not include Action Research-see next two entries)
- Ospina, S. & G. Anderson. (2014). "The Action Turn". In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Action Research*. London: Sage Pu. P. 18-21
- Exemplar: Kasdan, A. 2021. “Research, Organizing and Policy Change: Methods and Lessons on the Path from Participatory Action Research to a Right to Counsel in NYC”. In: Burns,

Howard & Ospina, The SAGE Handbook of Participatory Research an Inquiry. (Chap 48, p. 680-691).

- Atkinson, P. 2005. Qualitative Research–Unity and Diversity. In Forum: Qualitative Social Research. 6(3): Art. 26

### **Recommended:**

- Bradbury, H.H. 2010. What is good Action Research? Action Research Journal. 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); react briefly to the examples for those approaches provided in Creswell’s assigned Chapters and Appendix, (and consider Kasdan 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 11) Choosing topics, exploring questions; Closing the Intro**

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Maxwell, Chapters 1 and 2
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña
  - Pages 6-10 (An approach to qualitative data analysis)
  - Pages 14-15 (Introduction and Loose versus...)
  - Pages 20-21 ((Methodologies, genres...))
- Piore, MJ. 2006. Qualitative Research: does it fit in economics? European Management Review. 3: 17-23

#### **Recommended:**

- Lupton, D. (editor) (2020) Doing fieldwork in a pandemic (crowd-sourced document).

#### **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 with your team. No need to be concerned yet about a specific approach to inquiry. 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.

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

## **II. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN**

## **Week 4 (February 18)** Designing the study: frameworks, questions, problems, goals

### **Reading assignment:**

- Maxwell, Chapters 3 and Ch 4
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 15-24 (Displaying the Conceptual.. & Formulating Research...)
- Booth et al, Chapters 3 and 4

### **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 3 (team):**

As a team, write and bring to class a tentative research question and a tentative flow diagram of your conceptual framework. **Use the format proposed by Booth et al on pages 48 and 61** (48 gives you the structure, 61 a further elaboration for 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). Citation style is not important, just be consistent.

## **Week 5 (February 25)** Bounding the territory: cases, sites, sampling and other issues

### **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.
- 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:**

- 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 & individual component):**

**TEAM:** Re-frame your research question and flow diagram based on ongoing developments and work to further clarify your unit of analysis. Update your previous assignment and submit via NYU Brightspace.  
**INDIVIDUAL:** Closely read the Rivera reading and construct a matrix specifying the sampling frame



you would imagine for the work, based on the research question asked and methods and participants eventually used (see handout posted in Brightspace). Use a spreadsheet program to construct the matrix and submit via NYU Brightspace.

Hint: Your team will need to complete a sampling frame matrix for your final Portfolio; you must complete this within the next two or three weeks, but this will not be collected until the final portfolio submission.

## **Researcher identity memo due on Tuesday March 1**

**Week 6 (March 4)** Preparing for the field: methods; relationships; fieldwork; ethics

### **Reading assignment:**

- Maxwell, Chapter 5, only Pages 87-96; 100-104; 115-120
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña:
  - Pages 30-35 (Instrumentation);
  - 39-47 (Management issues...\*\* skim 41-45 on software) and
  - 49-60 (Ethical Issues in Analysis)
- Quinn Patton's Chapter 6
- Guillemin, 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.

### **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.
- On fieldnotes, as you start fieldwork!: 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

### **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. Submit updated content and the Questions and Methods Matrix via NYU Brightspace.

### **Assignment 6 (individual):**

Pick one option and submit via NYU Brightspace

#### **OPTION A**

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. Upload a short write up (a paragraph) about what surprised you of the exercise and be prepared to talk about this assignment in class.

#### **OPTION B**

View **the first 40 minutes** of SAGE Publishing's 2021 video, titled: "Research Ethics in Practice". The video can be found on YouTube and via this [link](#). After watching the panel, write a short reflection (a

paragraph) about the video and your key takeaways.

Hint: 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.

### **ATTENTION: Research proposal is due on Tuesday, March 9**

As you work on your proposal you will find it helpful reading Maxwell’s chapters 6 and 7, and the appendixes. In Ch 6, Maxwell discusses issues of validity. Ch 7 and the Appendixes address directly issues associated with writing a research proposal and two possible examples of one. See grading criteria on NYU Brightspace.

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.

### **Week 7 (March 11) The art and craft 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

#### **Recommended:** especially if you are new to interviewing/qualitative work

- McDonald, B. & P. Rogers. (2014) Interviewing. *Methodological Briefs, Impact Evaluation No. 12*. Florence, Italy: Unicef Office of Research, pp. 1-11
- 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. [skim and read more carefully pages 69-80 on logs].

**Assignment 7** (team): Interview protocol draft. More on this in class.

**(March 18) – No class due to NYU Spring Break**

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

Hint: The next two classes represent a departure from the knots and bolts of qualitative research. While we focus on this interim topic, you must continue to work outside of 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.

**Week 8 (March 25)** Multiple modes of inquiry: linking worldviews, paradigms, theoretical perspectives, and methodological tools

**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.
  - “Mapping the Terrain” (Introduction, pp.xix-xxvii only)
  - “Exploring the Competing Basis for Legitimacy” (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
- Shwartz-Shea, P. & D. Yanow. 2014. “Ways of Knowing: Research questions and Logics of Inquiry” In *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. p 25-43
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Pages 5-6 (top) (Our Orientation)

**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 same volume
- 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*.

**Attention: SCHEDULED NYU LIBRARY TRAINING (in preparation re-read Miles, Huberman and Saldaña pp. 41-45 on software).**

**Week 9 (April 1)** Applications and illustrations (with emphasis on 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.
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Chapter 2, pp 35-39 (top) (Linking...)

- Exemplar: Guest Speaker: Professor Valentina Mele, Bocconi University, on Mixed Methods (in preparation, please check the first two recommended readings below (if you have time and interest, please skim).

**Recommended:**

- Belardinelli, P. and V. Mele. 2020. Mixed methods in public administration: Advantages and challenges. In Vigoda-Gadot, E. and D. R. Vashdi (ed). *The Eldar Handbook of Research Methods in Public Administration, Management and Policy*. Mass: Edward Edgar Pu. (pp. 28-41).
- Mele, V, and P. Belardinelli. 2019. Mixed methods in public administration Research: Selecting, Sequencing, and Connecting. In *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Volume 29, Issue 2, April 2019, Pages 334–347.
- McKim, C.A. (2017) The Value of Mixed Methods Research: A Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. Vol 11(2) 2020-222.
- 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 8 (individual):**

After having taken the training on software programs for qualitative research with Data Services, please write a two-paragraph discussion 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?

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

**Week 10 (April 8) Data Collection/Analysis (1): Documenting and describing**

**Reading assignment:**

- Patton, MQ. (2005). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Chapter 8, ONLY 452-467.
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña:
  - Read carefully Chapters 4 (61-99) and 5 (103-118).
  - Scan Chapters 6, 7 & 8 (read the intro and the introduction to each section and choose a few specific methods, searching for what you think can be helpful for your project).
- Exemplar: 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

**Recommended:**

- Reichertz, J. (2014) "Induction, Deduction, Abduction." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. Access Date: March 24, 2019.
- 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 9 (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 15) Collection/Analysis (2): Explaining and theorizing**

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Patton, MQ. (2005). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Chapter 8, ONLY pages 477- end of 481.
- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Chapter 9 (221-254) (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:**

- 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

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

Create either an explanatory effects matrix or a case dynamic matrix (pages 230-234 in MH&S), or a (within case) causal network (pp. 238-248); whichever 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**

#### **Reading assignment:**

- Miles, Huberman & Saldaña: Chapter 11. Read intro p. 276 and concentrate on the last two sections (Standards for...and Analytic documentation – pp. 304-314) but see assignment for other sections.
- Nowell, B. and K. Albrecht. (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 11** (team & individual component):

**INDIVIDUAL:** 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. Post your tactic and a short blurb about why you chose it to the Week 12 ‘Assignment 11 Individual Component’ discussion board via NYU Brightspace.

**TEAM:** 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. Submit this short memo under Assignment 11 via NYU Brightspace.

**Week 13 (April 29)** Developing a credible story: theorizing & constructing credible arguments

**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:**

- 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 6)** Sharing the findings: in conversation with the literature; Conclusions: the craft of qualitative research

**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: Please use the article you chose in Class 2; re-read it per assignment below.

**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.

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

**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:

- 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?
- 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.

**ATTENTION: Portfolios (& team progress reports) due on Friday May 13**

-

**End of Schedule of Assignments -**

**Explanation of Letter Grades Points and Criteria:**

**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   **C-** 1.7 points   **F** 0.0 points

- (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 the 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: JAN 20/2022**