



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Department of Educational Studies

Faculty of Education
Education Centre at Ponderosa Commons
6445 University Boulevard
Vancouver B.C. V6T 1Z2
CANADA

Tel: 604-822-5374

Fax: 604-822-4244

Web: http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca

EDST 508A

(2018-2019)

Review of Research in Educational Studies

(aka Research Methods I – Ed.D. Cohort 2018)1

André Elias Mazawi, Professor, Adult Education and Learning Program (ALE)

Office: Ponderosa Commons, Room 3045 ; Tel.: 604-827-5537 ; Email: <Andre.Mazawi@ubc.ca>

Course location: Orchard Commons, Room 4052, 6363 Agronomy Road, UBC Campus

SYLLABUS – COURSE CONTENTS

A. What is this course about? 1
B. What are the course’s objectives? 2
C. How is the course organized? 2
D. What about course readings and resources? 2
E. How is each of the four sessions designed? 3
F. What are the course’s thematic foci? 4
Session I 4
Session II 8
Session III 13
Session IV 16
G. What about assignments and their marking? 19
H. Any complementary resources? 20
I. What UBC regulations, policies, & procedures apply? 22
J. What food sites are available on campus? 22
K. Appendices 23

1 I acknowledge and am grateful for the comments and suggestions offered by my colleague, Professor Deirdre Kelly, during the preparation of this syllabus and for generously sharing Appendix 5. All responsibility for the course’s design is the instructor’s. AEM.

Review of Research in Educational Studies (aka Research Methods I – Ed.D. Cohort 2018)

A. WHAT IS THE COURSE ABOUT?

EDST 508A is a requirement of the Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership and Policy. The *Guidelines for the examination of the Ed.D. dissertation* state that the Program “is designed to provide advanced professional study for educators who have leadership and policy responsibilities. The aim is to integrate scholarship and practice. The focus is on *professional practice*. The coursework, the comprehensive examination, and the research dissertation are all oriented to the practice of educational leadership and policy. ... The program starts with practice, takes students on a journey into theory, philosophy, and reflection and then, through a research project, develops knowledge and understanding with the potential to *improve practice*” (February 9, 2010, emphases added).

Over this backdrop, EDST 508A offers participants a broad introductory overview of major methodological approaches (paradigms or traditions) they could draw on to research the contexts associated with their respective professional practice and its potential improvement. To that end, the course introduces, more specifically, a very select range of research methods located within these approaches or at their intersections. The course also offers participants with an opportunity to critically reflect on what it means to undertake research on one’s professional practice and what it means to seek its ‘improvement’ through research. The course provides participants with conceptual, theoretical, and practical tools and understandings in relation to which they could position themselves meaningfully – as researcher-and-practitioners – when they design their respective projects.

Central to this course stand concerns over the [social, cultural, economic, political, and ethical](#) implications of professional practice for Indigenous peoples, colonized, marginalized, socio-economically oppressed, [pathologized](#) communities, and racialized groups. ‘Doing research’ on professional practice is therefore not just about mastering the technical skills needed for the conduct of research. It hinges on the researcher-practitioner’s position and how it is translated into methodological practices. It further hinges on the researcher-practitioner’s understanding how theories, methodologies, and research methods – and their ensuing knowledge-claims – come to inform policy making and implementation, given the inherent “antagonism present in human societies” (Mouffe, 2014:150).

From this vantage point, EDST 508A is underpinned by the premise that methodologies – and their concomitant methods – need to be judiciously drawn upon, not just as research techniques and tools (which they are), but also as practices that carry with them ethical and political implications for individuals, groups, and societies. Researching practice requires a reflexive consideration of the contested character of professional knowledge and the methodologies and methods through which such knowledge is generated. It also requires an understanding of what the improvement of professional practice stands for within the context of a democratic, just, equitable, multicultural, and diverse society. This means, as [Boaventura de Sousa Santos](#) (2007) observes, that those doing research need not only master the research tools at their disposal, but also question their limits (p. xii), “trying out new ways of producing knowledge and of examining their possibility for social emancipation” (p. xvii).

References

Chantal Mouffe (2014). By way of a postscript. *Parallax*, 20(2), 149-157.

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2007). [Reinventing social emancipation: Toward new manifestos](#). In *Democratizing democracy: Beyond the liberal democratic canon*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos (pp. vii-xxiii). London & New York: Verso.

B. WHAT ARE THE COURSE'S OBJECTIVES?

By the end of this course participants would be expected to:

1. understand the [epistemic](#) and [ontological](#) assumptions of different research traditions they may draw on in relation to their research projects;
2. understand how researchers – as social actors – construct and engage social, cultural, economic, and political issues within different sites of practice;
3. consider intersections of “research” and “practice” in terms of how they challenge the researcher’s judgment, ethical considerations, and social-political awareness and engagement;
4. position themselves critically in relation to various methodologies and their associated research methods;
5. apply core [concepts](#) in research methods to the design of research projects.

C. HOW IS THE COURSE ORGANIZED?

EDST 508A is organized in a [seminar](#) form, [intuitively understood as a space of discussions, group work, individual reflection and plenary presentations](#). It offers participants with an opportunity to engage readings, online and audiovisual resources that focus, in the present case, on methodological traditions and research methods. In plenary discussions and group activities participants will bring their professional and life experiences, expertise, skills, and knowledge to bear on what it means to undertake research in diverse contexts of professional practice. They will also reflect on how to enhance their understanding of research methods in relation to ethical considerations and wider social issues associated with their areas of interest and field(s) of professional practice.

D. WHAT ABOUT COURSE READINGS AND RESOURCES?

All assigned course readings, without exception, are accessible full text online through the [UBC Library](#) and its [off-campus access](#) platforms. Some readings are available full text online on the Internet and can be accessed simply by clicking on a title’s embedded [hyperlink](#). Clicking on these hyperlinks leads to additional, elective or mandatory readings and materials to be used as supplementary course resources. All course resources and readings are downloadable in advance of the course. Participants are encouraged to build their digital course folder prior to the first session, and organize it in thematic sub-folders, as suggested in this syllabus. Taking [detailed notes](#) would help participants delve into the relevant aspects of this course.

Please note that assigned readings have not been uploaded on any centralized platform, such as [Canvas](#). An important aspect of this course is to familiarize participants with [library-based research](#) when they look for resources and materials relevant to their academic and dissertation bound journeys. Searching for such resources and materials, and downloading them, represents an important skill that participants are expected to acquire. Placing all readings on a centralized platform means basically avoiding, if not dismissing entirely, the library as a major asset and a major repository of knowledge, even if this is limited to its online holdings. By having to search the library for the assigned readings and relevant materials, participants will not only familiarize themselves with the online version of the Library’s holdings, but also find other readings and resources that they did not know about or were not aware of in the process of their searching for knowledge and

readings. Online available resources represent a rich and wide range of materials — textual, visual, audiovisual, and audio, arts etc. Participants are strongly encouraged to visit the UBC Library (and any public and university libraries), whenever possible. Otherwise, at least please take the habit of browsing the online collections and familiarize yourself with resources made available to you. Doing so is a major asset for your doctoral journey.

It goes without saying that if course participants would like to search for and upload the assigned readings to a centralized interface, they are free to do so at their initiative and organize these readings in the way they consider best fitting for their needs. The course instructor is not to be expected to undertake this work.

E. HOW IS EACH OF THE FOUR COURSE SESSIONS DESIGNED?

EDST 508A includes four weekend sessions, each held over Friday evening and, next day, full day on Saturday:

Friday: Part A: Evening Session 17:00-20:00 – 15 minutes break at 18:30

Saturday:

Part B: Early Morning Session 09:00-10:15 (75 minutes) – 15 minutes break

Part C: Late Morning Session 10:30-12:15 (105 minutes) – 45 minutes lunch break

Part D: Early Afternoon Session 13:00-14:30 (90 minutes) – 15 minutes break

Part E: Late Afternoon Session 14:45-16:00 (75 minutes)

F. WHAT ARE THE COURSE'S THEMATIC FOCI?

Session I (January 25-26, 2019):

Understanding and researching practice in relation to professionalism and power politics

'How we know what we know'? Can we know our (social) world "[truly](#)", to start with? If so, how do we generate, and represent, that [knowledge](#)? What are the assumptions – [ontological](#) and [epistemic](#) – associated with such knowledge claims? How is research positioned in relation to notions of [reality](#) ([what is it?](#)) and in relation to our capacity to know that reality in some ways (can we?)? How do our assumptions shape and forge the tools (or ways) we use in order to generate knowledge about reality? More specifically, how do we come to know ourselves, others around us, and our practice as a set of hierarchical relationships? In that sense, [is the capacity to know contingent on wider social, political, economic, cultural \(temporal\) contexts of collective action](#)? For instance, how does power politics, the gender and social class location of social actors impact the ways through which they come to know the world surrounding them? What are the roles of critique, [skepticism](#) (also, [read](#)) and [doubt](#) in the generation of knowledge?

- Key Concepts:
 - [Paradigm](#), [methodology](#), method, research methods, inquiry, philosophical inquiry
 - [Ontology](#), [epistemology](#), [social epistemology](#), [Standpoint theory](#) (see [the following illustration](#), a clip from the movie *Crash*), see also: situated knowledge & [ethnoepistemology](#), [Indigenous knowledge](#) (also: [watch](#)), axiology, praxis
 - [Agency](#), social structure, [determinism](#),
 - [Skepticism](#) (see [also](#)), reflexivity, [meaning](#) (see [also](#))

Mandatory background readings relevant for the course (to be read in advance of the first session):

- [Sandra Harding](#) (2015). *Objectivity and diversity: Another logic of scientific research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Watch: [Supplementary resource](#))
- [Linda Tuhiwai Smith](#) (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books. (Watch: [Supplementary resource](#))

Part A: Introduction - Scientific knowledge, controversies, and the politics of science

Generating scientific knowledge relies heavily on the researchers' capacity to thoughtfully, transparently, and systematically collect data on a phenomenon they are interested in. What tools do they use to that end? What are the assumptions that guide them in using various tools? How should we understand the robustness of these tools and their appropriateness, particularly in the social sciences? Are all tools equally viable to answer any research question? How does the choice of research tools shape the role of researchers and the kinds of data collected (or not)? What are the considerations – theoretical, political, cultural, economic, and ethical – that guide researchers in the choice of their research tools?

17:00-17:30: Introduction
Reviewing the course syllabus;
Introducing the course;
Setting expectations; Q & A

- Lorraine Daston, Lorraine (2008). On scientific observation. *Isis*, 99, 97-110.

17:30-18:30

- Screening



[Tales from the Jungle:
Margret Mead and the Samoans](#)

Directed by Peter Oxley (60 min, 2006)

“Exploring the work of [Margaret Mead](#), this film investigates the 12 months Mead spent with the Samoans in the Twenties.

Her resulting book, *Coming of Age in Samoa*, had a huge impact on Western culture.

Mead believed cultures like the Samoans could teach people how to live in harmony. Her book depicts a society of free love – devoid of jealousy and teenage turmoil.

But, decades later, her work was criticized as being tainted by her romantic views and strong belief in liberal values.

Tales from the jungle examines whether Mead's study was merely misinterpretation and romantic wishful thinking.” ([A BBC Production, 2006](#))

Elective background materials to be consulted in advance of the screening:

- Margaret Mead (1928). [Coming of age in Samoa: A psychological study of primitive youth for Western civilization](#). New York: William Morrow & Company.
- Paul Shankman (2009). [Derek Freeman and Margaret Mead: What did he know and when did he know it?](#) *Pacific Studies*, 32(2-3), 202-231.
- Alice Dreger (2013). [Sex, lies, and separating science from ideology](#). *The Atlantic*, February 15.

During the screening:

1. Observation: How did [Margaret Mead](#) and [Derek Freeman](#) come to know Samoan society? Can you identify some of these ways (methods)? What were their assumptions about the anthropological study of a society, like the Samoan? Are these assumptions compatible?
2. Positioning: Document your own reactions and thoughts throughout the screening: How have these emotions and thoughts evolved throughout the screening? Why?
3. Linkages: Based on your observations and notes (1 & 2), what linkages with Sandra Harding (2015) and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) can you make in relation to the determining of research focus, the methods used, and the role of the researcher as knowledge generator?

18:30-18:45 – Break

18:45-19:45 – Plenary discussion of documentary in terms of implications for research design and methodology

19:45-20:00 – Instructor’s summary and guidance for next steps

Part B: Being, doing, knowing – On the discordant bases of professional practice

The point of departure for our discussion on research methods is the world of professional practice. In the reading for this module, Dall’Alba and Barnacle (2015) ask, “How is it possible that professionals act unethically or neglectfully when they should *know* better?”. Pointing to the “discordant” bases of professional practice, they argue that this discord “highlights issues of knowledge and skills, as well as who and how we are, as professionals.” We will build on this article in two ways. First, we will interrogate professionals’ ways of being, knowing and doing within the wider context of their professional practice (Dall’Alba & Barnacle). Secondly, we will raise questions around professional practice and the methodological challenges prevalent researching it (Kemmis, see Also appendix 6).

- Stephen Kemmis (2010). What is professional practice? Recognising and respecting diversity in understandings of practice. In *Elaborating professionalism: Studies in practice and theory*, edited by Clive Kanes (pp. 139-165). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Gloria Dall’Alba & Robyn Barnacle (2015). Exploring knowing/being through discordant professional practice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47(13-14), pp. 1452-1464.

Part C: The study of the discordant bases of professional practice

The class breaks into 3-4 groups. Each group discusses one aspect of the above readings focusing on its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts (30 minutes). Particular attention should be granted to how Dall’Alba and Barnacle’s (2015) article and Kemmis’ (2010) chapter could inform the study of professional practice in terms of:

- Ontological and epistemic assumptions;
- Theoretical considerations; Research questions;
- Methodological design;
- Methods that could be used for data collection.

Groups report on their discussion (30 minutes). An open class discussion and summary follows (45 minutes).

Part D: Philosophical inquiry and the study of professional praxis

Researching a phenomenon can be undertaken in different “ways” which may share some commonalities, yet also differ significantly in terms of the underlying assumptions, purposes, and motivations of the researcher. Being aware of this plurality and the situated characteristic of research stands at the centre of the present section. This plurality of approaches to research is particularly consequential when thinking through educational questions concerned with ‘what *ought to be the case*’ of professional practice rather than ‘*what is the case*’ of professional practice. One among many reasons for that is that the *aims* of education, and what educators should do and how, are informed and governed, not by ‘scientifically-deducted’ and “universal laws”, but within the context of philosophical, ethical, moral, and political (ideological) positions, conditions, and traditions that compete significantly in terms of their ontologies, epistemologies, axiologies, and concomitant praxes (for these terms, please refer to Appendix 1 on p. 20 of this syllabus). In that case, inquiring into what ought to be the case heavily relies on identifying the underlying worldview(s), assumption(s), motivations, and ethical principles that would best guide practice in a given context and time.

In this section, we will distinguish between different approaches to research. We will also delve into the notion of “philosophical inquiry” and consider its potential contributions – possibilities and limitations – to the study of professional practice and its underpinning conceptualizations. For J. Randall Koetting (2001) “philosophical inquiry” involves “conceptual analysis, situating educational issues within a philosophical tradition, and the

examination of epistemological and axiological assumptions, criticism, etc.” He further emphasizes that “critical thinking and analysis of existing literature and theory [are] part of philosophical inquiry” (p. 1139) (Refer also to Appendix 5).

- Nicolas C. Burbules & Bryan R. Warnick (2006). Philosophical inquiry. In *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*, edited by Judith L. Green, Gregory Camilli, Patricia B. Elmore, with Audra Skukauskaitė & Elizabeth Grace (pp. 489-501). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association. [For a summary, refer to Appendix 5, too]
- Wesley Buckwalter & John Turri (2016). [Perceived weaknesses of philosophical inquiry: A comparison to psychology](#). *Philosophia*, 44, 33-52.

Plan of this session:

- Introduction of the readings by the instructor (30 minutes).
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the above readings in terms of their *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts (30 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (30 minutes).

Part E: Research methods, knowledge, power, and the researcher as colonizer

How are research tools situated in relation to the wider contexts of colonialism and anti-colonial struggles, politics, and marginalization? [How does politics – in its manifold manifestations – inform methodological choices and preferences?](#) In brief, [what politics surround knowledge production and how do they shape methodological choices and preferences?](#) These questions capture foundational problematics on the intersections between methodology, knowledge generation, colonialism, hegemony, Indigeneity, and politics. We will continuously revisit these questions in more detail, transversally, throughout the term, and more particularly in Session IV (March 29-30), reflecting on their implications for research methods and design.

- Mary Hawkesworth (2006). Contending conceptions of science and politics: Methodology and the constitution of the political. In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, edited by Dvora Yanow & Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (pp. 27-49). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Inc.
- Robert E. Floden (2011). Speaking truth to policy and practice. In *The Sage handbook for research in education: Pursuing ideas as the keystone of exemplary inquiry* (2nd ed.), edited by Clifton C. Conrad & Ronald C. Serlin (Chapter 2). London: Sage.
- Derek Antoine (2017). Pushing the academy: The need for decolonizing research. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 42, 113-119.

Recommended complementary reading:

- J. Kaomea (2003). Reading erasures and making the familiar strange: Defamiliarizing methods for research in formerly colonized and historically oppressed communities. *Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 14-25.
- Sandra Harding (1995). ‘Strong objectivity’: A response to the new objectivity question”, *Synthese*, 104(3), 331-349.
- John A. Weaver & Nathan Snaza (2017). Against methodocentrism in educational research. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 49(11), 1055-1065.

Session II (February 22-23, 2019):

'A tale of two cultures' I: Quantitative and qualitative methodologies in the social sciences

In their book, *A tale of two cultures: Qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences*, Gary Goertz and James Mahoney (2012) observe that quantitative and qualitative methodologies can be viewed as “alternative cultures”, each having “its own values, beliefs, and norms”, and each being associated with “distinctive research procedures and practices” (p. 1). They also caution readers that these two methodological paradigms should not be viewed as mutually exclusive “monolithic blocks”. They rather represent “loosely integrated traditions, and they contain internal contradictions and contestation”. As such, these two paradigms are not “hermetically sealed from one another but rather are permeable and permit boundary crossing” (pp. 1-2).

In the present (February, 23-24) and next (April, 6-7) sessions, we will critically examine the philosophical assumptions of these two broadly defined paradigms, along the perspective outlined by Goertz and Mahoney (2012). We will explore the possibilities and limitations of each paradigm; and familiarize ourselves with particular research methods associated with each one of them. Most importantly, we will simulate how research on professional practice can draw on one or more of these approaches and methods and at what cost.

- Key Concepts:
 - [Inductive vs. deductive reasoning](#)
 - [Paradigm](#) (refer: Thomas Kuhn, on his book *The structure of scientific revolutions*, 1970);
 - Theory as story; storytelling and meaning
 - Quantitative research, qualitative research, mixed method research,
 - Empiricism, positivism, [realism](#), critical realism, [relativism](#), constructivism, phenomenology
 - Grounded theory, case study, interview, focus group, (critical) discourse analysis (CDA), ethnography, autoethnography, action research
 - Transcript, coding, analysis, interpretation

For present session and next session:

- Data (datum), data collection, fieldwork, data analysis
- Ethics, researcher-participant relationship, trust, rapport, anonymity, confidentiality, informed consent

Part A: Introducing the qualitative-quantitative debates

- Igor Hanzel (2011). Beyond Blumer and Symbolic Interactionism: The qualitative-quantitative issue in social theory and methodology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 41(3), 303-326.
 - See also Table 1.2 in Merriam and Tisdell (2016, p. 20) in Part B, below.

Plan of this session:

- Introduction by instructor (17:00-17:45) + guidance for group discussions
- Group discussions of Hanzel (2011) (17:45-18:15)
- Break (18:15-18:30)
- Plenary discussion of the qualitative-quantitative distinction (18:30-20:00)

Part B: Philosophical bases of qualitative research

- Sharan B. Merriam & Elizabeth J. Tisdell (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
 - Chapter 1: What is qualitative research? (pp. 3-21)
 - Chapter 2: Six common qualitative research designs (pp. 22-42)
 - Chapter 3: Expanding the qualitative paradigm: Mixed methods, action, critical and arts based research (pp. 43-72)
- Robert E. Stake (2008). Qualitative case studies. In *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*, edited by Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (pp. 119-149). Los Angeles & London: Sage Publications.

Recommended reading:

- Maxwell, Joseph A. (2004). Causal explanation, qualitative research, and scientific inquiry in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(2), 3-11.
- Maxwell, Joseph, A. (2008). “The value of realist understanding of causality for qualitative research”, in: *Qualitative Inquiry and the Politics of Evidence*, edited by Norman K. Denzin & Michael D. Giardina (pp. 163-181). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Linda S. Gilbert, Kristi Jackson, & Silvana di Gregorio (2014). Tools for analyzing qualitative data: Relevance of qualitative data analysis software. In *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (4th ed.), edited by J. Michael Spector, M. David Merrill, Jan Elen, & M.J. Bishop (pp. 221-236). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business.

Part C: The possibilities and limitations of qualitative methodologies

How might qualitative research inform a study concerned with an aspect of their professional practice?

- What research questions would a qualitative methodology help you answer in relation to the study of your professional practice (provide examples)?
- What ontological and epistemic assumptions would lead you to use – or not use – any of the six common qualitative research designs discussed by Merriam and Tisdell (2016)?
- What “data” would each of the six common qualitative research designs discussed by Merriam and Tisdell (2016) allow you to collect, and what data they would not?
- What are the possibilities and limitations of the qualitative methodologies discussed by Merriam and Tisdell (2016) for a potential study of professional practice? Can limitations be addressed, and, if so, how (provide examples of the trade-offs you would have to engage in when thinking how to design the methodology of your study)?

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) how the above two readings regarding the philosophical bases of qualitative research.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts (30 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (45 minutes).

Part D: Qualitative method I – Qualitative interviewing

- Svend Brinkmann (2013). *Qualitative interviewing: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford University Press.
 - Chapter 1: Introduction to qualitative interviewing (pp. 1-43)
 - Chapter 2: Research design in interview studies (pp. 44-81)
- Kathy Charmaz (2017). Continuities, contradictions, and critical inquiry in Grounded Theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1-18.

Building on the previous discussion (refer to Part C, above), address the following questions:

- Would qualitative interviewing be a research method you would draw on for your potential study of professional practice? If so, what specific interviewing type (of those discussed by Brinkmann) would be the most appropriate and why (provide examples)?
- What ethical issues would emerge if you were to undertake your study as described under the previous point? What judgments would you have to exert to address these ethical issues and their implications for the robustness of your study (explain and provide examples)?
- Researching professional practice – particularly when undertaken in one’s work environment – raises questions around anonymity, confidentiality, informed consent, ethics, and power relations in the workplace. How would these concerns play out if you were to research your own workplace environment or community of practice; what strategies would you design to address these challenges?

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) how qualitative interviewing can be drawn upon in the study of professional practice and workplace dynamics.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts, providing examples (30 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (30 minutes).

Part E: Qualitative method II – Ethnography/Ethnographies

Ethnography has a controversial history attached to it (see the BBC documentary as one example, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s, *Decolonizing methodologies*, as another). Paul Atkinson and Lisa Morriss (2017) observe that, “Ethnographic research is concerned with documenting the local knowledge that social actors use to accomplish mundane tasks, and also the knowledge they use in accomplishing more esoteric activities” (p. 323). They add that “successful ethnography depends on the researcher’s acquisition of a degree of competence in those systems of knowledge” (*ibid.*).

In *Writing the new ethnography*, H.L. Goodall, Jr. (2000) identifies “Four tasks involved in learning how to become an ethnographer”:

You have to learn how to do fieldwork.

You have to learn how to write.

You have to learn who you are as a fieldworker, as a writer, and as a self.

And you have to learn how— and where— those activities are meaningfully connected...”.

H.L. Goodall, Jr. (2000) continues:

“To become an ethnographer who writes new ethnographies requires habits of being in the world, of being able to talk and listen to people, and of being able to write— habits that are beyond method. These ethnographic practices involve a craft that anyone can learn, but there is also *art* to it, a confluence made out of a person and the process, one that separates those who know about and can theorize new ethnography from those who know about, theorize about, and do it.

It is a difference that emerges on the written page.

Which is to say: New ethnographers are not researchers who learn to “write it up,” but writers who learn how to use their research and how they write to “get it down.”

Approaching ethnographic fieldwork as an “art”, is a theme taken up by anthropologist Harry F. Wolcott (2005), in his book, *The art of fieldwork*:

“... fieldwork never did belong exclusively to anthropology, and today the term is sometime used so broadly as to be synonymous with qualitative research in general, as in ‘taking a fieldwork approach’. Anthropologists might have preferred to be more protective of their special term *ethnography*, but in some circles even that term is used so widely as to be synonymous with the other two. ... [Notwithstanding,] how an anthropologist goes about fieldwork differs little, if at all, from how any other qualitative researcher goes about it. The critical difference that distinguishes these orientations are in the mindwork that accompanies fieldwork” (pp. 55-56).

In this session, we will ask:

- What kind of knowledge – or knowledges – does ethnographic fieldwork facilitate? What are its/their conditions of production? (About variants in approaches to ethnography and what it stands for)
- Which variant of ethnography can be useful for the study of diverse aspects and problematics of professional practice? What competences do practitioner-researchers need to acquire (and how) to engage variants of ethnographic fieldwork?
- What distinguishes “to be in fieldwork” from “doing fieldwork”, as Castañeda (2006) suggests, when it comes to researching professional practice ethnographically?
- What aspects of ethnography can be challenging – in terms of fieldwork, ethics, and power relations – when researching a given workplace or one’s professional practice?

Readings:

- Quetzil E. Castañeda, (2006). The invisible theatre of ethnography: Performative principles of fieldwork. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 79(1), 75-104.
- Frances Maggs-Rapport (2000). Combining methodological approaches in research: Ethnography and interpretive phenomenology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 31(1), 219-225.
- Keyan G. Thomaselli, Lauren Dyll, & Michael Francis (2008). ‘Self’ and ‘Other’: Auto-reflexive and Indigenous ethnography. In *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*, edited by Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, & Linda Tuhiwai Smith (pp. 347-372). Los Angeles & London: Sage.

Select readings on Institutional Ethnography [IE] (Dorothy Smith):

- On “standpoint”:
James Reid (2018). Standpoint: Using Bourdieu to understand IE and the researcher’s relation with knowledge generation" In *Perspectives on and from Institutional Ethnography*, edited by James Reid and Lisa Russell, pp. 71-90. Emerald Publishing.
- Jonathan Tummons (2018). Institutional Ethnography, theory, methodology, and research: Some concerns and some comments. In *Perspectives on and from Institutional Ethnography*, edited by James Reid and Lisa Russell, pp. 147-162. Emerald Publishing.

Recommended readings:

- Francine Lorimer (2011). Using emotion as a form of knowledge in a psychiatric fieldwork setting. In *Emotions in the field: The psychology and anthropology of fieldwork experience*, edited by James Davies & Dimitrina Spencer (pp. 98-126). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Samer Shehata (2006). Ethnography, Identity, and the production of knowledge. In *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*, edited by Dvora Yanow & Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (pp. 244-263). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Inc.
- Tony E. Adams & Stacy Holman Jones (2008). Autoethnography is queer. In *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*, edited by Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, & Linda Tuhiwai Smith (pp. 373-390). Los Angeles & London: Sage.

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) how ethnography – in its variants – can be drawn upon in the study of different aspects of professional practice and workplace dynamics.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts, providing examples (15 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (30 minutes).

Session III (March 15-16, 2019):

'A tale of two cultures' II: – Quantitative and qualitative methodologies in the social sciences

Introducing quantitative methodologies and methods (refer to introduction of previous session, p. 7).

- Key Concepts:
 - Correlation, causation, effect; independent vs. dependent variable
 - Measurement, variation, co-variation, distribution, prediction, generalisability, sample/sampling
 - Experimental design, quasi-experimental design, random distribution
 - Survey, questionnaire, statistical analysis, meta-analysis
 - Model, coding, validity, reliability, replication
 - [Explanation](#)

For present and previous sessions:

- Data, data collection, fieldwork
- Ethics, researcher-participant relationship, trust, rapport, anonymity, confidentiality, informed consent, [Indigenous protocols](#)

Part A: Philosophical bases of quantitative research

- Jake M. Hofman, Amit Sharma, & Duncan J. Watts (2017). Prediction and explanation in social systems. *Science*, 355, 486-488.
- Salvatore Babones (2015). Interpretive quantitative methods for the social sciences. *Sociology*, 50(3), 453-469.
- John Jerrim & Robert de Vries (2017). The limitations of quantitative social science for informing public policy. *Evidence and policy: A journal of research, debate, and practice*, 13(1), 117-133.
- Jeremy Freese & David Peterson (2017). Replication in social science. *Annual review of sociology*, 43, 147-165.

Part B: Correlational and causal models of inference

What does a [correlational](#) versus [causal](#) claim entail in quantitative research? How ought each claim be understood in the study of professional practice?

- Daniel Steel (2011). Causality, causal models, and social mechanisms. In *The Sage handbook of the philosophy of social sciences*, edited by Ian C. Jarvie & Jesús Zamora-Bonilla (Chapter 13). London: Sage.
- Julian Reiss (2009). Causation in the social sciences: Evidence, inference, and purpose. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 39(1), 20-40.

Recommended readings:

- Gary Goertz & James Mahoney (2012). *A tale of two cultures: Qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences*. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press. Part 1: Causal Models and Inference, pp. 41-83.

- Peter Y. Chen & Paula M. Popovich (2002). *Correlation*. London: Sage.
- Gerlad A. Knezek & Rhonda Christensen (2014). Tools for analyzing quantitative data. In *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (4th ed.), edited by J. Michael Spector, M. David Merrill, Jan Elen, & M.J. Bishop (pp. 203-220). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business.

Part C: Quantitative methods and the study of professional practice

Building on the previous discussion (Parts A & B), address the following questions:

- What research questions would quantitative research methods enable in relation to the study of professional practice? Why? Within which limitations (provide examples)?
- What specific quantitative research methods could be used and what data would need to be collected?
- How would a researcher ensure that the collected data is valid, reliable, and usable?

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) correlational versus causal studies of professional practice and workplace dynamics.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts, providing examples of possible quantitative methods that can be used in that regard (30 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (45 minutes).

Part D: Beyond dualism I – Mixed Methods Research

- Gitte Sommer Harrits (2011). More than method? A discussion of paradigm differences within mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 5(2), 150-166.
- David L. Morgan (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76.

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) the notion of mixed methods research in terms of its applicability to studies of professional practice and workplace dynamics.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts, providing examples of possible quantitative methods that can be used in that regard (30 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (30 minutes).

Part E: Beyond dualism II – Participatory and community-based research methods

Jarg Bergold and Stefan Thomas (2012) observe that, “Participatory research methods are geared towards planning and conducting the research with those people whose life-world and meaningful actions are under study” (p. 192). In doing so, participatory research methods seek to bridge the gap between scholarly discourse on, and the socially-situated knowledge emerging from the lived experiences of people, in ways that facilitate the coproduction of transformative social knowledge. Bergold and Thomas further add that, “Participatory approaches are not fundamentally distinct from other empirical social research procedures. On the contrary,

there are numerous links, especially to qualitative methodologies and methods” (*ibid.*). That being said, ‘participation’ is not a neutral space of relationalities, nor is it obvious in terms of what it stands for. It is deeply immersed in the power structures and legacies that underpin social action.

In this session, we will locate participatory research methods within the context of ethnographic research in a range of contexts of practice (work with children and youth, in schools, and with communities). We will interrogate the epistemic and ontological assumptions of participatory research in relation to the politics of participation and the ethic that binds (or ought to bind) participating members. We will raise critical questions in relation to the authenticity of the ‘data’, what it stands for, and how it is ‘analyzed’ and translated into ‘knowledge’, and a ‘transformative’ one at that. We will examine the ethical issues involved in using participatory methods in general, and more particularly with vulnerable social groups, such as children, undocumented migrants, oppressed communities, and communities living in contexts of poverty and extreme disadvantage. We will build on this discussion to expand our insights into ethnographic methods.

- Jarg Bergold & Stefan Thomas (2012). Participatory research methods: A methodological approach in motion. *Historical Social Research*, 37(4), 191-222.
- Naomi Nichols, Alison Griffith, and Mitchell McLarnon (2018). Community-based and participatory approaches in Institutional Ethnography. In *Perspectives on and from Institutional Ethnography*, edited by James Reid and Lisa Russell, pp. 107-124. Emerald Publishing.

Explore examples of participatory community-based research in various contexts:

- Shauna Mackinnon (Ed.)(2018). *Practising community-based participatory research: Stories of engagement, empowerment, and mobilization*. Vancouver, BC: Purich Books.
- Arjun Appadurai (2006). The right to research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 167-177.

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) the notion of participatory and community-based research in terms of its applicability to studies of professional practice and workplace dynamics.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts, providing examples of possible quantitative methods that can be used in that regard (15 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (30 minutes).

In their *Handbook on critical and indigenous methodologies*, Denzin, Lincoln, and Smith (2008) observe that, “The term research is inextricably linked to imperialism and colonialism”, serving “as a metaphor for colonial knowledge, for power, and for truth” (p. 4). They add that, “As agents of colonial power, Western scientists discovered, extracted, appropriated, commodified, and distributed knowledge about the indigenous other” (p. 5). In that sense, research and its deployed apparatuses, have played a significant role in undermining the relevance and viability of Indigenous epistemologies, and as a consequence curtailed the self-determination of Indigenous people. In the present section, we will delve into these historically and politically situated constructions of research practices by asking:

- Is a conversation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies possible given the inequities of power and privilege that persist between them in academe and in the ways professional practice is currently sanctioned?
- What modifications are needed within established understandings of social theory and methodology in order to claim the self-determining and emancipatory potential of research in Indigenous contexts?
- Is a project of decolonizing established constructions of social theory and research methodologies possible? If so, what are the limitations of such an endeavour?
- What are the challenges that underpin the undertaking of research on professional practice within Indigenous contexts? As practitioners who are often outsiders to Indigenous contexts, how might one reconcile the spaces needed for research with those spaces – territorial, relational, economic, cultural, and ethical – of Indigenous individuals, communities, and peoples?
- Key Concepts:
 - Colonialization, epistemicide, pathologizing practices
 - Methodologies & power in settler societies (research & Indigeneity)
 - Doctrine of discovery, research & dispossession
 - Quantitative/qualitative binary & Indigenous peoples
 - Indigenous knowledges, Indigenous epistemologies, Indigenous methodologies
 - Indigenous protocols, Four Rs (the), self-determination

Part A: Indigenous methodologies – paradigms, methods, practices

- Maggie Walter & Chris Andersen (2013). *Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology*. Walter Creek, CA: Left Coast Press Inc.
 - Introduction (pp. 7-20)
 - Chapter 1: Deficit indigenes (pp. 21-40)
 - Chapter 2: Conceptualizing quantitative methodologies (pp. 41-57)
 - Chapter 3: The paradigm of Indigenous methodologies (pp. 58-81)
 - Chapter 4: Indigenous quantitative methodological practice – Canada (pp. 111-129)
- [Linda Tuhiwai Smith](#) (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books. (Watch: [Supplementary resource](#))
- Kovach, Margaret (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, ON: Toronto University Press.
 - Chapter 1: Indigenous and qualitative Inquiry: A round dance? (pp. 23-38).

Part B: Protocols, and articulations of ethics in Indigenous methodologies

- Kirkness, V. J. and R. Barnhardt (2001). [First Nations and higher education: The Four R's - Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity, Responsibility](#). In *Knowledge Across Cultures: A Contribution to Dialogue Among Civilizations*, edited by R. Hayhoe and J. Pan. Hong Kong. Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Margaret Kovach (2014). Thinking through theory: Contemplating Indigenous situated research and policy. In *Qualitative research outside the Academy*, edited by N. Denzin & D. Giardina (pp. 92-106). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press Inc.

PART C: Decolonising methodologies? Decolonizing knowledge?

- [Linda Tuhiwai Smith](#) (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books.
- Walter D. Mignolo and Catherine E. Walsh (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Durham & London: Duke University Press. [read Walter D. Mignolo's Part II: The decolonial option, chapters 5 through 10]

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) aspects of decolonial approaches to knowledge and research in terms of their applicability to studies of professional practice and workplace dynamics.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts, providing examples of possible quantitative methods that can be used in that regard (30 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (45 minutes).

Part D: Research ethics

What ethical concerns and challenges do researchers encounter when it comes to not harming research participants and preserving their dignity and human rights? What concerns researchers more specifically encounter over anonymity, confidentiality, ethics, and power relations when researching their own the workplace and professional community? What practical strategies adopt to address these challenges and concerns?

- Donna M. Mertens & Pauline E. Ginsberg (Eds) (2009). *The handbook of social research ethics*. London: Sage
 - Chapter 10: Ethical practices in qualitative research (by Yvonna S. Lincoln)
 - Chapter 19: The ethics of the researcher-subject relationship: Experiences from the field (by Peggy Gabo Ntseane)
 - Chapter 24: Use and misuse of quantitative methods: Data collection, calculation, and presentation (by Bruce L. Brown & Dawson Hedges)

Recommended additional readings from the volume edited by Mertens and Ginsberg (2009):

Chapter 3: Feminist perspectives on research ethics (by Mary M. Brabeck & Kalina M. Brabeck)
Chapter 4: Critical race theory: Ethics and dimensions of diversity in research (by Veronica Thomas)
Chapter 5: Philosophy, ethics, and the disability community (by Martin Sullivan)

Plan of this session:

- Up to three class participants discuss (30 minutes) aspects of ethical practices in research and their implications to studies of professional practice and workplace dynamics.
- The class breaks into 3-4 groups, each discussing one aspect of the presentation in terms of its *methodological* implications for researching professional practice in specific workplace contexts, providing examples of possible ethical concerns in research they may have or believe they would encounter (30 minutes).
- An open class discussion and summary follows (30 minutes).

Part E: Summative Activity

- Summative discussion by up to three team members (30 minutes)
- Summative debriefing, class plenary (30 minutes)
- Instructor's guidance towards the submission of the final course assignment (15 minutes)

G. WHAT ABOUT ASSIGNMENTS & THEIR MARKING?

Three *interlocked* requirements count towards the final course mark (maximum 100%):

1. *Active participation* in the course: attendance of the four sessions, pro-active undertaking of readings, effectively contributing to group work and to plenary discussions and presentations. (*sine qua non*)
2. Delivery of two *plenary presentations* in class (in teams of up to three).

The presentation should explicitly build on course readings in view of (1) introducing the thematic at hand and (2) facilitate group work discussions that follow the presentation during a given session. This requirement counts for 30% of final mark for *each* presentation (total: 60% of final mark).

3. Writing an *individual critical review essay* that focuses on one of the books concerned with methodology and methods listed in this syllabus. It is also possible to choose other methodology and/or method-related book agreed upon with the instructor. This assignment counts for 40% of final mark.

The critical review essay should:

- (a) Introduce the book; explain how & why it is relevant for a range of aspects engaged by this course; how does it inform the methodological design of a potential research project?
- (b) Discuss the weaknesses and strengths of the methodology or method discussed in this book in relation to the theoretical underpinnings of your project. Provide clear examples for each.
- (c) Conclude by assessing the extent to which this methodology (or specific method, as applicable) is adequate for researching and improving professional practice. Justify and provide alternatives.

Assignment formatting:

Font Times New Roman 12;

Length: Up to 2,000 words, that is, up to 8 pages, double-spaced and numbered. This length excludes any references and footnotes.

Referencing: APA conventions. See "[Evaluating and Citing Sources](#)".

Assignment should be submitted as a PDF on the agreed upon date, yet to be discussed in class.

- UBC marking policy: "The Faculty of Graduate Studies considers 60% as a minimum passing grade for graduate students". For further details, refer to EDST Graduate Course Grading Policy, and there consult the "[Order of Marking Standards](#)".

H. ANY COMPLEMENTARY RESOURCES?

- Online resources (UBC Library):

SAGE Research Methods – accessible via the UBC Library – offers a rich repository of manuals, handbooks, books, videos, cases, data sets, and research design planners. Participants are strongly encouraged to browse and discover this online resource, one among many. Particular attention is drawn to the “Little Green Books” and the “Little Blue Books” series, offering succinct and readable accounts of different research methods within the quantitative and qualitative traditions, respectively.

“*SAGE Research Methods* supports research at all levels by providing material to guide users through every step of the research process. Nearly everyone at a university is involved in research, from students learning how to conduct research to faculty conducting research for publication to librarians delivering research skills training and doing research on the efficacy of library services. *SAGE Research Methods* has the answer for each of these user groups, from a quick dictionary definition, a case study example from a researcher in the field, a downloadable teaching dataset, a full-text title from the *Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences* series, or a video tutorial showing research in action.

SAGE Research Methods is the ultimate methods library with more than 1000 books, reference works, journal articles, and instructional videos by world-leading academics from across the social sciences, including the largest collection of qualitative methods books available online from any scholarly publisher. The site is designed to guide users to the content they need to learn a little or a lot about their method. The Methods Map can help those less familiar with research methods to find the best technique to use in their research. Built upon SAGE’s legacy of methods publishing, *SAGE Research Methods* is the essential online tool for researchers.”
(Cited from About)

- Select list of handbooks:

Cappelen, Herman; Szabó Gendler, Tamar; & Hawthorne, John (Eds.) (2016). *The Oxford handbook of philosophical methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clandinin, Jean (Ed.) (2007). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, Norman K.; Lincoln, Yvonna S.; & Smith, Tuhiwai Linda (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. Los Angeles & London: Sage.

Flick, Uwe (2014). *The Sage handbook of qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage.

Green, J.L. et al. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Jarvie, Ian C. & Zamora-Bonilla, Jesús (Eds.) (2011). *The Sage handbook of the philosophy of social sciences*. London: Sage.

Kaplan, David (Ed.) (2004). *The Sage handbook of quantitative methodology in the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Panter, A.T. & Sterba, Sonya K. (Eds.) (2011). *Handbook of ethics in quantitative methodology*. London & NY: Routledge.

J. Michael Spector, M. David Merrill, Jan Elen, & M.J. Bishop (Eds.) (2014). *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business.

Wolf, Christoph; Joy, Dominique; & Fu, Yang-Chih (Eds.) (2016). *The Sage handbook of survey methodology*. London: Sage.

- Select list of books:

Bernard, H. Russell (2011). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (5th ed.). Lanham and New York: Altamira.

Chilisa, Bagele (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davies, James & Spencer, Dimitrina (Eds.) (2010). *Emotions in the field: The psychology and anthropology of fieldwork experience*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.) (2008). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Los Angeles & London: Sage.

Denzin, Norman K. & Giardina, Michael D. (Eds.) (2008). *Qualitative inquiry and the politics of evidence*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Flyvbjerg, Bent (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gary Goertz & James Mahoney (2012). *A tale of two cultures: Qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences*. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Kovach, Margaret (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, ON: Toronto University Press.

Reed, Isaac Ariail (2011). *Interpretation and social knowledge: On the use of theory in the human sciences*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Schostak, John & Schostak, Jill (2008). *Radical research: Designing, developing and writing research that makes a difference*. London & New York: Routledge.

Seale, Clive (Ed.) (2004). *Social research methods: A reader*. London: Routledge.

Yanow, Dvora & Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine (2006). *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Yin, Robert K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

I. WHAT UBC REGULATIONS, POLICIES, & PROCEDURES APPLY?

Inter alia, the following policies apply:

[UBC Calendar for 2018-2019](#). Refer more specifically to: Policies & Regulations

[UBC Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies](#). Policies and Procedures.

[UBC Policies](#).

Policy # 65: Religious Holidays.

Policy # 68: Disruption of Classes/Services by Snow. Also, see “[campus emergencies](#)”, below.

Policy # 73: Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities.

Policy # 85: Scholarly Integrity.

[Campus emergencies](#).

- “In the event of an emergency, messages will be posted at and Twitter (@ubcnews). ... Should there be a closure, we recommend you check [the] mentioned locations.”
- Refer also to: “[campus emergencies](#)” page on the UBC website.

J. WHAT FOOD SITES ARE AVAILABLE ON CAMPUS?

A number of food sites operate on the UBC campus on Saturday. A list of [UBC food sites on campus and their hours of operation is available](#). A [map](#) shows the specific location of each food site on the UBC campus.

K. APPENDICES

Appendix 1

| Question | Philosophical Discipline |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1. What is? | <i>Ontology</i> (model of reality as a whole) |
| 2. Where does it all come from? | <i>Explanation</i> (model of the past) |
| 3. Where are we going? | <i>Prediction</i> (model of the future) |
| 4. What is good and what is evil? | <i>Axiology</i> (theory of values) |
| 5. How should we act? | <i>Praxeology</i> (theory of actions) |
| 6. What is true and what is false? | <i>Epistemology</i> (theory of knowledge) |

Table 1: Summary of the worldview questions, with their corresponding traditional philosophical discipline.

Source: Clément Vidal (2008) Wat is een wereldbeeld? [What is a worldview?]. In *Nieuwheid denken. De wetenschappen en het creatieve aspect van de werkelijkheid*, edited by H. Van Belle & J. Van der Veken (Eds.). Acco, Leuven.

Appendix 2

TABLE 1.2. CHARACTERISTICS OF QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH.

Source:

Sharan B. Merriam & Elizabeth J. Tisdell (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, p. 20.

Appendix 3

Table 1. Contemporary “Core” Characteristics of Mixed Methods Research

| Characteristic number | Description of characteristic |
|-----------------------|---|
| #1 | Methodological eclecticism |
| #2 | Paradigm pluralism |
| #3 | Iterative, cyclical approach to research |
| #4 | Set of basic “signature” research designs and analytical processes |
| #5 | Focus on the research question (or research problem) in determining the methods employed within any given study |
| #6 | Emphasis on continua rather than a set of dichotomies |
| #7 | Emphasis on diversity at all levels of the research enterprise |
| #8 | Tendency toward balance and compromise that is implicit within the “third methodological community” |
| #9 | Reliance on visual representations (e.g., figures, diagrams) and a common notational system |

Source: Charles Teddlie & Abbas Tashakkori (2012). Common ‘core’ characteristics of Mixed Methods Research: A review of critical issues and call for greater convergence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(6), 774-788.

Appendix 4

Table 1 Examples of the heterogeneity of qualitative research methods

| Issue/dimension | Variation |
|--|--|
| Generalizability of results | Great/small possibilities to generalize results |
| Epistemological approach | Empirism/rationalism |
| Structure | Structured/holistic |
| Interest in regularities | Great interest/small interest (more interpretation oriented) |
| Use of quantification (e.g., numbers) | No quantification/quantification |
| Causal explanation | Legitimate (and possible)/Not legitimate |
| Characteristic properties of qualitative methods | Different suggestions (see Table 2) |

Table 2 Different opinions about the characteristic properties of qualitative methods

- (1) No statistics or other forms of quantification are/should be used (Strauss and Corbin 1998)
- (2) The qualitative approach is emancipating (Hamilton 1998)
- (3) The qualitative approach is a naturalistic (i.e., not laboratory based) interpretive approach (Denzin and Lincoln 1998)
- (4) Words are data (Tesch 1990)
- (5) Meaning contents are the study object (Pope and Mays 1999)
- (6) The qualitative approach is radically interpretivist and constructivist (i.e., it assumes that there is no reality independent of the investigation (Sale et al. 2002, p. 45))

Source:

Carl Martin Allwood (2012). The distinction between qualitative and quantitative research methods is problematic. *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, 46(5), 1417-1429 (pp. 1419 & 1420).

Appendix 5

Facets of 'philosophical inquiry'

1. **Analyzing** a term or concept, showing its multiple uses and meanings, for the primary purpose of clarification.
2. **Critiquing**, ideologically or deconstructively, a term or concept, identifying internal contradictions or ambiguities in uses of the term and a disclosure of partisan effects the term has in popular discourses.
3. **Exploring** the hidden assumptions underlying a particular view or broader school of thought.
4. **Reviewing**, sympathetically or critically, a specific argument offered elsewhere.
5. **Questioning** a particular educational practice or policy.
6. **Proposing** the ends or purposes education should achieve, either in terms of benefits to the person, to the society, or both.
7. **Speculating** about alternative systems or practices of education, whether utopian or programmatic, that contrast with and challenge conventional educational understanding and practices.
8. **Discerning** by thought experiment, a method that takes an imaginary situation, analyzes it, then gradually modifies one or another element of the situation to determine which features would be relevant to changing its pertinent character.
9. **Assessing** a philosophical or literary text, [a work of art, or an audio-visual composition] by engaging in *exegetical* work that generates a close reading with an eye more toward explicating and understanding its complex meanings rather than analyzing or critiquing it.
10. **Synthesizing** disparate research from within philosophy or additional fields (e.g. political theory, cognitive psychology, sociology, etc.) on a particular theme or topic, in order to delineate their meanings and implications for educational theory and practice.

- Summary of:

Nicolas C. Burbules & Bryan R. Warnick (2006). Philosophical inquiry. In *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*, edited by Judith L. Green, Gregory Camilli, Patricia B. Elmore, with Audra Skukauskaitė & Elizabeth Grace (pp. 489-501). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Appendix 6

| Focus: | <i>The individual</i> | <i>The social</i> | <i>Both:</i> <i>Reflexive-dialectical</i> view of individual–social relations and connections |
|--|--|---|--|
| Perspective: | | | |
| <i>Objective</i> | (1) Practice as individual behaviour, seen in terms of performances, events & effects: behaviourist and most cognitivist approaches in psychology | (2) Practice as social interaction - e.g., ritual, system-structured: structure-functional and social systems approaches | |
| <i>Subjective</i> | (3) Practice as intentional action, shaped by meaning and values: psychological <i>verstehen</i> (empathetic understanding) and most constructivist approaches | (4) Practice as socially structured, shaped by discourses, tradition: interpretive, aesthetic-historical <i>verstehen</i> & post-structuralist approaches | |
| <i>Both:</i> <i>Reflexive-dialectical</i> view of subjective–objective relations and connections | | | |

Fig. 8.1 Relationships between different traditions in the study of practice

| Focus: | <i>The individual</i> | <i>The social</i> | <i>Both:</i> <i>Reflexive-dialectical</i> view of individual–social relations and connections |
|--|--|--|--|
| Perspective: | | | |
| <i>Objective</i> | (1) <i>Practice as individual behaviour:</i> Quantitative, correlational-experimental methods. Psychometric and observational techniques, tests, interaction schedules. | (2) <i>Practice as social and systems behaviour:</i> Quantitative, correlational-experimental methods. Observational techniques, sociometrics, systems analysis, social ecology. | |
| <i>Subjective</i> | (3) <i>Practice as intentional action:</i> Qualitative, interpretive methods. Clinical analysis, interview, questionnaire, diaries, journals, self-report, introspection | (4) <i>Practice as socially structured, shaped by discourses and tradition:</i> Qualitative, interpretive, historical methods. Discourse analysis, document analysis. | |
| <i>Both:</i> <i>Reflexive-dialectical</i> view of subjective–objective relations and connections | | | |

Fig. 8.2 Methods and techniques characteristic of different approaches to the study of practice

Source:

Stephen Kemmis (2010). What is professional practice? Recognising and respecting diversity in understandings of practice. In *Elaborating professionalism: Studies in practice and theory*, edited by Clive Kanes (pp. 139-165). Dordrecht: Springer.