

**QUAL 8400: Qualitative Research Traditions**  
**2008 Summer-First Session**  
**June 5-July 1**

Time and Location: Daily, 2:15-4:30 pm, Room 417 Aderhold  
Professor: Dr. Bettie St.Pierre, Language & Literacy Education  
Mail and Messages: 125 Aderhold Hall  
Office Phone: (706) 542-5674  
Office Fax: (706) 542-4509  
Home Phone: (706) 353-8893  
Email: [stpierre@uga.edu](mailto:stpierre@uga.edu)  
Office Hours: By appointment. Before and after class are good!

**Course Description**

This course concentrates on postpositivist educational research with a focus on the design of such studies and the issues faced by researchers using qualitative methods. Central objectives include formulating criteria by which to evaluate postpositivist research in the human sciences, gaining an understanding of the socio-intellectual context within which such research is conducted, and making a first attempt to design a qualitative study. Reading in unfamiliar discourses is required, and students are encouraged to heed French poststructural philosopher Jacques Lacan's advice, "to read does not obligate one to understand. First it is necessary to read . . . avoid understanding too quickly" [quoted in Ulmer, Gregory. (1985). *Applied Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.] One might also heed Roland Barthes' (1974) advice on rereading:

Rereading, an operation contrary to the commercial and ideological habits of our society, which would have us "throw away" the story once it has been consumed (or "devoured"), so that we can then move on to another story, buy another book, and which is tolerated only in certain marginal categories of readers (children, old people, and professors), rereading is here suggested at the outset, for it alone saves the text from repetition (those who fail to reread are obliged to read the same story everywhere) . . . Reading is no longer consumption, but play. (*S/Z*. (Richard Miller, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang, 15-16.)

A great deal of reading (re-reading, mis-reading, co-reading), some of which deals with complex and unfamiliar theories, will be required in this course in order to become acquainted with the very broad range of approaches to qualitative research in education. Since this is an introductory course, it is designed to provide an overview and a point of departure for those who find such research too seductive to refuse. Those wishing to pursue the study of qualitative research will need to take other courses that focus on the specifics of data collection, analysis, interpretation, and representation.

**Required Texts**

- Crotty, Michael. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage Publications.
- Glesne, Corrine. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). New York: Longman.
- National Science Foundation. (2004). *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/start.htm>. We'll read much of this 147 page document, including selections from the appendices. *You'll need to print each section separately* from the website. If you click on the entire PDF document icon, you'll get the wrong NSF document! A copy will be available in OIT.
- Packet of Required Readings (available for copying in the Office of Information Technology, 232 Aderhold).

**Recommended Texts**

- Behar, Ruth. (1993). *Translated woman: Crossing the border with Esperanza's story*. Boston: Beacon Press. [exemplar]
- Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.). (2003). *Landscape of qualitative research: Themes and theories*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [methodological/theoretical]
- Fine, Michelle. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the Politics of an Urban Public High School*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. [exemplar]
- Kirsch, Gesa E. (1999). *Ethical dilemmas in feminist research: The politics of location, interpretation, and publication*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (1997). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. [exemplar]
- Lather, Patti. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. [exemplar]
- Linden, R. Ruth. (1993). *Making stories, making selves: Feminist reflections on the holocaust*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press. [exemplar]
- Lopez, Gerardo R. & Parker, Laurence. (2003). *Interrogating racism in qualitative research methodology*. New York: Peter Lang. [methodological/theoretical]
- Merchant, Betty & Willis, Arlette Ingram (Eds.). (2000). *Multiple and intersecting identities in qualitative research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum. [methodological/theoretical]
- McIntyre, Alice. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. [exemplar]
- National Research Council. (2002). *Scientific research in education*. R.J. Shavelson & L. Towne (Eds.). Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. [NRC Report—policy]
- Peters, Michael A. & Burbules, Nicholas C. (2004) *Poststructuralism and educational research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. [theoretical]
- Schwandt, Thomas A. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. [dictionary]
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books. [methodological]
- St.Pierre, Elizabeth A. & Pillow, Wanda S. (Eds.). (2000). *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education*. New York: Routledge. [methodological/theoretical]

(The following are oft-cited introductory texts and are available at Amazon.com)

- Lincoln, Yvonna S. & Guba, Egon G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.

### **Policies and Procedures**

- **Absences/Tardies.** Given that there are only 19 days of class, a great deal of material must be covered each day, our work will be intense, and work cannot be “made up.” You are expected **to attend each class. If you think you will miss more than one class, drop the course now.** Also, much explanatory work about assignments and discussions about expectations are done at the very beginning of class, and tardiness is frowned upon. **Be on time.** It is your responsibility to contact me to arrange make-up work.
- **Late work.** Late work will be docked 2 points/day and will receive no comments. I will not accept work after the 5:00 pm deadline on July 1 (grades are due July 7); if you turn work in late on that day, it will receive a grade of 0.
- **Class discussions.** Everyone will have the opportunity to speak, and I look forward to lively discussions. Therefore, I will not be too thrilled if you dominate the talk and will surely speak with you about the basics of being a good colleague. If you’re in doubt about whether you’re talking too much, ask me or your colleagues.
- **Incompletes.** There will be no incompletes! No, none, not any, that means you!

### **Grading**

Using the following point system, you will earn a final grade based on your fulfillment of the **Requirements** and **Optional Projects** listed below. PhD and EdD students' earned points from the **Requirements** must total at least 40 to earn an A and 35 for a B, **regardless of how many optional points earned.** Likewise, Masters and EdS students must earn at least 30 points from the **Requirements** to earn an A and 25 for a B. The final evaluation of the course/instructor/yourself is worth a possible 3 bonus points added to your final grade. Use the optional projects to design work that suits your needs and produces a total grade with which you are satisfied. **Do not assume that you will get full credit for each project!!** Turn in all work in a folder with pockets. Put your name on the outside right corner, put the Grade Sheet in the left side pocket, and submit written work in the right side pocket preceded by the Table of Contents. Always submit work in this folder with your Grade Sheet enclosed. **Do not lose your Grade Sheet!**

A	90 – 200 (no A+)
B	80 - 89
C	70 - 79
D	60 - 70
F	below 60

### **Partnerships**

I believe we need other people to help us think, particularly when we are wrestling with issues as complex as those that inform qualitative research. In order to facilitate such an effort, I encourage you to work with a partner during this course. You may work with someone from the same content area or from a different content area; there are advantages and disadvantages to each choice. All the projects, both required and optional, may be done with your partner.

If you choose to work in a partnership, you will hand in all written work as an individual. However, you should use your partner to help you think about which optional projects to choose; to talk with about emerging issues and concerns; to critique, proofread, and edit your work; and to help you get out of your own head and into different thinking spaces. (See Reading #34 in the Required Readings for a discussion of the advantages of working in a writing group.)

You may certainly choose to work by yourself at all times. You may also choose to work by yourself on some projects and with your partner on others. Do what works best for you. *If you plan to work with a partner, find one as soon as possible.*

### **Requirements**

- Attendance and participation in class discussion (pass/fail).
- Written work must be typed, double-spaced, 12-point font, and standard margins. Submit all work in a folder with pockets. Put your name on the outside right corner, put the Grade Sheet in the left side pocket, and submit written work in the right side pocket preceded by the Table of Contents. Always submit work in this folder with your grade sheet enclosed **Do not lose your Grade Sheet.**
- **Mini Interview Study.** (20 possible points). *Due Friday, June 27 in class.* Conduct and audiotape an interview with someone in our class. You must conduct a *new* interview; you can't use one you've already done. Your write-up should be 3-4 pages long and must include each of the following: (1) a brief description of the context of the interview, the participant, and the topic of your questions (who did you interview and why did you choose this person? what were you interested in learning? what was the interview about?) (2) a brief overview of what you learned about the **interview method** (remember that I am interested in what you learned about **interviewing**, not about what the person said.), (4) personal learnings from this in terms of self-as-researcher— are you a good interviewer? what do you need to work on? (5) attach the transcript of the interview, (6) attach your Interview Guide. You must cite Glesne and other readings as you discuss your experience. **It is advisable to do this project AFTER methods have been discussed in class.** (We will adjust the due date if necessary.)
- **Research Proposal.** (30 possible points-note that the top grade tends to be about 25). *Due Tuesday, July 1 by 5:00 pm.* Design a qualitative research study consulting the Research Design and Research Proposal Guide handouts in your packet as well as UGA's Institutional Review Board's *Application for Approval of Research with Human Research Participant*. The IRB's current application form is available on the UGA website. Write a research proposal that convinces the reader that you are ready to apply for Human Subjects approval and begin fieldwork. Details will be discussed in class.
- **Optional Projects** (see below). (possible points vary). *Due Tuesday, July 1 by 5:00 pm.*
- **Final Evaluation of Course, Instructor, and Self.** (3 possible bonus points). Turn in the last day of class, Tuesday, July 1 in class.

### **Optional Projects**

- **Bibliography Project** (10 possible points): In standard APA bibliographic form, generate a bibliography of readings that are not in this syllabus that you hope to follow up on as a result of this course, with a one sentence rationale for why you want to read each. These might be articles and books referred to in your readings that seem pertinent to your work. Divide the bibliography as follows: (1) oft-cited classics, (2) recent work that might help you grasp the issues, and (3) whatever meets your particular substantive interests. Include a minimum of 4-6 citations in each section, but don't go overboard on this. Include a brief explanatory introduction to your bibliography.
- **Dictionary Project** (10 possible points): Keep track of terms you don't understand and define them in a way that is useful for you. Include at least 15 terms. (**See example in packet**)
- **Journal Identification Project** (10 points possible if done alone; 15 if done as a partnership): Spend time **in the library** compiling a list of journals that publish a lot of qualitative research in education. Your list must include *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *Qualitative Inquiry*, and at least 3 other journals. Skim through issues over the last few years and write a 3-4 page report on what you learned that reflects issues raised in this class.
- **Response to Recommended Texts** (15 points possible): Write a three-page response to one of the texts listed in the Recommended Texts in the syllabus. Some of these are exemplars, and some are not. If you choose an exemplar, critique the study for its design and the other issues we have discussed in class. If the text you choose is not an exemplar, explain how it represents and extends what we have discussed in class.

- **Response Journal Project** (15 points for each half of course; 30 points possible): For each class, write a 1-2 page reaction to the **readings** and the **issues** raised in class discussion. Date your entries. Responses should not summarize class discussions or what you have read. Your response should be grounded in the readings—don't use the journal as a place to go off on big tangents. **Focus on the readings** and comment on issues you finding interesting/troubling in the articles/books. I should be able to tell that you are doing your reading and that you are wrestling with what you are learning. You need to address EACH reading in your journal. You can do this for just the first half or just the second half of the course if you like. **Journals will be due June 19 and June 27.** If you are concerned about whether your journal is acceptable, I'll be happy to check it during class breaks. (Hand in journals in your folder with the Grade Sheet.)
- Design your own optional project(s) based on your needs at this time. **Submit to me in advance a written proposal** explaining what you intend to do and the number of points for which you wish to work. You cannot complete an IRB Application for this project since it is almost a duplicate of your Research Proposal, i.e., you can't get credit for the same work twice.

### Class Schedule

Since I don't know how quickly we'll be able to move through this material, I have arranged it in sequence without dates. We will move from one topic to the next as quickly as possible. Thus, you need to attend each class in order to know what to read when. We do need to complete all material, so read ahead if you can.

Topics	Readings
<b>Introductions, Review of Syllabus, etc.</b>	Read Crotty and Glesne ASAP
<b>TOPIC I. Misc. Introductory Material</b>	Readings 1-3
<b>TOPIC II. Paradigm Proliferation Research Exemplars</b>	Readings 4-6 Readings 7-10
<b>TOPIC III Alternative Perspectives on Postpositivism</b>	Readings 11-14
<b>TOPIC IV Postpositivist Issue I: Ethics &amp; Politics</b>	Readings 15-19
<b>TOPIC V Postpositivist Issue II: Fieldwork Experience, Research Design, and Methods</b>	Readings 20-28
<b>TOPIC VI Postpositivist Issue III: Data Analysis &amp; Writing the Text</b>	Readings 29-34
<b>TOPIC VII Postpositivist Issue IV: Validity</b>	Readings 35-41
<b>TOPIC VIII Postpositivist Issue V: Post-Paradigmatic Futures</b>	Readings 42-43

### **Required Reading**

1. Miscellaneous Handouts: methodology vs. methods; interpretation of data; deconstructive methods; Jude's juicy journals; postmodern discourse

2. Terminology Handouts: miscellaneous dictionaries, miscellaneous terminology, empiricism, false consciousness, hegemony, hermeneutics, phenomenology, positivism/postpositivism, praxis.
3. Examples of Optional Projects: example of glossary, example of annotated bibliography.  
-----
4. Paradigm Handouts: paradigms-Lather/St.Pierre, paradigms-Pillow, paradigms-Guba, paradigms-Hassan, paradigms-Kelly, paradigms-Akins.
5. Sipe, Lawrence & Constable, Susan. (1996). A chart of four contemporary research paradigms: Metaphors for the modes of inquiry. *Taboo: The journal of culture and education*, 153-163.
6. Entire Crotty text.  
-----
7. Research Exemplar – Positivist. Walberg, Herbert J. & Walberg III, Herbert J. (1994). Losing local control. *Educational Researcher*, 23(5), 19-26.
8. Research Exemplar – Interpretive. Belenky, Mary Field, et al. (1986). Introduction: To the other side of silence. In *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind* (pp. 3-20). New York: BasicBooks. Also, Chapter 1 "Silence" from the same text, pp. 23-34. Also, Appendix A, Interview Schedule.
9. Research Exemplar – Critical. Jones, Alison. (1989). The cultural production of classroom practice. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 10(1), 19-31.
10. Research Exemplar – Deconstructive. Jones, Alison. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire, and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory*, 49(3), 299-316.  
-----
11. Bower, Bruce. (1998). Objective visions: Historians track the rise and times of scientific objectivity. *Science Times*, 154(23), 360-362.
12. Lather, Patti & Moss, Pamela A. (2005). Introduction: Implications of the *Scientific Research in Education* report for Qualitative Inquiry. *Teachers College Record*, 107(1), 1-3.
13. Howe, Kenneth R. (2004). A critique of experimentalism. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(1), 42-61.
14. Hacking, Ian. (1991). How should we do the history of statistics? In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 181-195). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
-----
15. Chapter 6 in Glesne.
16. Spradley, James P. (1979). Excerpt on ethical principles. In *The ethnographic interview* (pp. 25-39). New York: Harcourt & Brace.
17. Harding, Sandra. (1993). Introduction: Eurocentric scientific illiteracy—A challenge for the world community. In Sandra Harding (Ed.), *The "racial" economy of science: Toward a democratic future* (pp. 2-22). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
18. Kaomea, Julie. (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.
19. Bower, Bruce. (2001). Rumble in the jungle. *Science News*, 159(4), 58-60.

- 
20. Research Design Handouts: research process; research design-description; research design-St.Pierre, TC to St.Pierre's proposal; TC to St.Pierre's dissertation, Chapter 1 of St.Pierre's dissertation. Research Proposal Guide.
  21. Statement of Problem Handouts: Statement of the Problem & Research Questions; Statement of the Problem: Exercise.
  22. Human Subjects Material—UGA Application Form
  23. Chapters 3 & 4 in Glesne.
  24. National Science Foundation. (2004). *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/start.htm> [pp. 1-20 (introductory material), pp. 59-69 (Burton), pp. 101-104 (Nee), pp. 121-125 (Silbey), pp. 127-132 (Smith), pp. 137-140 (Turner)] **NOTE THAT WE MAY NOT READ ALL OF THIS, SO DON'T READ TOO MUCH AHEAD.**
  25. Proweller, Amira. (1998). *Constructing female identities: Making meaning in an upper middle class youth culture*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press. [Appendix: Methodology & Research Design, pp. 209-233]
  26. Erickson, Frederick. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). In Wittrock, Merlin C. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 119- 161). New York: Macmillan. [Section, "Data Collection," pp. 139-145]
  27. Brannen, Julia. (2004). Working qualitatively and quantitatively. In Clive Seale, Giampietro Gogo, Jaber Gubrium & David Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 282-296). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  28. Errante, Antoinette. (2000). But sometimes you're not part of the story: Oral histories and ways of remembering and telling. *Educational Researcher*, 29(2), 16-27.
- 
29. Chapter 7 in Glesne.
  30. Erickson, Frederick. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). In Wittrock, Merlin C. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 119- 161). New York: Macmillan. [Section, Data Analysis & Reporting, pp. 145-156]
  31. National Science Foundation. (2004). *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/start.htm> [pp. 45-47 (Becker), 49-51 (Bennett), pp. 95-99 (Mohoney), pp. 133-136 (Snow)] **NOTE THAT WE MAY NOT READ ALL OF THIS, SO DON'T READ TOO MUCH AHEAD.**
  32. Chapter 8 in Glesne.
  33. Richardson, L. & St.Pierre, E.A. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). (pp. 959-978). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
  34. Durst, Russel K. (1992). A writer's community: How teachers can form writing groups. In Karin Dahl (Ed.), *Teacher as writer: Entering the professional conversation* (pp. 261-271). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- 
35. Validity Handouts: articles on validity, some definitions of validity, validity-Lincoln & Guba.
  36. Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1995). Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(3), 275-289.

37. Seale, Clive. (1999). *The quality of qualitative research*. London: Sage. [Appendix A: Criteria for the evaluation of qualitative research papers, pp. 189-192]
38. Lather, Patti. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(4), pp. 673-693.
39. Scheurich, James Joseph. (1993). The masks of validity: A deconstructive investigation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 9(11), 49-60.
40. National Science Foundation. (2004). *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/start.htm> [pp. 39-43 (Bashi), pp. 55-57 (Blee), pp. 83-90 (Katz), pp. 91-93 (Lamont)] **NOTE THAT WE MAY NOT READ ALL OF THIS, SO DON'T READ TOO MUCH AHEAD.**
41. American Educational Research Association. (2006). Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science Research in AERA Publications. *Educational Researcher*, 35(6), pp. 33-40.
- 
42. National Science Foundation. (2004). *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/start.htm> [pp. 141-144 (Venkatsh), pp. 145-148 (Weitzman)] **NOTE THAT WE MAY NOT READ ALL OF THIS, SO DON'T READ TOO MUCH AHEAD.**
43. Peters, Michael A. & Burbules, Nicholas C. (2004) *Poststructuralism and educational research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. [Chapter 2, pp. 33-53]