

University of Maryland
College of Education
Research in Education Policy, Planning and Administration
EDPL 690
Fall 2006
Monday, 7:00-9:45
Room # 3315

Caroline Eick
Visiting Assistant Professor
Room 2110 D Benjamin Building
Email: ceick@wam.umd.edu

Office Hours
Tuesday, 3:00-4:00
& by appointment

Course Overview:

Research in Education Policy, Planning and Administration is an introductory course to educational research. It is not designed to help you become proficient in any one methodological technique, research paradigm or analytic framework. This course is designed to: (1) help you better understand the debates about educational research today, both in theory and in practice; (2) give you an appreciation of how research is used in education policy and practice; (3) provide a foundation for more in-depth study of research methods; (4) sharpen your abilities to be a critical reader of other people's research as well as to develop your own research; and (5) offer you an opportunity to reflect deeply and critically on the research enterprise and its role in constructing social realities.

Principal questions explored in the readings, course discussions, and group-work, include: What is research? How is it carried out? What are the assumptions that underlie it? How do we know if it is "good" research? What is the relationship of research to theory? What is the relationship of research to practice? How can research improve education policy, planning, and administration? Just a few decades ago there was general agreement on how to approach these questions. The model for research in education (and in the social sciences) came principally from the model used in the natural and physical sciences. Educational research used the "scientific method" to test the truth of hypotheses about educational processes. The methods used were almost exclusively quantitative -- experimental, quasi-experimental, and survey.

This situation has changed dramatically. While the physical science model is still strongly held by many researchers, there has developed a multitude of alternative ways of viewing and carrying out research. Each of these views of research has different, although often overlapping, answers to the questions posed above. Sometimes this change has been characterized as a debate between "quantitative" and "qualitative" research. While this characterization can be a useful starting point, it obscures the variety of theories, traditions, fieldwork strategies, and analytical frameworks that are being used. Moreover, this characterization ignores a whole range of research strategies that come out of critical, feminist, black feminist, postmodern, post-colonial and other theories. Most fundamentally, in the debates about research methods today, we are facing very different underlying paradigms, in the sense Thomas Kuhn used the term (in The Structure of Scientific Revolution), which have basic and often incommensurable differences.

Class Format and Approach

The course is organized around four units. In the first and second units we examine quantitative/positivist and qualitative/interpretive methodologies, and the epistemologies that undergird the different approaches to research questions and design. In the third unit, we discuss theoretical developments that have problematized categories of methodology, and encouraged the development of interdisciplinary approaches (i.e., critical, feminist, postmodern, post-colonial theories; intersectional, pan-ethnic, transnational analyses, etc.) We consider the role of these theoretical perspectives and conceptual frameworks in disorienting dominant, normalized knowledge and knowledge-making. Finally, in the fourth unit, we examine issues of ethics and professional responsibilities.

Classes are a combination of lectures, discussions of readings, and group-work. Group-work assignments vary in format (i.e. *debates* regarding merits of differing conceptual frameworks for different research questions; *brainstorming sessions* focused on producing provocative statements about the relationship between research, theory and practice). Groups are organized, as much as possible, to include students at different levels in their graduate careers, and from different academic programs and research interests. Approximately one third of the time is devoted to discussions of readings, another one third to group-work, and the last third to group presentations/findings.

Requirements

Students are expected to complete all of the readings, attend class regularly, deliver assignments on due dates, and participate fully in class discussions. Students, who for valid reasons cannot attend a class, should let the professor know in advance. Absent students are responsible for making arrangements to acquire missed materials and information from other students.

Students are required to hand in their assignments at the beginning of class on due dates. Late papers will be penalized a letter grade unless prior arrangements have been made with the professor, and only in extreme circumstance (e.g., serious health problem) will an incomplete be granted. Due dates for assignments are:

1. **First assignment due October 9 (week 5)—15% of course grade:**
Reflective paper
2. **Second assignment due October 30 (week 8)—15% of course grade:**
First Critique
3. **Third assignment due November 20 (week 11)—15% of course grade:**
Second Critique
4. **Fourth assignment due December 11 (week 14)—40% of course grade:**
Final Paper
5. **Participation in group-work and class discussions—15%**

Description of Assignments

Reflective Paper: [Due September 25]

In this short assignment (2-3 pages / double-spaced), you respond to ideas in the readings that captured your interest, imagination, and curiosity. You can structure your paper around a quotation, an entire argument advanced by one of the authors, or a recurring theme across readings. You can argue for or against author(s)' idea(s); offer new questions that might advance or develop further the discussions brought up by authors in the readings; or explain how the ideas challenge or confirm your own understanding.

This assignment is *not a summary*! This assignment is an opportunity for you to critically articulate your responses to authors' espoused epistemologies and paradigms—an opportunity for you to begin developing (or to develop further) your scholarly contributions, and engage in dialogues with your scholarly communities.

** Hand in hard copy only of this assignment*

First Critique: [Due October 16]

The following is required for this short assignment (1-3 pages / double-spaced):

- (1) That you identify a research topic of interest to you.
- (2) That you explain its relevance and importance to the field of education.
- (3) That you review and critique two sources that examine the topic through different methodologies and different analytic lenses.

The following should be addressed in your critiques:

- (1) Identify author's methodological approach
- (2) Identify author's theoretical / conceptual framework, underlying epistemology/paradigm
- (3) Critique how well each study meets the criteria and assumptions of its methodology and conceptual paradigms.

**Hand in hard copy only of this assignment*

Second Critique: [Due November 13]

This works builds on your first critique. The following is required for this assignment (1 to 3 double-spaced pages added to your first critique, for a total of 2 to 6 pages):

- (1) That you write an introduction, in which you present the research topic you are investigating. *Build on feedback received on your first critique to refine your introduction.*
- (2) That you review and critique two other sources that examine the topic, as much as possible, from different analytic approaches.
- (3) That you critique how well each study meets the criteria and assumptions of its methodology and conceptual paradigms.

**Hand in hard copy as well as electronic copy of this assignment. (The electronic copy must be sent prior to the beginning of class on due date).*

Final Paper: [Due December 11]

This assignment builds on your two previous critiques. In this final paper you synthesize your critiques of the four sources you reviewed, and discuss if, and how, your research topic might have been explored more effectively or more deeply. The following is required for this assignment (8 to 10 double-spaced pages):

- (1) An introduction that (1) identifies your research topic and explains its relevance/importance to the field of education, and (2) sets the context for the analysis that follows.
- (2) An analysis in which you:
 - critique each study from the perspective of other paradigms
 - assess which methodological approaches and conceptual frameworks best address the research question, underscoring limitations and strengths of various approaches
- (3) A conclusion in which you express your own reflections on research processes as they pertain to the topic you are investigating, and more broadly, as these contribute to constructing a knowledge-base in the field of education. In the conclusion, you are encouraged to be as philosophical, critical, theoretical or practical, as broad or as focused in your reflections as you wish to be.

Participation in group-work and class discussions: [Throughout the semester]

Group-work is an essential component of this course. It provides opportunities for creating smaller learning spaces within the broader EDPL 690 learning community; spaces within which students, not the instructor, take the lead in advancing their learning processes, and establishing support networks. While there are weekly tasks assigned for groups to produce, how groups choose to proceed in their collaborations is defined by each group, not by the instructor.

To ensure effective reporting of group-work, weekly rotating facilitators for each group take notes, report in whole class discussion at end of group-work, and hand-in a copy of produced work to instructor.

University of Maryland Point Distribution for Grades

A+ = 95-100; A = 89-94; A- = 83-88; B+ = 77-82; B = 71-76; B- = 65-70; C+ = 59-64

Summary of Key Dates

October 9: Reflective Paper

October 30: First Critique

November 20: Second Critique

December 11: Final paper

Additional Information

Documented Disabilities

The University of Maryland encourages instructors to make accommodations for students with disabilities. If you have a documented disability and wish to discuss an academic accommodation, please contact the instructor as soon as possible.

Honor Code

"The University of Maryland, College Park has a nationally recognized Code of Academic Integrity, administered by the Student Honor Council. This Code sets standards for academic integrity at Maryland for all undergraduate and graduate students. As a student you are responsible for upholding these standards for this course. It is very important for you to be aware of the consequences of cheating, fabrication, facilitation, and plagiarism. For more information on the Code of Academic Integrity or the Student Honor Council, please visit <http://www.studenthonorcouncil.umd.edu/whatis.html>."

Students will not be penalized because of observances of their religious beliefs. Whenever possible, students will be given reasonable time to make up any academic assignment that is missed due to participation in a religious observance. Please advise me as soon as possible of any absences for religious observances.

Required Material

The readings are outlined in the syllabus. Other than the assigned individual readings, the following books are required:

Cresswell, J. (1998) *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. ISBN 0-7619-0143-4

Mertens, D. (2004) *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches (2nd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. ISBN 0761928057

Recommended:

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W.F. Tate (Eds.), (2006). *Education research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy*. New York: Teachers College Press. ISBN 0807747041

Lagemann, E.C. (2000) *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago. ISBN 0-226-46772-4

Additional readings are on the e-reserve course system, accessed via databases. Additional readings are cited in syllabus under weekly readings.

CHRONOLOGY / TOPICAL OUTLINE

INTRODUCTION

Day 1: Monday (9/11)—*Introductions, Course Review & Logistics*

- Overview of course syllabus and materials
- Organization of groups (facilitators, etc.)
- Group-Work / Warm-up: Exploring personal conceptions of research.
- Whole class discussion: Identifying broad cross-cutting themes

Day 2: Monday (9/18)—*Contextualizing Debates Surrounding Educational Research*

Required readings for this week include:

Berliner, D. (2002). Educational research the hardest science of all. *Educational Researcher*, 31,8 (Nov.) 18-20.

Cresswell, J. (1998)-> Read Preface and Chapter 1.

Donmoyer, R. (1996). Educational research in an era of paradigm proliferation: What's a journal editor to do?" *Educational Researcher*, 25, 2 (March), 19-25.

Lagemann, E.C. (2000) *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research*. Chicago: The University of Chicago. / Introduction.

Hass, B. (2004). "The brouhaha surrounding scientifically-based research," *Stanford Educator*, Fall, pp. 1-7.

Kuhn, excerpt from *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Excerpt can be found at <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/kuhn.htm>

Mertens, D. (2004)-> Read Preface and Chapter 1.

Mooney, C. (2004). Beware 'sound science.' It's doublespeak for trouble," *Washington Post*, Feb. 29, p. B02.

Shulman, L. (1997) Disciplines of inquiry in education: A new overview. In R. Jaeger (ed.) *Complementary methods for research in education*: Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Group Work

The meanings of science in education research; the meaning of education research for education policy:

Informed by this week's readings, craft two statements (1 to 3 sentences each) that problematize (1) research in education in general; (2) the use of educational research to inform school policies.

UNIT I. QUANTITATIVE / POSITIVIST PARADIGM

Day 3: Monday (9/25)—Experiments and Quasi-Experiments

Required readings for this week include:

Howell, W., Peterson, P. et al. (2000). Test-score effects of school vouchers in Dayton, Ohio, New York City, and Washington, D.C.: Evidence from randomized field trials. Presented at the American Political Science Association meetings, Washington, DC, September.

Mertens, D. (2004).-> Read Chapter 4.

Porter, A. (1997). Comparative experiments in educational research” in R. Jaeger (ed.) *Complementary methods for research in education*: Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Shulman, S. (2005). Seek simplicity...and distrust it. Education Week on the Web:
<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2005/06/08/39shulman.h24.html>

Possible guest speaker-> to be determined.

Group-Work: *Strengths and weaknesses in experimental and quasi-experimental research design*
Informed by this week’s readings, and guest speaker’s presentation, craft a paragraph (3 to 5 sentences) that reflects on / or problematizes data collection and analysis in quantitative research.

Day 4: Monday (10/2)—Case Study: Vouchers

Required readings for this week include:

General:

Levin, H. (1998) Educational vouchers: Effectiveness, choice, and costs. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 17, 3, 373-392.

Mathews, J. (2000) Schools improve for D.C. pupils with vouchers. *Wash. Post*, 8/28/00, p.A1,5.

Critique:

People for the American Way. (2000). Deception by the numbers: Ten reasons to doubt the latest claim for vouchers.” *Editorial Memorandum*, September 21.

Metcalf, K. (1998). Advocacy in the guise of science. *Education Week*, September 23.

Myers, D. & Pfliegerer, J. (2000). Voucher claims of success are premature in New York City.” Press release from *Mathematica*, September 15.

Critique And Response:

Davis B. (1996). Dueling professors have Milwaukee dazed over school vouchers." *Wall Street Journal*, October 11.

Peterson, P. et al. (2000). Letter to the editor department. *New York Times*, September 17.

Viadero, D. (1998). "Researcher at center of storm over vouchers." *Education Week*, August 5.

Zernicke, K. (2000). New doubt is cast on study that backs voucher efforts." *New York Times*, September 15.

Pro-Voucher

Fuller, H. (2000). School choice helps Black students." *Washington Post*, 9/17, p. B5.

Will, F.G. (2000). "Stonewalling school reform." *Washington Post*, 8/31.

Group-Work: Quantitative Research and ideology

Groups craft a question or a statement of their choice that illuminates a feature of the debates presented in this week's readings that captured their imagination.

Day 5: Monday (10/9)—Correlational and Survey Research

First Assignment Due: Reflective Paper

Required readings for this week include:

CER. (2005). New survey reveals information gap: Polling experts find survey questions misleading, unrepresentative. Center for Education Reform Press Release, Washington D.C., Aug. 23.

Rose, L.C., and Gallup, A.M. (2005) "The 37th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 42-56.

Inc/Woman Trend. (2005). Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll raises methodological, contextual concerns. Center for Education Reform, Aug. 23.

Lawton, M. (1996). Support for private school vouchers is on the increase Gallup poll reports." *Education Week on the Web*, 9/4.

Mertens, D. (2004)-> Read Chapters 5 and 6.

Olson, L. (1996). "Poll results backing choice run counter to earlier surveys." *Education Week on the Web*, 9/18.

Group-Work: Role of polls in research

Craft a statement that reflects on / or problematizes the role of public opinion in educational research (2 to 3 sentences).

UNIT II. QUALITATIVE/ INTERPRETIVE PARADIGMS

Day 6: Monday (10/16)—*Qualitative v. Quantitative Debates*

Required readings for this week include:

Cresswell (1998)->Read Chapters 4 and 5.

Firestone, W. (1987) “Meaning in method: The rhetoric on quantitative and qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 16, 7, 16-21.

Mertens (2004)->Read Chapter 8 and re-read relevant parts of Chapter 1.

Smith, J. & Heshusius, L. (1986) Closing down the conversation: The end of the quantitative-qualitative debate among educational inquirers. *Educational Researcher*, 15, 1, 4-13.

Group-Work: *Research as world-views*

Group members discuss their predispositions toward either quantitative or qualitative analytic approaches, examine individual reasons for those predispositions, and produce a synthesizing account of their insights (2 to 3 sentences).

Day 7: Monday (10/23)—*Historical Methods, Ethnography and Case Studies*

Required readings for this week include:

Cresswell (1998)-> Read ethnographic and case study pages in analytic table of contents.

Cresswell(1998)-> Read appendix E: “An ethnography – The elementary school principal: Notes from a field study.”

Cresswell (1998)-> Read appendix F: “A case study – K. Asmussen and J. Cresswell, Campus response to a student gunman.

Dougherty, Jack. (1999). "From anecdote to analysis: oral interviews and new scholarship in educational history," *The Journal of American History*, 86, 2, 712-723.

Kaestle, C. (1997). “Recent methodological developments in the history of American education” In R. Jaeger (ed.) *Complementary methods for research in education*: Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Portelli, Alessandro. (1998). What makes oral history different.” In Perks, R. &

Thomson, A. (Editors). *The Oral History Reader*. New York: Routledge: 63-73.

Wolcott, H. (1997) "Ethnographic research in education" in R. Jaeger (ed.) *Complementary methods for research in education*: Washington, D.C.: AERA.

Group-Work: Case Study / Ethnography / History / Oral History

Groups explore commonalities in all four methodological approaches, imagine a possible integrated approach, and craft a synthesizing statement 92 to 3 sentences).

Day 8: Monday (10/30)—Phenomenology and Grounded Theory
Second Assignment Due: First Critique

Required readings for this week include:

Charmaz, K. (2000) "Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods." In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cresswell (1998)-> Read phenomenology and grounded theory pages in analytic table of contents.

Cresswell (1998)-> Read appendix C: "A phenomenology—D. Riemen, The essential structure of a caring interaction: Doing phenomenology.

Hultgren, F. (1989) Introduction to interpretive inquiry" in F. Hultgren and D. Coomer (eds.) *Alternative modes of inquiry in home economics research*.(yearbook no. 9). Peoria, IL: Glencoe.

Stevens, F. (2004). Understanding gay identity development within the college environment. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 2, (March/April), 185-206.

Wu, Z. (1991). The lived experience of being a foreigner. *Phenomenology + Pedagogy*, 9, 267-275.

Group-Work: *What questions for what methodology?*

Group members identify questions they would explore through a grounded theory approach, and a phenomenological approach (3 questions per methodology), and provide reasons for their choice of method to match question.

UNIT III. CRITICAL / FEMINIST / POSTMODERN / POSTCOLONIAL PARADIGMS

Day 9: Monday (11/6)—*Debates and Overview/ Critical and feminist perspectives*

Required readings for this week include:

Anderson, G. (1989) Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status and new directions, *Review of Educational Research*, 59, 3 (Fall), 249-270.

Carspecken, P. (1996) *Critical ethnography in educational research*. NY: Routledge (Chapter 1)

Hamovitch, B. (1996) "Socialization without voice: An ideology of hope for at-risk students," *Teachers College Record*, 98, 2, (Winter), 286-305.

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W.F. Tate (Eds.), (2006). *Education research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy*. New York: Teachers College Press. / Introduction

Lather, P. (1991) *Getting Smart*. NY: Routledge / Intro. by M. Apple and Chapter. 3.

Mertens, D. (2004)-. Read pp. 16-26, 243-4, 257-260.

Nielsen, J. (1990) Introduction, in J. Nielsen (ed.) *Feminist research methods*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Skrla, L. (2000) Sexism, silence, and solutions: Women superintendents speak up and speak out, *Education Administration Quarterly*, 36, 1 (February) 44-75.

Sleeter, C. (2002) Epistemological diversity and research on pre-service teacher preparation for historically underserved children," W. Secada (Ed.) *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 2000/2001, Washington, DC: AERA, 2002.

Sutton, M. (1998). Feminist epistemology and research methods. In N. Stromquist (Ed.), *Women in the third world: An encyclopedia of contemporary issues*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Group-Work: Qualitative research and ideology?

Groups craft a question or a statement of their choice that illuminates a feature of the debates presented in this week's readings that captured their imagination.

**Day 10: Monday (11/13)— Frameworks and Examples Continued—
Black Feminist, Critical Race, Post-Critical and Post-Colonial Perspectives**

Required readings for this week include:

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (2006). *The post-colonial studies reader*. (2nd ed.) New York: Routledge. / General Introduction and Introduction to the Second Edition.

Capper, C. (1998) Critically-oriented and postmodern perspectives: Sorting out the differences and applications for practice.” *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34, 3 (August), 354-379

Collins-Hill, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge. (Chapter 1)

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). Part II: Paradigms and perspectives in transition. *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 157-162.

Duncan, G. (2002). Beyond love: A critical race ethnography of the schooling of adolescent Black males,” *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35, 2, 2002, 131-143.

Fine, M., Burns, A., Payne, Y., and Torre, M. Civics lessons: The color and class of betrayal,” *Teachers College Record*, 106, 11, Nov. 2004, 2193-2223.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Radicalized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. Pp. 257-277

Lather, P. (1986) Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place, *Interchange*, 17, 4 (Winter), 63-84.

Noblit, Flores & Murillo. (2004). Postcritical ethnography: An introduction.” In Noblit, Flores & Murillo (Eds.) *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique*. Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press Inc.

Weis, L. & Fine, M. (Eds.) (2000). *Construction sites: Excavating race, class, and gender among urban youth*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University (Foreword and Introduction).

Group-Work: *Qualitative research and race*.

Groups craft a question or a statement of their choice that illuminates a feature of the debates presented in this week’s readings that captured their imagination.

Day 11: Monday (11/20)—Paradigms and Approaches Continued

Staying close to people's lives

Third Assignment Due: Second Critique

Required readings for this week include:

Carson, T. (1990) "What kind of knowing is critical action research?" *Theory Into Practice*, 29, 3 (Summer)168-173.

Fulton, Y. (1997). "Nurses' views on empowerment: A critical social theory perspective." *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26, 529-536.

Ginsburg, M. et al. (1996) Choices in conceptualized classroom-anchored research and linking it to policy/practice to improve educational quality in 'developing' countries *Research Papers in Education*, 11, 3, 239-254.

Lopez, G., Guajardo, M. Scheurich, J. (1998) Windows/ventanas: A postmodern re-presentation of children in migrancy, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34, 3 (August), 397-426.

Noffke, S. (1997) Professional, personal, and political dimensions of action research. In M. Apple (ed.) *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 22. Washington, DC: AERA.

Omeldo, Irma. (1999). Redefining culture through the memorias of elderly Latinas. *Qualitative Inquiry* 5, 3,353-376.

Preston, R. (1997) Integrating paradigms in educational research: Issues of quantity and quality in poor countries. In M. Crossley and A. Vulliamy (eds.) *Qualitative educational research in developing countries*. NY: Garland.

Smith, L. (1999) *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous people*. NY: Zed

White, C. Native Americans at promise: Travel in borderlands. In B. Swadden and J. Zubeck (eds.) *Deconstructing the Discourse of Risk*. SUNY Press, 1995.

Group-Work: Epistemology and methodology / Methodology and practice

Informed by this week's and previous weeks' readings, groups craft statements that link epistemology and methodology, and methodology and practice, while addressing issues of social justice.

UNIT IV: ETHICAL ISSUES AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Day 12: Monday (11/27)—Ethics

Required readings for this week include:

American Evaluation Association (Dec.2, 2003) Statement on “Scientifically based evaluation methods.”

Cresswell (1998)->Read pp. 132-133.

Cohen, P. (2000) Oops, sorry: Seems that my pie chart is half-baked.” *New York Times*, April 8, p. B7.

Deyhle, D., Hess, A., & LeCompte, M. (1992) Approaching ethical issues for qualitative researchers in education. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (1st ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dyson, M. (Dec. 5, 2003) “The public obligations of intellectuals.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Ethical Standards of AERA

Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen S., & Wong, L. (2000). “For whom: Qualitative research, representations and social responsibilities.” In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. Pp. 107-131.

Mertens, D. (2004)->Read pp. 33-38, 119-120, 332-338.

University of Maryland Guidelines for Human Subject Review

USDOE (Nov. 18, 2002) Report on scientifically based research supported by U.S. Department of Education

Winerip, M. (May 7, 2003) “What Some Much-noted Data Really Showed about Vouchers.” *New York Times*

Wolcott, H. (1999) *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage (pp. 280-289)

Group-Work: *Researcher responsibility*

Groups craft a code of ethics for educational researchers.

Day 13: Monday (12/4)—Researchers and their paradigm journeys

Required readings for this week include:

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. Pp. 1-28.

Heshusius, L. and Ballard, K. (eds.) (1996) *From positivism to interpretivism and beyond: Tales of transformation in educational and social research (The Mind-body Connection)*. NY: Teachers College. (Foreword, Preface, Afterthoughts, and pieces by Ballard, Guba, Smith and one other – maybe Anglin, Marling, or Heshusius).

Mertens, D. (2004). Read (or re-read)-> Chapter 2

Group-Work:

Groups decide on a task of their own choosing that brings to light insights gathered from readings, as well as personal experiences.

Day 14: Monday (12/11)—*In Closing...*

Last Assignment Due: Final Paper

- Course evaluations
- Group-work / Wrap-Up
- Other to be decided