St. John's University
Department of Administrative and Instructional Leadership
EDU 7663 – Using Technology in the Study of Qualitative Research Methodology

Location: Oakdale Campus
Professor: Dr. Rory J. Manning
Phone: 631-218-7709
Email: manningr@stjohns.edu

GRADUATE BULLETIN COURSE DESCRIPTION
EDU 7663 Using Technology in the Study of Qualitative Research Methodology: Students in this course will learn how qualitative data analysis software can be used as a tool to enhance the research analysis process. This course will integrate theory with applications, as well as provide instruction on how to use the software. Students will use both text analysis and qualitative analysis software programs in a study where they design the instruments, collect the data, and analyze the results. Credit: 3 semester hours.

TIME REQUIREMENT

The New York State Department of Education regulations are that each graduate course meet for at least 28 hours of instruction to earn three (3) graduate credits. St. John's University requires at least 30 contact hours of instruction and 15 additional hours at home to earn three (3) graduate credits.

COURSE OBJECTIVES
The purpose of the course is to develop an understanding of how computer software can be used to enhance qualitative research methods and their application to educational research. Students will examine the theoretical foundations of qualitative research through readings, discussion, and field work assignments. Students will learn how to design and implement qualitative research studies through projects and activities.

Students will learn how qualitative data are reported in the professional literature through readings and critiques of published works.

REQUIRED TEXTS AND READINGS

CLASS SCHEDULE
Friday, Session 1

* Orientation
* Course Requirements
* Overview of Qualitative Research Design
  • Grounded Theory Design
  • Ethnographic Design
  • Narrative Research Design
* Collecting and Analyzing Qualitative Data
* Mixed Method Research Design

* Introduction to QSR NVivo 10
  • The NVivo Workspace
  • Importing Materials (Documents, audio, video, images, etc.)
  • Coding and Making Nodes
  • Memos
  • Node Classifications (Demographic attributes)
* Test of Procedures Data Set
* Development of Coding Rules
* Coding Team and Inter-Rater Reliability in Qualitative Analysis
* Creating Visual Summaries of the Data
  • Framework Matrices
  • Text analysis queries
  • Coding queries
  • Compound Queries
  • Models, graphs, cluster analysis
  • Reports and extracts

Saturday, Session 2

* Final Presentations
* Summary

COURSE REQUIREMENTS/ASSIGNMENTS

I.   Critical analyses of two published qualitative research studies from journals (3 - 5 pages each, typed, double-spaced, using APA conventions for references, title page, heading, page numbering, etc.). Critically analyze the two articles during the semester according to two different due dates given, using the guidelines below.

1. Theoretical framework

a. Briefly state the framework/theories that guided the development of the research, naming salient theorists and their views. Indicate whether you see any shortcomings in the description.

2. Method

a. What methods are used for data collection and data analysis, and how appropriate are they for investigating the research questions posed?
b. Are the methods of sufficient reliability and validity? Provide illustrations.

3. Findings and Discussion

a. What are the relevant findings, and are they described and interpreted appropriately?
b. Are there gaps in the description of findings that you notice?

      c. What practical and/or theoretical applications do you derive from this research?

    4. Limitations

    a. What are the limitations of the study noted by the authors?
    b. What limitations do you notice that have not been mentioned by the authors?

II.   Mini-Proposal: Students will develop a dissertation proposal (chapters 1-3) on a topic of interest. The goal of this assignment is to expose students to the richness of high-quality qualitative research. The final presentation should include a well developed problem statement, an outline of a thorough literature review and a definitive methodology all centered on a theoretical framework.

EVALUATION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Class participation	40%
Two article reviews	20%
Presentation	15%
Mini Proposal	25%

GRADE EVALUATION

A	=	95-100
A-	=	90-94
B+	=	87-89
B	=	84-86
B-	=	80-83
C+	=	75-79
C	=	70-74

GRADING RUBRICS

Writing Skills Rubric

	Unacceptable 1	Beginning 2	Competent 3	Skilled 4	Exemplary 5
Main Idea/Thesis	Overall position is not evident. Topic as expressed is superficial or undeveloped.	Overall position is evident, but often too simplistic. Topic is also simplistic and one-dimensional.	Overall position is clear with a sense of developed ideas. Topic is interesting and significant, but not deeply explored in needed areas	Overall position is clear and developed. Topic is interesting, significant, and is engaged from several angles.	Overall position is well articulated and thoroughly developed. Topic is interesting, significant, and intellectually challenging with multiple facets addressed.
Argument	No argumentative structure is evident. Ideas are unconnected.	Argumentative structure is rudimentary. Claims are repeated rather than developed. Few objections are addressed and may be misrepresented.	Argumentative structure is evident but sometimes simplistic. Objections are addressed but formulaically.	Argumentative structure is evident. Objections are taken seriously and typically addressed fair-mindedly.	Argumentative structure is clearly evident. Objections are taken seriously and addressed fair-mindedly with great skill.
Evidence	Claims are not supported by reliable evidence from credible sources, making the paper unconvincing	Some claims are supported by valid, reliable evidence, but support is inconsistent, making the paper less than convincing.	Claims are typically supported by valid, reliable evidence from credible sources, making the paper for the most part convincing.	Claims are almost always supported by valid, reliable sources, so that the paper is generally convincing.	Claims are supported by reliable, valid evidence from credible sources and effectively synthesized in a very convincing manner.
Organization	Ideas appear unconnected. Several paragraphs are incoherent, lacking clear topic sentences and developed by restatement; they may contain irrelevant information. Paper shows serious lack of unity and coherence. Introduction and/or conclusion may be weak, trite, or nonexistent.	The paper is organized, though simplistically. Paragraphs are occasionally incoherent, without strong topic sentences and clear development. An introduction and conclusion are attempted but are perfunctory or formulaic. The introduction may be overly general and the conclusion may simply restate the thesis.	The introduction provides some context for the paper and states a thesis, though in a predictable way. Paragraphs are usually clear with serviceable topic sentences, development, and information. Main points are logically structured. Transitions provide coherence, but may be formulaic. The conclusion summarizes the paper but does not explore implications or significance.	The introduction sets the context for the paper and states a clear thesis. Nearly all paragraphs are coherent with strong topic sentences, developing systematically so that meaning is clear. Main points are clear and logically structured. Transitions provide a sense of coherence. The conclusion summarizes the paper and makes some effort to explore implications and significance.	The introduction skillfully captures reader attention while establishing the context for the paper. All paragraphs are coherent with apt topic sentences, developed so the meaning is exceptionally clear and easy to follow. All the main ideas are clear and logically structured. Transitions provide a strong sense of coherence. The conclusion summarizes and explores implications and significance.
Readability	Awkward phrasing, unskillful or inappropriate voice/tone, and unsophisticated and/or imprecise vocabulary hinder understanding.	Awkward phrasing, unskillful or inappropriate voice/tone, and unsophisticated and/or imprecise vocabulary distract from the paper's ideas.	Phrasing is generally effective; voice/tone and vocabulary are generally suitable for the paper's ideas and only occasionally work against its ideas.	Clear phrasing, appropriate management of voice and tone, and vocabulary enhance the paper's ideas.	Skillful phrasing, adept management of voice and tone, and apt word choice create an inviting paper.

Final Presentation Rubric

	Presentation Rubric				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Total**
Organization	Audience cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence of information.	Audience has difficulty following presentation because student jumps around.	Student presents information in logical sequence which audience can follow.	Student presents information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow.	
Subject Knowledge	Student does not have grasp of information; student cannot answer questions about subject.	Student is uncomfortable with information and is able to answer only rudimentary questions, but fails to elaborate.	Student is at ease and answers most questions with explanations and some elaboration.	Student demonstrates full knowledge (more than required) by answering all class questions with explanations and elaboration.	
Visual Aids	Student uses superfluous visual aids or no visual aids.	Student occasionally uses visual aids that rarely support the presentation.	Student's visual aids relate to the presentation.	Student's visual aids explain and reinforce the presentation.	
Mechanics	Student's presentation has four or more spelling errors and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has three misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has no more than two misspellings and/or grammatical errors.	Presentation has no misspellings or grammatical errors.	
Eye Contact	Student makes no eye contact and only reads from notes.	Student occasionally uses eye contact, but still reads mostly from notes.	Student maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently returns to notes.	Student maintains eye contact with audience, seldom returning to notes.	
Verbal Techniques	Student mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and speaks too quietly for audience in the back of class to hear.	Student's voice is low. Student incorrectly pronounces terms. Audience members have difficulty hearing presentation.	Student's voice is clear. Student pronounces most words correctly. Most audience members can hear presentation.	Student uses a clear voice and correct, precise pronunciation of terms so that all audience members can hear presentation.	
Group Work	Cannot work with others in most situations. Cannot share decisions or responsibilities.	Works with others, but has difficulty sharing decisions and responsibilities.	Works well with others. Takes part in most decisions and shares in the responsibilities.	Works very well with others. Assumes a clear role in decision making and responsibilities.	
				Total Points:	
A= 26-28	**B= 24-25**	**C= 21-23**	**D= 19-20**	**F= 0-18**	

Last updated November 2016

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: There are numerous texts now available related to Qualitative Research or Ethnography in Education. A few a listed below.

Corbin, J. S. & Strauss, A. (2007). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques for developing grounded theory. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches, second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2007). Strategies for qualitative inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eisner, E. W. (1998). The enlightened eye. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Eisner, E. W. & Peshkin, A. (1990). Qualitative research in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College Press.

LeCompte, M. D. & Priessle, J. (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2006). Designing qualitative research, fourth edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2006). Interpreting qualitative data, third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wengraf, T. (2001). Qualitative research interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

 (Readings)

Note: There are many books that report the findings of naturalistic inquiry. Below are just a few classics and a handful of more recent publications that pertain to educational topics. Several Doctoral Dissertations are also relevant, but may be located through ProQuest Digital Dissertations, and have not been included in this list. In the list of journals (above) the results of numerous qualitative studies may be found.

Behar, R. (1996). The vulnerable observer. Boston: Beacon Press.

Becker, H. S. (1963). Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: The Free Press.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Harper-Collins.

Bogdan, R. & Taylor, S. (1994). The social meaning of mental retardation. New York: Teachers College Press

Chin, E. (2001). Purchasing power: Black kids and consumer culture. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Clydesdale, T. (2007). The first year out: Understanding American teens after high school. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cottle, T. (1976). Barred from school. Washington DC: New Republic.

Fassler, R. (2003). Room for talk: Teaching and learning in a multilingual classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fine, M. & Weis, L. (1998). The unknown city: The lives of poor and working-class young adults. Boston: Beacon Press.

Gouldner, H. (1978). Teachers' pets, troublemakers, and nobodies. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Irvine J. J. & Foster, M. (1996). Growing up African American in Catholic schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kozol, J. (1992). Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools. New York: Harper Collins.

Lareau, A. (1989). Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education. London: Falmer Press.

Lee, S. J. (1996). Unraveling the model minority stereotype: Listening to Asian-American youth. New York: Teachers College Press.

McCormick, J. (2004). Writing in the asylum: Student poets in city schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaren, P. (1998). Life in schools. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Mead, M. (1949). Coming of age in Samoa. New York: Penguin.

Mead, M. (1962). Growing up in New Guinea. New York: Morrow Quill.

Peshkin, A. (1986). God's choice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rist, R. (1978). The invisible children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Valdes, G. (1996). Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

NOTE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, colleges are required to provide reasonable accommodations for documented disabilities. Such documentation should be on file at the Student Life Office. If students require such services, please see your instructor by the second class of the semester.

Plagiarism Policy

Plagiarism is incorporating someone else's work into your work without giving proper credit to the original source. Citations let your audience know what work is yours and what is the work of others. Failure to cite sources properly is a serious breach of ethics, inside and outside the academic world. Because the university promotes education and values trustworthy research, your professors expect that you will use information ethically in your work. Penalties for plagiarism (whether intentional or unintentional) can range from loss of credit for an assignment/course, to being suspended/expelled from the university. Citing sources correctly is a serious responsibility.