

**University of Calgary**  
**Werklund School of Education**  
**Office of Graduate Programs in Education**

**EDER 603.26 L02**  
**Research Methodology in Education**  
**Fall 2016**

**Instructor:** Sarah Elaine Eaton, Ph.D.  
**Virtual Office:** <https://connectmeeting.ucalgary.ca/saraheaton/>  
**Phone:** 403-220-6378  
**Email:** seaton@ucalgary.ca  
**Skype:** SarahElaineEaton

**Virtual Office Hours:** by appointment

Class location: EDC 351  
Class day and time: Mondays, 09:00 – 11:50

**Term Dates:**  
September 12, 2016 – December 9, 2016

**Dates of note:**  
Monday, October 10 – Thanksgiving day – Holiday. University closed.  
Thursday, November 10 – Sunday, November 13 – Reading days. No classes.

**Course Description:**

This introductory course is designed for graduate students in the first year of their campus-based Masters of Arts in Education and Masters of Science in Education programs. It focuses on various issues, methods, and techniques in educational research. The curriculum includes some of the issues and dilemmas that frame the context for contemporary research in educational contexts, as well as preliminary consideration of research strategies, methods, and techniques in a manner intended to assist participants in selecting research questions, methods, and strategies for further study. Participants will also be encouraged to approach research scholarly journal articles and textbooks with a critical eye and provide some skills and techniques for this kind of close reading.

The field of education sits at a point of intersection of many other domains – including neurology, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and the many disciplines represented in various subject area specialties. This positioning compels a particular sort of methodological breadth across all programs in education. For that reason, it is not the purpose of the course to develop extensive technical (operational) competence in any particular method of research. Rather, the broader aim is to support an initial understanding of the nature and purpose of various approaches – all of which are used in understanding educational and other social phenomena, though they may appear to differ substantially.

Over the past 50 years, there has been a proliferation of theories and associated research methodologies in the field of education. A principal aim of the course is to nurture a sort of ‘methodological connoisseurship’ – not by championing specific emphases and approaches, but by interrogating the distinctions and commitments that are associated with various approaches to inquiry. To achieve this end, we should aim for a radical departure from traditional research method courses that focus on a

cluster of specific methodologies. The emphasis here will be on the decisions, attitudes, and commitments that one might have to a particular approach and which would compel certain methods.

The guiding question/attitude is not “How is this perspective/methodology different/wrong?” – which is deemed unproductive. After all, every frame is partial and can be found wanting. The orientation is thus more toward “How is this perspective/methodology right?” To that end, among the simultaneous considerations are:

- What is the focus (the subject, object, phenomenon, unit of analysis) of interest?
- Does it change? If so, at what pace?
- Is it self-transformative and do other agents/phenomena (e.g. other educators and researchers) participate in its change?

To more deeply understand how a phenomena, theme, or topic, might be taken up from a variety of methodological perspectives, participants are encouraged to conduct a course-based project focusing on a particular methodology. The instructor will meet individually with each student to discuss what this might look like for each of them.

### **Course objectives and Learner Outcomes:**

1. To review the range of methodologies and attendant methods used in educational research—including the gathering of empirical data, the application of theory, the generation of theory and the critique of theory.
2. To establish a basic literacy in research methodologies. Participants should be able to offer preliminary definitions of principal approaches to research in education and to distinguish among them according to phenomena examined, theoretical commitments, and relevance to their own research interests.
3. Differentiate between the central tenets of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis strategies with special consideration being given to the strengths, weaknesses and relevance of each in education
4. To appreciate how the methodological breadth is better articulated in terms of complementarities than conflicts, recognizing that methods are developed in conversation with the phenomena they are intended to “investigate.” To adequately compare methods demands a range of questions, including queries on what is being studied, who is doing the studying, the purposes of the study, the time frames of the inquiry, etc. Significantly, details around technical differences among methods are at best, secondary considerations in this conversation.
5. To interrogate the personal pre-judgments and methodological positioning that frame one’s questions, orient one’s selection of techniques, influence the details one notices, and affects the inference one draws.
6. To introduce participants to the issues and challenges of conducting ethical research.
7. To enhance your capacity to critically read, write, and assess theoretical and methodological texts and other resource documents.
8. Understand how action research applies to educational settings and contexts
9. To identify viable and interesting research questions, in both your own potential research endeavours and the work of published academics.
10. To prepare a preliminary research proposal that demonstrates thinking through a research question and engaging in the first steps of designing a study.

**Topics:**

The following list is intended to provide a preliminary sense of many of the key terms and topics that will be explored throughout the course:

- Epistemology, Ontology, Truth
- Purposes of Educational Research
- Objectivity-Oriented Methodologies: Statistical Methods; Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Research; Grounded Research
- Subjectivity-Oriented Methodologies: Phenomenology, Narrative Inquiry; Autobiography
- Intersubjectivity-Oriented Methodologies: Hermeneutics; Ethnography
- Interobjectivity (Participatory)-Oriented Methodologies: Action Research, Design-Based Research
- Research Criteria: Reliability vs. Reasonableness, Validity vs. Viability, Predictability vs. Practicality, Rigor vs. Relevance
- Mixed-Modes or Mixed Methods Research
- Research Ethics

**Course Design and Delivery:**

On campus, face-to face.

Additionally, a D2L site will serve as a site to archive course materials and support learning.

**Required Texts and readings****Books**

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Hendricks, C. (2016). *Improving schools through Action Research: A reflective practice approach* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

**APA 6th Edition**

Formal academic writing tasks in this program require adherence to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.).

Online resources include <http://www.apastyle.org/> and <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

**Online Tutorial:**

TCPS 2 - CORE tutorial. Online - <http://www.ucalgary.ca/research/researchers/ethics-compliance/tcps2-core-tutorial>

- The instructor strongly encourages students to complete the online ethics tutorial: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans: A Concise, Online Tutorial (CORE). Upon completion of the tutorial, a CORE certificate of completion will be issued which is required as part of the ethics application for students electing to conduct research with human subjects.

Tri-Council Policy Statement on Research with Human Participants (TCPS 2, 2014). Online: <http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-eptc2/Default/>

**Articles:**

Additional journal articles may be incorporated into our course conversations as needed and will be provided in D2L.

Resources from the U of C Library:

Scholarly versus Non-Scholarly sources - <http://136.159.25.22/Tutorials/ScholarlyVsNonScholarly/>

Evaluating Internet Resources - <http://136.159.25.22/Tutorials/EvalInternetSources/>

**Learning Tasks Overview:**

Learning Task Number	Description of Learning Task	Percent of final grade	Grouping for Task
Learning Task #1	Scholarly Community of Inquiry and Knowledge Building DUE: Self-Reflection due Monday, November 28	30%	Individual
Learning Task #	Critical Analysis of a Master's Thesis DUE: Due Monday, October 31	35%	Individual
Learning Task #3	Preliminary Research Proposal DUE: Monday, December 5	35%	Individual or Group*

\*Consult with your instructor to get approval for collaborative group or partner work.

Note: All written work for this course must be submitted in Word format, both for drafts for peer sharing, and for final submission for instructor assessment.

**Weekly Course Schedule:**

This schedule may change to meet the emerging needs and dynamics of the participants in the course.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic(s)</b>	<b>Readings and Tasks</b>	<b>Important dates</b>
Week 1 Mon., Sep 12	Introduction	Introduction to the course, the texts, each other and the course content. Epistemology, Ontology & other research foundations	
Week 2 Mon., Sep 19	Contribution vs. attribution	Readings: Creswell: Chapter 1 Hendricks: Chapter 1 & 2	
Week 3 Mon., Sep 26	Developing an ethical foundation	TCPS CORE 2 tutorial Readings: Creswell: Chapters 3 & 4	
Week 4 Mon., Oct 3	Research questions	Readings: Creswell: Chapter 2 Hendricks: Chapter 3	Due: Thesis title & author for LT2 submitted to instructor
Week 5 Mon., Oct 10	Thanksgiving – University Closed (No class.)		
Week 6 Mon., Oct 17	Sharing Draft Research Questions	Cresswell: Chapters 5, 6 & 7	Due: Draft Research Questions
Week 7 Mon., Oct 24	Learning to Analyze Research	Hendricks: Chapter 4 Dialogic analysis of another's thesis:	
Week 8 Mon., Oct 31		Creswell: Chapters 8 & 9	LT2 Due – Oct. 31
Week 9 Mon., Nov 7	Validity, reliability, probability	Creswell: Chapter 10	
Week 10 Mon., Nov 14	Sharing Draft Proposals	Hendricks: Chapters 5 - 6	Due: Draft Research Proposal
Week 11 Mon., Nov 21		Hendricks: Chapter 7	
Week 12 Mon., Nov 28	Design-Based Research	Hendricks: Chapter 8 Special Guest: Dr. Barb Brown	
Week 13 Mon., Dec 5	Next steps & Wrap Up		LT3 Due – Dec. 5

**Changes to Schedule:**

Please note that changes to the schedule may occur in response to student questions and conversations.

**Learning Tasks and Assessment**

There are three (3) required Learning Tasks for this course.

**Learning Task 1: Scholarly Community of Inquiry and Knowledge Building 30% – Self-Assessment Due:** Monday, November 28 by 5:00 p.m. Mountain time or earlier**Description:**

Students are expected to engage fully in the community of inquiry by attending class on a weekly basis and engaging actively in class discussions and activities. This includes demonstrating that you have completed the weekly assigned readings, reflected critically on what you have read, and you engage with peers in collaborative and supportive dialogue. There are assigned readings for most weeks of the course.

Your contributions to the weekly discussions and activities demonstrate that you acknowledge being part of a community of scholarship, recognizing that successful scholars work collaboratively, engaging deeply in ongoing dialogue to build and share knowledge.

**Assessment Criteria:**

To get credit for engagement in the scholarly community of inquiry, students are expected attend class and contribute to the ongoing dialogue. Learning Task #1 will be graded throughout the course using the Criteria for Scholarly Knowledge Building Rubric.

**Learning Task #1 - Rubric  
Criteria for Scholarly Knowledge Building**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>“Surface” Scholarly Discourse: Fails to meet requirements (C+ or lower)</b>	<b>Meets All Requirements (B- to B+)</b>	<b>Deeper Scholarly Discourse: Meets All and Exceeds Some Requirements (A- to A+)</b>
<b>Constructive Uses of Authoritative Sources</b>	Readings are summarized with little or no critical analysis or thoughtful interpretation.  Or You do not provide concrete evidence of having engaged with the course material.	Information sources are critically evaluated and writing demonstrates recognition that even the best ideas are improvable. You cite or quote specific details from the article.	You draw upon content from the readings by citing or quoting specific passage. You supplement these with additional information sources, as evidence for helping others build knowledge and deepen their understanding.
<b>Democratizing Knowledge</b>	You add your contribution with little recognition of others in the group or you regularly contribute late/not at all and therefore outside of the conversation.	You recognize and praise everyone’s work and help others find needed information.	You treat all participants as legitimate contributors to the shared goals of the community; all have a sense of ownership of knowledge advances achieved by the group.
<b>Epistemic Agency</b>	You demonstrate a personal sense of direction, power, motivation, and responsibility. Your writing requires additional thought and work to connect it with the expressed thoughts of classmates.	You mobilize personal strengths to set forth your ideas and to negotiate a fit between personal ideas and ideas of others.	You mobilize personal strengths to set forth your ideas and to negotiate a fit between personal ideas and ideas of others, using contrasts to spark and sustain knowledge advancement rather than depending on others to chart that course for you.
<b>Idea Diversity</b>	You participate in brainstorming different ideas independent of the conversation in the discussion board or do not put forward any new ideas.	You play an active role in putting forward different ideas to create a dynamic learning environment.	You play an active role in putting forward different ideas to create a dynamic environment in which contrasts, competition, and complementarity of ideas is evident, creating a rich environment for ideas to evolve into new and more refined forms.

Improvable Ideas	You accept or reject ideas as truth on the basis of logical argument and evidence.	You treat all ideas improvable, informed by argument and evidence.	You treat all ideas as improvable by aiming to mirror the work of great thinkers in gathering and weighing evidence, and ensuring that explanations cohere with all available evidence.
Knowledge Building Discourse	<p>Your contribution to discourse is irregular, not timely or does not meet requirements (weekly post in response to readings &amp; substantive post in response to peers).</p> <p>Your contribution to discourse allows participants to minimally express and gain feedback on their ideas, defend different points of view, arrive at conclusions.</p>	<p>Your regular and timely contribution to discourse meets requirements (weekly post in response to readings &amp; substantive post in response to peers) and serves to identify shared problems and gaps in understanding, the need for ongoing inquiry.</p>	<p>Your regular and timely contribution to discourse exceeds requirements and serves to engage peers in scholarly discourse, identify shared problems and gaps in understanding and to advance understanding.</p> <p>Demonstrates deep scholarly engagement, mastery of topics, and leadership of a knowledge building community.</p>
Peer Review Contributions	<p>You offered limited peer review.</p> <p>Your peer review was not constructive.</p> <p>Limited participation in putting forward different ideas.</p>	<p>You offered clear, helpful peer review to your colleagues.</p> <p>You play an active role in putting forward different ideas, providing additional information sources and drawing from your experiences to create a dynamic environment.</p>	<p>You offered in-depth and detailed peer review with helpful, constructive feedback.</p> <p>You offered specific, concrete suggestions for improvement in a manner that made it easy for your colleagues to integrate your feedback effectively.</p> <p>You play an active role in putting forward different ideas, providing additional information sources and drawing from your experiences to create a dynamic environment in which contrasts, competition and complementarity of ideas is evident, creating a rich environment for ideas to evolve into new and more refined forms.</p>

**Learning Task 2: Critical analysis of a Master’s thesis (35%) – Due:** Monday, October 31 by 5:00 p.m. Mountain time or earlier

**Description:**

This learning task involves selecting and analyzing a published Master’s thesis to gain a deeper understanding of what a thesis is, how a thesis is structured and presented. The deeper objective of this exercise is for you to begin thinking about your own thesis and how you might organize, structure and present your own work. By choosing a published Master’s thesis, you will be finding your own exemplar of a work that has passed a Master’s level thesis examination and is therefore one representation of a successful Master’s research project.

You may choose either a digital format (likely through ProQuest via the U of C library) or work with a printed copy of a thesis from the Doucette Library.

**Submit the title and author of the thesis you have selected to your instructor by Monday, October 3.**

**Learning Task #2 Rubric**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Fails to Meet Requirements (C+ or lower)</b>	<b>Meets All Requirements (B- to B+)</b>	<b>Meets All and Exceeds Some Requirements (A- to A+)</b>
<b>Methodology Understandings</b>	<p>Description of research methodology is inaccurate or missing detail.</p> <p>You provide surface level application reading and a cursory understanding of the connections between worldview, research design (inclusive of research topic, problem, and purpose) and research methods.</p>	<p>Provides a description of the research methodology from the thesis selected.</p> <p>You show emerging understandings of the connections between worldview, research design (inclusive of research topic, problem, and purpose), and research methods in your analysis of the thesis .</p>	<p>Provides a clear and succinct description of the research methodology from the thesis selected.</p> <p>You show exemplary and in-depth understanding and mastery of the connections between worldview, research design (inclusive of research topic, problem, and purpose), and research methods in your analysis of the thesis.</p>

Organization and Structure	You offer a cursory overview of the organization and structure of the thesis.	You provide a broad, general overview of the structure and overview of the thesis.	You offer an exemplary analysis of the structure of the work that includes an informed commentary on how the structure of the thesis aligned with the research project itself.
Sources	You demonstrate a cursory review of the sources used in the thesis	You provide a broad overall analysis of the kinds of sources used in the thesis.	You provide an insightful analysis of the sources used to inform the thesis, with a discussion of the kinds of sources used, balance of different kinds of sources, currency of the sources in relation to the publication of the thesis itself, and so on.
Critical Reflection	You provide a basic reflection of what you learned from this assignment.	You offer a broad and general reflection about how this learning task deepened your knowledge of what a thesis is and how it is written.	You offer an insightful and detailed reflection about how this learning task deepened your knowledge of what a thesis is and how it is written, adding in details about how this assignment has changed your thinking about theses and influenced your own plans or perceptions about writing your own thesis.
Scholarly Writing	Non-scholarly writing is submitted.  Your paper contains many spelling, grammar or structural errors.	Scholarly report. Mostly written using APA Style.  Your paper contains very few spelling, grammar or structural errors.	Clarity, simplicity, and appropriate academic English characterize the documentation. Scholarly writing that requires little to no editing and demonstrates adherence to APA standards.  Your paper is free of spelling, grammar and structural errors.

**Learning Task 3: Preliminary Research Proposal (35%)****Due:** Monday, December 5 by 5:00 p.m. Mountain time or earlier.

In this learning task, you articulate your current understanding of your role as an educational researcher by situating your emerging research ideas and questions within a methodological approach, such as action research.

In this assignment you will articulate your process of coming into your emerging research interests, purpose, questions and ethical considerations. You will be critically reflecting on the self as researcher within your overall research design. You are required to: (1) examine the sorts of research interests and questions that you currently have, (2) discuss the methodological considerations that accompany that/those interest(s), and (3) elaborate on the theoretical and ethical considerations that might arise in the pursuit of greater understanding of that research question and interest.

This learning task intended as a *preliminary exercise in conceptualizing and writing up a research proposal*. The proposal you write for this class need not necessarily be the one you submit to your supervisor later in your program. You may use your final learning task in this course as a point of departure later on, carrying forward the wisdom that it is normal for a preliminary proposal to further develop as you continue to broaden and deepen your knowledge of your chosen topic area. The objective of this learning task is to prepare you for that task (e.g. “a practice run”) and should in no way be considered the final version of the proposal you will eventually discuss and submit to your thesis supervisor.

- The following layout is **only a sample** guideline and may be used or adapted for your paper:
  - **Title Page** – include a descriptive title, avoid abbreviations, maximum 12 words (APA format).
  - **Introduction of the Topic** (~1 page) – Include a clear description of the topic, practical problem or issue based on your current research interests and research contexts.
  - **Theoretical Framework / Worldview** (~1-2 pages) Articulate the development of your identity as a researcher in relation to multiple perspectives on educational research, and clearly connect your interests, experiences, and expertise within a problem of practice, and within one or more research questions and ideas. Discussion could include your experiences in relation to an emerging theoretical framework/paradigm/worldview and how that informs your interest and identification of an emerging problem of practice. Consider, what brings you to this research?
  - **Literature Review** (~ 1-2 pages) – provide a literature-informed discussion about the problem identified in the introduction and the research questions and ideas of interest (aim, objectives, or intent). Specify how this work is new and original, who might benefit and any other considerations for the researcher in advancing this research agenda. Establish the argument by expressing your point of view and citing recent and relevant literature to articulate originality and importance of the study you are proposing in this paper. What emerging themes are you noticing, inclusive of

ethical considerations, in the literature you have read on your topic? What are your next steps in searching for further literature on your topic based your initial reading of a sample of literature? Begin thinking about how your research converges and diverges from the predominant literature on your topic.

- **Research Design: Research Question, Purpose and Methodology** (~ 3-4 pages) – Refine the purpose into emerging research questions (one or more) according to the methodology selected and to convey the emerging design for the inquiry. Share your process of coming into your research questions in relation to your selected methodological approach. Include your initial thoughts in the manner in which you are conceptualizing your inquiry: What is your purpose for the emerging inquiry? What brings you to your methodological approach? How does that approach inform your research questions? What are some ethical considerations? What is/are possible contexts for your inquiry?
- **Data Collection / Methods of Inquiry** (~ 2-3 pages) – Discuss how you plan to collect data or conduct your scholarly inquiry. Include commentary on how you might analyze and interpret multiple forms of information and data gathered throughout the inquiry.
- **Ethical Issues** (~ 1 page) – Discuss the ethical considerations and anticipated issues in the inquiry based on the setting and participants that may be chosen relative to your role, the purpose of the inquiry, and the methods selection.
- **Conclusion** (~ 1 page) – Provide a conclusion, summarizing your process for conceptualizing an emerging research study. Include some initial thoughts for carrying out a disciplined inquiry/ study into the problem of practice and employing proposed methodologies/ methods of inquiry, along with the anticipated benefits of this work. You might also include possible limitations of the proposed work.
- **References** – Provide a complete list of sources cited in your paper, in APA format.

The paper should be approximately 12-15 pages and will be graded using the criteria in the rubric. Scholarly writing following APA format is expected.

**Learning Task #3 Rubric**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Fails to Meet Requirements (C+ or lower)</b>	<b>Meets All Requirements (B- to B+)</b>	<b>Meets All and Exceeds Most Requirements (A- to A+)</b>
<p>Organization &amp; Structure</p>	<p>The title is vague or non-descriptive or not in APA format.</p> <p>No clear structure is discernible.</p> <p>Writing is not clearly organized.</p>	<p>A title page with a clear title, course name &amp; number, student name and date are included.</p> <p>An organized table of contents is provided.</p> <p>Clearly identifies the purpose of the paper early in the report and paper is organized with clear headings and subheadings.</p> <p>The conclusion points beyond the research report.</p>	<p>Includes APA style title page with title, course name &amp; number, student name and date. Title is an orienting device and provides a clear, powerful invitation describing research report, suggesting argument or implications; includes searchable keywords in title.</p> <p>The table of contents is clearly organized with explicit headings and subheadings for structure.</p> <p>The value of the paper is described early in the report with a clear “road map” provided for the reader. The body of the paper flows logically and includes sections with clear labels and transitions between sections. The conclusion points beyond the research report to the larger context, and identifies likely benefits and direction for future research.</p>

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Introduction</p>	<p>Introduction includes limited or superficial identification and description of practical problem or issue, context and importance of chosen topic.</p> <p>Introduction to rationale for research is missing or requires additional clarification.</p>	<p>The introduction provides an adequate identification and description of practical problem or issue.</p> <p>Adequate description of the context and importance of the chosen topic with some references to relevant literature.</p> <p>Adequate argument/ introduction to rationale for the research with some evidence of theoretical underpinnings and understanding of ethical issues.</p>	<p>Exceptional identification and description of the topic, practical problem or issue stimulating reader interest to which a broad audience can relate. The introduction draws the reader’s attention to a central concern, debate or contention.</p> <p>Clearly describes the context for the problem of practice and background. The introduction articulates originality and draws upon relevant literature or deficiencies in past literature to provide a backdrop and frame the problem.</p> <p>Provides a clear argument/ introduction to rationale for the research approach with evidence of theoretical underpinnings and demonstrates insight into the ethical issues to be addressed.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Research Statement/ Literature-informed Discussion</p>	<p>Literature-informed rationale for research is missing or requires additional clarification; limited or superficial identification and description of practical problem or issue, context and importance of chosen topic.</p> <p>Self is missing from the process of an emerging literature review.</p> <p>Emerging themes on topic are difficult to discern.</p>	<p>Adequate argument/ literature-informed rationale for the research with some evidence of theoretical underpinnings and understanding of ethical issues.</p> <p>Adequately situates self in the process of an emerging literature review.</p> <p>Adequately articulates emerging themes on topic.</p>	<p>Exceptional identification and description of the topic, practical problem or issue with evidence of theoretical underpinnings and understanding of ethical issues.</p> <p>Substantively situates self as researcher and point of view in the process of an emerging literature review.</p> <p>Clearly articulates emerging themes on topic.</p> <p>Addresses emerging thoughts on location of inquiry within the literature.</p>

Conceptualization of Inquiry/ Methodology	Emerging research questions do not align with methodological approach and/or are difficult to discern.  Process of coming into the inquiry is unclear.	Emerging research question(s) could work with methodological approach articulated.  Attempt to articulate the process of coming into the inquiry.	Emerging research question(s) are well suited and clearly align to methodological approach articulated.  Process of coming into the inquiry is clearly articulated and demonstrates significance.
Methods of Inquiry	The choice of design is not clearly presented. Additional methodological considerations need to be addressed.	Presents a design that attempts to be cohesive, grounded in the literature, personal experience and reflection, and the required readings from the course, but could be more clear.	Emerging design of research is well thought out and cohesive, grounded in the literature, personal experience and reflection, and the required readings from the course.
Ethical Issues	Additional theoretical and ethical considerations need to be addressed.	Theoretical and ethical considerations are examined critically with regards to the research proposed.	Theoretical and ethical considerations unique to the proposed study are examined critically.  Particular attention is given to ways that theoretical and ethical issues might be mediated and provides necessary steps to address anticipated issues.
References	Contains few or incomplete references. Pays little attention to APA standards.	Contains cited references with few APA errors.	Contains a complete list of references, accurately cited using APA format.
Writing	Non-scholarly writing is submitted.	Scholarly report. Mostly written using APA Style.	Scholarly writing that requires little to no editing and demonstrates adherence to APA standards.
Incorporates Peer Feedback	Limited use of peer feedback to strengthen and improve one's own work	Clearly demonstrate how peer review was used to strengthen and improve one's own research processes and strategies, and the quality of written work	

### Appendix: Additional Suggested Readings

Learning about research is ongoing element of a scholar's development. You may want to consult these sources in addition to our required course readings:

- Argyris, M., & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bastardi, A. & Shafir, E. (1998). On the pursuit and misuse of useless information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(1), 19-32.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.152.9570&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Bell, J. (1993). *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Brown, B., Dressler, R., Eaton, S. E., & Jacobsen, D. M. (2015). Practicing what we teach: Using action research to learn about teaching action research. *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 16(3), 60-77.
- Byrne, B. (2004). Qualitative interviewing. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching Society and Culture* (2nd ed., pp. 179-192). London: Sage Publications.
- Campitelli, G. & Labollita, M. (2011). Correlation of cognitive reflection with judgment and choices. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5(3), 182-191.
- Coleman, M. E., & Briggs, A. R. J. E. (2002). *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management. Educational Management Research and Practice* (pp. 312). London: Paul Chapman Publishing, A SAGE Publications Company.
- Dai, D. Y. (Ed.). (2011). *Design research on learning and thinking in educational settings: Enhancing intellectual growth and functioning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Los Angeles CA: Sage.
- Epley, N., Keysar, B., Van Boven, L., Gilovitch, T. (2004). Perspective taking as egocentric anchoring and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(3), 327-339.
- European Commission. (n.d.). Cause-and-effect analysis. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/methods/mth\\_att\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/methods/mth_att_en.htm)
- Ferguson, P. B. *Action research for professional development: Concise advice for new action researchers*. Retrieved from [http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/pdf/booklets/24\\_AR.pdf](http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/pdf/booklets/24_AR.pdf)
- Gilbert, D. & Osborne, R. E. (1989). Thinking backward: Some curable and incurable consequences of cognitive busyness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 940-949.
- Griffin, D., & Tversky, A. (1992). The weighing of evidence and the determinants of confidence. *Cognitive Psychology*, 24, 411-435.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In Y. S. Lincoln & N. K. Denzin (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing case study research: a practical guide for beginning researchers*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Harland, T. (2014). Learning about case study methodology to research higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(6), 1113-1122. doi:10.1080/07294360.2014.911253
- Huck, S.W. (2011). *Reading statistics and research* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kinash, S. (n.d.). Paradigms, methodology and methods. Retrieved from [http://ecms-ext.bond.edu.au/prod\\_ext/groups/public/@pub-tls-gen/documents/genericwebdocument/bd3\\_012336.pdf](http://ecms-ext.bond.edu.au/prod_ext/groups/public/@pub-tls-gen/documents/genericwebdocument/bd3_012336.pdf)
- Konnikova, M. (2013). *Mastermind: How to Think Like Sherlock Holmes*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Li, P. (n.d.). A guide to research tools: Case study (.pdf). Retrieved from <http://web.viu.ca/rtri/Case%20Study.pdf>
- Lieberman, M. D., Gaunt, R., Gilbert, D. T., & Trope, Y. (2002). Reflection and reflexion: A social cognitive neuroscience approach to attributional inference. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 34,199-249.
- MacDonald, C. (2012). Understanding participatory action research: A qualitative research methodology option. *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 13(2), 34-50.
- Mackenzie, N., & Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16. Retrieved from <http://www.iier.org.au/iier16/mackenzie.html>
- Mayne, J. (2008). Contribution analysis: An approach to exploring cause and effect. [http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC\\_Brief16\\_Contribution\\_Analysis.pdf](http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/files/publications/briefs/ILAC_Brief16_Contribution_Analysis.pdf)
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- McNiff, J. (2010). *Action research for professional development: concise advice for new action researchers*. Poole: September Books.
- McNiff, J. (2013). *Action research: principles and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Most, S.B., Scholl, B.J., Clifford, E.R., & Simons, D.J. (2005). What you see is what you set: Sustained inattention blindness and the capture of awareness. *Psychological Review*, 112(1), 217-242.
- Parsons, J., Hewson, K., Adrian, L., & Day, N. (2013). *Engaging in action research: A practical guide to teacher-conducted research for educators and school leaders*. Edmonton: Brush Education.
- Seale, C. (Ed.). (2012). *Researching society and culture* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Higher Education Series.
- Seale, C. (1998). Qualitative interviewing. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching society and culture* (pp. 202-216). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Silverman, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.
- Slavin, R.E. (2007). *Educational research in an age of accountability*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Smith, J. P., diSessa, A. A. & Roschelle, J. (1993). Misconceptions reconceived: A constructivist analysis of knowledge in transition. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 3(2), 115-163.
- Stoecker, R. (2005). *Research methods for community change: a project-based approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Suter, W.N. (2006). *Introduction to Educational Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Topolinski, S., & Reber, R. (2010). Gaining insight into the “aha” experience. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(6), 402-405.

- Wilson, T. D. & Brekke, N. (1994). Mental contamination and mental correction: Unwanted influences on judgments and evaluations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(1), 117- 142.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Macmillan.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Unstructured interviews. In B. M. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science* (pp. 308-319). Libraries Unlimited: University of Texas.

### Graduate Programs in Education: Grading Scale

Distribution of Grades*			
Grade	GP Value	Percent	Graduate Description
A+	4.0	95 - 100	<b>Outstanding</b>
A	4.0	90 - 94	<b>Excellent - superior performance showing comprehensive understanding of the subject matter</b>
A-	3.7	85 - 89	<b>Very good performance</b>
B+	3.3	80 - 84	<b>Good performance</b>
B	3.0	75 - 79	<b>Satisfactory performance.</b> <i>Note: The grade point value (3.0) associated with this grade is the minimum acceptable average that a graduate student must maintain throughout the program as computed at the end of each year of the program.</i>
B-	2.7	70 - 74	<b>Minimum pass for students in the Faculty of Graduate Studies</b>
C+	2.3	65 - 69	All grades below B- are indicative of failure at the graduate level and cannot be counted toward Faculty of Graduate Studies course requirements.
C	2.0	60 - 64	
C-	1.7	55 - 59	
D+	1.3	50 - 54	
D	1.0	45 - 49	
F	0.0	< 45	

\*Based upon Faculty of Graduate Studies 2016/2017 Calendar, "Distribution of Grades"

It is at the instructor's discretion to round off either upward or downward to determine a final grade when the average of term work and final examinations is between two letter grades.

-----  
**Werklund School of Education Appeals Policy and Process**

- <http://werklund.ucalgary.ca/gpe/werklund-school-education-appeals-policy-amp-process>

**Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRIs)**

Students are strongly encouraged to complete course evaluations for each course taken in their program. Student feedback on their experience in a course is taken very seriously by the Werklund School of Education in timetabling and staffing courses. Student feedback via the Course Evaluation is used to monitor the quality of teaching, the quality of students' learning experiences and the quality of course design in Graduate Programs in Education.

Students are advised to become familiar with the Faculty of Graduate Studies policies and the University of Calgary support services in these areas: intellectual property, academic integrity, plagiarism, research ethics, effective writing, and English language proficiency. Information about these topics is available through the following web addresses:

- **Plagiarism + academic misconduct:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/grad/current/gs-o.html>

- **Intellectual Honesty:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/grad/current/gs-m.html>
- **Integrity:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/grad/current/gs-r.html>
- **Research Ethics:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/research/researchers/ethics-compliance>
- **My Grad Skills:** <http://grad.ucalgary.ca/mygradskills>
- **Intellectual Property:** <http://grad.ucalgary.ca/current/managing-my-program/academic-integrity/intellectual-property>
- **Student Success:** <http://www.ucalgary.ca/ssc/>

### **Graduate Studies Calendar, Excerpts on Plagiarism:**

#### O.1.a) Definitions

1. Plagiarism - Plagiarism involves submitting or presenting work as if it were the student's own work when it is not. Any ideas or materials taken from another source written, electronic, or oral must be fully and formally acknowledged.

(b) Parts of the work are taken from another source without reference to the original author.

(c) The whole work (e.g., an essay) is copied from another source, and/or,

(d) A student submits or presents work in one course which has also been submitted in another course (although it may be completely original with that student) without the knowledge of or prior agreement of the instructor involved.

#### O.1.b) Penalties, can include and are not limited to:

1. Failing Grade - A student may be given a failing grade in either an exercise or course in which that student is found guilty of plagiarism, cheating or other academic misconduct. A student may not avoid a failing grade by withdrawing from the course.

2. Disciplinary probation.

3. Suspension.

4. Expulsion.

**Copyright:** All material used in the course is for the sole use of the individual and should not be recopied in either print or digital format. For copyright guidelines, including those relating to photocopying and electronic copies, please refer to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) fair dealing guidelines: <http://library.ucalgary.ca/copyright>

**Academic Accommodations** – It is the students' responsibility to request academic accommodations. If you are a student with a documented disability who may require academic accommodations and have not registered with Student Accessibility Services, please contact them at 403-220-6019. Students who have not registered with Student Accessibility Services are not eligible for formal academic accommodations. More information about academic accommodations can be found at [www.ucalgary.ca/access](http://www.ucalgary.ca/access) .

### **Accommodations on Protected Grounds other than Disability**

Students who require an accommodation in relation to their coursework or to fulfill requirements for a graduate degree, based on a protected ground other than disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to their Instructor or the appropriate Associate Dean, Department Head or the department/faculty designated contact person. Students who require an accommodation unrelated to their coursework or the requirements for a graduate degree, based on a protected ground other than disability, should communicate this need, preferably in writing, to the Vice-Provost (Student

Experience). For additional information on support services and accommodations for students with disabilities, visit [www.ucalgary.ca/access/](http://www.ucalgary.ca/access/).

**Campus Security** provides a range of services intended to promote and facilitate a safe and secure learning and living environment, e.g. the SafeWalk program for students attending classes on campus. For more information please visit <http://www.ucalgary.ca/security/> or telephone 403-220-5333.

The **Freedom of Information Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPP)** prevents instructors from placing assignments or examinations in a public place for pickup and prevents students from access to exams or assignments other than their own. Therefore, students and instructors may use one of the following options: return/collect assignments during class time or during instructors' office hours, students provide instructors with a self-addressed stamped envelope, or submit assignments, or submit/return assignments as electronic files attached to private e-mail message.

**Emergency Evacuation Assembly Points** - For both the Education Tower and Education Block, use the Scurfield Hall Atrium (Primary) or Professional Faculties Foodcourt. See: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/emergencyplan/assemblypoints>