

EURR 5200/ 5300 – Interdisciplinary Seminar (Winter 2013)
Tuesdays, 2:30-5:30, Tory 230

Instructors:

Dr. Joan DeBardeleben

Office: 3307 River building
Office Hours: Thursday 10-11, 3-5
Telephone: (613) 520 –2886
E-mail: joan_debardeleben@carleton.ca

Dr. Piotr Dutkiewicz

Office: Loeb Bld. C-679
Office Hours: Thursday 10.00 -11.20
Telephone: (613) 520 5628
E-mail: piotr_dutkiewicz@carleton.ca

Dr. Crina Viju

Office: 3312 River building
Office Hours: Tuesday 10 AM -1PM
Telephone: (613) 520-8440
E-mail: crina_viju@carleton.ca

This course represents a follow-up to EURR 5001, which is normally a prerequisite for this course. EURR 5200/5300 has two components: Several sessions will be devoted to questions of research design and research methods. Each student will do an oral presentation for one of these sessions. The other sessions will be devoted to discussion of student research proposals.

All students must complete the following requirements:

1. **Seminar Participation:** All students must complete all course readings, attend class sessions, and are expected to participate in class discussions. Expectations for participation in particular class sessions may be provided. Disruptions to class (e.g., ringing cell phones, late arrivals) will result in a reduction of the grade.
2. **Quiz** on research methodology materials (February 5).
3. **Research Materials Assignment:** Each student is to prepare a guide to specified research materials (3 pages) by **February 26 (2:30 p.m.)**. More detailed instructions on this assignment are given below.
4. **Commentary on other Students' Research Proposals:** Each student is expected to provide at least one written suggestion, question, or constructive criticism on each of the other students' research proposals (see point 5 below). The comment should be about one page in length. It must be handed in at the beginning of the class session, but its core points should also be brought up in the discussion. If the student proposal requiring comment is handed in more than 24 hours late, no written commentary is required.

- 5. Presentation of Research Proposal:** Each student is to prepare a draft research proposal for his or her MA research essay or thesis (8 pages) and present it in class. He or she will present the proposal during a seminar session. Two presentations will be scheduled for each session, and these will be the sole order of business. By the *Friday* (by 5 p.m.) before the presentation the student will provide a copy of the draft proposal to each member of the class through e-mail (via WebCT). This synopsis should include a bibliography of key items (at least 6-8 important sources). Each student must also designate one article-length reading (no more than 35 pages) for other students to read in preparation for the session. The reading should be provided 2 weeks before the class session at which the proposal is presented either by providing the course instructors with information about on-line accessing or a full bibliographic citation. At the session, the student will make a presentation of 15 minutes **MAXIMUM** on the proposal. This should **NOT** repeat the content of the written proposal, but rather supplement it with additional comments or, ideally, clarification of issues that the presenter would like discussed in the session. The bulk of the session will be an in-depth discussion of the proposal. If possible, students should have their research supervisor (if they have one) to attend the class.
- 6. Final Version of Research Proposal:** Taking into account the class discussion and feedback from instructors, each student will complete a second version of the research proposal (10 pages plus bibliography) by **April 5**. This proposal will be commented on by one of the instructors **by April 13**; on the basis of these comments, the student will prepare a third, final version **by April 20**. This proposal should, if possible, be accompanied by an approval form from the student's supervisor. Completion of this assignment is required to pass the course. The mark for this component will be based on the final product handed in on the final deadline, assuming all stages of the process have been followed as required. If any preliminary drafts of the proposal are not handed in, the mark on the final proposal will be reduced by 5 points (of 100) for each draft missed. If drafts or other assignments are handed in late, 2 points (of 100) will be deducted for each day late. No final proposals will be accepted after **April 24** as a condition for completion of the course without a valid medical or equivalent excuse.

Evaluation:

Seminar participation	20%
Research materials assignment	10%
Quiz on research methods	10%
Commentary on other students' research proposals	10%
Presentation of research proposal	10%
Final version of research proposal	40%

Hard copies and electronic copies must be submitted for all materials to be evaluated.

Due Dates and Penalties

Seminar participation will be graded on the basis of attendance and the quality of regular contributions to the class discussion; familiarity with required course readings will be

considered an important criterion of evaluation. Each student will be evaluated according to these criteria during each seminar session.

Please note the following important rules associated with this course:

- No final proposals will be accepted after **April 24** as a condition for completion of the course without a valid medical or equivalent excuse.
- A student will not receive a passing grade in the course if the final research proposal is not handed.
- Penalties for other late assignments will be as follows (waived with a valid medical or equivalent excuse):
- Research materials assignment: Two points (of a % scale) for each day late (including weekends). No papers accepted after **March 5**.
- Students absent on a date of an oral presentation will receive a “0” for the oral component unless a valid medical (or equivalent) excuse is provided. Students who are not able to be present for the presentation must inform the instructor as far as possible in advance of the class.

COURSE OUTLINE

Note: All required readings are available either online through the Carleton catalogue (ON) or on library reserve (R). All readings listed under Required Readings should be done in their entirety. These readings should be given priority. Students are also asked to review at least one of the selections for each week under the heading “Texts for research presentation.”

Please note that some reading assignments may be adjusted. Such changes will be announced through WebCT. Please check WebCT regularly.

January 8 (DeBardleben, Viju)

Week 1 – Introduction to the course: Selecting a topic and designing a research proposal

Please read the Institute’s ‘Regulations for Research Essay/Thesis and Language Requirements’ as well as the ‘Graduate Student Application for Ethics Approval’ before this session. Come prepared with any questions you may have.

January 15 (Sahadeo)

Week 2 – Research approaches: History and the humanities

- Jeff Sahadeo, SSHRC grant proposal (and reviews)
- SSRC: On the Art of Writing Proposals
- Keith Jenkins, *Re-thinking History* (London: Routledge, 2003), 6-32
- Valerie Raleigh Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Guide for the Humanities and the Social Sciences*, 2nd. edition (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press), 1-23.
- Sheila Fitzpatrick and Lynne Viola, eds. *A Researcher's Guide to Sources on Soviet Social History in the 1930s* (1990), 3-32 (can be skimmed), 233-54.
- James Clifford, “Spatial Practices: Fieldwork, Travel and the Disciplining of Anthropology” in *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 52-91.

January 22 (DeBardeleben)

Week 3 – Choosing a research design

Required reading:

- Gary King, Robert O. Keohane & Sidney Verba (1994), *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton UP), 3-28 (ON R)
- Ted Palys, *Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives* (2009), pp. 31.-54 (R)

Example articles for discussion

- Kenneth Wilson, “How Russians View Electoral Fairness: A Qualitative Analysis”. *Europe-Asia Studies*. Jan2012, Vol. 64 Issue 1, p145-168. .
- McAllister, Ian; White, Stephen, “Public Perceptions of Electoral Fairness in Russia”. *Europe-Asia Studies*. Jun2011, Vol. 63 Issue 4, p663-683.

January 29 (DeBardeleben)

Week 4 – Part I Comparative approaches: why compare, what to compare and when not to compare (DeBardeleben)

Required reading:

- Todd Landman (2008), *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*, 3rd edition (London: Routledge), 4-11, 23-49, 68-78, 86-94 (R)
- Ted Palys, *Research Decisions*, pp. 54-65 (R)

Example articles for discussion

- Christian Joppke, “Transformation of immigrant integration: civic integration and antidiscrimination in The Netherlands, France, and Germany,” *World Politics* 59, no.2 (2007), pg:243 -73 (ON)
- Terri Givens and Adam Luedtke, “European Immigration Policies in Comparative Perspective: Issue Salience, Partisanship and Immigrant Rights,” *Comparative European Politics*, vol, 3, no. 1 (April 2005), pp. 23-49.
- Peter Scholten and Arco Timmermans, “Setting the Immigrant Policy Agenda: Expertise and Politics in the Netherlands, France and the United Kingdom,” *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* (November 2010), 12 (5), pg. 527-544

Part II – Research techniques: In-depth interviews, research ethics

Optional reading:

- Jeffrey M. Berry (2002), ‘Validity and Reliability Issues in Elite Interviewing’, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35(4), 679-682 (ON)
- Beth L. Leech (2002), “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35(4), 665-668 (ON)
- Jarol B. Manheim, Richard C. Rich, Lars Willnat & Craig L. Brians (2006), *Empirical Political Analysis: Research methods in political science*, 6th edition (New York: Pearson Longman),; elite interviewing, pp. 355-64; content analysis, pp. 169-181 (R and Library Data Centre)

February 5 (Viju)

Week 5 – Policy Research (Viju)

A quiz on research methodology (from the material covered in the first 5 weeks) will be held at the end of this session.

Required reading:

- Dunn, W.N. (2008). *Public Policy Analysis. An Introduction*. (4th edition), Chpt. 1, pp. 1-23 (R).
- Guess, G.M. and Farnham, P.G. (2011). *Cases in Public Policy Analysis*. (3rd edition), Chpt. 6 (pp. 275-302), Chpt. 7 (pp. 315-333) (R)

Example article for discussion

- Ryan, L., Convery, F. and Ferreira, S. (2006). “Stimulating the use of biofuels in the European Union: Implications for climate change policy.” *Energy Policy* 34 pp. 3184-3194 (ON)
- Clinch, J.P. and Healy, J.D. (2001). “Cost-benefit analysis of domestic energy efficiency.” *Energy Policy* 29 pp. 113-124 (ON)
- Radaelli, C. M. (2000). “Policy transfer in a European Union: Institutional isomorphism as a source of legitimacy.” *Governance* 13(1) pp. 25-43 (ON)

February 12 (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)

Week 6 Discussion of four research proposals (group will be divided accordingly).

February 26 (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)

Week 7 – Discussion of four research proposals

***** Research Materials Assignment is due February 26. *****

March 5 (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)

Week 8 – Discussion of four research proposals

March 12 (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)

Week 9 – Discussion of four research proposals

March 19 (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)

Week 10 - Discussion of four research proposals

March 26 (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)

Week 11 - Discussion of four research proposals

April 2

Week 12 – Part I: Hypothesis testing (DeBardeleben)

- W. Lawrence Neuman (2011), *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (7th edition), Chpt 6, Chpt 7 (partial), pp. 163-217 (R)

Part II: The Life of a Research Project: Field Studies (Dutkiewicz) – slide

presentation and discussion – no readings required.

April 9 (Viju)

Week 13 - Using Quantitative Data

Required reading:

- Blaikie, Norman (2003). *Analyzing Quantitative Data. From Description to Explanation*. (SAGE Publication). Chapters 1, 3, 6 (R) (just skim Chapters 3 and 6)

Example articles for discussion

- Dickens, R. and Ellwood, D.T. (2003), “Child poverty in Britain and the United States.” *The Economic Journal* 113(June) pp. F219 – F239 (ON)
- Constant, A. and Zimmermann, K. F. (2005), “Immigrant performance and selective immigration policy: A European perspective.” *National Institute Economic Review* 194 pp. 94-106. <http://ner.sagepub.com/content/194/1/94.full.pdf+html>.



GUIDELINES FOR THE RESEARCH MATERIALS ASSIGNMENT

Each student should identify primary and original language research materials in a defined topic area. (Students who do not yet have adequate language proficiency may rely on translated sources for primary source materials. These materials should, however, emanate from the region of study in most cases, unless they involve statistical materials or data sets. If this applies to you, you must contact one of the instructors for permission). The materials should preferably be related to the projected topic of the student’s MA research project; if they relate to a different topic, this must be approved by one of the instructors in advance. The task is to identify various types of original source materials that may be helpful, including, but not limited to, original language materials. Types of materials may include:

Primary materials:

- a) Newspapers (when used as primary source material). Here you should identify particular newspapers that deal with your topic, with examples of 2-3 relevant articles for each newspaper you list. Please do not include more than three newspapers among your list of ten sources.
 - b) Legal documents
 - c) Proceedings of legislative bodies, assemblies, or other meetings
 - d) Data sets
 - e) Memoirs
 - f) Speeches
 - g) Archival materials
 - h) Statistical data
- These may include translated sources (please indicate where translations are available.)

Secondary materials in appropriate regional language:

- a) Journal articles or books in a regional language
- b) Internet sources for research reports

For the assignment, students are to identify and discuss at least ten sources. You need not read all of the sources in detail but should provide a description of the source and of the purpose for which the materials may be useful. Your report should be 4 pages in length (double-spaced); it should (a) give a short overview of each source, (b) discuss its general utility; (c) consider limitations of the resource, or biases; and (d) discuss whether the material is current or dated. Also discuss the availability of the materials, the search tools you used, and the methods of analysis that might be applied to them. Indicate whether you located references to other materials that would be useful but are not easily available here or through Interlibrary Loan.

.....

Academic Accommodation

You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term because of disability, pregnancy or religious obligations. Please review the course outline promptly and write to me with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist.

It takes time to review and consider each request individually, and to arrange for accommodations where appropriate. Please make sure you respect these timelines particularly for in-class tests, mid-terms and final exams, as well as any change in due dates for papers.

You can visit the Equity Services website to view the policies and to obtain more detailed information on academic accommodation at <http://carleton.ca/equity/accommodation>

Plagiarism

The University Senate defines plagiarism as “to use and pass off as one’s own idea or product the work of another without expressly giving credit to another”. (Calendar p. 48).

- Copying from another person’s work without indicating this through appropriate use of quotations marks and citations of footnotes.
- Lengthy and close paraphrasing of another person’s work (i.e. extensive copying interspersed with a few “different” phrases or sentences).
- Submitting written work produced by someone else as if it were one’s own work (e.g. another student’s term paper, a paper purchased from a commercial term paper “factory”, material downloaded via the Internet, etc.)

In an academic environment plagiarism is a serious offence, and it is not a matter that can be dealt with by an informal arrangement between the student and the instructor. In all cases where plagiarism is suspected, instructors are now required to notify their departmental Chair, and the Chair in turn is required to report the matter to the Associate Dean of the Faculty. The Associate Dean makes a formal investigation and then decides on an appropriate sanction. Penalties can range from a mark of zero for the plagiarized

work, to a final grade of F for the course, to suspension from all studies, to expulsion from the University. (Students should be aware that the Senate classifies as an instructional offence the submission of “substantially the same piece of work to two or more courses without the prior written permission of the instructors involved.”)

Requests for Academic Accommodations

For Students with Disabilities:

“Students with disabilities requiring academic accommodations in this course must register with the Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities for a formal evaluation of disability-related needs. Registered PMC students are required to contact the centre, 613-520-6608, every term to ensure that I receive your letter of accommodation, no later than two weeks before the first assignment is due or the first in-class test/midterm requiring accommodations.”

For Religious Obligations:

Students requesting academic accommodation on the basis of religious obligation should make a formal, written request to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such request should be made during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist, but not later than two weeks before the compulsory event. Accommodation is to be worked out directly and on an individual basis between the student and the instructor(s) involved. Instructors will make accommodations in a way that avoids academic disadvantage to the students.

Students or instructors who have questions or want to confirm accommodation eligibility of a religious event or practice may refer to the Equity Services website for a list of holy days and Carleton’s Academic Accommodations policies, or may contact an Equity Services Advisor in the Equity Services Department of assistance.

For Pregnancy:

Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a letter of accommodation. The student must then make an appointment to discuss her needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.