

**EURR 5010 (A and B)**  
**Research Design and Methodology in European, Russian and Eurasian Studies**  
**(Winter 2016)**  
**Mondays 2:35-5:25 PM**

**Instructors**

**Dr. Crina Viju**

E-mail: [crina.viju@carleton.ca](mailto:crina.viju@carleton.ca)  
Phone: 613 520-2600x8440  
Office: 3312 River Building  
Office Hours: Tue 12-2 PM

**Dr. Piotr Dutkiewicz**

[piotr\\_dutkiewicz@carleton.ca](mailto:piotr_dutkiewicz@carleton.ca)  
Phone: 613 520-2600x2856  
Office: Loeb C-679  
Office hours: Mon 1-2:30 PM

**Dr. Jeff Sahadeo**

E-mail: [jeff.sahadeo@carleton.ca](mailto:jeff.sahadeo@carleton.ca)  
Phone: 613-529-2600x2996  
Office: 3314 River Building  
Office Hours: Thurs 1-3 PM

**Dr. Achim Hurrelmann**

[achim.hurrelmann@carleton.ca](mailto:achim.hurrelmann@carleton.ca)  
Phone: 613 520-2600x2294  
Office: 3305 River Building  
Office Hours: Tue and Thu 1-2 PM

This course represents a follow-up to EURR 5001, which is normally a prerequisite for this course. EURR 5010 has two components: Several sessions will be devoted to questions of research design and research methods. The other sessions will be devoted to discussion of student research proposals. The class is split into two sections for some sessions, but unless indicated is held jointly for the A and B sections.

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 8**).
3. **Research Materials Assignment:** Each student is to prepare a guide to specified research materials (3 pages) to be handed in by **February 29 at the beginning of class (2:35 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 *Thursday* (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 CULearn). 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) 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 4 at the beginning of class**. This proposal will be commented on by one of the instructors **by April 11**; on the basis of these comments, the student will prepare a third, final version **by April 18 by 5 p.m.** to Professor Viju in hard copy and electronic copy. 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 25** as a condition for completion of the course without a valid medical or equivalent excuse.
7. **Attendance at three guest lectures/conferences or three reaction papers:** Students in the core seminar are expected to attend at least three guest lectures/conferences/workshops/roundtables relating to the program outside of class time. A list of events is available on the EURUS and CES websites ([www.carleton.ca/eurus](http://www.carleton.ca/eurus), [www.carleton.ca/ces](http://www.carleton.ca/ces)) Attendance should be verified by the event organizer. A list of events attended should be provided to the Prof. Viju no later than **April 18, 2016**. Students have the option of completing three short reaction papers, each one involving a summary and critical analysis of extra course readings, in lieu of attending these events, to be handed in no later **April 18, 2016**. Each paper should be three pages in length (double-spaced) and the readings should be from the optional readings list for different weeks in the term. The paper must meet a passing standard. The requirement is pass/fail, but must be satisfactorily fulfilled to pass the course.

## **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%
Attendance at 3 guest lectures/conferences or 3 reaction papers	Pass/Fail

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 25** 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 submitted.
- 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 7**.
- 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 Ares, CU Learn, the Carleton catalogue, or on library reserve. All readings listed under Required Readings should be done in their entirety. These readings should be given priority. Students are also asked to review selections for each week under the heading "Example articles for discussion", as instructed, where such a heading exists.

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

## **January 11, Week 1**

### **Part I: Introduction to the course: Selecting a topic and designing a research proposal (Dutkiewicz and Viju)**

#### Required Readings:

- The Institute's 'Regulations for Research Essay/Thesis and Language Requirements' Come prepared with any questions you may have (on CU Learn)
- Gary King, Robert O. Keohane & Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994), 3-28 (ON R)
- Ted Palys and Chris Atchison, *Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives* (Toronto : Thomson Nelson, 2008), pp. 31-54 (R)

## **January 18, Week 2 (Hurrelmann)**

### **Social Science Approaches: Choosing a research design; comparative research designs**

#### Required readings:

- Craig Leonard Brians, Lars Willnat, Jarol B. Manheim and Richard C. Rich, *Empirical Political Analysis: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition (Boston: Longman, 2011), pp. 75-87. (R)
- Todd Landman, *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 22-49, 67-78, 85-94 (R)

#### Background reading (optional; useful reference when constructing your proposal):

- Ted Palys and Chris Atchison, *Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives* (Toronto: Thomson Nelson, 2008). (R)

Example articles for discussion (required): Read both of the following articles and be prepared to make a short summary of one, focusing on research design, why a comparative approach was selected or not, how cases were selected for analysis, advantages and disadvantages of using a comparative or single-case approach, and methods of study.

- Valerie Bunce and Sharon L. Wolchik, "Defeating Dictators: Electoral Change and Stability in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes", *World Politics* 62, no. 1 (2010), 43-86. (comparative study)
- Miroslav Beblavý and Emília Sičáková-Beblavá, "The Changing Faces of Europeanisation: How Did the European Union Influence Corruption in Slovakia Before and After Accession?", *Europe-Asia Studies* 66, no. 4 (2014), 336-556. (single case study)

## **January 25, Week 3 (Viju)**

### **Policy Research**

#### Required readings:

- Dunn, W.N. (2008). *Public Policy Analysis. An Introduction*. (4<sup>th</sup> edition), Chapters

1 and 5 (R).

Example articles for discussion (required): Read both of the following articles and focus on identifying the policy analysis steps and the costs and benefits of both policy issues. How are they valued? Can you identify any problems regarding the valuation methods?

- 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)

### **February 1, Week 4 (Sahadeo)**

#### **Cultural and Historical Approaches**

##### Required Readings:

- Keith Jenkins, *Re-thinking History* (London: Routledge, 2003), 6-32
- Jeff Sahadeo, “‘Without the Past There Is No Future:’ Archives, History and Authority in Uzbekistan” *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History* ed. Antoinette Burton. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 45-67.
- John van Maalen” *Tales from the Field: On Writing Ethnography* 2<sup>nd</sup>. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 1-7
- Valerie Raleigh Yow, *Recording Oral History: A Guide for the Humanities and the Social Sciences*, 2<sup>nd</sup>. edition (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press), 1-23.

Example articles for discussion (required readings): Read both of the following articles focusing on their research design and method. What are the authors’ research questions? Why do you think the authors might have chosen to employ cultural approaches to answer their research questions? What types of sources do they use? What methods do they employ to evaluate their sources? How suitable or effective is each author’s method for addressing his or her research question? How sound are each author’s conclusions? You might also wish to reflect on the presentation of the research (how the author situates his or her work in the academic literature, how evidence is presented, style, different disciplinary conventions in writing, etc.).

- Clifford Geertz, “Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight” *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: BasicBooks, 1973), 412-453 (condensed version will be posted on CU Learn)
- Madeleine Reeves, “Travels in the Margins of the State: Everyday Geography in the Ferghana Valley Borderlands” *Everyday Life in Central Asia: Past and Present* ed. Jeff Sahadeo and Russell Zanca (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 279-293
- Joan Neuberger, “Culture Besieged: Hooliganism and Futurism” In *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia* ed. Stephen Frank and Mark Steinberg, (1994), 185-204

Recommended:

- Review Clifford Geertz (1973), ‘Thick Description: Toward and Interpretative Theory of Culture,’ *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: BasicBooks), 1-30 (assigned for Cultural Studies Session in EURR 5001) and read “Deep Paly: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight” *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: BasicBooks),

**February 8, Week 5**

**Part I – Quiz**

**Part II – Field work: an example (Dutkiewicz)**

- THE HOLY GRAIL: IN PURSUIT OF THE DISSERTATION PROPOSAL  
(Michael Watts Institute of International Studies University of California, Berkeley)

**February 22, Week 6**

**Discussion of four research proposals (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)**

**February 29, Week 7**

**Discussion of four research proposals (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)**

**\*\*\* *Research Materials Assignment is due February 29 at the beginning of class.* \*\*\***

**March 7, Week 8 (Crina not available)**

**Discussion of four research proposals (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)**

**March 14, Week 9 (Jeff not available)**

**Discussion of four research proposals (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)**

**March 21, Week 10**

**Discussion of three research proposals (split group, instructors and schedule TBA)**

**March 28, Week 11 (Hurrelmann)**

**Research techniques: In-depth interviews, content analysis, research ethics**

Required Readings:

- Craig Leonard Brians, Lars Willnat, Jarol B. Manheim and Richard C. Rich, *Empirical Political Analysis: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition (Boston: Longman, 2011), pp. 194-208, 365-376, 408-410. (R)
- Students planning research involving human subjects are asked to take a look at the Carleton Research Ethic Board’s instructions for your ethics clearance application: <http://carleton.ca/curo/wp-content/uploads/Carleton-University-%E2%88%92-Research-Ethics-Form-Instructions.htm#1D>

Recommended:

- Jeffrey M. Berry, “Validity and Reliability Issues in Elite Interviewing”, *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35, vol. 4 (2002), 679-682. (ON)
- Beth L. Leech, “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews”, *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35, vol. 4 (2002), 665-668. (ON)

Example articles for discussion (required): Read one of the following, depending on which research methodology interests you:

- Nathaniel Coprey and Karolina Pomorska, “The Influence of the New Member States in the EU: The Case of Poland and the Eastern Partnership Policy,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 66, no. 3 (2014), pp. 422-443 (interviews) OR
- Achim Hurrelmann, Anna Gora and Andrea Wagner (2014), “The Legitimation of the European Union in the News Media: Three Treaty Reform Debates”, *Journal of European Public Policy* 20, no. 4 (2013), 515-534 (quantitative content analysis)
- Petr Kratochvíl and Lukáš Tichý, “EU and Russian Discourse on Energy Relations”, *Energy Policy* 56 (2013) 391–406 (qualitative content analysis)

#### **April 4, Week 12**

##### **Part I - Using Quantitative Data (Viju)**

###### 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 (both required)

- 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>

##### **Part 2 - Hypothesis construction and testing (Dutkiewicz and Viju)**

- Todd Landman (2008), *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*, 3rd edition (London: Routledge), 4-11
- W. Lawrence Neuman (2011), *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches (7<sup>th</sup> edition)*, Chpt 6 (pp. 178-193)

---

#### **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 Accommodations:**

The Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (PMC) provides services to students with Learning Disabilities (LD), psychiatric/mental health disabilities, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), chronic medical conditions, and impairments in mobility, hearing, and vision. If you have a disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact PMC at 613-520-6608 or [pmc@carleton.ca](mailto:pmc@carleton.ca) for a formal evaluation. If you are already registered with the PMC, contact your PMC coordinator to send me your ***Letter of Accommodation*** at the beginning of the term, and no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (*if applicable*). After requesting accommodation from PMC, meet with me to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Please consult the PMC website for the deadline to request accommodations for the formally-scheduled exam (*if applicable*).

**Religious Observance:** Students requesting accommodation for religious observances should apply in writing to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such requests 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 no later than two weeks before the compulsory academic 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 student. Instructors and students may contact an Equity Services Advisor for assistance ([www.carleton.ca/equity](http://www.carleton.ca/equity)).

**Pregnancy:** Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a *letter of accommodation*. Then, make an appointment to discuss your needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.

### **Plagiarism:**

The University Senate defines plagiarism as “presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own”. This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another’s data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another’s works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
- handing in substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course’s instructor. The Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They may include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of F for the course.

Student or professor materials created for this course (including presentations and posted notes, labs, case studies, assignments and exams) remain the intellectual property of the author(s). They are intended for personal use and may not be reproduced or redistributed without prior written consent of the author(s).

### **Submission, Return and Grading of Term Work:**

Written assignments must be submitted directly to the instructor(s) according to the instructions in the course outline. Late assignments may be submitted to the drop box in the corridor outside room 3305 River Building. Assignments will be retrieved every business day at **4 p.m.**, stamped with that day's date, and then distributed to the instructors. For written assignments not returned in class please attach a stamped, self-addressed envelope if you wish to have your assignment returned by mail. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

Final standing in courses will be shown by alphabetical grades. The system of grades used, with corresponding grade points is:

Percentage	Letter grade	12-point scale	Percentage	Letter grade	12-point scale
90-100	A+	12	67-69	C+	6
85-89	A	11	63-66	C	5
80-84	A-	10	60-62	C-	4
77-79	B+	9	57-59	D+	3
73-76	B	8	53-56	D	2
70-72	B-	7	50-52	D-	1

Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by an instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.

**Carleton E-mail Accounts:** All email communication to students from the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies will be via official Carleton university e-mail accounts and/or cuLearn. As important course and university information is distributed this way, it is the student's responsibility to monitor their Carleton and cuLearn accounts.

**Official Course Outline:** The course outline posted to EURUS website is the official course outline.