

## Mixed Methods Research (RMTD 440)

**Dr. Leanne Kallemeyn**

[lkallemeyn@luc.edu](mailto:lkallemeyn@luc.edu)

(best means to contact)

Ph: 312-915-6909

Lewis Tower #1122

820 N. Michigan Ave.

Office hours by appt.

### Course Overview

#### Course Description

This *advanced* course will address the theory and practice of mixing inquiry methodologies in social inquiry. The course will cover selected roots of the contemporary interest in mixing methods, various conceptualizations of mixed methods design and analysis, and challenges of mixed methods practice. The course emphasis on practice will feature critiques of empirical mixed method studies from various disciplines and domains of study.

Students enrolling in this course should have basic familiarity with the conceptual logic and core constructs of econometric, experimental, or survey (post-positivist, quantitative) social science (i.e., RMTD 421) *and* of case study, interview, or ethnographic (constructivist or interpretivist, qualitative) social science (i.e., RMTD 420).

Course objectives for students include the following:

1. Students will develop an historical and contextual understanding of the roots of the contemporary interest in mixing methods. History matters.
2. Students will develop an understanding of various conceptual or theoretical frameworks for mixing methods, and the key differences among them.
3. Students will develop basic competencies in mixed methods practice.
4. Students will generate a unique contribution – theoretical, practical or both – to the mixed methods conversation and literature.

The IDEA course objectives essential for this course include:

- Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving and decisions)
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view as needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course

Other objectives important to this course include:

- Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
- Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view

#### Required Text

Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed Methods in Social Inquiry* (Vol. 9). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons. ISBN-13: 978-0787983826

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. ISBN-13: 978-1483359045

**Grading**

<u>Scale</u>		<u>Assignments</u>	<u>Points</u>
93-100	A	Group Presentation & Discussion	20
90-92	A-	Project idea	N/A
86-89	B+	Revised project idea	N/A
83-85	B	Draft of Design/Outline of Paper	N/A
80-82	B-	Final Project	60
Below 80	C	Class participation	20

Class participation is based on attendance, contributions to group discussion and small group activities (including Blog and Forum posts in Week 4), timeliness of assignments, and presentation of your final project. For contributions to group discussion, be sure to do all the readings in advance of each class and come to class prepared for the discussion. Bring at least one question or comment that emerges from the readings with you to each class. Be prepared to share this question or comment with the class, along with the reading passages that generated it.

Late assignments: I strongly discourage turning in assignments after the due date. The nature of the course is that the assignments build on one another. As a result, turning in one late assignment affects the appropriate completion of subsequent assignments. I will accept late assignments and do not reduce points for late assignments, but I will also provide less feedback and will not as rapidly return your graded assignment to you. If you know in advance that you will be gone when an assignment is due, please plan ahead and submit it early. If you have an unexpected personal circumstance, please talk to me about your concerns with completing course obligations.

### **Weekly Schedule with Course Readings & Assignments**

#### **Week 1 (Aug. 27): Introduction to Course**

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2010). Overview of contemporary issues in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods research, second edition* (pp.1-41). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

#### **Week 2 (Sept. 3): Defining Mixed Methods Social Inquiry**

Greene, Ch. 1 & 2  
Creswell, Ch. 1 & 6

#### **Week 3 (Sept. 10): Roots of Contemporary Conversation in Mixed Methods**

Greene, Ch. 3

[Maxwell, J. \(2015\). Expanding the history and range of mixed methods research. \*Journal of Mixed Methods\*. doi: 10.1177/1558689815571132](#)

*\*On triangulation ...*

[Mathison, S. \(1988\). Why triangulate? \*Educational Researcher\*, 17\(2\), 13-17.](#)

*\*From positivist, quantitative traditions ...*

Reichardt, C.S., & Cook, T.D. (1979). Beyond qualitative versus quantitative methods. In T.D. Cook & C.S. Reichardt (eds.), *Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research* (pp. 7-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*\*From interpretivist, qualitative traditions ...*

[Smith, J.K., & Heshusius, L. \(1986\). Closing down the conversation: The end of the quantitative-qualitative debate among educational inquirers. \*Educational Researcher\*, 15\(1\), 4-12.](#)

*\*In evaluation theory and practice ...*

[Greene, J.C., Caracelli, V.J., & Graham, W.F. \(1989\). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. \*Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis\*, 11, 255-274.](#)

*Project Idea DUE*

#### **Week 4 (Sept. 17): Book Club (ONLINE)**

Suárez-Orozco, C., Suárez-Orozco, M. M., & Todorova, I. (2009). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society*. Harvard University Press. Introduction, Ch. 1, Ch. 5, and Ch. 7

Kling, J.R., Liebman, J.B., & Katz, L.F. (2005). Bullets don't got no name: Consequences of fear in the ghetto. In T.S. Weisner (ed.), *Discovering successful pathways in children's development* (pp. 243-282). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gibson-Davis, C., & Duncan, G.J. (2005). Qualitative/quantitative synergies in a random assignment program evaluation. In T.S. Weisner (ed.), *Discovering successful pathways in children's development* (pp. 283-304). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Skinner, D., Matthews, S., & Burton, L. (2005). Combining ethnography and GIS technology to examine constructions of developmental opportunities in contexts of poverty and disability. In T.S. Weisner (ed.), *Discovering successful pathways in children's development* (pp. 223-242). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

#### **Week 5 (Sept. 24): Current Frameworks in Mixed Methods**

Greene, Ch. 4 & 5

[Johnson, R.B., & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. \(2004\). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. \*Educational Researcher\*, 33\(7\), 14-26.](#)

[Shannon-Baker, P. \(2015\). Making paradigms meaningful in mixed methods research. \*Journal of Mixed Methods Research\*, doi: 10.1177/1558689815575861](#)

Greene, J., and Hall, J. (2010). Dialectics and pragmatism: Being of consequence. In A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp.119 -144). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mertens, D.M., Bledsoe, K.L., Sullivan, M. & Wilson, A.. (2010). Utilization of mixed methods for transformative purposes. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., pp. 193-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

#### **Week 6 (Oct. 1): Purposes of Mixed Methods Research\***

Greene, Ch. 6

*Re-read* Greene, Caracelli, & Graham (1989) from Week 3

[Collins, K., Onwuegbuzie, A., and Sutton, I. \(2006\). A model incorporating the rationale and purpose for conducting mixed methods research in special education and beyond. \*Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal\*, 4\(1\), 67-100.](#)

[Lee, Y-J., & Greene, J.C. \(2007\). The predictive validity of an ESL placement test: A mixed methods approach. \*Journal of Mixed Methods Research\*, 1\(4\), 366-389. doi:10.1177/1558689807306148](#)

**Week 7 (Oct. 8): Mixed Methods Research Designs\***

Greene, Ch. 7

Creswell, Ch. 2—5

[Teddle, C., & Tashakkori, A. \(2006\). A general typology of research designs featuring mixed methods. \*Research in the Schools\*, 13\(1\), 12-28.](#)

Natasi, B.K., Hitchcock, J.H., & Brown, L.M. (2010). An inclusive framework for conceptualizing mixed methods design typologies. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods research, second edition* (pp. 305-338). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Revised Project Ideas DUE*

**Week 8 (Oct. 15): NO CLASS—INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS****Week 9 (Oct. 22): Book Club, Revisited: Finding Purposes and Designs in Empirical Examples\***

Suárez-Orozco, C., Suárez-Orozco, M. M., & Todorova, I. (2009). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society*. Harvard University Press. Introduction, Ch. 1, Ch. 5, and Ch. 7

Kling, J.R., Liebman, J.B., & Katz, L.F. (2005). Bullets don't got no name: Consequences of fear in the ghetto. In T.S. Weisner (ed.), *Discovering successful pathways in children's development* (pp. 243-282). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gibson-Davis, C., & Duncan, G.J. (2005). Qualitative/quantitative synergies in a random assignment program evaluation. In T.S. Weisner (ed.), *Discovering successful pathways in children's development* (pp. 283-304). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Skinner, D., Matthews, S., & Burton, L. (2005). Combining ethnography and GIS technology to examine constructions of developmental opportunities in contexts of poverty and disability. In T.S. Weisner (ed.), *Discovering successful pathways in children's development* (pp. 223-242). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

*Draft of Design/Outline of Paper DUE*

**Week 10 (Oct. 29): Data Analysis\***

Greene, Ch. 8

Creswell, Ch. 7

[Greene, J. C., and McClintock, C. \(1985\). Triangulation in evaluation: Design and analysis issues. \*Evaluation Review\*, 9, 523-545.](#)

Smith, M.L. (1997). Mixing and matching: Methods and models. In J.C. Greene & V.J. Caracelli (eds.), *Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms. New Directions for Evaluation no. 74* (pp. 73-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Teddle, C., & Taskakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. Excerpts from Chapter 11. The analysis of mixed methods data (pp. 263-284)

**Week 11 (Nov. 5): Quality\***

Greene, Ch. 9

Creswell, Ch. 9

[Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. \(1990\). Standards for qualitative \(and quantitative\) research: A prolegomenon. \*Educational Researcher\*, 19\(4\), 2-9.](#)

O'Cathain, A. (2010). Assessing the quality of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods research, second edition* (pp. 531-555). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2008). Quality of inferences in mixed methods research: Calling for an integrative framework. In M.M. Bergman (ed.), *Advances in Mixed Methods Research: Theories and Applications*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

[Onwuegbuzie, A.J. & Johnson, R.B. \(2006\). The validity issue in mixed research. \*Research in the Schools\*, 13\(1\), 48-63.](#)

**Week 12 (Nov. 12): NO CLASS AEA—WORK ON FINAL PROJECTS**

**Week 13 (Nov. 19): Reporting and Presentations**

Greene, Ch. 10

Creswell, Ch. 8

[Freshwater, D. \(2007\). Reading mixed methods research: Contexts for criticism. \*Journal of Mixed Methods Research\*, 1\(2\), 134-146.](#)

**NOV. 26—NO CLASS; THANKSGIVING**

**Week 14 (Dec. 3): Wrap-up and Presentations**

Greene, Ch. 11

Creswell, Ch. 10

[Harrits, G.S. \(2011\). More than method?: A discussion of paradigm differences within mixed methods research. \*Journal of Mixed Methods Research\*, 5\(2\), 150-166.](#) doi: 10.1177/1558689811402506

[Greene, J.C. \(2008\). Is mixed methods social inquiry a distinctive methodology? \*Journal of Mixed Methods Research\*, 2\(1\), 7-22.](#) doi: 10.1177/1558689807309969

**Week 15 (Dec. 10): Final Examination**

FINAL PROJECT DUE (MUST BE UPLOADED ON SAKAI BY 6:30PM)

*\*indicates a week that an example of a mixed methods study will be added to the reading list*

## Assignment Descriptions

### Assignment Submission

Please submit all assignments electronically via Sakai. I will repost your assignments with grades and comments. If you have difficulties uploading the file, then please email it to me at [lkallemeyn@luc.edu](mailto:lkallemeyn@luc.edu).

### Group Presentation and Discussion of a Mixed Methods Study (20 pts)

With a partner, choose an empirical example of a *good* research study that utilizes mixed methodology in your field or area of interest. The example could be published work, your own work, or that of classmates or colleagues. You will need to defend your judgment of “goodness” during your presentation. Your presentation should concentrate on illustrating and critiquing one or more of the conceptual ideas about mixing methods offered in the readings and class discussions, and it should include an activity in which to engage other class members. Plan on 45-60 minutes for your presentation and discussion. Be sure to post the article, book section, conference presentation, research proposal, or other material about the study in Sakai at least one week prior to your assigned week, so that your colleagues will have an opportunity to review it in preparation for your discussion. Be sure that all aspects of the discussion and activity focus on *how* the study was conducted, not what the study found. When grading the presentation, I will be looking for the following (adapted from <http://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching-resources/document-your-teaching/peer-evaluation-teaching/>):

#### Presenters as teachers

- Communicates clearly (1 pt)
- Has a positive attitude towards colleagues (1 pt)
- Exhibits respect for all colleagues (1 pt)

#### Experts on content knowledge

- Finds a good example of mixed methodology (2 pt)
- Has thorough knowledge of the article (2 pt)
- Connects the study to at least one conceptual idea we have discussed in the course (2 pt)
- Uses relevant information from course readings in teaching (2 pt)
- Focuses class discussion on the study’s methodology, or aspects of how the study was conducted/reported (and not study findings) (2 pt)

#### Facilitators of learning processes

- Places colleagues at the center when designing and teaching the presentation and activity (1 pt)
- Has an activating presentation and activity for colleagues (1 pt)
- Builds a presentation and activity in such a way that colleagues gradually learn to learn in a self-directed manner (1 pt)
- Gives feedback (1 pt)
- Assesses students’ learning (1 pt)

### Organizer

- Cooperates with co-presenter, so there is equitable responsibilities with presentation and activity (1 pt)
- Communicates when cooperating with co-presenter (1 pt)

### Mixed Methods Research Project (60 pts)

Choose one of the following options.

Option 1: You may develop an elaborate research plan, or methodology for a study. This research plan MUST utilize mixed methodologies. In a dissertation, the third chapter typically focuses on methodology, so you could also think of this project as the methodology chapter of a dissertation. I encourage you to pilot aspects of your research design this semester to help you develop your plan.

How you choose to organize the chapter is up to you, and you should work directly with the chair of your dissertation committee throughout the semester on the development of this chapter. Be sure that you cite appropriate literature that informs the design of your research, in addition to what you may include in your literature review.

Further assignment details will be available on Sakai.

Option 2: You may summarize, synthesize, reflect on, critique, challenge, or otherwise engage the *mixed methods content* of the course in some final product. The product can take one of many forms, including a conventional course paper, a publishable article, a presentation for a conference, or – using an alternative representation – a story, poem, or performance. Students may work in groups (*of no more than 3*) for this final course product. Planning for the final product will proceed in stages throughout the semester. An approved plan for this final paper is required through the submission of your project ideas and revisions to your project ideas.

Possible conferences for submitting papers include the following:

- Mixed Methods International Research Association (see <http://mmira.wildapricot.org/>)-Submissions and conference to be determined
- American Evaluation Association Mixed Methods Evaluation TIG—Submissions in March 2016 and conference in fall 2016 (see <http://www.eval.org>)
- International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry—Submissions in December 2015 and conference in May 2015 at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (see <http://www.icqi.org/>)
- American Educational Research Association, such as the Mixed Methods Research SIG (see <http://www.aera.net/Home/tabid/10041/Default.aspx>)-Submissions in July 2016 and conference in Spring 2017

For both options, you will submit your ideas, revision of your ideas, and an outline to me for formative feedback and approval prior to working on your final project. You will also have an

opportunity to present your final project to the class to receive their feedback, prior to the completion of your final project. Timely and thoughtful completion of these assignments will contribute to your participation grade. I will only assign a grade to the final project.

### **Learning Community at Loyola University Chicago and School of Education**

Please see <http://luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/> for a summary of information on LUC's policies on academic honesty, accessibility, ethics and electronic communication policies.

#### **Diversity**

A characteristic of the mixed methods research tradition is an openness to varying beliefs, perspectives, and ways of knowing. In order to foster a learning community in the classroom, openness to and respect of various perspectives and backgrounds is essential (gender, race, age, religion, ability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, age, methodological preferences, etc.). As your instructor, I will promote full participation and contribution by all class members, asking that varied viewpoints be expressed, thoroughly considered and respected by all members of our class.

#### **Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework of Loyola's School of Education is "professionalism in service of social justice." This course contributes to the realization of this framework by engaging students in the knowledge of qualitative research, skills of inquiry, and ethics necessary to be professional and just qualitative researchers. Certain methodological approaches to qualitative research, which will be introduced in this course, also specifically aim to address social inequities.

The following is the exact wording of the School of Education's Conceptual Framework:

The School of Education at Loyola University Chicago, a Jesuit and Catholic urban university, supports the Jesuit ideal of knowledge in the service of humanity. We endeavor to advance professional education in the service of social justice, engaged with Chicago, the nation, and the world. To achieve this vision the School of Education participates in the discovery, development, demonstration, and dissemination of professional knowledge and practice within a context of ethics, service to others, and social justice. We fulfill this mission by preparing professionals to serve as teachers, administrators, psychologists, and researchers; by conducting research on issues of professional practice and social justice; and by partnering with schools and community agencies to enhance life-long learning in the Chicago area.

Although this course touches on the majority of the conceptual framework standards, two assignments in this course will serve as assessments for CF 1 and 6.

#### **Dispositions**

This course will assess dispositions related to professionalism, fairness, and the belief that all students can learn. Refer to LIVETEXT for the rubric corresponding to these dispositions.