Stockholms
universitet

Research traditions and theoretical perspectives, 15 hp

Study guide June 2023

Course leaders: Anna-Lena Kempe, Matilda Wiklund, & Tore West

Stockholms universitet

Index

Introduction- course content

During this course we will focus on the underlying questions and concepts that have shaped research within the social sciences, and more specifically, educational research. We will start our journey with a retake on the history of science: what has shaped the overall ideas of what gets legitimized as "knowledge" in relation to other forms of knowing and proposing (epistemology) and the nature of our existence (ontology).

The course aims at developing *generic academic competences* rather than on the particularities of the doctoral project.

The course will focus on questions and original hypotheses concerning overarching phenomena/concepts like "society" and "individuals", "language", "power", "symbols", and "knowledge", as well as central phenomena within education like "teaching", "learning" and "identity" and "subject formation". These features are discussed with examples from various theoretical perspectives and methodological traditions.

A scientific theory can be described as a net of concepts trying to frame and define a particular phenomenon and hence placing various aspects thereof in focus while others will fall into the shadow: Contrasting theoretical and methodological traditions produce data and carry out analysis on individual, intrapersonal, interactional, institutional, overarching historical and societal or conceptual levels (philosophical methods) as well as analysis of materiality. These traditions construe different forms of knowledge of complex phenomena. Some traditions describe theory as what comes out of an *empirical close-up analysis* while others state their philosophical assumptions *before* they engage in the data production and data analysis.

During the course we will focus on the relationship between *theory, methodology* and *data*, and on how these parts of the research process are carried out and represented within different research traditions. Finally, we will discuss different forms of analysis and how results are represented, and conclusions are drawn from data in relation to the overall theoretical assumptions confining the phenomena studied. This will render us the possibility to critically assess the claims made in different traditions and to examine issues of validity and reliability in relation to research questions in education.

Learning Outcomes

Upon completing the course, the doctoral student is expected to have:

- a broad competence within and a systematic understanding of the research area of education/didactics,
- developed an increased familiarity with scientific theoretical foundations, scientific methodology, in general, and specific theories and methods applied especially within the field of pedagogy/didactics,
- competence to critically assess philosophical and scientific assumptions within different research traditions in education.

Writing process and knowledge making

Studies at the doctoral level require that students focus on *representing* their reading of the course texts in written form. Seminars and workshops are therefore prepared when doctoral students write compulsory memos on the literature. Externalizing the reading is central for capturing every text's central idea and critically reviewing and comparing the texts in focus.

An abstract with critical questions is a knowledge representation that forms the basis for discussions and further deepening reflections, and hence contributes into making significant associations with prior learning. Abstracts, about 3- maximum 4 pages, should address key themes and concepts in the literature.

Further purposes of the Abstract writing are:

- to set the basis for group discussions,
- produce materials for the final examination,
- to make it possible to get an insight about one's own and the peers' thinking throughout the learning process.

Schedule

https://cloud.timeedit.net/su/web/stud1/ri107755X55Z06Q6Z66g0Y80y7096Y30Q04gQY6Q 54737.html

The course consists of 10 full day meetings 10:00-15:00.

For a detailed planning see the appendix.

The last session on January 19 2024 will be a full day symposium (9:00-16:00) when PhD student's papers are presented and critiqued by a fellow student. After that PhD

students have until February 1 to their disposal to revise their papers before they are uploaded to Athena and graded by the course teachers.

Reading schedule and preparations for the first seminar on September 15.

To reach the learning outcomes doctoral students are supposed to allocate 50% of their work time for course work. The course literature amounts to ca 1800 pages in total which makes It necessary to prepare a reading schedule for the course work. You will find a detailed planning in the attachment of this guide (and in Athena from September 1). Written an bstract of 3-4 pages. Note, the abstracts are supposed to be an externalization of your reading and *not* a 'perfect paper! (If you fall ill or need to take care of a sick child etc., just mention this to the course leaders and move on in the schedule. You can write a PM on the missed content/seminar later.)

Course preparations

In preparation for seminar 1 on September 15 you should read the following:

Guyer (2014). Page 51-141

Kant (1996). Page 11-22

Noddings (2015). chapter 3-4 (e-book)

Potter, G. (2017). chapter, 1 -3.

Sady, Wojciech, "Ludwik Fleck" (2019) https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/fleck/

Scruton, R. (1995). chapter 3 -4 and 7-9.

For the first two seminars on September 15 and 27, we have prepared questions (see attachment) for you to keep in mind while reading and they will then be discussed during the seminars.

In preparation for seminar 3-9 you will write abstracts and critical reflections and pose seminar questions on each text.

Course Activities and preparations: the steps of engagement

The course is built on a sequence of seven steps of engagement and reflection focusing on the themes and issues for each of the 10 full day group sessions.

Individual preparations (reading and writing 3-4 pages concerning the themes of the course in relation to the literature (and the videoclips). The PM/abstract needs to be uploaded in Athena no later than 3 days before the seminar). *Writing an abstract/answer questions and posing new questions as preparations for the seminars*

and the exam is mandatory <mark>*but will not be graded since these papers are employed as vehicles for learning.*</mark>

1. A) Videotaped lectures. The lectures will address the core concepts and themes in the literature B) individual reading of the course literature.

2. Writing anabstract on the literature and pose seminar questions.

3. Act as a 'critical friend' by reading reflection on a peer's paper. (Athena provides you with the paper you are supposed to read and comment on.)

4. Plenum seminar: the group discusses issues in relation to the literature and the lectures. The course leaders relate the overall themes and questions of the course to the lectures (Full day seminar at 10 am to 11 am).

5. Student-led small groups/critical friend seminar: reading and critiquing the abstracts and posing questions for the following plenum seminar (a preparations for the seminar with the lecturers) between 11 -12.

6. Plenum seminar: doctoral students presenting and discussion their questions with the lecturers (13:00-1400).

7. Plenum: Brief summary of the day in relation to the overarching themes of the course. New questions.

    At the end of the course:

8. Individual work and symposia: presenting and critiquing the individual exam papers during a symposium.

9. Revising your paper after the symposia and uploading the final version for grading.

Feedback and group discussions with a "critical friend"

At the courses, doctoral students work continuously together by giving each other feedback (critical friend) on abstracts in small group discussions. It is a course requirement to have published an abstract three days before each seminar and to give constructive feedback to other students in student-led small groups seminars. Course leaders read abstracts before the seminars and give verbal feedback to the group by raising themes and issues stemming from the doctoral students' reflections.

Compensation of absence

If you miss a mandatory seminar you can compensate. Please contact the teachers.

Examination

The final paper should contain the various themes presented during the course as well as a critical, comparative reflection on these themes. The paper is supposed to demonstrate that learning outcomes have been achieved. Doctoral students can choose to relate the course literature to their own project, and the more specific questions this raises. Each paper will be discussed, during the symposium at the end of the course. The final paper should be sent to the course leaders on February 1. The grades used are G (pass) or U (fail). Students will be notified of their grade within 15 working days, via email. Possible re-examinations are submitted after the first consultation with the course leaders.

Criteria for Grading

To receive a passing grade, the doctoral student must demonstrate in their final paper that they have fulfilled the learning outcomes of the course through:

- Presenting, conducting analysis, and critically reflecting over the main themes of the course and the course literature, in a coherent manner.

- Being able to demonstrate differences and similarities between the original hypotheses and methodologies as well as the analytical premises presented in the course concerning perspectives and research traditions.

- Making concise arguments and being grammatically correct to demonstrate an attention to detail that is expected of scholarly work.

- Being precise and correctly citing and referencing according to the APA System.

Plagiarism and self-plagiarism

One can cite other sources, but both direct and indirect quotes must always be referenced using correct and full references. Copying or extracting shorter or longer sections of text and indicating that one is the author of this text is prohibited. This is considered plagiarism. Also prohibited is using sections from previously graded text (aka self-plagiarism).

Plagiarism is regarded fundamentally as a crime, not only against established research ethics, but also against the general approach towards one's own and others' texts.

Plagiarism is cheating and may be grounds for suspension. All course papers are submitted to Mondo and checked by a software for originality.

Examination: draft, public discussion, and grading

In their assessment report, the doctoral students will show in the text that they achieved the expected learning outcomes for respective courses. Generally, for all examinations at the doctoral level the doctoral student can:

• report, comparatively analyze and critically meta-reflect on the course's main themes and literature in a coherent way,

• argue nuanced and linguistically correctly in line with the requirements and contingency of the academic genre and,

• manage accuracy and referencing correctly according to the APA or Harvard system.

Course Evaluation

Once the grading has been done, students will receive a link to the course evaluation via email. All comments made in the course evaluation are completely anonymous.

Course literature

Alvesson, M. & Sköldberg, K. (2018). *Reflexive methodology: new vistas for qualitative research.* (Third edition). Los Angeles: Sage.(508 p.)

Beaney, Michael, "Analysis", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2021/entries/analysis/.(8 p.)

Beck, U. (2010) Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: a research agenda. The *British Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 61, 381-403. (22 p.)

Bernstein, R. (1992) The Resurgence of Pragmatism. *Social Research*, 59(4), 813-840.(28 p.)

Brinkmann M., Friesen N. (2018) Phenomenology and Education. In: Smeyers P. (eds) *International Handbook of Philosophy of Education*. Springer International Handbooks of Education. Springer, Cham. P. 591-606 (15 p.).https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72761-5_46

Braidotti, R. (2019). A theoretical framework for the critical posthumanities. *Theory, culture & society,*36(6), 31-61. (30 p.)

Cole, D. R. (2012). Matter in motion: The educational materialism of Gilles Deleuze.Educational *Philosophy and Theory*, 44(sup1), 3-17 (14 p.)

Cholewinski, M. (2009). An introduction to constructivism and authentic activity. *Journal of the school of contemporary international studies Nagoya University of Foreign Studies*, 5, 283-316.https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/235011948.pdf

Csanadi, A., Eagan, B., Kollar, I.et al.(2018). When coding-and-counting is not enough: using epistemic network analysis (ENA) to analyze verbal data in CSCL research.Intern. J. Comput.-Support. Collab. Learn13,419–438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-018-9292-z (20 p.)

Delanty, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology* 57(1), 25-47 (12 p.)

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education. New York: The Free Press. Selected Chapters. (about 40 p.)

Dunn, K. & Mulvenon, S. (2009). A critical review of research on formative assessment: The limited scientific evidence of the impact of formative assessment in education. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(7), 1-11. (10 p.)

Garrison, J. and Neiman, A. (2002). Pragmatism and Education. In *The Blackwell Companion to the Philosophy of Education.* Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 19-37. (18 p.)

Guyer, P. (2014). *Kant*, Second Edition, London, Routledge, (Chapter 2 –Kant's Copernican revolution), pp. 51-141. (90 p.)

Halldén, O., Scheja, M. & Haglund, L. (2013). The Contextuality of Knowledge. An intentional approach to meaning making and conceptual change. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), *International Handbook of Research on Conceptual Change* (pp. 71-95). London: Routledge (25p.)

Hammersley, M. (2005). Ethnography and discourse analysis: incompatible or complementary? Polifonia(10) pp. 1–20. (19 p.)

Hester, S., & Francis, D. (2000). Ethnomethodology and local educational order. *Pragmatics and beyond new series*, 1-20. (19 p.)

Insulander I., Kempe, A-L., Lindstrand, F., Selander, S. & West, T. (2021). Designs for learning– Designs in learning. I: G. Kress, S. Selander, R. Säljö & C. Wulf (red.). *Learning as social practice. Beyond education as an individual enterprise.* Routledge, Ebook p. 30–69 (39 p.)

Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and Literacy in School Classrooms. *Review of Research in Education,* 32(1), 241–267. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07310586 (26 p.)

Kanselaar, G. (2002). *Constructivism and socio-constructivism. Constructivism and socio-constructivism*, 1-7. PDF on-line (6 p.)

Kant, I. (1996). An Answer to the Question: "What is Enlightenment?", in *Immanuel Kant, Practical Philosophy*, edited by Mary J. Gregor, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-22. (11 p.)

Karlsson, G. (1993). *Psychological qualitative research from a phenomenological perspective*. Chapter 2-5(69 p.in Athena)

Kingston, N., & Nash, B. (2011). Formative assessment: A meta-analysis and a call for research. *Educational measurement: Issues and practice*, 30(4), 28-37. (9 p.)

Latour, B. (1996). Cogito ergo sumus! Or psychology swept inside out by the fresh air of the upper deck. Review symposium: Cognition in the wild. Mind, Culture, & Activity, 3, 54. 63.

Lee, Y. A. (2007). Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of pragmatics*, 39(1), 180-206. (26 p.)

Leiviskä-Deland, A.-C., Karlsson, G. & Fatouros-Bergman, H. (2011). A phenomenological analysis of the psychotic experience. *Human Studies*, 34:23-42. (19 p.)

Lenz Taguchi H. (2012). A diffractive and Deleuzian approach to analysing interview data. *Feminist theory*,13(3), 265-281 (16 p.)

Lenz Taguchi, H. (2016). "The Concept as Method" Tracing-and-mapping the Problem of the Neuro (n) in the Field of Education. Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies, 16(2), 213-223.(10 p.)

Loh, J. (2013). Inquiry into issues of trustworthiness and quality in narrative studies: A perspective. *The qualitative report*, 18(33), 1. (15 p.)

Matta, C. (2015). Interpretivism and Causal Explanations: A Case from Educational Research. *Philosophy of the social sciences*, 45(6), 543-567. (24 p.)

Matta, C. (2021). Neuroscience and educational practice–A critical assessment from the perspective of philosophy of science. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*,53(2), 197-211(14 p.)

Mondada, L. (2019). Contemporary issues in conversation analysis: Embodiment and materiality, multimodality and multisensoriality in social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 145, 47-62. (15 p.)

Nicholson, C. (2013). Education and the Pragmatic Temperament. In *Cambridge Companion to Pragmatism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 249-271. (22 p.)

Noddings, N. (2015). *Philosophy of education*. (Fourth edition.) Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Chapter 3-4.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International journal of qualitative methods*, 16(1). P. 1-13. (12 p.)

Nussbaum, M. (2008). *Toward a Globally Sensitive Patriotism*. Daedalus, 137(3), 78-93 (15 p.)

Potter, G. (2017). The philosophy of social science: new perspectives. (2. ed.). Routledge.(Chapter, 1 -3) (68 p.)

Rodrigues, M. V., & Emmeche, C. (2019). Abduction and styles of scientific thinking. *Syntheses*, 1-29 .(28. p.)

Ryan, G. S. (2022). Postpositivist critical realism: philosophy, methodology and method for nursing research. *Nurse researcher*, 30(3). (16 p.)

Rönnström, N. (2019) Educational Cosmopolitanism: Complex Capabilities, Institutional Requirements and a Research Stance. Knowledge Cultures, 7(3), 87-109. (22 p.)

Saqr, M., Fors, U., Tedre, M. & Nouri, J. (2018). How social network analysis can be used to monitor online collaborative learning and guide an informed intervention. PLoS ONE 13(3): e0194777. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0194777

Sady, Wojciech, "Ludwik Fleck", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/fleck/(10p.)

Scheja, M. (2006). Delayed understanding and staying in phase: Students' perceptions of their study situation. *Higher Education*, 52, 421-445 (24 p.)

Schrag, F. (2013). Can this marriage be saved? The future of 'neuro-education'. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 47(1), 20-30. (10 p.)

Scruton, R. (1995). *A short history of modern philosophy: from Descartes to Wittgenstein*. (2. rev. and enl. ed.) London: Routledge. Chapter 34, 7 & 9 (58 p.)

Sidnell, J. (2012). Basic conversation analytic methods. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 77-99. (22 p,)

Stoller, S. (2009). Phenomenology and the poststructural critique of experience. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 17(5), 707-737. (30 p.)

St. Pierre, E. A. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *International journal of qualitative studies in education*, 13(5), 477-515.(38 p.)

Säljö, R. (2021). The conceptualization of learning in learning research. Form introspectionism and conditioned reflexes to meaning-making and performativity in situated practices in Kress, G, Selander, S., Säljö, R. & Wulf, C. (2021). *Learning As Social Practice: Beyond Education As an Individual Enterprise* . Routledge. Ebook page 146-168 (22 p.)

Thomas, G. (2010). Doing case study: Abduction not induction, phronesis not theory. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(7), 575-582. doi:10.1177/1077800410372601 (7 p.)

Van Leeuwen, T. (2014). Critical discourse analysis and multimodality. *Contemporary critical discourse studies*, 281-295 (14 p.)

Viberg, O., Hatakka, M., Bälter, O., & Mavroudi, A. (2018). The current landscape of learning analytics in higher education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 89, 98-110.

Vosniadou, S., Pagondiotis, C. & Deliyianni, M. (2005) From the Pragmatics of Classification Systems to the Metaphysics of Concepts. *Journal of the Learning Sciences,* 14:1, 115-125, DOI: 10.1207/s15327809jls1401_6 (10 p.)

Youdell, D., Lindley, M., Shapiro, K., Sun, Y., & Leng, Y. (2020). From science wars to transdisciplinarity: the inescapability of the neuroscience, biolog, and sociology of learning. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 41(6), 881-899.(18 p.)