'Tips and tricks, lessons learned with foundations'

Dr Rebecca Catto, Assistant Professor, Sociology rcatto@kent.edu







Know your foundation(s)



Put yourself and your research out there: create opportunities NETWORK

SCIENCE & RELIGION EXPLORING THE SPECTRUM



🗖 Lesen Sie diese Seite auf Deutsch. 👞 💶 Lea esta página en español.



'Science and Religion: Exploring the Spectrum of Global Perspectives' is a major international research project that seeks to build an understanding of the social and cultural contexts of public perceptions of the relationship between 'science' and 'religion' across all religious and non-religious groups.



Work collaboratively, across disciplines/mixed methods



Be clear, precise, and firm in the value of the qualitative research proposed

Oiesis and Prolepsis Narrative - Performative - Learning - Environments

gazine - Home About this blog Articles Links Tools



Hannah Arendt

This post might be considered a postscript to those posts which concern Aspects of the University of Dissensus [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7]. The terrain covered in this blog, which is affiliated to the thinking around narrative environment design [1], [2], [3], [3], even as it had at one time some resonance with the American university, does not sit well in the British university, yet it still might be said to have some habitation there in the margins of the STEMMification of the contemporary university.

Overall, the critical relation might be said to be towards science conceived as positive sciences (STEMM subjects) in which the world is made up of 'objects' (res extensa) for a subject (res cogitans) as two distinct forms of 'substance' with their respective ontologies or modes of existence. Rather than 'objects', which can be mastered, controlled and exploited, there are 'things' that matter to 'me' and to 'us', and which trouble 'me' and 'us', even as 'the I' and 'the we' are articulated in relation to 'the It' (or 'the Id) and to 'the they'.

In other words, the world is a field of engagement and struggle which is political through and through, with politics conceived as the possibility of giving voice and action to those who have no voice and that which is deemed incapable of acting, a world whose disagreements and tensions are not simply capable of being resolved by technical solutions in the form of a (universal) consensus. It is instead a polyversity of dissensus, in the which the STEMM university (with its technical discussions and proposals) sits awkwardly and inadequately. Copyright © The Author(a), 2009. Reprints and permissions: http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav http://eth.agepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

'How many cases do I need?' On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research

 Mario Luis Small University of Chicago, USA

A B S T R A C T
Today, ethnographers and qualitative researchers in fields such as urban poverty, immigration, and social inequality face an environment in which their work will be read, cited, and assessed by demographers, quantitative sociologists, and even economists. They also face a demand for case studies of poor, minority, or immigrant groups and neighborhoods that not only generate theory but also somehow speak to empirical conditions in other cases (not observed). Many have responded by incorporating elements of quantitative methods into their designs, such as selecting respondents 'at random' for small, in-depth interview projects or identifying 'representative' neighborhoods for ethnographic case studies, aiming to increase generalizability. This article assesses these strategies and argues that they fall short of their objectives. Recognizing the importance of the predicament underlying the strategies - to determine how case studies can speak empirically to other cases - it presents two alternatives to current practices, and calls for greater clarity in the logic of design when producing ethnographic research in a multimethod intellectual environment.

KEY WORDS ethnographic methods, generalizability, representativeness, validity, case study, sequential interviewing, extended case method, science Article

Epistemological boot camp: The politics of science and what every qualitative researcher needs to know to survive in the academy

Karen M. Staller University of Michigan, USA

Abstract

Doctoral students and faculty members sometimes face unexpected barriers when engaging in qualitative research that can impede career advancement. In part, this can be because gualitative methodologies often conflict with objectivist epistemological assumptions that are deeply embedded in university cultures. Since ontology, epistemology, methodology, and methods are related, it is imperative for qualitative researchers to understand these differences and recognize the resulting tensions. Furthermore, when conducting qualitative research it is critical to design studies in which the epistemology, methodology, and methods are logically integrated for the best quality work. In this article, I seek to make transparent the link between everyday problems that arise (in dissertation defenses, funding and Institutional Review Board applications, peer review, tenure and promotion, etc.) and the underlying epistemological and methodological issues that produce them. I seek to educate beginning qualitative researchers about the importance of this integration in their own work and to arm them with some diagnostic skills. In doing so they will be better prepared to successfully negotiate the politics of science, the politics of evidence, and the politics of methods within their home institutions.

Qualitative Social Work

© The Author(s) 2012 Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav DOI: 10.1177/1473325012450483

12(4) 395-413

qsw.sagepub.com

Keywords

Academy, epistemology, methodology, politics of science, qualitative inquiry, qualitative research, qualitative research design, rigor

p.402 "those who go against the grain – in this case qualitative researchers in general – need to recognize that they sit in a disadvantaged position relative to the dominant culture and therefore should take extra steps to protect themselves and their work for misplaced critique."

"being critically aware of the impact that the different epistemological assumptions that undergird qualitative forms of inquiry (which can be drastically different from privileged and institutionalized objectivist ones) have for the design, implementation and dissemination of their research. Only then is it possible to locate and articulate the differences between your work and those who might critique it from a different perspective."



See the gaps







Home Episodes About



Are you data-curious?

We're here to help.

It's ironic that in an era of big data, truth sometimes seems more elusive than ever.

To make better choices about how to manage our lives, our work, and our environment, we need to use the best possible information to guide us. But even with great data, humans don't always make great choices- we misinterpret, we oversimplify, we fail to see fallacies in logic or flaws in the data itself- and even our most rational examinations of the numbers are fundamentally human, shaped by culture, prior experience, and our internal biases.

In this podcast, we explore the process of how data becomes information, information becomes knowledge and knowledge becomes belief- and how, in turn, belief shapes the way we take and interpret data. From young learners to practicing scientists, the ways we incorporate information into our worldview is affected by our experiences. We combine social and data science perspectives with the study of how humans learn, in order to examine not just what we know, but how we know it.



Christie Bahlai, PhD, is a Data Scientist and Ecologist. Her work focuses on Rebecca Catto, PhD is a Sociologist. Her research is grounded in the Bridget Mulvey, PhD is an Education Researcher in Curriculum and ☆



Calling Residents of Northeast Ohio



Seeking local participants to be part of a major international study about Science, Identity and Values.

All Participants will receive a Target Gift Card.

Must be 18 years or older to participate. Zoom focus groups will last for approximately 90 minutes. Participation is voluntary and confidential.

If interested, please <u>click here</u> to take a brief survey.





This study has been approved by IRB at Kent State and University of Birmingham