

**City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus**

**offered by Department of Public and International Affairs
with effect from Semester A 2022/23**

Part I Course Overview

| | |
|--|--|
| Course Title: | Research Design for the Social Sciences |
| Course Code: | PIA5026 |
| Course Duration: | One Semester |
| Credit Units: | 3 |
| Level: | P5 |
| Medium of Instruction: | English |
| Medium of Assessment: | English |
| Prerequisites: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i> | Nil |
| Precursors: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i> | Nil |
| Equivalent Courses: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i> | AIS5026 Research Design for the Social Sciences |
| Exclusive Courses: <i>(Course Code and Title)</i> | AIS5022 Theory and Methodology in Asian and International Relations |

Part II Course Details

1. Abstract

This course offers an introduction to key methodological approaches required to understand, critically analyse, and explain problems in social sciences. It first covers philosophical, ethical and practical issues regarding systematic *social inquiry*. It then provides students with specific tools and techniques for empirical research in social sciences, including literature review, case studies, qualitative interviews, focus groups and participant observation, quantitative surveys and questionnaires, archival research and e-research. Students will learn the necessary skills for conducting and evaluating social inquiry, as well as crafting an independent research project upholding the highest standards of academic integrity. The core assignment is a research *proposal* (not a *paper*) in which students wishing to write an individual Master's thesis across Semester B and the Summer Term (course codes = PIA6013/PIA6015) must design an original *project* (successful completion of the course with a grade of A or above is required to do so). This course will be an opportunity for students to bring their own research questions into the class, on a topic of their choice, and discuss their research design and methodology. It can also prepare students for the (team-based) capstone course PIA6018.

Course Aims

This course aims to provide students with the ability to: (1) design, plan, write and disseminate a polished research project, (2) identify a research problem in social sciences and develop hypotheses or propositions to effectively describe, examine, critique, and solve that problem, (3) build arguments that are coherent, empirically supported, and theoretically grounded, as well as evaluate arguments made by others, (4) understand the values and limitations of different methodological approaches and evaluate scholarly work based on the merits of research design and instruments, (5) review a literature, and evaluate the reliability and validity of selected references and sources, and (6) identify, and comply with, ethical issues related to social inquiry and academic integrity.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

(CILOs state what the student is expected to be able to do at the end of the course according to a given standard of performance.)

| No. | CILOs | Weighting (if applicable) | Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate) | | |
|-----|---|------------------------------|---|----|----|
| | | | A1 | A2 | A3 |
| 1. | Identify the strengths and weaknesses of various methodological approaches to social science research | 10 | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 2. | Review the appropriate academic literature, evaluate the validity and reliability of secondary data sources, independently design data collection and analysis | 30 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 3. | Identify and assess ethical and academic integrity issues related to research and writing in social sciences | 10 | | ✓ | ✓ |
| 4. | Design a study (*research proposal*) to solve open research questions in the social sciences and test original, innovative research hypotheses or propositions. | 50 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | | 100% | | | |

A1: Attitude

Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.

A2: Ability

Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.

A3: Accomplishments

Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

(TLAs designed to facilitate students' achievement of the CILOs.)

| TLA | Brief Description | CILO No. | | | | | | Hours/week (if applicable) |
|-----|---|----------|---|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 1 | Lectures on various methodological approaches in social inquiry | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| 2 | Classroom exercises, presentations and debates | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| 3 | Weekly required readings | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | |
| 4 | Writings assignments, including literature review, methodology plan and research proposal | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

(ATs are designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs.)

Attendance and active participation in class discussion is expected. Discussions are based on weekly required readings as well as on oral presentations of individual research projects. Several skills exercises will be carried out, and evaluated, weekly; they can include mock exercises, data search, literature reviews, focus groups, interviews and questionnaire preparation. Students will start thinking about a research problem of their choice early on in Semester A, discuss it with the course instructor, present their draft project in class, and write and submit a full research proposal at the end of the semester.

| Assessment Tasks/Activities | CILO No. | | | | | | Weighting | Remarks |
|--|----------|---|---|---|--|--|-----------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | | |
| Continuous Assessment: 100 % | | | | | | | | |
| Attendance, class participation and skills exercises | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | 10% | |
| Presentation in class (individual, or teamwork) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | 20% | |
| Written assignments - Literature review | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | 10% | Week 6 |
| Written assignments - Methodology plan | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | 10% | Week 9 |
| Written assignments - Research proposal | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | 50% | Week 14 |
| Examination: 0 % (duration: N/A, if applicable) | | | | | | | 100% | |

5. Assessment Rubrics

(Grading of student achievements is based on student performance in assessment tasks/activities with the following rubrics.)

Applicable to students admitted in Semester A 2022/23 and thereafter

| Assessment Task | Criterion | Excellent (A+, A, A-) | Good (B+, B) | Marginal (B-, C+, C) | Failure (F) |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1. Classroom participation, debates and skills exercises | Frequency and quality of contributions in class discussions and exercises. | Continuous contributions to classroom discussions and interventions that show a high level of analysis. | Fair contributions to classroom discussions and interventions that reveal some attempts at analysis. | Infrequent contributions to classroom discussions and contributions that show little analytical insights. | No contribution to classroom discussions and repeated absence. |
| 2. Class presentation | Quality of argument, structure of class presentation; cohesiveness of overall presentation if teamwork; oral delivery; visual aids; evidence of critical research | Excellent structure, supporting an analytical argument backed by excellent research and answering set topic or question, clear speech, excellent use of PowerPoint decks or similar tools. | A good, coherent structure at least partially supporting an analytical argument, backed by some research, providing some answers to a set topic or question, adequate speech and use of PowerPoint decks. | Flawed structure, yet to some extent supporting an analytical argument backed by little research providing shortcomings or inadequate answers to a set topic or question, poor speech quality or use of PowerPoint decks. | No recognizable structure without any analytical argument backed by no discernible research, providing no answers to a set topic or question, inappropriate speech and use of PowerPoint decks; plagiarism. |
| 3. Written assignments (literature review, methodology plan, and final research project) | Ability to write a proposal for a hypothetical research project (ideally a master's thesis) designed to test an innovative explanatory theory; quality and structure of paper; evidence of critical thinking and significant desk/library research. | Outstanding with regard to research question or puzzle, review and critique of the relevant literature, specification of theory or hypothesis, methods and research design; excellent quality of writing. | Generally effective but not especially original or innovative with regard to research question, fair review and critique of the relevant literature, suitable specification of theory or hypothesis, methods and research design; satisfactory quality of writing. | Major misunderstanding or misuse of course materials, no original ideas with regard to research question, limited or irrelevant review and critique of the literature, lack of theory or hypothesis, poor methods and research design; low quality of writing and elements of plagiarism. | Failure to complete the assignment, or major portions thereof; substantial amount of cheating or plagiarism. |

Applicable to students admitted before Semester A 2022/23

| Assessment Task | Criterion | Excellent (A+, A, A-) | Good (B+, B, B-) | Fair (C+, C, C-) | Marginal (D) | Failure (F) |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Classroom participation, debates and skills exercises | Frequency and quality of contributions in discussions, exercises and homework | Excellent contributions to discussions, exercises and homework | Good contributions to discussions, exercises and homework | Fair contributions to discussions, exercises and homework | Poor contributions to discussions, exercises and homework; traces of plagiarism | Failure to contribute in discussions, exercises and homework; substantial amount of plagiarism or cheating. |
| 2. Class presentation | Innovativeness, quality, and style of in-class presentation. | Excellent analysis of existing research, discussion of innovative ideas with regard to theory/methods, impressive delivery and supporting materials | Effective analysis of existing research, discussion of persuasive but not truly innovative ideas with regard to theory/method, impressive delivery and supporting materials | Fair but superficial analysis of existing research, lack of original ideas with regard to theory/method. Clear presentation delivery and supporting materials. | Incomplete, shallow analysis of existing research. Poor presentation delivery and supporting materials. Elements of plagiarism | Failure to complete the assignment. Elements of cheating. |
| 3. Written assignments (literature review, methodology plan, and final research project) | Ability to write a proposal for a hypothetical research project (ideally a master's thesis) designed to test an innovative explanatory theory | Outstanding with regard to research question, review and critique of the relevant literature, specification of theory or hypothesis, methods and research design. | Generally effective but not especially original or innovative with regard to research question, review and critique of the relevant literature, specification of theory or hypothesis, methods and research design. | Minimally acceptable in its application of course materials, but lack of any original ideas with regard to research questions, review and critique of the relevant literature, specification of theory or hypothesis, methods and research design. | Major misunderstanding or misuse of course materials, no original ideas with regard to research question, review and critique of the relevant literature, specification of theory or hypothesis, methods and research design. Elements of plagiarism | Failure to complete the assignment, or major portions thereof; substantial amount of cheating or plagiarism. |

Part III Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

1. Keyword Syllabus

(An indication of the key topics of the course.)

Social Research; Research Design; Ethics of Research; Research Methodology; Theory Building; Concept Formation; Measurement; Causal Inference; Qualitative and Quantitative Methods; Survey; Comparative Method; Case Study; Ethnography; Fieldwork; Interview; Focus Group; Participant Observation; Informed Consent; Archival Research; Data Collection; E-Research; Dissemination of Research; Academic Integrity.

2. Reading List

2.1 Compulsory Readings

(Compulsory readings can include books, book chapters, or journal/magazine articles. There are also collections of e-books, e-journals available from the CityU Library.)

Ragin, Charles C. and Lisa M. Amoroso, 2011. *Constructing Social Research* (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, [Chapter 1 “What Is (and Is Not) Social Research”, pp. 5-32].

Bryman, Alan, 2012. *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press [Chapter 6 “Ethics and Politics in Social Research”, pp. 129-154].

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb and Joseph M. Williams, 2003. *The Craft of Research* (2nd ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [Chapter 1 “Research, Researchers, and Readers”, pp. 1-34].

King, Gary, Robert Keohane and Sidney Verba, 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, Chapter 1 “*The Science in Social Science*”, pp. 3-12.

2.2 Additional Readings

(Additional references for students to learn to expand their knowledge about the subject.)

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb and Joseph M. Williams, 2003. *The Craft of Research* (2nd ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Brady, Henry E. and David Collier, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (2nd ed.), Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bryman, Alan, 2012. *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooley, Linda and Jo Lewkowicz, 2003. *Dissertation Writing in Practice: Turning Ideas into Text*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Della Porta, Donatella and Michael Keating, eds., 2008. *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz and Linda L. Shaw, 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gerring, John, 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge: CUP.

Israel, Mark and Iain Hay, 2006. *Research Ethics for Social Scientists: Between Ethical Conduct and Regulatory Compliance*, London: Sage Publications.

King, Gary, Robert Keohane & Sidney Verba, 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mahoney, James, Erin Kimball and Kendra Koivu, 2009. “The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences”, *Comparative Political Studies* 42(1): 114-146.

Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz, 2006. “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research”, *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227-249.

Ragin, Charles C. & Lisa M. Amoroso, 2011. *Constructing Social Research* (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ritchie, Jane and Jane Lewis (eds.), 2003. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, London: Sage Publication.

Weiss, R., 1994. *Learning from Strangers: Art & Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*, New York: Free Press.

Willis, J. W., 2007. *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive & Critical Approaches*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.