

**New York University
Educational Leadership Program
East Building, Suite 303
239 Greene Street
New York, NY 10012**

E95.2031: Participatory Action Research (PAR)

Instructor:	Gary Anderson	Class Location:	TBD
Office Location:		Class Time:	Saturday, time TBD
Telephone		Email Address:	
Office Hours:			

Catalogue description: Introduction to various approaches to Participatory Action Research (PAR) with an emphasis on approaches that encourage the participation of as many stakeholders as possible. The course will cover action research traditions, issues of positionality, methodology, validity and ethics. Students will engage in various field

Objectives:

1. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the various traditions of participatory action research. (evaluated by double entry journals)
2. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the various insider/outsider positions researchers can take, and related issues of a study's trustworthiness, transferability, and ethics. (Evaluated by double entry journals and 3-5 page study reflections)
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to design a PAR study.

Grading:

50% Participatory Action Research Proposal. See appendix A for description and criteria.

30% Double Entry journals and reflections on readings (See appendix B)

20% Class participation

Complete the Institutional Review Board's on-line Human Subjects Tutorial with a score of 90 or above. (<http://www.nyu.edu/osp/human.html>).

Required Texts:

Reason, P. and Bradbury, H. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: Concise Paperback Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herr, K. and Anderson, G. L. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Recommended: Any text that reviews basic qualitative data gathering skills (ie. interviewing, observation, document analysis, discourse analysis, etc.)

Session 1: What is Participatory Action Research?

Session 2: Getting Started: The evolution of a research question.

Required readings:

Herr, K. and Anderson, G. L. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (chapter 5)

Freire, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum. (chapters 1 & 2)

Session 3: Positionality of the researcher (Insider/Outsider).

Required readings:

Herr, K. and Anderson, G. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chapter 3)

See also (not required):

Anderson, G.L. and Jones, F. (2000). Knowledge generation in educational administration from the inside-out: The promise and perils of site-based, administrator research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 428-464.

Bartunek, J. and Louis M. R. (1996). *Insider/outsider team research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Villenas, S. (1996). The colonizer/colonized Chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(4), 711-731.

Session 4: The epistemological debate.

Required readings:

Anderson, G.L. and Herr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars. Is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities? *Educational Researcher*, 28(5), 12-21.

Introduction: Inquiry and participation in search of a world worthy of human aspiration. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: concise paperback edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

See also (not required):

Anderson, G.L. (2002). Reflecting on Research for Doctoral Students in Education. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 22-25.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Lindblom, C. and Cohen, D. (1979). *Usable knowledge: Social science and social problem solving*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lindblom, C. (1995). *Inquiry and change: The troubled attempt to understand and shape society*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Session 5: Action research traditions

Required readings:

Herr, K. and Anderson, G. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (chapters 1 and 2).

Gaventa, J. and Cornwall, A. (2002). Power and knowledge. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: concise paperback edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mieczakowski, J. and Morgan S. (2006). Ethnodrama: Constructing participatory, experiential, and compelling action research through performance. In P. Reason and Bradbury, H. *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 176-184) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

See also (not required)

Chambers, R. (1994). The origins and practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal. *World Development*, 22(7), 953-966.

Cornwall, A. (1997). Performance and Participation, *PLA Notes*, issue 29, pp. 23-28,

London: IIED.

Boal, A. (1979). *Theater of the Oppressed*. New York: Theater Communications Group.

Session 6: Action Research traditions

Required readings:

Kemmis, S. (2002). Exploring the relevance of critical theory for action research: Emancipatory action research in the footsteps of Jurgen Habermas. In P. Reason and Bradbury, H. *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 91-102) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pasmore, W. (2006). Action research in the workplace: The socio-technical perspective. In P. Reason and Bradbury, H. *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 38-48) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lewis, H. (2002). Participatory research and education for social change: Highlander research and education center. In P. Reason and Bradbury, H. *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 356-362) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Session 7: Validity criteria for Action Research

Required readings:

Herr, K. and Anderson, G. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chapter 4)

Conclusion: Bradbury, H. and Reason, P. (2006). Broadening the bandwidth of validity: Issues and choice-points for improving the quality of action research. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: concise paperback edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Session 8: Creating “local” and “public” knowledge through Action Research: Naturalistic generalization.

Required readings:

Stake, R. (1986). An evolutionary view of educational improvement. In E.R. House (Ed.) *New directions in educational evaluation*. (pp. 89-102). London: Falmer Press.

Chapter 9: Park, P. (2006). Knowledge and participatory research. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: concise paperback edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Session 10: Exemplars of Action Research

Required reading:

Herr, K. and Anderson, G. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chapter 6)

Required reading: Select one:

Chapter 30: Gordon, G.B. (2006). *Transforming lives: Towards bicultural competence*. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: concise paperback edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wang, C. (2003). Using photovoice as a participatory assessment and issue selection tool. In Minkler, M. and Wallerstein, N. (Eds.) *Community-based participatory research for health*. (pp. 179-196) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chavez, V., Duran, B., Baker, Q., Avila, M. and Wallerstein, N. (2003). The dance of race and privilege in community based participatory research. In M. Minkler and N. Wallerstein (Eds.) *Community-based participatory research for health*. (pp. 81-97) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christman, J., Hirshman, J., Holtz, A., Perry, H., Spelkoman, R., and Williams, M. (1995). Doing Eve's work: Women principals write about their practice. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 26(2), 213-227.

Herr, K. (1999b). Unearthing the unspeakable: When teacher research and political agendas collide. *Language Arts*, 77 (1). 10-15.

Kelly, J.G., Azelton, S., Lardon, C., Mock, L.O., Tandon, D., Thomas, M. (2004). On community leadership: Stories about collaboration in action research. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 33, 205-216.

Session 11: Exemplars of Action Research

Readings: Select two from the following:

Chapter 18: Martin, A.W. (2006). Large-group processes as action research. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: concise paperback edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chapter 40: Whitmore, E. and Mckee, C. (2006). Six street youth who could... In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of Action Research: concise paperback edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Themba, M. and Minkler, M. (2003). Influencing policy through community-based

participatory research. In Minkler, M. and Wallerstein, N. (Eds.) *Community-based participatory research for health*. (pp. 349-370) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Torre, M. and Fine, M. (2006). Researching and resisting: Democratic policy research by and for youth. In S. Ginwright, P. Noguera, J. Cammarota (Eds.) *Beyond resistancne!: Youth activism and community change*. New York: Routledge.

Ballenger, C. (1992). Because you like us: The language of control. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), 199-208.

Maguire, P. (1993) Challenges, contradictions, and celebrations: Attempting participatory research as a doctoral student. In, P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall. and T. Jackson (Eds.) *Voices of change: Participatory research in the United States and Canad* (pp. 157-176) Wesport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tandon, S. D., Kelly, J.G. and Mock L. (2001). Participatory action research as a resource for developing African American community leadership. In D. Tolman and M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.) *From subjects to subjectivities: A handbook of interpretive and participatory methods* (200-217) New York: New York University Press.

Session 12: autoethnography and self-study

Required readings:

Bullough, R.V. and Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 13-22.

Hanrahan, M. (1998). Academic growth through action research: A doctoral student's narrative. In B. Atweh, S. Kemmis, and P. Weeks (Eds.) *Action research in practice: Partnerships for social justice education* (pp. 302-325) London: Routledge.

Connelly, F.M. and Clandinin, J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.

See also:

Reed-Danahay, D. (Ed.). (1997) *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social*. New York: Berg.

Session 13: Ethics of Action Research, Institutional Review Board.

Required readings:

Herr, K. and Anderson, G. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chapter 7)

Hammack, F.M. (1997). Ethical issues in teacher research. *Teachers College Record*, 99(2), 247-265.

Hoonard, W. C. van doss (2001). Is research-ethics review a moral panic? *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 38(1), 19-36.

See also (not required):

Wax, M.L. (1982). Research reciprocity rather than informed consent in fieldwork. In J.E. Sieber (Ed.) *The Ethics of Social Research: Fieldwork, Regulation, and Publication*, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Zeni, J. (2001). A guide to ethical decision making for insider research. In J. Zeni (Ed.), *Ethical Issues in Practitioner Research*, 153-165. NY: Teachers College Press.

Sessions 14, 15 Critical friends groups and presentations.

Appendix A

As a final project, students will write a Participatory Action Research Proposal.

Criteria for Individual or group Participatory Action Research (PAR) proposal: A guide to self-evaluation.

1. Quality of final product: This criteria refers to the clarity and organization of your proposal, as well as issues such as grammatical correctness and use of APA style. Although proposals may vary in length, it is hard to imagine a proposal under 15 pages in length.
2. Literature Review. To the extent possible, you should review literature relevant to your research question. Although this review will likely not be as extensive as a review for a thesis or dissertation, it should be sufficiently extensive to frame your question.
3. Discussion of Methodology. Include a discussion of your positionality, validity criteria, and implications for ethics and IRB. Also provide specific details as to who your participants will be, what research methods you will use, and if possible examples of interview questions, observation protocols, document analysis, visual artifacts, etc.

4. Critical reflection. How will you reflect critically on the biases, paradigms, ideologies, and "gut reactions" you have as you begin the inquiry. How will you "keep yourself honest" as you gather and analyze data. How will your study move beyond confirming your prejudices to challenging them.

Appendix B

Suggested format for the Double Entry Journal

1. Author(s), year of publication, title of chapter or article and title of book or journal it came from, and the location and name of the publisher.

Left-hand side- Objective Summary & Highpoints	Right-hand side- Subjective Reflections
2. Full summary of reading (5 or 6 sentences someone who hadn't read the reading could understand)	1. Your thoughts on the overall content of the reading. 2. How did it tie in with your experiences, beliefs, philosophy, prior knowledge? 3. Have your ideas changed or been confirmed?
3. List 6-10 thought provoking points or quotes from the reading	These are just prompts for reflection – you needn't answer each one. 1. Do you agree or disagree with each point? 2. Are you annoyed, impressed, scared, dazzled or ? 3. Is there anything more you would like to know about the topic? 4. Are you aware of any literature or research that conflicts with the author's position? 5. How did this change your understanding of this topic?
4. 1 question you have.	1. Why is this question important to you? 2. What are the implications of the question?