

TRANSMITTAL

**DATE:** April 22, 2004

**TO:** Rebecca Scott  
Senate Council

**FROM:** Lissa Holland  
Graduate Council

The Graduate Council met on April 8, 2004 and approved the following:

COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES

*Geography*

**New Courses**

**GEO 610 Introduction to Methods in Geography (3 credits)**

A broad survey of methods and methodological debates of research in human/physical geography. Emphasis on contemporary research examples.

***Prerequisites:*** Graduate standing.

APPLICATION FOR NEW COURSE

1. Submitted by College of Arts and Sciences Date September 24, 2  
Department/Division offering course Geography

2. Proposed designation and Bulletin description of this course

a. Prefix and Number GEO 610 b. Title\* Intro to Methods in Geography  
\*NOTE: If the title is longer than 24 characters (including spaces), write  
A sensible title (not exceeding 24 characters) for use on transcripts Intro Methods in Geo

c. Lecture/Discussion hours per week 3 d. Laboratory hours per week n/a

e. Studio hours per week n/a f. Credits 3

g. Course description

A broad survey of methods and methodological debates of research in human/physical geography. Emphasis on contemporary research examples

h. Prerequisites (if any)

graduate standing

i. May be repeated to a maximum of n/a (if applicable)

4. To be cross-listed as

n/a

Prefix and Number

Signature, Chairman, cross-listing department

5. Effective Date as soon as possible (semester and year)

6. Course to be offered  Fall  Spring  Summer

7. Will the course be offered each year?  Yes  No  
(Explain if not annually)

8. Why is this course needed?

To introduce students to a broad range of methods in geography

9. a. By whom will the course be taught? Professor Anna Secor

b. Are facilities for teaching the course now available?  Yes  No  
If not, what plans have been made for providing them?

## APPLICATION FOR NEW COURSE

10. What enrollment may be reasonably anticipated? 10
- 
11. Will this course serve students in the Department primarily?  Yes  No  
Will it be of service to a significant number of students outside the Department?  
If so, explain.  Yes  No
- 
- Will the course serve as a University Studies Program course?  Yes  No  
If yes, under what Area? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
12. Check the category most applicable to this course
- traditional; offered in corresponding departments elsewhere;
  - relatively new, now being widely established
  - not yet to be found in many (or any) other universities
13. Is this course applicable to the requirements for at least one degree or certificate at the University of Kentucky?  Yes  No
14. Is this course part of a proposed new program:  
If yes, which?  Yes  No
- 
15. Will adding this course change the degree requirements in one or more programs? \*  Yes  No  
If yes, explain the change(s) below  
It will replace GEO 600 as a required course for all Geo. grad students
- 
16. Attach a list of the major teaching objectives of the proposed course and outline and/or reference list to be used.
17. If the course is a 100-200 level course, please submit evidence (e.g., correspondence) that the Community College System has been consulted.
18. Within the Department, who should be contacted for further information about the proposed course?  
Name Richard Schein Phone Extension 7 2119


\*NOTE: Approval of this course will constitute approval of the program change unless other program modifications are proposed.

Print Form

Clear Form

APPLICATION FOR NEW COURSE

Signatures of Approval:

  
Department Chair  
*David Leep*  
Dean of the College

10-28-03

Date  
FEB 06 2004

Date

NOV 21 2003

Date of Notice to the Faculty

\*Undergraduate Council

Date

\*University Studies

Date

\*Graduate Council

Date

\*Academic Council for the Medical Center

Date

\*Senate Council (Chair)

Date of Notice to University Senate

\*If applicable, as provided by the Rules of the University Senate

ACTION OTHER THAN APPROVAL

**GEO 610**  
**Introduction to Methods in Geography**

**1. Learning objectives**

GEO 600 is a survey of methods and methodological debates in geography. By the end of the semester, students will have

- 1) gained a general knowledge of the methods geographers use and the debates surrounding their use,
- 2) acquired a basic understanding of how to do research using various analytic methods, and
- 3) come to understand the epistemological underpinnings of methodological choices.

**2. Course description**

With these goals in mind, the readings have been selected both to introduce students to the scope of methodological approaches with which geographers are currently engaged and to provide a sampling of the kinds of materials that are out there to help researchers work through the nuts and bolts of the research process. Many of the items on the reading list are chapters of books that you might want to read in their entirety as you progress with your research program. For example, although we read only one chapter of it for this class, I can recommend Fowler's *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation* to anyone trying to design a survey questionnaire. This course is thus designed to prepare students to do research at the MA level, and to provide a jumping off point for PhD students (who will also be taking an advanced methods class in their chosen area).

**3. Course requirements and Grading**

A basic requirement is to come to class prepared, having completed the weekly readings. Anyone who misses four classes or more will automatically receive a failing grade in this seminar (barring a university approved excuse). You will also be asked to come to class **each week with a set of three to five questions** (typed please) on the reading. I will use them to help guide and stimulate our discussion throughout the seminar. **Fifty percent** of your grade will be based on these aspects of your engagement.

Readings will be available each week in POT 1422, in the mailboxes to the right against the wall as you enter the room. There is one book that you should purchase for the class: Gillian Rose's *Visual Methodologies*. This will be available by the third week of school at the UK bookstore in the student center under the course number.

There are **two writing assignments**, one for each of the two units (first will be due Week 8 and the second Week 15). These will comprise the other **fifty percent** of your grade. Each is an essay of 10-15 pages, and for each you have a choice of doing one of the following:

- 1) Engage with methodological debates pertaining to the topics discussed in class. Use course readings as a starting point but also go beyond these in your research and discussion.
- 2) Conduct a mini-project using one of the analytical techniques discussed in class. Report your experiences and relate these to literature on the use of such methods. Since this is not a research design class, the emphasis will be on the process of data acquisition and analysis.
- 3) Review, compare, critique and evaluate the methodologies of a set of five or so articles that take a similar methodological approach (e.g. five studies using multi-level modeling, five ethnographies, five studies using focus groups, etc.).

For the second essay, you must choose one of the two options that you didn't do for the first essay. The second paper will focus on methods and debates pertinent to the second half of the class.

#### 4. Outline of classes and readings

##### Week 1: Introduction

##### Week 2: Statistical analysis and the scientific method

Hacking, Ian. 1991. How should we do the history of statistics? In G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect*, 181-195. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Barnes, T. J. 1998. A history of regression: actors, networks, machines and numbers. *Environment and Planning A* 30 (2): 203-223.

Hepple, L. 1998. Context, social construction and statistics: regression, social science and human geography. *Environment and Planning A* 30 (2): 225-234.

Harvey, David. 1969. *Explanation in Geography*. New York, St. Martin's Press. (pages v-ix, 3-23)

Burt, James E. and Barber, Gerald M. 1996. *Elementary Statistics for Geographers*, Second edition. New York, Guilford. (pages 1-31)

##### Week 3: Trends in Quantitative Methods: Locality, ecological inference and multi-level modeling.

Fotheringham, A. Stewart. 1997. Trends in quantitative methods I: Stressing the local. *Progress in Human Geography* 21 (1): 88-96.

Sui, Daniel. 2000. New directions in ecological inference: An introduction. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (3): 579-581.

Fotheringham, A. Stewart. 2000. A bluffer's guide to *A Solution to the Ecological Inference Problem*. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (3): 582-586.

Anselin, Luc. 2000. The alchemy of statistics, or creating data where no data exist. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (3): 586-592.

O'Loughlin, John. 2000. Can King's ecological inference method answer a social scientific puzzle: Who voted for the Nazi party in Weimer Germany? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (3): 592-601.

King, Gary. 2000. Geography, statistics and ecological inference. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (3): 601-606.

Jones, Kelvyn and Duncan, Craig. 1996. People and places: the multilevel model as a general framework for the quantitative analysis of geographical data. In Paul Longley and Michael Batty (Eds.), *Spatial analysis: Modelling in a GIS environment*, pp. 79-104. New York, John Wiley Sons.

##### Week 4: Designing surveys for quantitative analysis

Czaja, Ronald and Blair, Johnny. 1996. "Chapter 1: An introduction to surveys and to this book," "Chapter 2 – Stages of a survey," and "Chapter 7 – Designing the Sample." In *Designing Surveys: A Guide to Decisions and Procedures*. Thousand Oaks, Pine Forge Press.

Weisberg, Herbert F., Krosnick, Jon A. and Bowen, Bruce D. 1996. "Designing a survey." In *An Introduction to Survey Research, Polling, and Data Analysis*, Third Edition. London, Sage Publications.

Fowler, Floyd. 1995. "Some general rules for designing good survey instruments." *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation*. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume 38. London, Sage Publications.

##### Week 5: Rethinking quantitative geography

Doel, Marcus A. 2001. 1a. Qualified quantitative geography. *Environment and Planning D; Society and Space* 19: 555-572.

Sheppard, Eric. 2001. Quantitative geography: representations, practices and possibilities. *Environment and Planning D; Society and Space* 19: 535-554.

Philo, C. 1998. Guest editorial: Reconsidering quantitative geography: the things that count. *Environment and Planning A* 30 (2): 191-201.

Sibley, D. 1998. Sensations and spatial science: gratification and anxiety in the production of ordered landscapes. *Environment and Planning A* 30 (2): 235-246.

Dixon, D. P. and Jones, J.P III. 1998. My dinner with Derrida, or spatial analysis and poststructuralism do lunch. *Environment and Planning A* 30 (2): 247-260.

Phillip, L. J. 1998. Combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to social research in human geography – an impossible mixture? *Environment and Planning A* 30 (2): 261-276.

#### Week 6: Quantitative methods and feminist research

McDowell, Linda. 1992. Doing gender: feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 17 (4): 399-416.

Cope, Meghan. 2002. Feminist epistemology in geography. In P. Moss (Ed.), *Feminist Geography in Practice*, pp. 43-56. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Mattingly, Doreen J. and Falconer-Al-Hindi, Karen. 1995. Should women count? A context for the debate. *Professional Geographer* 47 (4): 427-435.

Moss, Pamela. 1995. Embeddedness in practice, numbers in context: The politics of knowing and doing. *Professional Geographer* 47 (4): 442-449.

Lawson, Victoria. 1995. The politics of difference: examining the quantitative/qualitative dualism in post-structuralist feminist research. *Professional Geographer* 47 (4): 449-457.

Rocheleau, Dianne. 1995. Maps, numbers, text and context: Mixing methods in feminist political ecology. *Professional Geographer* 47 (4): 458-466.

#### Week 7: Reading quantitative geographical research

Robbins, Paul. 2001. Tracking invasive land covers in India, or why our landscapes have never been modern. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 91 (4): 637-659.

Florida, Richard. 2002. The economic geography of talent. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 92 (4): 743-755.

Gilbert, Melissa R. 1998. "Race," space and power: The survival strategies of working poor women. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88 (4): 595-621.

Pattie, Charles and Johnston, Ron. 2000. "People who talk together vote together": An exploration of contextual effects in Great Britain. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (1): 41-66.

O'Loughlin, John. 2001. Democratic values, trust and geographic context: A multilevel analysis of the world values survey data, 1990-97. Paper presented at the conference on "Interrogating the globalization project" at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 2 November 2001.

#### Week 8: Introduction to qualitative methods [FIRST WRITING ASSIGNMENT DUE]

Dwyer, Claire and Limb, Melanie. 2001. Introduction: doing qualitative research in geography. In Melanie Limb and Clair Dwyer (Eds.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*. London, Arnold.

Smith, Susan. 2001. Doing qualitative research: from interpretation to action. In Melanie Limb and Clair Dwyer (Eds.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*. Arnold: London.

Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S., 1994. "Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, editors N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Crang, Mike. 2002. Qualitative methods: the new orthodoxy? *Progress in Human Geography* 26 (5): 647-655.

Crang, Mike. 2003. Qualitative methods: touchy, feely, look-see? *Progress in Human Geography* 27 (4): 494-504.

#### Week 9: Visual methodologies: content analysis, semiotics, psychoanalysis

Rose, Gillian. 2001. *Visual Methodologies: An introduction to the interpretation of visual materials*. Sage: London. (chapters 1-5)

Manning, Peter K. and Cullum-Swan, Betsy. 1994. Narrative, content and semiotic analysis. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, editors N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

#### Week 10: Discourse analysis

Rose, Gillian. 2001. *Visual Methodologies: An introduction to the interpretation of visual materials*. London, Sage. (chapters 6 and 7)

Forbes, Dean. 2000. Reading texts and writing geography. In Iain Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, pp. 122-142. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Titscher, Stefan, Meyer, Michal, Wodak, Ruth and Yerrer, Eva. 2000. Two approaches to critical discourse analysis. In *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London, Sage Publications.

Foucault, Michel. 1991. Politics and the Study of Discourse. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect*, 53-72. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

#### Week 11: Interviewing

Fine, Michelle. 1994. "Working the Hyphen: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, editors N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Kvale, Steinar. 1996. "Chapter 1—The interview as conversation," "Chapter 5 – Thematizing and designing an interview study," "Chapter 11—Methods of analysis." *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. "Chapter 2 -- Feminist interview Research." In *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

#### Week 12: Focus Groups

Krueger, Richard A. 1994. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Wilkinson, Sue. 1998. "Focus groups in feminist research: power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning." *Women Studies International Forum* 24 (1): 111-125.

Goss, Jon D. and Leinbach, Thomas R. 1996. Focus groups as alternative research practice: Experience with transmigrants in Indonesia. *Area* 28 (2): 113-114.



Week 13: Ethnography

Atkinson, Paul and Hammersley, Martyn. 1994. Ethnography and participant observation. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, editors N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Agar, Michael H. *The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography*. San Diego, Academic Press. (chapters 4 and 5)

Dowler, Lorraine. 2001. Fieldwork in the trenches: Participant observation in a conflict area. In Melanie Limb and Clair Dwyer (Eds.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*. London, Arnold.

Week 14: Interpretation and writing

Denzin, Norman K. 1994. "The art and politics of interpretation." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, editors N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Richardson, Laurel. 1994. Writing: A method of inquiry. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, editors N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Altheide, David L. and Johnson, John M. 1994. Criteria for assessing the interpretive validity of qualitative research. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, editors N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Baxter, Jamie and Eyles, John. 1997. Evaluating qualitative research in social geography: Establishing "rigour" in interview analysis. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22 (4): 505-525.

Berg, Lawrence and Mansvelt, Juliana. 2000. Writing in, speaking out: Communicating qualitative research findings. In Iain Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Week 15: Reading qualitative geography [SECOND WRITING ASSIGNMENT DUE]

Pratt, Geraldine. 1998. Inscribing domestic work on Filipina bodies. In H.J. Nast and S. Pile (Eds.), *Places Through the Body*. London, Routledge.

Dixon, Deborah P. and Hapke, Holly M. 2003. Cultivating discourse: the social construction of agricultural legislation. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93 (1): 142-164.

Nagar, Richa. 2000. *Mujhe Jawab Do! (Answer me!)*: Women's grass-roots activism and social spaces in Chitrakoot (India). *Gender, Place and Culture* 7 (4): 341-362.

DeLyser, Dydia. 1999. Authenticity on the ground: Engaging the past in a California ghost town. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 89 (4): 602-632.

Bebbington, Anthony. 2000. Reencountering development: Livelihood transitions and place transformations in the Andes. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 (3): 495-520.

January 20, 2004

Dear Sung Hee Kim,

Thanks for meeting with me over questions regarding the proposed curriculum changes for the Geography graduate program.

Please allow me to address your committee's concerns. I will do so by: (A) briefly explicating the context of these changes, before; (B) addressing other, specific questions.

(A) There is a concern that the curriculum changes will mean that our students are not gaining sufficient methodological training. I note that the primary rationale listed in the 'Request for Change' core sheet is "to broaden our students' methodological preparation" and I hasten to add these changes will not, simultaneously, somehow make our students' methodological preparation 'shallower' or 'narrower' or will somehow leave students 'up in the air.' I suspect this might not be clear in the course change proposal for 2 reasons:

1. *The forms do not make clear the breadth of our students' methodological training, or the depth of their training through the advanced methods course required of them.* Our program is known for its unusual level of methodological training – four courses, more than our benchmarks. Through these four courses, students: are introduced to the ontological and epistemological development and foundations of geographic thought and methodologies since the enlightenment (GEO 707); explore by reading original research the evolution of a broad range of contemporary research methodologies (paradigms) in Geography (GEO 702); are given a broad introduction to the range of methods presently used in the discipline (GEO 610); and are required to focus their methodological training as relevant to their own research in an advanced methods course approved by the advisor and the DGS (GEO 700 or some other advanced methods course). The aim of this sequence is twofold: to provide a *critical perspective* on methodology over the *long duree* (since the Enlightenment) as well as leading students toward *proficiency in methods* for prosecuting their own research. In this context, GEO 610 simply replaces GEO 600, which was a rather narrower introduction to spatial statistics alone, and did not account for other, mainstream epistemologies and methods as practiced in Geography especially over the past twenty years.

2. *There is some misunderstanding of the role GEO 710 previously played in our program.* The Bulletin notes that GEO 710 is a "... review of methodological issues in geographic research, including theoretical foundations, data structures, research design, analysis, and writing geographic reports." We have come to see this course as largely redundant. All of these topics are already covered in depth through (required) GEO 702, 707, 610, and 700/advanced methods requirement. What is left are *some* elements of

research design and geographic reports. We feel that these are best covered (and our students best served) by leaving *specific* research design questions to the thesis/dissertation proposal (which is required of our PhD students before qualifying exams may be taken; and requires a full-committee defense), and by requiring a new course, GEO 743, which will introduce students to the increasingly important world of proposal design in the context of (external) grant writing and submission.

(B) Specific questions as communicated to me:

1. Regarding the concern that GEO 610 does not provide our students “any recognizable fluency in the methods they will expound...” with an example drawn from the King debate (from the *Annals, AAG*) that is part of the syllabus: I note that the aim of GEO 610 is not to make our student *proficient* in spatial statistics or statistical analysis or, in this case, ecological inference. Rather, the aim is to provide students with a broad introduction to the *kinds of methods* utilized in the (increasingly methodologically catholic) discipline of Geography and to allow them access to the *kinds of questions and debates* that might lend themselves to a particular method. GEO 610 is not a course in gaining *fluency* toward methodological practice; but is intended to explore the range and epistemological foundations of particular methods by reading essays employing those methods, by reading debates in which those methods are interrogated, and, when possible, to give students the opportunity to work through hypothetical situations in which they *might* employ those methods in their own work. GEO 610, then, is a course in ‘methodological literacy,’ which prepares students to choose their next required methods class in our sequence (the next course providing a more in-depth ‘how to’ focus).

2. I note that these changes have earned consensus in our department. They (continue to) place us at the forefront of methodological training in the discipline and will not harm, but rather will help our students to compete for jobs and can only enhance our reputation.

3. I apologize for the confusion over the actual course rubric of the new 600-level course. Multiple drafts and my own lack of proofreading are to blame. The new course should be labeled GEO 610, and all references to GEO 605/610 should be changed to refer to GEO 610.

4. Questions regarding GEO 743:

(a) Course proposal question #13 ‘no response.’ There is a response for #13. However, there is no response for #12, which should be checked in the box labeled ‘not yet to be found in many (or any) other universities.’

(b) More detailed descriptions of course requirements: it seems clear to me course requirements are (i) regular attendance and discussion and; (ii) completion of a grant proposal and participation in an in-class review of that proposal.

(c) Grading policy: and so each of these two components are worth 50% of the final grade. We are happy to amend the line “grant proposal/in class proposal review” to “grant proposal *and* in class proposal review (which will constitute a review and inclass discussion of each class members’ proposal by a panel made up of other class members and the professor” (as in keeping with the description 2 paragraphs preceding).

5. Questions regarding GEO 610:

(a) Learning outcomes: I don't understand the query, unless we are splitting hairs over the heading 'learning objectives' as opposed to 'learning outcomes'; in which case we are happy to amend the syllabus.

(b) Grading Policy: I don't understand the nature of the inquiry. Perhaps the committee member raising the question could contact me.

Please feel free to have individual committee members contact me with specific questions.

Sincerely Yours,

Rich Schein