

CUS505 Methods in Cultural Research 文化研究的方法

Course Title : Methods in Cultural Research 文化研究的方法

Course Code : CUS505

No. of Credits : 3 credits

Mode of Tuition : 3 hours of lecture/seminar

Class Contact Hours : 3 hours per week, 42 hours for the whole course

Category in Major Prog. : Core course

Discipline : Cultural Studies

Prerequisite(s) : Nil

Co-requisite(s) : Nil

Exclusion(s); : Nil

Exemption Requirements : Nil

Brief Course Description : This core course enhances the students to develop a reflexive attitude about and critical abilities of different methods used by cultural researchers. Method here is understood not only as research techniques, procedures, and practices, but also as involving the theories and perspectives that inform the production of a particular kind of research and justify it in terms of knowledge-making. Practical examples will be used to illustrate diverse cultural studies methods such as textual analysis, ethnographic methods (participatory action research, interviews, focus groups and story-telling), oral history, archival work, etc. Discussion of methodological issues involved in those examples will help students map out the trajectories in which cultural studies as a discipline developed in the past and the implications they have nowadays.

Aims : 1. To guide students to pay critical attentions to the techniques and procedures of doing cultural research in such different areas, such as literature, film and media, popular culture, postcolonial studies, commons, and community economies.

2. To provide a platform for students to discuss different perspectives on research methods and related issues such as research ethics, knowledge, and power.

Learning : On completion of the course, students will able to :

Outcomes(LOs)

1. LO1: apply at least one of the methods learnt in the course to handle a practical or research problem;

2. LO2: present a critical reflection of the research method(s) used and the process of research based on methodological issues discussed in class.

Indicative : 1. Philosophical basis of cultural research

Contents 2. Studying lived experience and resistance

3. Ethnography and understanding the Other

4. Reading discourse and ideology

5. Semiotics and genealogy

6. Methods of commoning

Teaching : The delivery of the course is informed by the philosophy and pedagogical

Method principles of flipped classroom and action strategies. Students will take

s part in lectures, seminars, group and discussion of readings and practical work. The emphasis is on student participation in the analysis of issues, relating their own views, experience and observations to the critical questions addressed in the course framework.

Measurement of Learning Outcomes:

LO:	Assessment:	Group Discussion (Commentary and Reflections on Reading, CRR)	Group Presentations (Two Group Presentations)	Individual Essay
		(20%)	(40%)	(40%)
LO1		v	v	v
LO2		v	v	v

Measurement of Learning Outcomes : Students will be assessed on their ability to apply at least one of the methods learnt to handle a chosen topic in cultural research and to reflect critically upon the research method(s) used and the process of research. The learning outcomes will be measured in the following ways.

1. Group Discussion (Commentary and Reflections on Reading, CRR)
Participation in discussion of assigned materials requires that students review concepts and theories learnt and preview materials in preparation for class. (LO1, LO2)
2. Group Presentations (Two Group Presentations)
Group presentations on selected topics aim to test students' understanding of assigned readings, grasp of theoretical materials, and application of conceptual framework to local examples. Students would demonstrate their abilities in applying research methods to reflect and solve practical or academic problems. (LO1, LO2)
3. Individual Essay
Individual paper requires that students understand the research methods chosen and reflect on the process of applying them in researching the contexts that concern them. (LO1, LO2)

Assessment : The course adopts 100% continuous assessment basing on the following types of assessment.

Assessment Type (%)	Description
1. Group Discussion (Commentary and Reflections on Readings, CRR) (20%)	4 assigned readings for group discussions to review topics learnt and preview topics to cover
2. Group Presentations (40%)	2 group presentations of 2 topics in class
	Individual Essay (40%) 1 individual Essay (Around 4,500 words in Chinese, or 3,500 in English)

Assessment : 1. Commentary and Reflection on Readings (CRR) (Group work) (20%, 4 assigned course materials, 5%@)
Throughout the course, students will engage in four guided group reading exercises to develop understanding of various issues in cultural research. The guiding questions should prepare students to review the theories and concepts learnt and preview new ones.
Schedule of the assigned readings and guiding questions will be given

in due course.

2. Two Group Presentations (40% = 1st, 15% + 2nd, 25%)

In groups, students will present two topics chosen from “Topics for Group Presentation and Individual Paper” in class.*

a. 1st presentation carries 15% and will be conducted at the mid-term.

b. 2nd presentation carries 25% and will be conducted in the last lesson.

Each group needs to submit the PowerPoint slides and a 2-page summary + a reference list one day ahead of the presentation date. No written report is required.

Peer assessment will be conducted as a reference for the assessment of an individual’s contribution to the group presentation.

3. Individual Essay (40%)

Students will write an individual paper (Around 4,500 words in Chinese, or 3,500 in English) on a topic chosen from “Topics for Group Presentation and Individual Paper”. *

The paper should contain two parts:

a. A preliminary but comprehensive, critical and analytical account derived from the materials; and

b. A critical self-reflection upon the methodological issues adopted.

* The submission due dates and “Topics for Group Presentation and Individual Paper” will be given in due course.

Assessment Rubrics

1. Group Discussion: Commentary and Reflection on Readings (CRR)(20%, 5%x4)

Criterion	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (60-89%)	Pass (30%-59%)	Failure (0-29%)
Personal Reflection (5%)	Ability to proficiently demonstrate reflection and deep thinking of acquired knowledge/concepts, integrating them into issues from wide perspectives (e.g., contexts, cultures, disciplines); creative solutions and critical thinking evident.	Shows satisfactory ability to relate acquired knowledge to previous experiences with some insight.	Demonstrates attempt to analyze issues from multiple perspectives; includes event descriptions with limited consideration in descriptive style; minimal deeper analysis.	Only includes mere descriptions of theoretical knowledge; no reflection is demonstrated beyond the descriptions

2. Two Group Presentations (40%=1st, 15%+2nd, 25%)

Criterion	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (60-89%)	Pass (30%-59%)	Failure (0-29%)
Content (15%)	Identifies clearly the main issues to be addressed Examines the issues from all important perspectives. Overall logic is clear.	Identifies most of the main issues to be addressed Examines the issue / problem from most of the important perspectives but not all relevant arguments and counter arguments are fully examined.	Identifies an issue area, but without specific delineation of the main issues to be addressed Examines the question/ issue/ problem from some of the important perspectives.	Fail to identify an issue area and the main issues to be addressed No critical engagement with issues, and themes. Presentation characterized by serious inaccuracies and misunderstanding
	Presenter(s) engage the audience at all times, actively seeking for suggestions from the audiences and incorporate these insights into the final project in thoughtful ways	Presenter(s) engage the audience most of the time, consistently seeking for suggestions from the audiences, and incorporate these insights into the final project	Presenter(s) attempts to engage the audience, tries to seek for suggestions from the audiences, and to incorporate these insights into the final project	Presenter(s) seem to make little attempt to engage the audience.
Team-work (5%)	Excellent performance of teamwork. Demonstrates full communication with formal roles for each group member. Equal distribution of workload.	Good performance of teamwork. Demonstrates some communication with roles for each group member. Moderate distribution of workload.	Fair performance of teamwork. Demonstrates limited communication with informal roles for each group member. Some distribution of workload.	Poor performance of teamwork. Demonstrates no communication with unclear roles for each group member. Unequal distribution of workload.

3. Individual Essay (40%)

Criterion	Excellent (90-100%)	Good (60-89%)	Pass (30%-59%)	Failure (0-29%)
Understanding of Topic (10%)	Comprehensive understanding and coverage of issues. Insightful and well-informed. Clearly answers the question.	Clear discussion of relevant issues. Shows good insight into the subject. Answers the question.	Shows some coverage and understanding of main issues. Does not answer the question fully/directly enough.	Very little or no understanding of the issues. Does not answer the question.
Use of evidence (13.5%)	Wide range of evidence used to support arguments. Thoroughly researched. Use of primary sources.	Good use of evidence to support arguments. Have researched and drawn on some evidence.	Adequate range of evidence used. Could have drawn on more suitable evidence.	Inadequate use of evidence to support argument. No use of evidence to support argument
Critical analysis (13.5%)	Excellent critical awareness of subject matter and current issues. Shows original thinking and analysis.	Goes beyond description. Analyses material to develop argument.	More description than analysis in content. Needs to draw material together to develop argument.	Describes the issues but shows significant misunderstanding of basic issues.
Structure of Argument (1.5%)	Clear structure. Presents a convincing and well developed argument.	Clear structure. Develops a sound argument.	Argument needs further development. Structure needs more clarity.	Poor structure. No clear argument. No clear linkage from point to point.
Writing & Referencing (1.5%)	Uses references correctly. Demonstrates excellent writing skills.	Generally uses references correctly but some parts less well referenced. Competent writing skills.	Some parts not referenced correctly. Writing skills could be improved.	Not referenced correctly. Poor writing skills. Needed proof reading.

Important Notes : 1. Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 6 hours of personal study) per week to achieve the course

learning outcomes.

2. Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations and Course Work. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is “the presentation of another person’s work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student’s own work”. Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.

Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.

3. To enhance students’ understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course
4. “Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness” is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>.
5. Students must adhere to the University’s guidelines and practices when using Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools. The official documents “*Guidelines for Using GAI Tools at Lingnan University*” and “*Best Practices for Ethical and Responsible Use of GAI Tools in Course Assessments*” can be found here: <https://www.ln.edu.hk/tlc/generative-artificial-intelligence/gai-guidelines-best-practices>.

Required/Essential
Readings:

Saukko, P. (2003). *Doing research in cultural studies: An introduction to classical and new methodological approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Gray, A. (2003). *Research practice for cultural studies: Ethnographic methods and lived cultures*. SAGE Publications.

Pickering, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Research methods for cultural studies*. Edinburgh University Press.

Recommended/Supplementary Readings :

Chinese references

吳俊雄、曾嘉燕（2002）。《16+少女口述歷史》。香港：新婦女協進會。

游美惠（2000）。〈內容分析、文本分析與論述分析在社會研究的運用〉。《調查研究》，（8），4–42。

楊巧玲（2017）。〈學習做勞工，同時做男人：反學校文化中階級與性別的交織之民族誌研究〉。《教育研究集刊》，63（4），1–36。

龍彥（2004）。〈經驗：在黑暗與光明之間——女大學生流產研究〉。《社會性別》，1，137–160。

羅浩源（2012）。〈性別與數學：傳意在兩性學習數學上的角色〉。載蔡寶瓊、陳潔華（編著），《教育的性別視角：課室與教學實證研究》。香港：香港城市大學出版社。

Chinese books

潘毅、陳鳳儀、顧靜華、盧燕儀（2013）。《不一樣的香港社會經濟》。香港：香港商務出版社。

許寶強（2002）。《資本主義不是甚麼》。香港：牛津大學出版社。

Journal article and encyclopedia entry

Bingham, C. (2010). Hermeneutics. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 6, 63–68.

Brooks, R., & Waters, J. (2021). International students and alternative visions of diaspora. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 69(5), 557–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2021.1948501>

Books and edited books

Choi, K. W. Y. (2010). *Remade in Hong Kong: How Hong Kong people use Hong Kong Disneyland*. Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Dellenbaugh, M., Kip, M., Bieniok, M., Müller, A., Schwegmann, M., & Müller, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Urban commons: Moving beyond state and market*. Basel, Berlin, & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Gibson-Graham, J. K., Cameron, J., & Healy, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Take back the economy: An ethical guide for transforming our communities*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Grossberg, L. (2010). *Cultural studies in the future tense*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Pollock, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Remembering: Oral history performance*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stokes, J. (2003). *How to do media & cultural studies*. London, England: Sage.

Summerfield, P. (1998). *Reconstructing women's wartime lives: Discourse and subjectivity in oral histories of the Second World War*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chapters in edited books

- Fincham, B., McGuinness, M., & Murray, L. (2010). Introduction. In B. Fincham, M. McGuinness, & L. Murray (Eds.), *Mobile methodologies* (pp. 1–10). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). London, England: Sage.
- Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (2002). From the individual interview to the interview society. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research* (pp. 3–32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gutting, G. (2005). Archaeology; Genealogy. In *Foucault: A very short introduction* (pp. 32–53). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, S. (1993). Encoding, decoding. In S. During (Ed.), *The cultural studies reader* (pp. 90–103). London, England, & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. L. (2014). Introduction. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. L. Leavy (Eds.), *Feminist research practice: A primer* (pp. 1–14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, R. et al. (2004). Time please! Historical perspectives. In *The practice of cultural studies* (pp. 119–134). London, England; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Misztal, B. A. (2003). Studying memory. In *Theories of social remembering* (pp. 126–155). Maidenhead, England; Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Rollins, J. (1996). Invisibility, consciousness of the other, and resentment among black domestic workers. In C. L. Macdonald & C. Sirianni (Eds.), *Working in the service society* (pp. 255–270). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Sayer, A. (1992). Knowledge in context. In *Method in social science: A realist approach* (pp. 12–44). London, England: Routledge.

Journal articles (remaining)

- Farrell, T. S. C. (2012). Reflecting on reflective practice: (Re)visiting Dewey and Schön. *TESOL Journal*, 3(1), 7–16.
- King, N., Horrocks, C., & Brooks, J. (2019). Philosophical assumptions. In *Interviews in qualitative research* (pp. 6–26). London, England: Sage.
- Lai, R. Y. S., & Choi, S. Y. P. (2019). Premarital sexuality, abortion, and intergenerational dynamics in China. *Modern China*, 1–27.
- Leung, D. S.-c. (2021). Convivial agriculture: Evolving food and farming activism in South China. *China Perspectives*, (2), 29–38.
- Martin, F. (2017). Mobile self-fashioning and gendered risk: Rethinking Chinese students' motivations for overseas education. *Globalizations, Societies and Education*, 15(5), 706–720.
- Moran, J. (2005). Introduction: Waiting, cultural studies and the quotidian. In *Reading the everyday* (pp. 1–28). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, England; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Reason, M., & Heinemeyer, C. (2016). Storytelling, story-retelling, storyknowing: Towards a participatory practice of storytelling. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2016.1220247>
- Shu, J. (2020). Ethnodrama with Hong Kong problem gamblers and their family: Between ethnographic reality and dramatic fiction. *Research in Drama Education*, 25(2), 302–308.
- Small, M. L. (2009). How many cases do I need? On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research. *Ethnography*, 10(1), 5–38.

Web / encyclopedia entries

- George, T. (2020, December 9). Hermeneutics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2021 ed.). <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/hermeneutics/>
- Graham, L. J. (2005, November). Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. Paper presented at *The Australian Association of Research in Education Annual Conference*, Parramatta, Australia. <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/2689>

Peer Assessment Form

Team: _____

Instruction: Evaluate your peer team members on their participation in the course group work. This is due on the submission day along with the group work.

Name	Criterion	Ratings (1-10)	Further comments (optional)
1	Participation in project activities		
	Fulfilment of her/his roles		
	Leadership		
	Overall		
2	Participation in project activities		
	Fulfilment of her/his roles		
	Leadership		
	Overall		
3	Participation in project activities		
	Fulfilment of her/his roles		
	Leadership		
	Overall		
4	Participation in project activities		

	Fulfilment of her/his roles		
	Leadership		
	Overall		
5	Participation in project activities		
	Fulfilment of her/his roles		
	Leadership		
	Overall		
** peer assessment will be counted into the final mark.			

