
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE, ART & HISTORIC PRESERVATION

HP 631

Fall 2012

Preservation Graduate Thesis Seminar

2:00 pm to 4:50 pm, Thursday; ARCH 108.

Seminar format, 3 credits

Instructor: Jeremy C. Wells, Ph.D. Phone: 401-254-5338; email: jwells@rwu.edu; office ARCH 232

OFFICE HOURS

Regular walk-in office hours are Wednesdays, 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm, and Thursdays and Fridays, 1:00 pm to 2:00 pm, in ARCH 232. I highly encourage you to check my online calendar to confirm my availability and reserve a time slot, however, before you plan on arriving. To reserve a 30-minute slot, go to <http://goo.gl/1Y6Z4> to view my calendar and meeting availability. Look for the time slots labeled “office hours”, click on the specific time slot that you wish to reserve, make sure your name is in the “what” field, and click “save”. (You will need to have a Google calendar account to be able to view my online calendar.) Make sure to cancel your appointment if your plans change.¹ I am also available to meet at other times by special appointment.

CATALOG DESCRIPTION

This seminar serves as the first part of the cumulating academic experience for students in the graduate-degree program. The seminar is focused on the development of issues towards a thesis proposal through research, readings, discussions, papers and presentations, augmented by lectures by faculty and visiting lecturers. This includes attention to theoretical, philosophical and ethical concepts. Students work closely with the faculty supervisor in a self-defined and self-directed study of an aspect of historic preservation. Students are encouraged to select a focus that demonstrates original and critical thinking and contributes to available scholarship. The product is a thesis proposal document that embodies the work of the semester.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to help the student understand how to conduct research and use this knowledge to develop a thesis proposal. The student will then use the skills acquired in this course to complete a master’s thesis in HP 651 (Graduate Thesis in Historic Preservation). Historic preservation covers a wide range of activities from materials conservation to planning; this course, however, will focus on the latter aspect of preservation practice to be congruent with the goals of the graduate program in historic preservation in the School of Architecture, Art and Historic Preservation.

At the graduate level, as opposed to the undergraduate level, the student is expected to contribute novel ideas that will advance the discipline of historic preservation in order to increase its effectiveness and relevance to stakeholders. In this sense, this course will help provide the skills so that the student—a burgeoning professional—can contribute to the intellectual and applied growth of historic preservation and the broader field of heritage conservation. The end product of the two course HP 631 / HP 651 sequence is an original body of scholarship that addresses a particular problem or issue in the discipline. A thesis, therefore, is different from a project in that it combines theoretical and applied approaches culminating in a unique contribution to a particular field. A project, on the other hand, assumes an existing theoretical frame in an uncritical way, and while adding to a body of knowledge, makes no overt attempt to advance practice

¹ When you reserve a time slot, you will receive an email confirmation of your appointment in your Gmail account. To cancel the appointment, click the “no” link in the email indicating that you will not attend. Alternately, you can cancel an appointment by opening your Google calendar, finding the appointment, clicking on it, and choosing the option to “cancel” it.

or contribute to the intellectual boundaries of a discipline. A useful analogy is to think of a project as baking a cake from a pre-existing recipe, while a thesis attempts to come up with a better recipe.

The practice of historic preservation lies at the intersection of history—the objective, chronological facts about the past—and heritage—the meanings people ascribe to the tangible and intangible aspects of the historic environment. Traditionally, research in historic preservation has been synonymous with the interpretive (i.e., historical) research methodology commonly employed by historians. This approach, however, is unable to reveal the nature of heritage, primarily because significance is always assumed to reside in the past. There are a number of other useful research methodologies that can address aspects of heritage, however. Research that investigates the economics of historic preservation, such as the role and effectiveness of financial incentives, uses correlational research methodologies where data is analyzed through statistical techniques. Social science research methodologies are able to address heritage through a process of understanding the contemporary values, perceptions, and behavior of people in their interactions with the historic environment. “Environmental design and behavior research” (EDBR) is the term used to describe social science research methodologies directed to the built environment.

EDBR looks at how human-modified and "natural" environments influence people's perception, valuation, and experience of and reaction to place. Research from this type of inquiry has been used to help design buildings and landscapes and inform the conservation of various natural and cultural environments. For instance, "evidence-based design," typically used with health care facilities, utilizes post-occupancy evaluations in an effort to identify design elements that contribute to positive patient outcomes. Designs that work are carried forth to new iterations, while failed ideas are modified or eliminated. In this way, a natural evolution of design takes place through slow, incremental improvements driven by research. Environmental design and behavior research is inherently interdisciplinary, drawing techniques from a variety of disciplines, such as geography, anthropology, and sociology, to provide answers to important research questions. EDBR addresses aspects of the contemporary valuation of place, sense of place, and how historic places should be preserved, conserved, and modified to retain authenticity. EDBR can also address economic values of heritage through concepts such as hedonics, which is related to people's preferences for certain environmental attributes.

In this course, students will be encouraged to explore contemporary issues and concerns in the practice of historic preservation and develop a working theory, proposition, and research question from this exercise. Rather than a particular discipline dictating the research methodology that should be used, students will employ a research methodology that is the best fit for the particular research question. For this reason, students will be encouraged to explore questions that can be better answered through methodologies other than the historical/interpretive approach, which tends to dominate the field.

PREREQUISITES

HP 351 or HP 551

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Overall objective:

Upon the successful completion of this course, a student will 1) understand the major elements of developing, researching, and writing a master's thesis and 2) have developed a thesis research proposal to guide this process.

Specific objectives:

Be able to:

1. Explain the major components of a master's thesis and its purpose.
2. Prepare a literature review that integrates scholarly sources on a particular topic.
3. Identify a research topic and a research question based on the literature review.

4. Select a research methodology and method based on the nature of the working theory, proposition, unit of analysis, and research question.
5. Demonstrate how data is collected and analyzed.
6. Create and defend a research proposal.
7. Write drafts of the literature review and methodologies chapters that will be integrated into a thesis document
8. Prepare a working timetable for the completion of a thesis by the end of the following (spring) semester.

REQUIRED COURSE MATERIALS

Textbooks

- Babbie, Earl. (2011). *The basics of social research (5th edition)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. (ISBN 9780495812241)
- Booth, Wayne C. et al. (2008). *The craft of research (3rd edition)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (ISBN 9780226065663)
- Bui, Yvonne N. (2009). *How to write a master's thesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. (ISBN 9781412957106)
- Graff, Gerald, & Birkenstein, Cathy. (2010). *They say / I say (2nd edition)*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co. (ISBN 9780393933611)

Additional required readings will be provided as PDF files through the Bridges course management system.

COURSE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

This course requires students to use the Bridges collaboration and learning environment (CLE) that is provided, maintained, and supported by Roger Williams University. Bridges is accessed at <http://bridges.rwu.edu> and requires a valid student login name and password. Documentation and training on using the Bridges CLE is available at this site.

REQUIREMENTS

Readings

Approximately 100 pages of readings will be assigned each week from provided PDF files on Bridges and from the required textbooks. Make sure to budget your time accordingly. A bibliography of the readings is provided at the end of this syllabus.

Writing well

Because your thesis will be available to the public and represents your best work, it is expected that all writing in this course will contain a minimum of grammatical and mechanical errors, be written in a manner that is clear, cogent, and concise, and not exhibit awkward sentence construction. Always proof your draft papers multiple times before submitting.

Keep in mind that your final thesis in HP 651 is expected to be free of grammatical, mechanical, or spelling errors.

For some hints and suggestions on effective proofreading, see: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/561/1/>

Writing center

Students are encouraged to use the Writing Center in the Center for Academic Development (CAD), as needed, for assistance with identifying writing style issues and improving overall writing skills. Based on the quality of writing assignments submitted, the instructor may require mandatory weekly visits to the Writing Center, which will then become part of the overall grade assessment for this course. Info on the center is at <http://rwu.edu/go/writingcenter>.

While the majority of tutorial support offered through the Center for Academic Development is aimed at undergraduates, the center also offers assistance more appropriate for graduate-level students. There are a few basic guidelines and suggestions for graduate students in order to access tutoring:

- The Writing Centers offer faculty tutoring in addition to peer tutoring. Some graduate students prefer to work with a faculty tutor who might have specialized content knowledge, documentation expertise, or thesis experience. Faculty tutors teach in the Math and Writing programs; you must make an appointment (in the CAD or by phone at 254-3219) in order to meet with a faculty tutor.
- Appointments with faculty tutors are typically half an hour; if you have a long document or feel you might need more time, you can request a double block, if available, for a one-hour appointment.
- During high-demand stages of the semester, it may be more difficult (occasionally impossible) to get an appointment with a faculty tutor. Schedule appointments ahead of time!
- When you come in for your appointment (2nd floor Library, within the CAD), you will need to log in at the TutorTrac station on your immediate right inside the CAD.
- Bring all assignment handouts and necessary texts to the appointment, including any recommendations the instructor has provided. Please come prepared with an agenda of what you would like to focus on during the session to maximize efficient use of your time.
- You can contact the Writing Tutoring Coordinator, Karen Bilotti, at kbilotti@rwu.edu if you have any questions or concerns related to accessing the appropriate assistance.
- There is no charge for any tutoring in the CAD.

Assignments

(Further details on these assignments will be provided in class.)

1. Writing assessment paper

The purpose of this paper is to assess a student's ability to use provided notes, including direct quotes, collected from scholarly sources in order to create a short research paper on a given topic. Special attention needs to be paid to writing style, use and citation of the notes from the scholarly sources, use and integration of direct quotes, and the overall organization of the paper.

2. Literature review paper

Students will select a topic area and prepare a literature review on it, with the goal of producing a draft chapter (chapter 2) for their thesis. Students will use this paper to inform the development of the research proposal by identifying knowledge gaps and a working theory, proposition, and a research question.

3. *Research proposal – draft, oral defense, and final written paper*

The student will deliver the following three products for the research proposal, in this sequence:

- a. A written draft of a master’s thesis research proposal.
- b. An oral defense of the research proposal in a public forum based on the proposal draft and feedback from the instructor.
- c. Using feedback from the defense, the student will then make modifications to the draft proposal and submit a final, written version.

4. *Methodology paper*

Based on the outcome of the research proposal, students will create a draft of their methodology chapter (chapter 3) for their thesis.

5. *Online thesis work plan*

Students will create an online work plan that will include a schedule for completion of their thesis by the end of the next semester using a shared template supplied in Google docs. This document will also include details on a selected reader(s).

EVALUATION

Writing assessment paper:	5%
Weekly writing center visits:	5%*
Literature review paper:	30%
Draft research proposal:	10%
Oral defense:	10%
Final research proposal:	20%
Methodology paper:	15%
<u>Online thesis work plan:</u>	<u>5%</u>
Total:	100%

Roger Williams University’s grading system will be used for this course, which is defined as follows:

93-100	= “A”	77-79%	= “C+”
90-92	= “A-”	73-76	= “C”
87-89	= “B+”	70-72	= “C-”
83-86	= “B”	60-69	= “D”
80-82	= “B-”	Below 60	= “F”

* Students who are not required to visit the Writing Center on a weekly basis will automatically receive a 100% for this grade; for students who are required to visit the writing center, this grade will be based on the overall percentage of weekly visits made to the Writing Center.

Note for graduate students: The minimum, passing grade for the final course grade is a “B-” (or at least 80%) as described in the course catalog.

Grading rubric for the writing assessment paper

Paper submitted by the deadline = 100%

Paper not submitted by the deadline = 0%

Grading rubric for the literature review, thesis proposal, and methodology papers

Completeness of content and presented evidence*	Mechanics, writing style, and citations	Organization*
<i>Weight = 40%</i>	<i>Weight = 50%</i>	<i>Weight = 10%</i>
"A" = Paper covers all assigned areas. Ample use of evidence to support arguments and stated claims.	"A" = Minimal spelling and/or grammatical errors; writing is clear and coherent; consistent use of citation format. Sources of discussed material are consistently cited.	"A" = Well organized; selected format mirrors that which is used in a typical report of this type.
"B" = Some areas incomplete, but paper is still substantial and understandable. Some use of evidence to support arguments and stated claims.	"B" = Some spelling and/or grammatical errors; some issues with clarity and coherency; some inconsistencies in the use of a citation format. Most sources are cited properly, with some omissions.	"B" = Good organization, but may need some additional editing.
"C" = Substantial areas lacking or incomplete. Little attempt at using evidence to substantiate claims or support arguments.	"C" = Significant spelling, grammatical, clarity, and coherence errors that impede reading the paper; inconsistent and/or improper use of citation format. Significant material is discussed without referencing its source.	"C" = Has significant problems in the way the paper is organized; confusing ordering of material.
"F" = Complete failure to follow assignment. No attempt to use evidence to substantiate claims or support arguments.	"F" = Numerous spelling, grammatical, clarity, and coherence errors that substantially impair communication. No attempt made to cite sources.	"F" = Haphazard and ill-conceived organization.

* Grades for the completeness of content and presented evidence and organization rubrics will be increased by 10% for the draft thesis proposal only (effectively turning a "B" into an "A", a "C" into a "B", and a "D" into a "C").

Grading rubric for thesis defense

Completeness of content	Visual and oral communication	Professionalism
<i>Weight = 30%</i>	<i>Weight = 50%</i>	<i>Weight = 20%</i>
"A" = Good summary of subject area without missing important details.	"A" = Abundant and effective use of visuals to convey additional information. Clear, organized, and coherent in delivery; speaks to and engages with audience.	"A" = Oral and visual communication and body language is appropriate for a professional audience; lack of colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions.
"B" = Some areas not covered or missing.	"B" = Some use of visuals to convey additional information. Some issues with clarity and organization, but overall understandable; some eye contact with audience.	"B" = Some uses of colloquialisms, idiomatic expressions, and inappropriate body language.
"C" = Substantial areas lacking or incomplete.	"C" = Significant material is discussed without visual supplementation. Significant problems with organization of thoughts and problems with clarity; lack of eye contact with audience.	"C" = Frequent use of colloquialisms, idiomatic expressions, and inappropriate body language.
"F" = Complete failure to follow assignment.	"F" = No attempt made to use visual communication. Disorganized, incoherent communication.	"F" = Complete lack of professional demeanor.

Grading rubric for the online thesis work plan

Work plan submitted in its entirety by the deadline = 100%

Work plan not submitted by the deadline, and/or parts missing = 0%-99%

The following grading rubric is provided for your reference in determining how your final thesis document will be evaluated in HP 651

Grading rubric for the final thesis document

Quality of content*

“A” = All major elements are present; overall characteristics of the thesis are outstanding or very good.

“B” = Some elements are missing, but none that are critical; overall characteristics of the thesis are acceptable.

“F” = Significant elements are missing; overall characteristics of the thesis are unacceptable.

* Refer to “Quality of content” grading rubric below, for details.

Explanation of the quality of content grading rubric

Barbara E. Lovitts (2005) conducted a focus group to help establish the characteristics of a well-written dissertation. In all, 276 professors that represented 74 departments, 10 disciplines, and 9 universities participated in the study. Although a thesis is not as rigorous or resource and time intensive as a thesis, the overall product of both processes is similar.

The following quality rubric for thesis work has been adapted from Lovitts’ results. A thesis must contain all of the following elements:

Introduction

- Includes a problem statement
- Makes clear the research question to be addressed
- Describes the motivation for the study
- Describes the context in which the question arises
- Summarizes the thesis’ findings
- Discusses the importance of the findings
- Provides a roadmap for readers

Literature Review

- Is comprehensive and up to date
- Shows a command of the literature
- Contextualizes the problem
- Includes a discussion of the literature that is selective, synthetic, analytical, and thematic

Methods

- Are appropriate
- Described in detail
- In alignment with the question addressed
- The author demonstrates an understanding of the methods’ advantages and disadvantage and how the methods are used.

Results

The analysis:

- Is appropriate
- Aligns with the question and hypotheses raised
- Shows sophistication
- Is iterative

In addition, the amount and quality of data or information is:

- Sufficient
- Well presented
- Intelligently interpreted

The author also cogently expresses:

- The insights gained from the study
- The study’s limitations

Discussion/conclusion

- Summarizes the findings
- Provides perspective on them
- Refers back to the introduction
- Ties everything together
- Discusses the study’s strengths and weaknesses
- Discusses implications and applications for the discipline
- Discusses future directions for research

In addition, a thesis can be characterized as outstanding, very good, acceptable, and unacceptable based on the following criteria (again, adapted from Lovitts' [2005] study):

Outstanding

- Is original and significant, ambitious, brilliant, clear, clever, coherent, compelling, concise, creative, elegant, engaging, exciting, interesting, insightful, persuasive, sophisticated, surprising, and thoughtful
- Is very well written and organized
- Connects components in a seamless way
- Exhibits mature, independent thinking
- Has a point of view and a strong, confident, independent, and authoritative voice
- Asks new questions or addresses an important question or problem
- Clearly states the problem and why it is important
- Displays a thorough understanding of complicated literature
- Exhibits command and authority over the material
- Argument is focused, logical, rigorous, and sustained
- Has rich data from multiple sources
- Analysis is comprehensive, complete, sophisticated, and convincing
- Results are significant
- Conclusion ties the whole thing together
- Uses appropriate methods, and techniques
- Is publishable in a journal
- Is of interest to a larger community and changes the way people think
- Pushes the discipline's boundaries and opens new areas for research

Very Good

- Is solid
- Is well written and organized
- Has some original ideas, insights, and observations, but is less original, significant, ambitious, interesting, and exciting than the outstanding category
- Has a good question or problem
- Shows understanding and mastery of the subject matter
- Has a strong, comprehensive, and coherent argument
- Includes well-executed research
- Demonstrates technical competence
- Uses appropriate methods, and techniques
- Obtains solid, expected results or answers
- Makes a modest contribution to the field but does not open it up

Acceptable

- Is workmanlike
- Demonstrates technical competence
- Shows the ability to do research
- Is not very original or significant
- Is not interesting, exciting, or surprising
- Displays little creativity, imagination, or insight
- Writing is pedestrian and plodding
- Has a weak structure and organization
- Is narrow in scope
- Has a question or problem that is not exciting—is often highly derivative
- Displays a narrow understanding of the field
- Reviews the literature adequately—knows the literature but is not critical of it or does not discuss what is important
- Can sustain an argument, but the argument is not imaginative, complex, or convincing
- Uses appropriate methods and techniques
- Has an unsophisticated analysis—does not explore all possibilities and misses connections
- Has predictable results that are not exciting
- Makes a small contribution

Unacceptable

- Is poorly written
- Has spelling and grammatical errors
- Has a sloppy presentation
- Contains errors or mistakes
- Plagiarizes or deliberately misreads or misuses sources
- Does not understand basic concepts, processes, or conventions of the discipline
- Lacks careful thought
- Looks at a question or problem that is trivial, weak, unoriginal, or already solved
- Does not understand or misses relevant literature
- Has a weak, inconsistent, self-contradictory, unconvincing, or invalid argument
- Relies on inappropriate or incorrect methods
- Has data that are flawed, wrong, false, fudged, or misinterpreted
- Has wrong, inappropriate, incoherent, or confused analysis
- Includes results that are obvious, already known, unexplained, or misinterpreted
- Has unsupported or exaggerated interpretation
- Does not make a contribution

Reference: B.E. Lovitts. (2005). How to grade a dissertation. *Academe*, 91 (6).

OFFICIAL NOTICES AND POLICIES

Use of electronic devices in the classroom

Students may use laptops and tablets/slates for note taking during class. The use of these devices for any other activities, such as surfing the web, texting, or e-mail is not allowed in the classroom. At no time is the use of a cell phone permitted during class time for any reason. The volume must be muted on *all* electronic devices in your possession or the device must be turned off. Students found to be in violation of this policy will be asked to leave the classroom and will be marked as absent.

Late assignments

Due dates for assignments are listed in the schedule at the end of this syllabus. Late assignments will be docked 5% for each day they are late. This automatic reduction is non-negotiable unless an exception has been granted by the instructor in advance of the due date.

If there is an upcoming activity that will prevent you from turning in an assignment on time, contact me as early as possible to discuss when you can turn in your assignment, and how I might be able to accommodate your request. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, the default is to arrange for a time to turn in your assignment *early* instead of *late*. You must submit your request by e-mail at least two weeks in advance (and preferably earlier) of a known event to request accommodation.

Unfortunately, there are times in our lives where we may have a personal or family emergency or unforeseen illness. In this case, send me an e-mail as soon as you can requesting an extension. A missed assignment due to an illness requires that you submit a note (scanned image is fine) from a doctor. Note: Activities such as weddings, vacations, and personal conferences are not considered to be extenuating circumstances.

Attendance

Students are expected to arrive to class on time and attend all classes with the realization that there will be the occasional extenuating circumstance. For this reason, each student will be given two “freebie” absences and two late to class waivers during the semester that can be used as the student sees fit without any repercussion on the final grade for the course. After two absences, three percentage points will be deducted from the final grade for each additional absence up to a maximum of twelve percentage points. After being late to class two times, students that are late again will be marked as absent for the class period. The only exceptions to this policy are if a student presents a proper note from a medical doctor or if he/she is officially representing a university program at a conference or similar event (notification needs to be given in advance of the class meeting). Students are responsible for any missed material.

Instructor’s attendance

Students should wait at least 20 minutes before departing should the instructor be late for class. Advance notice will be given of an absence by e-mail with instructions for a make-up meeting and/or assignments.

Academic integrity

From Roger Williams University’s Academic Standards (<http://www.rwu.edu/academics/academicaffairs/standards>):

Although multiple definitions exist, plagiarism is best defined as incorporating the words or ideas of another person into a paper, presentation, or other scholarly form without properly crediting the source from which the words or ideas come. Plagiarism is a violation of ethical practices. The author who commits plagiarism attempts to claim another person’s work as his or her own. Thus, plagiarism is both a form of intellectual theft and of intellectual fraud. In its worst form, plagiarism may consist of directly copying large or small portions of either printed works or, as frequently happens in schools, written papers of another student. There are, however, more subtle forms of plagiarism as well. Paraphrasing, or changing an author’s ideas or words, is also a form of plagiarism if the source of the idea being paraphrased is not acknowledged, and this form of plagiarism is comparable to direct copying and every bit as serious.

No matter what the cause, universities consider plagiarism to be a serious offense – among the most serious academic crimes there are. Faculty members react against plagiarism because they consider it an attack on one of the values that universities hold sacred – honesty in the pursuit of knowledge.

Disability access statement

If you are a student with a disability for which you wish to receive academic accommodations, you must first register with Student Accessibility Services on the second floor of the University Library in the Center for Academic Development. Reasonable accommodations will be made to students who provide the instructor with a signed Academic Accommodation Authorization Form from Student Accessibility Services.

Disclaimer

Although considerable effort has been made in developing this syllabus, unforeseen events may require changes to its content and the course schedule. Changes, if required, will be made in light of assuring that the course's learning objectives are met.

SCHEDULE

This schedule is subject to change

Week	Thursday
1	August 30
Topic/task	1. Course introduction 2. What is a “master’s thesis”?
Assignment made	
Optional reading	Chapter 1 (pp. 1-20) from <i>How to Write a Master’s Thesis</i>
2	September 6
Topic/task	1. What is “research”? 2. Picking a research topic 3. Literature review
Assignment made	1. Literature review 2. Writing assessment paper
Readings due	1. Parts I and II (pp. 1-102) from <i>The Craft of Research</i> 2. Chapters 2, 3, and 6 (pp. 21-76, 120-136) from <i>How to Write a Master’s Thesis</i>
Optional readings	1. Examples of literature reviews from selected theses provided in Bridges
Assignment due	
3	September 13
Topic/task	1. Systems of inquiry and research design 2. The research proposal
Assignment made	Research proposal
Readings due	1. Chapters 1, 2, and 4 (pp. 1-62, 92-126) from <i>The Basics of Social Research</i> 2. Creswell – Writing Strategies and Ethical Considerations.pdf
Optional readings	1. Faigman - Scientific Method (1997).pdf 2. Krathwohl - Historical Research (2004).pdf 3. Amedo et al. – Spatial-Environmental Influences on Human Activities and Experiences (2009).pdf
Assignment due	WRITING ASSESSMENT PAPER DUE
4	September 20
Topic/task	Developing and honing analytical, organizational, and writing skills
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. Parts III, IV, and V (pp. 103-276) from <i>The Craft of Research</i> 2. Chapters 5 and 7-10 (pp. 96-119, pp. 137-208) from <i>How to Write a Master’s Thesis</i> (skim and then read at your own pace through the semester) 3. <i>They say / I say</i> (complete book – skim and then read at your own pace through the semester; use as a reference)
Video due	Watch “Critical Thinking” video at http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=VQvajSs77PU
Assignment due	
5	September 27
Topic/task	Quantitative research design
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. Chapters 5 to 7 (pp. 128-243) from <i>The Basics of Social Research</i>
Assignment due	
6	October 4
Topic/task	Quantitative research methodologies
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. Chapters 8 and 9 (pp. 254-311) from <i>The Basics of Social Research</i>
Optional readings	1. Levi - Fake Historic Architecture (2005).pdf
Assignment due	
7	October 11
Topic/task	1. Qualitative research methodologies 2. Evaluation research
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. Chapters 10 to 12 (pp. 313-416) from <i>The Basics of Social Research</i>
Optional readings	1. Low - Anthropological Methods for Cultural Values (2002).pdf 2. Wells - Our History is Not False (2010).pdf 3. Wells - Historic Preservation, Significance, and Age Value (2012).pdf
Assignment due	LITERATURE REVIEW DUE

8	October 18
Topic/task	Qualitative and quantitative data analysis
Assignment made	Methodology paper
Readings due	1. Chapters 13 and 14 (pp. 418-472) from <i>The Basics of Social Research</i>
Assignment due	
9	October 25
Topic/task	Ethical research
Guest speaker	Speaker from RWU's Human Subjects Review Board
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. Chapter 4 (pp. 77-95) from <i>How to Write a Master's Thesis</i> 2. Chapter 3 (pp. 64-90) from <i>The Basics of Social Research</i>
Assignment due	DRAFT OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL DUE
10	November 1
Topic/task	In class research proposal work session
Assignment made	
Readings due	
Assignment due	
11	November 8
Topic/task	Research proposal defense
Location	Time and location TBD
Assignment made	
Readings due	
Assignment due	RESEARCH PROPOSAL (ORAL) DEFENSE DUE
12	November 15
Topic/task	Successfully pacing yourself in order to complete the thesis on time
Assignment made	Online thesis work plan
Readings due	
Assignment due	
13	November 22
Topic/task	No meeting (Thanksgiving Break)
14	November 29
Topic/task	In class work session
Location	
Assignment made	
Readings due	
Assignment due	FINAL RESEARCH PROPOSAL DUE
15	December 6
Topic/task	Wrap-up
Assignment made	
Readings due	
Assignment due	

1) METHODOLOGY PAPER AND 2) ONLINE THESIS WORK PLAN DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7

ASSIGNED READINGS BIBLIOGRAPHY

Required readings

- Babbie, Earl. (2011). *The basics of social research (5th edition)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Booth, Wayne C. et al. (2008). *The craft of research (3rd edition)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bui, Yvonne N. (2009). *How to write a master's thesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, John W. (2009). Chapter 4: writing strategies and ethical considerations. In *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (pp.73-93). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Graff, Gerald, & Birkenstein, Cathy. (2010). *They say / I say (2nd edition)*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Optional readings

- Amedeo, D. et al. (2008). Chapter 1: an overview of spatial and/or environmental influences on human activities and experiences. In *Person-environment-behavior research: investigating activities and experiences in spaces and environments* (pp. 1-26). New York: Guilford Press
- Faigman, David et al. (1997). Chapter 2: scientific method: the logic of drawing inferences from empirical evidence. In *Modern scientific evidence: the law and science of expert testimony* (pp. 46-80). St. Paul, MN: West Group.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2004). Historical research. In *Methods of educational and social science research (2nd ed.)* (pp.571-86). Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Levi, D. J. (2005). Does history matter? Perceptions and attitudes toward fake historic architecture and historic preservation. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 22(2), 149-159.
- Low, S. M. (2002). Anthropological-ethnographic methods for the assessment of cultural values in heritage conservation. In M. L. de Torre (Ed.), *Assessing the values of cultural heritage* (pp.31-49). Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.
- Wells, J. C. (2010). Our history is not false: perspectives from the revitalisation culture. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(6), 464-485.
- Wells, J. C. and E. D. Baldwin. (2012). Historic preservation, significance, and age value: A comparative phenomenology of historic Charleston and the nearby new-urbanist community of I'On. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 32, 384-400.