

Ida202- w16

# METHODS in DESIGN and LANDSCAPE RESEARCH

## community participation

Tuesday 9a-11:50a; 166 Hunt Hall

instructor: Sheryl-Ann Simpson // [ssimpson@ucdavis.edu](mailto:ssimpson@ucdavis.edu) // 183 Hunt Hall

office hours: Tuesday 3p-5p; Thursday 11a-1p + by appointment

Evidence-based and human-centered design, alongside outcomes-based evaluation are important buzzwords in contemporary practice. But there are important questions and critiques about these ideas, such as what counts as evidence, which humans do we center around, what outcomes are important, and who gets to do all of the research involved.

Given that much research in design is often focused on people's perceptions, actions, uses, and interactions it would make sense that most research in this field would also have a participatory component. Practitioners, however, are not always trained in the basics of producing well-designed, meaningful research projects. And academic researchers are not always trained to ensure that their research is supportive rather than extractive, to incorporate local knowledge, or even just to talk to people.

In this course we'll explore the possibilities for participation in research from multiple perspectives. The course starts with the environmental design fields, but draws on ideas and examples from other action-based disciplines and professions including planning, community development, international development, social work, public policy and public health.

### through this course participants will gain a knowledge and understanding of:

1. a range of participatory research methods;
2. critical engagement with theoretical debates around knowledge claims in research;
3. connections between practice and theoretical debates;
4. the planning and execution of social justice-focused community-based research projects;
5. ideas for sharing research and results with varied audiences.

### course requirements:

Midterm Project [exact form and content determined collectively] due: wk 8 (40%)

Research Proposal Outline due: finals wk (40%)

Weekly Check-ins + Peer Reviews due: ongoing (20%)

### diversity and accessibility in the classroom:

Students with all types of learning styles and needs are welcome in this course. If you have a consideration that might require accommodation, please do not hesitate to approach me or to consult with the Student Disability Center.

<http://sdc.ucdavis.edu/>

### health support:

If you find yourself in need of physical or mental health accommodation please consult with Student Health and Counseling Services [<https://shcs.ucdavis.edu/>] and the Stress Resource supplement included on the course Smartsite.

### academic integrity:

Honesty, trust and integrity are absolutely essential in this course, and in research and practice in general. As such UC Davis treats any academic dishonesty violations with the utmost seriousness. Please familiarize yourself with UC Davis' policies on academic integrity and dishonesty, and when in doubt please ask! <http://sja.ucdavis.edu/>

### additional online community design and research resources:

Architects/Designers/Planners for Social Responsibility (ADPSR) – <http://www.adpsr.org/>

The Asset-Based Community Development Institute <http://www.abcdinstitute.org/>

Association for Community Design – <http://www.communitydesign.org/>

Community Planning – <http://www.communityplanning.net/index.php>

Design for Planning – <http://www.design4planning.org/>

Planners Network: The Organization of Progressive Planning – <http://www.plannersnetwork.org/>

UC Davis Center for Design in the Public Interest – <http://cargocollective.com/dipi>

# READING SCHEDULE

## WK1 - JAN5 **course introductions**

Introduction p1-14 + Fairness p77-96. in Hester, Randolph (2006) Design for Ecological Democracy. Cambridge MA:MIT Press.

Khan, Michael (1974) The Seminar, Unpublished Paper.

in class:

Manfrau (2015) Community Design Solutions | Milwaukee, WI.  
<https://vimeo.com/117434026>

Chinatown CDC (2012) Chinatown CDC's 35th Anniversary Gala – Tribute to Mrs. Chang Jok Lee.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sl3M11ucaSc>

Tateshots (2009) Jeremy Deller's Procession for Manchester  
<http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/video/new-work-jeremy-deller>

Center for Urban Pedagogy (2015) Door Wars.  
<https://vimeo.com/120074376>

## WK2 - JAN12 **research in practice**

Swaffield, Simon and M. Ellen Deming (2011) Research strategies in landscape architecture: Mapping the terrain. Journal of Landscape Architecture, (spring): 34-45.

Forsyth, Ann (2007) Innovation in urban design: Does research help? Journal of Urban Design, 12(3):461-473.

Beddoe, Liz (2011) Investing in the future: Social workers talk about research. British Journal of Social Work, 21: 557-575.

LeCroy, Craig Winston (2010) Knowledge building and social work research: A critical perspective. Research on Social Work Practice, 20(3):321-324.

Take a tour through: Kato, Yohei, Susan Verba, Sumayyah Ahmed, Perna Dudani and Sarah Perrault (2015) Evolution of Participatory Practices: 5 Disciplines 50 years.  
<http://dipi.ucdavis.edu/participate/index.html>.

## WK3 - JAN19 **surveys, focus groups and interviews**

McLafferty, Sara L. (2010) Conducting Questionnaire Surveys in Clifford, Nicholas, Shaun French, and Gill Valentine (eds) Key Methods in Geography. Sage: London. 77-87.

Longhurst, Robyn (2010) Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups in Clifford, Nicholas, Shaun French, and Gill Valentine (eds) Key Methods in Geography. Sage: London. 103-115.

Rubin, Herbert J and Irene S. Rubin (2005) The responsive interview as an extended conversation. in Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data 2nd edition, Chapt 6 108-128.

MacKinnon, Shauna and Sara Stephens (2008) Is Participation Having an Impact? Measuring Progress in Winnipeg's Inner City through the Voices of Community-Based Program Participants. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives: Manitoba Office. 1-7, Appendix 2

## WK4 - JAN26 analysis

Nind, Melanie (2011) Participatory data analysis: A step too far? *Qualitative Research*, 11: 349.

Jackson, Suzanne F. (2008) A participatory group process to analyze qualitative data. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 2(2):161-170.

MacEntee, Katie and Mitchell, Claudia (2011) Lost and found in translation: Participatory analysis and working with collections of drawings. In Linda Theron, Claudia Mitchell, Ann Smith and Jean Stuart (eds.) *Picturing Research: Drawing as Visual Methodology*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing.

Read the first and skim through the others:

Iriss (2015) Dear diary: The emotional experience of working in social sciences. Part of The View from Here. <http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/viewfromhere/story-2015/story-diary-analysis/>

Iriss (2015) Diary Stories. Part of The View from Here. <http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/viewfromhere/story-2015/story-stories/>

Pattoni, Lisa (2015) The view from here: Analysis. <http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/innovate/2015/03/31/the-view-from-here-analysis-2/>

additional resource:

Wimpenny, Katherine and Maggi Savin-Baden (2012) Exploring and implementing participatory action synthesis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18(8):689-698.

## WK5 - FEB2 theory: care

Lawson, Victoria (2009) Instead of Radical Geography, How About Caring Geography?. *Antipode*, 41(1):210-213.

Zitcer, Andrew and Robert W. Lake (2012) Love as a planning method. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 13(4): Interface: What's Love Got To Do With It? Illuminations on Loving Attachment in Planning. 606-609.

Kim England (1994) Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality and feminist research, *The Professional Geographer*, 46(1): 80-89

Umemoto, Karen (2012) Seeking the value of loving attachment in planning research. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 13(4): Interface: What's Love Got To Do With It? Illuminations on Loving Attachment in Planning. 594-598.

## WK6 - FEB9 theory: epistemologies and ontologies

Greenwood, Davydd James and Morten Levin (2007) Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change pp 1-34.

Agrawal, Arun (1995) Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change*, 26: 413-439.

Haraway, Donna (1988) Situated knowledge: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3): 575-599.

Norberg-Schultz, Christian (2003) The Phenomenon of place. in *Designing Cities: Critical Readings in Urban Design*. ed Alexander R. Cuthbert. Blackwell. p116-127.

additional resource:

Umemoto, Karen (2001) Walking in another's shoes: Epistemological challenges in participatory planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21:17-31.

WK7 - FEB16 **theory: choose your own adventure**

WK8-10 - FEB23-MAR8 **methods: choose your own adventure**

We'll pick the topics of the last four weeks of the course together, first a week of additional theory, then three weeks on specific families of methods.

For WK7 throughout the course take note of different frameworks, theories or theorists that pop up in the reading we will spend the week delving deeper into a selection of these.

For WK8-10 I will post a list of possible method families + a bibliography of possible readings to the course Basecamp we'll choose from these families together in class.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

I will hand out detailed assignments as the quarter moves on, but here is a quick taste...

### weekly check-ins

The readings for this course come from a variety of fields, and cover everything from practical advice to personal reflection, research examples to a bit more abstract theory. In order to get the most out of the seminar we need to come prepared with an understanding of the readings alongside our own questions.

As you are reading, read for comprehension before you evaluate. At the end ask yourself what is the metamessage? What is the main thing the author hoped readers would walk away with at the end of the piece, you should be able to sum this up in a few sentences at most. Then ask yourself what are your remaining questions? These might be questions of comprehension, there might be terms or concepts that even after a quick Google/Wikipedia search are still unclear, or that you'd like to continue to explore. These might be questions of critique, you may want to question findings, methods, conclusions of a piece, which is great, but remember to ground these questions in the text. These might be extension questions, there might just be something new that you are thinking or wondering about after the reading that you would like to explore or discuss.

To get this started each Monday you'll get a reminder to check-in at the course Basecamp by 7p to pick at least one reading and respond to two prompts 1) what's the metamessage, and 2) what are two of your questions. (You are always welcome to respond for more than one reading). Try to take a look at each other's responses before class.

### midterm project

For the first half of the course, we'll work collectively on a research project asking about the impact of community-based and service learning in the Landscape Architecture + Environmental Design program at UC Davis. Through this project you will move through the several stages of (participatory/community-centered) research including developing research questions, interview tools, doing some member checking and data analysis. What better way to learn about participatory research than to do it right?

### research proposal outline

The final assignment of the course is a research proposal outline designed to get you started on your own independent research projects. The outline will include a brief introduction, your research question, preliminary bibliography, preliminary methods outline, project timeline. We'll move stepwise through these pieces in the second half of the course. This assignment will be adjusted for 2nd year Master's students and advanced PhD students/candidates.

### peer reviews

As we go through the steps of the project proposal, you will each be responsible for providing peer reviews of each other's work. These peer reviews will be included in your body of work for assessment.

## PROPOSAL OUTLINE

The purpose of a research proposal falls somewhere in between a roadmap, and a contract with yourself. Proposals provide an opportunity to think systematically about a research projects, to think about what we hope the contribution might be, and to think through the logistics of a project. They are also a tool to share those thoughts with people who might become collaborators, funders or supervisors. At the same time we know that good research will likely take us slightly off-road now and again, so a strong proposal also has some flexibility built in, and some contingency plans.

Both the CDGG and the GGG have guidelines for the content of proposals for these programs, but generally proposals include:

**an introduction** that broadly introduces the topic, describes your research question, and the goals and possible contribution of the piece.

**literature review** that demonstrates an understanding of previous ways in which people have examined the topic, positions your work within a conversation, and might also begin to describe common methods used in the field. This can include academic literature, but will likely also include design precedents, and professional reports.

**methods outline** that tells us about your research strategy, design and methods. This section should leave a reader with a strong impression of what it is you actually plan to do. As much as possible include details like data type and sources, and you can begin to discuss an analysis plan. Also include a timeline for the work.

**works cited or bibliography** a list of the work you have cited in the piece, or an extended list of literature you will draw on during the project.

Ann Forsyth who is a wonderful source for lots of things has a great blogs post about common problems with proposals it is worth a read: <http://www.planetizen.com/node/29949>

For the final project in LDA202 you will produce a research proposal outline that includes:

An introduction including a research question, an outline of your literature review and methods section, a timeline for the project.

Tentative schedule:

**WK6** in class presentations your interests and tentative research questions

**WK7** Tues by 9a post literature review; Thus by 11:59p post two reviews

**WK 8** Tues by 9a post draft introduction with research question; Thurs by 11:59p post two reviews

**WK9** Tues by 9a post revised introduction + question + methods list; Thurs by 11:59p post two reviews

**WK10** in class discussions/presentations

**Thursday Mar 17th** 11:59p Proposal Outline due