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**OVERVIEW**

Research in the social sciences is a process of developing good questions and then finding or generating evidence with which to answer them. This course will explore this process, particularly focusing on how to use evidence to generate and test hypotheses. We will explore both research for exploratory purposes and for causal inference. We will explore both qualitative and quantitative research design; the data and method you choose should depend on the question you're asking and we will explore good design using a variety of methods. As King, Keohane, and Verba have said, good social science research shares a “unified logic of causal inference,” whether qualitative or quantitative.  
  
Research design refers to techniques for organizing the research process to be able to answer the key question at stake. Our goal will be, as much as possible, to control for confounding variables and alternative explanations through research design and data collection and we will explore ways to do this. Because a good design requires you to select the correct method, we will explore a variety of statistical techniques and qualitative tools that can help answer good questions and sharpen causal inferences.  
  
A thorough understanding of research design is crucial to conducting high quality research and assessing the limitations of existing research studies (and of your own designs and ideas). This course is intended to help students both conduct their own research and use/evaluate the findings of research conducted by others.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this course, students should:

* Understand the challenges facing researchers who wish to conduct research in the social sciences;
* Develop an understanding of the key components and steps of research design;
* Learn how various research and data analysis techniques can be employed to develop compelling evidence for and against research hypotheses;
* Be able to articulate the differences (and similarities) between quantitative and qualitative research and the pros and cons of each;
* Become comfortable critiquing research designs (their own and others’);
* Have the experience of developing and defending a research design on a question of their choosing; and
* Think of themselves as a cohort that is also a community of scholars, learning to support and constructively critique each other to make everyone’s work better.

**PREREQUISITES**

To succeed in this class, you should have already taken Quantitative Methods I (824:702, or an equivalent class in descriptive and inferential statistics) and Quantitative Methods II (824:709, or an equivalent class in multiple regression analysis). The latter may be taken concurrently, if necessary, but this is not preferred. You should also have taken the Logic of Social Inquiry (824:703), which covers the philosophical foundations of social science research and introduces a number of issues and research designs considered here. In comparison to that course, this class contains less philosophy of science and more of the nuts and bolts of how and when to employ different research designs.

**DISABILITIES**

Students with disabilities are welcome in this class.  If you have a disability or suspect you might have a disability but do not yet have documentation, please contact the Coordinator of Disability Services immediately: [(856) 225-6442](tel:%28856%29%20225-6442), Armitage Hall, Room 231 (in the Rutgers-Camden Learning Center).  No accommodations may be made without the explicit approval of the Office of Disability Service.  If you already have documentation of a disability, please present it to me within the first week of class so I may work with you to ensure you can properly access and complete the work for this course.

**INCLUSIVITY AND NAMES**

This is an inclusive classroom that is welcoming of all people and perspectives, including those of diverse races, religions, ethnicities, ages, gender identities and sexual orientations. If you go by a name or gender that is different from the one on official Rutgers documents, please let me know so that I can use the proper name and pronouns.

**EXPECTATIONS AND ATTENDANCE**

In this class we will create a learning community where we will discuss ideas, apply new concepts and begin to understand the relationship between government and urban issues. To do this, attendance and preparation are necessary. As your teacher, I expect you to complete the readings and assignments and show up to class, ready to actively engage in your own learning process. In return, you can expect me to be prepared, present the material enthusiastically, respond to your questions and concerns in a timely fashion, and lead you in a learning experience that will help you understand both urban politics and your own interests as learners.

**Class Attendance is Mandatory.**  This is a graduate course and you are expected to be in class. I have no interest in policing your attendance, however if attendance becomes a problem I reserve the right to institute the following policy: You may miss no more than three classes without providing documentation of an extenuating circumstance. After the first three absences, you will lose 10% of your participation grade for each unexcused absence. Legitimate reasons for additional absences include severe illness, death, family emergencies, and other issues evaluated at my discretion.

**EXPECTATIONS AND ATTENDANCE**

This is a graduate seminar. We meet 15 times and you are expected to be in class on time and prepared to actively participate. Repeated absences and tardies are not acceptable and will affect your grade.

Reading: Every student must come prepared to discuss ALL of the required readings in class. You should be able to identify the: Question, Argument, Hypothesis, Data, Methods, Findings, and Implications of your readings. If you need to skim, start by reading the abstract, introduction and conclusion and then look at the tables and charts. From there, skim for key words that will help you fill in the holes.

Participation: This is a seminar course with a workshop component with limited formal lectures. Each student is expected to participate in class discussions, offering critique and insight of weekly readings. Each student is also expected to come prepared to workshop their fellow classmates’ work.

**LATE POLICY**

One third of this class will be workshopping your papers. It is essential that you give your fellow classmates time to adequately read, think about and critique your work. As a result, you are expected to submit your work on time. If extenuating circumstances arise, please let us know as soon as possible so that we can decide on a solution.

**TECHNOLOGY POLICY**

*No laptop or cell phone use permitted in class during discussion*. You may use electronic reading devices (Kindles, iPads, Nooks, tablets, or other) as a reading aid, but with no typing, and only as long as you can refrain from using other applications such as email, Facebook, etc. If your use of electronics seems to be interfering with class discussion, I may ask you to revert to hardcopy text. Please plan on taking notes with pen and paper rather than electronically. Bring with you to class the book or other text(s) we read for that class meeting.

Violations of the “no-electronics” policy (texting, unauthorized laptop use, using a tablet for Facebook or other non-class-related reading, etc) will result in deductions of participation points. Students who violate this policy more than once in a class may be asked to leave for the day, as cell phone use of any variety – yes, even texting – is distracting and disruptive. If you are asked to leave the class for the day, you get a 0 for participation for that day, even if it is toward the end of the class meeting. Keep phones in pockets/purses/bags and off/silent any time class is in session.

*Exceptions to rule (disabilities and/or emergencies):*

* If you have documentation of a disability requiring the use of a computer or other electronic device, please present it to me in the first week of class meetings and we will discuss a reasonable accommodation.
* Students expecting an emergency phone call should speak to me prior to the beginning of the class, and if necessary can accept a phone call by keeping cell phone on “vibrate” and walking into the hall so as not to disrupt the rest of the class. Otherwise there is no phone use allowed in class.

**ACADEMIC HONESTY**

PLAGARISM AND CHEATING OF ANY KIND WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. Blatant plagiarism will be reported to the Dean of Students. I don’t want to do this, so don’t cheat. It is your responsibility to be familiar with Rutgers’ academic honesty statement. This statement is available at <http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/academic-integrity-policy/>.

## According to the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, to "plagiarize" means

* to steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own
* to use (another's production) without crediting the source
* to commit literary theft
* to present as new and original an idea or product derived from an existing source

Any time you reference a fact or idea that is not your own, you need to properly cite the source of that information. If you are unclear on citation standards, please see me immediately.

**REQUIRED TEXTS**

1. King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Pres
2. **Bhattacherjee textbook,** “Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices,” which will be free as a PDF in our course Sakai site, in the “Resources” section. (BHATTACHERJEE)
3. Assorted chapters, articles and essays provided on Sakai

**GRADE SCALE**A= 90-100  
B+= 87.5-89.9   
B= 80-87.4   
C+= 77.5-79.9  
C= 70-77.4  
D= 60-69.5  
F= 0-59.5

**ASSIGNMENTS**

There are 1000 possible points.

1. Daily participation and peer critique/workshopping 160 points total (16%)
2. Research Critiques 140 points, 10 points/week (14%)
3. Discussion leadership 100 points total, 50 points each (10%)
4. Midterm: Practice comp questions 200 points total (20%)
5. Research Design 400 points (50%)
   1. Question Workshop Paper 50 points
   2. Theory and Hypothesis Workshop Paper 50 points
   3. Methods and Data Workshop Paper 50 points
   4. Final Presentation 100 points
   5. Final Project 150 points

**EXPLANATION OF ASSIGNMENTS**

1. **Participation and Peer Workshops**

Each student is expected to have completed the readings and assignments before class and to participate in class discussions, offering critique and insight of weekly readings. Students should be prepared to ask questions about the method/topic we are covering, question and critique the academic articles we read, and provide feedback for workshop sessions. In most classes we will spend 1/3-1/2 of the time workshopping student work. Students whose work is being workshopped must submit their work by Sunday night to the class. The rest of the class needs to read, carefully consider, and critique this work based on questions I will provide you. You should be prepared to discuss your thoughts with specific questions, reference to specific parts of the paper, suggestions for alterations, etc.

1. **Research Critiques**

Every week you will read two academic articles to assess and critique the research design. I will provide you with a set of questions help guide this critique. You should come to class with bullet points about your critiques on each article. There is no magic number but I would expect a minimum of 5 thoughts/critiques per article with 8-10 for most articles. Your thoughts can/should include both the things the article is doing well and the things the article is not doing well. **You will submit these notes at the end of class; you should also post them in your Dropbox on Sakai.**

1. **Discussion Leadership**

You will identify two articles on your topic of interest for the class to critique. The articles must be methodologically oriented (not theory or legal articles) and ideally should use different types of methods. The class will read these articles as one of the critique articles. You will lead discussion on the days that we read your articles. You must **send your articles to Dr. Bowers by Monday 1/22** so that they can be incorporated into the syllabus. You will be graded on your preparation and ability to manage and facilitate discussion.

1. **Midterm Exam, March 7 in Class**

One of the requirements of the PhD is that you take a methodological comprehensive exam. For the midterm exam you will answer a modified methods comp question that focuses on research design. You will take this exam in class, without notes, just as you would in the comprehensive exam. I will, however, give you access to possible questions 1 week before the midterm so that you can organize your thoughts and prepare for this task.

1. **Research Design**

You will submit a 12-15 page research design that develops a project of your choosing. The project should be realistic and should answer an interesting question relating to your research interests. You may choose to use this as the start of a dissertation proposal. Your proposal must include a thorough literature review, a strong theory section with testable hypotheses, and a well thought out research design that identifies methodology, data sources, complications, and limitations. You do not need to have complete the research or have findings. You should have a minimum of 20 academic sources, but you should plan to review additional sources. You will have three chances to workshop your idea. You should submit workshop papers to the class forum by 11:55 pm the Sunday before you present. You will discuss your workshop paper for 5 minutes before You will present your research design to the class in a proposal-defense style presentation.

* 1. **Question Workshop**  
     You will write a 2-page paper that explains your question and reflects the research you’ve done up to this point. The paper should include
     1. Your question
     2. Why this question is interesting and important
     3. What the literature has to say about your question and what is missing from this literature, aka why you think this is a novel question
     4. You will upload this document to the Forum tab on Sakai by 11:59pm the Sunday before you present in class.
     5. In class, you will give a 5 minute explanation of your question- what motivated it, why you think it matters etc. before we discuss what you’ve written.
     6. You should plan to revise your question/literature based on the feedback you get.
  2. **Theory and Hypothesis Workshop**   
     You will write a 3-5 pages that explain theoretical framework and hypotheses. The paper should include
     1. A reminder of what the question is
     2. A detailed, literature-based explanation of what you believe to explain your question
     3. This discussion should be grounded in an existing theoretical framework that is appropriate for your question
     4. You should provide 1-4 falsifiable hypotheses that come out of your theory and speak to the causal mechanisms of your question. These should have an identifiable independent and dependent variable and have a directional outcome that, if it did not exist, would disrupt your hypothesis.
  3. **Data and Methods Workshop** 
     1. You will write a 4-7 pages about the data and methods you plan to use. The paper should include:
        1. Remind the reader of the question
        2. Remind the reader of your hypotheses
        3. Outline the data you plan to use
           1. Type
           2. Where it would come from
           3. How you would gather it
           4. DV(s)
           5. IV(s)
           6. Controls- particularly if/how you are controlling for alternative explanations
        4. Outline the method/design you plan to use
        5. Discuss how the method/design will answer your question
        6. Discuss how it will lend insight into your hypotheses/what you would specifically need to know or do to test your hypotheses
        7. Discuss limitations of data/method
  4. **Final Proposal**  
     **Due April 29**  
     Your proposal should be 12-15 pages, double spaced, Times New Roman 12pt font, 1”margins, Chicago style. You should have sufficient sources to show thorough research and understanding of your topic. \*MUST PRINT AND BRING TO CLASS\*
  5. **Proposal Presentation**:   
     **Due May 9**   
     Your presentation should 10-12 minutes long (practice because I will cut you off and mark you down if you go over). You must use a PowerPoint or Prezi (or other presentation software) presentation. You should be prepared for questions and critique- you will need to field questions about your work and ask questions of your colleagues.

**SCHEDULE OF READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS**Given the participatory nature of this course, we will work together to identify the topics that you are most interested in. I have provided the first week’s readings. The remainder of the reading list will be developed based on your feedback and will be given to you by Wednesday January 24.

**UNIT 1: Introduction, Developing Questions and Theorizing**

**Week 1: Class Introduction- What is Science, What is Knowledge and Developing Good Questions**

## January 17

## READING

1. Pardi, Paul. What is Knowledge. *Philosophynews.com* <http://www.philosophynews.com/post/2011/09/22/What-is-Knowledge.aspx>
2. Zinman, John*.* What is Science? in *Introductory Readings in the Philosophy of Science* E.D. Klemke, Robert Hollinger and David Wyss Rudge eds. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books. (attached)
3. Baglione Chapter 2 Getting Started:Finding a Research Question- this is targeted at an undergraduate audience, so the examples aren't great but the general content is good. (attached)
4. Listen to <https://www.thisamericanlife.org/630/things-i-mean-to-know>

# Week 2: Basic Research Concepts You Should be Familiar With

## January 24

## METHODS READING:

## 1. Bajarati Chapter 1 and 2

## 2. KKV Chapter 1

## ARTICLES FOR CRITIQUE:

## Bowers, Melanie, and Robert R. Preuhs. "Collateral consequences of a collateral penalty: The negative effect of felon disenfranchisement laws on the political participation of nonfelons." Social Science Quarterly 90, no. 3 (2009): 722-743.

1. Kroska, Amy, James Daniel Lee, and Nicole T. Carr. "Juvenile delinquency and self‐sentiments: Exploring a labeling theory proposition." *Social Science Quarterly* 98, no. 1 (2017): 73-88.

# Week 3: Theory Development- ADITI

## January 31

## METHODS READING

## Conceptual Foundations of Research in Research Methods in the Social Sciences 8th Edition (Sakai)

## Applied Research Questions, Literature and Theory in Applied Research Methods in Public and Nonprofit Organizations. (Sakai)

## KKV Chapter 3

## CRITIQUE READING

1. Geels, Frank W. "A socio-technical analysis of low-carbon transitions: introducing the multi-level perspective into transport studies." *Journal of Transport Geography* 24 (2012): 471-482.
2. Ford, Michael R., and Douglas M. Ihrke. "Board conflict and public performance on urban and non-urban boards: Evidence from a national sample of school board members." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 39, no. 1 (2017): 108-121.

## ASSIGNMENT:

**Week 4: Data, Measurement and Sampling- GABBY**

## February 7

## METHODS READING:

## The Theory of Measurement in The Research Methods Knowledge Base

## “Sampling and Sample Designs” in Research Methods in the Social Sciences 8th Edition (Sakai)

## Data Collection in Essential Statistics for Public Managers and Policy Analysts

## KKV Chapter 5

## CRITIQUE READING

1. Corey Lee Wrenn. Trump Veganism: A Political Survey of American Vegans in the Era of Identity Plitics. *Societies.*
2. Reid, Carolina K., Debbie Bocian, Wei Li, and Roberto G. Quercia. "Revisiting the subprime crisis: The dual mortgage market and mortgage defaults by race and ethnicity." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 39, no. 4 (2017): 469-487.

## ASSIGNMENT: Question Workshop- KATE and GABBY

**UNIT 2: EXPERIMENTS AND QUANTIATIVE ANALYSIS**

**Week 5: Experiments and Causal Inference- LEW**

## February 14

## METHODS READING:

## Research Designs: Experiments in Research Methods in the Social Sciences 8th Edition

## Cross Sectional and Quasi-Experimental designs in Research Methods in the Social Sciences 8th Edition

## CRITIQUE READING

1. Zimmerman, David J. 2003. “Peer Effects in Academic Outcomes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 85 (1): 9–23.
2. Alaimo, Katherine, Elizabeth Packnett, Richard A. Miles, and Daniel J. Kruger. "Fruit and vegetable intake among urban community gardeners." *Journal of nutrition education and behavior* 40, no. 2 (2008): 94-101.

## ASSIGNMENT: Question Workshop- Lew, Anetha, Aditi

**Week 6: Surveys, Indexes and Scales- ANETHA**

## February 21

## METHODS READING

## Survey Research in Applied Research Methods in Public and Nonprofit Organizations

## Questionnaire Construction in Research Methods in the Social Sciences 8th

## Index Construction and Scaling Methods in Research Methods in the Social Sciences 8th Edition

## 

## CRITIQUE READING- Discussion Leader Anetha

## [Besser, Terry L](https://search.proquest.com/indexinglinkhandler/sng/au/Besser,+Terry+L/$N). Community Involvement and the Perception of Success among small business operator in small towns.  [Journal of Small Business Management](https://search.proquest.com/pubidlinkhandler/sng/pubtitle/Journal+of+Small+Business+Management/$N/49244/OpenView/221004379/$B/15E2630DA20C45DAPQ/1); Milwaukee[Vol. 37, Iss. 4,](https://search.proquest.com/indexingvolumeissuelinkhandler/49244/Journal+of+Small+Business+Management/01999Y10Y01$23Oct+1999$3b++Vol.+37+$284$29/37/4) (Oct 1999): 16-29.

## Collins, Charles R., Zachary P. Neal, and Jennifer Watling Neal. "Transforming social cohesion into informal social control: Deconstructing collective efficacy and the moderating role of neighborhood racial homogeneity." Journal of Urban Affairs 39, no. 3 (2017): 307-322.

**Week 7**: **Dealing with Clustering and Time- ADITI**

## February 28

## METHODS READING

## Chapter 16 Panel Data Regression Models in Basic Econometrics by Damodar Gujarati and Dawn C Porter

## Chapter 21 Time Series Econometrics Some Basic Concepts in Basic Econometrics by Damodar Gujarati and Dawn C Porter

## CRITIQUE READING- Discussion Leader Aditi

1. Woodcock, James, Phil Edwards, Cathryn Tonne, Ben G. Armstrong, Olu Ashiru, David Banister, Sean Beevers et al. "Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions: urban land transport." *The Lancet* 374, no. 9705 (2009): 1930-1943.
2. Hopkins, Daniel J. "Politicized places: Explaining where and when immigrants provoke local opposition." *American political science review* 104, no. 1 (2010): 40-60.

## ASSIGNMENT: Theory Workshop- KATE and GABBY

**Week 8: Causal Inference with Stats- Regression Discontinuity and Propensity Score Matching- DR BOWERS**

## March 7

## METHODS READING Chapter 8 and 9 in Richard J. Murnane and John B. Willett. Methods Matter: Improving Causal Inference in Educational and Social Science Research.

## CRITIQUE READING

1. Berk, Richard A. and David Rauma (March 1983). “Capitalizing on Nonrandom Assignment to Treatments: A Regression-Discontinuity Evaluation of a Crime-Control Program.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 78, Issue 381, pp. 21-7.
2. Soroka, Stuart, Blake Andrew, Toril Aalberg, Shanto Iyengar, James Curran, Sharon Coen, Kaori Hayashi et al. "Auntie knows best? Public broadcasters and current affairs knowledge." *British Journal of Political Science* 43, no. 4 (2013): 719-739.

## ASSIGNMENT: Theory Workshop- ADITI, LEW, ANETHA

# Week 9: Spring Break- NO LEADER

## March 14

## READING: ENJOY SPRING BREAK

## 

**Week 10: Midterm Exam- NO LEADER**

## March 21: READING: NO READING

## ASSIGNMENT: In-class midterm

**UNIT 3: Qualitative Analysis**

**Week 11: Limits of Quantitative Analysis and Logic of Qualitative Research- ANETHA**

## March 28:

## METHODS READING:

## Brady And Collier Rethinking Social Inquiry Chapter 5, 6,7 (skim)

## Qualitative and Unobtrusive Measures in The Research Methods Knowledge Base

RESEARCH CRITIQUE

1. Walker, Helen and Preuss, Lutz (2008) Fostering sustainability through sourcing from small businesses: public sector perspectives. Journal of Cleaner Production, 16 (15)

<https://ac-els-cdn-com.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/S0959652608001054/1-s2.0-S0959652608001054-main.pdf?_tid=76c4ec40-fe1e-11e7-ac50-00000aacb35d&acdnat=1516479426_933f44e6ae9ba5304c4f465a09cd4929>

1. Rosdil, Donald L. "The survival of progressive urban politics amid economic adversity." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 39, no. 2 (2017): 205-224.

**Week 12: Case Studies and Field Work- KATE**

## April 4:

## METHODS READING

## Qualitative Data Collection in the Field in Applied Research Methods in Public and Nonprofit Organizations

## Gary Goetz. 2012. Case studies, causal mechanisms and selecting cases.

## KKV Chapter 6

## CRITIQUE READINGS

1. Tactical Developments for Achieving Just and Sustainable Neighborhoods: The Role of **Community**-Based Coalitions and Bottom-to-Bottom Networks in Street, Technical, and Funder **Activism by**Anguelovski, Isabelle
2. Doussard, Marc, and Jacob Lesniewski. "Fortune favors the organized: How Chicago activists won equity goals under austerity." *Journal of Urban Affairs* (2017): 1-17.

## ASSIGNMENT: Methods Workshop:- ADITI, GABBY

**Week 13: Interviews and Focus Groups- GABBY**

## April 11:

## METHODS READING

## Bajarati Chapter 12- Interpretive Research

## Edwards, Rosalind and Janet Holland. 2013. What is Qualitative Interviewing. Chapters 1, 3,6

## Analysis of Semi-Structured Interview Data by Kathleen W. Piercy

## CRITIQUE READING

1. Niklas Hansson and Kerstin Jacobsson. 2014. Learning to Be Affected: Subjectivity, Sense, and Sensibility in Animal Rights Activism. *Society and Animals.*
2. Pothukuchi, Kameshwari. "“To allow farming is to give up on the city”: Political anxieties related to the disposition of vacant land for urban agriculture in Detroit." *Journal of Urban Affairs* (2017): 1-21.

## ASSIGNMENT: Methods Workshop: LEW, KATE, ANETHA

**Week 14: Process Tracing and Historical Analysis- LEW**

## April 18:

METHODS READING

1. James Mahoney, Erin Kimball and Kendra Koivu. .2009. The Logic of Historical explanation in the Social Sciences. *Comparative Political Studies* 42:1
2. Mahoney, James. The Logic of Process Tracing Tests in the Social Science. *Sociological Methods and Research*

CRITIQUE READINGS

1. Vicino, Thomas J., and Anjuli Fahlberg. "The politics of contested urban space: The 2013 protest movement in Brazil." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 39, no. 7 (2017): 1001-1016.
2. Furman, Carrie, Carla Roncoli, Donald R. Nelson, and Gerrit Hoogenboom. "Growing food, growing a movement: climate adaptation and civic agriculture in the southeastern United States." *Agriculture and human values* 31, no. 1 (2014): 69-82.

**Week 15: GIS, Research Ethics, IRB, and Research Practicalities- KATE   
 *April 25:***

METHODS READING

1. GIS Best Practices Social Sciences. *ESRI*. <http://www.esri.com/library/bestpractices/social-sciences.pdf>
2. Research Ethics. Research Methods Database. <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/ethics.php>
3. Dutton, Bill. Six Principles to Guide Research Ethics. <https://billdutton.me/2010/02/05/principles-to-guide-research-ethics-in-the-social-sciences/>
4. Konnikova, Maria. 2015. “How A Gay-Marriage Study Went Wrong.” The New Yorker [Online], May 22, 2015.
5. Listen to This American Life episode "For Your Reconsideration", Prolouge and Act 1 <https://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/584/for-your-reconsideration>

## CRITIQUE READING- KATE IS DISCUSSION LEADER

1. Parks and young people: An environmental justice study of park proximity, acreage, and quality in Denver, Colorado by Alessandro Rigolon

<https://login.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselp&AN=S0169204617301111&site=eds-live>

1. Huang, Ganlin, and Jonathan K. London. "Mapping in and out of “messes”: An adaptive, participatory, and transdisciplinary approach to assessing cumulative environmental justice impacts." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 154 (2016): 57-67.

## ASSIGNMENT: Final Research Design Due in Class and ON SAKAI BY 6:00 PM EST

**Week 16: Final Presentation, Food and Reflection – NO DISCUSSION LEADER  
*May 9:* Final Presentations, Bring a snack to share**

***ASSIGNMENT: Final Presentation***

## 