

**WHERE COMPARATIVE POLITICS MEETS METHODS:
CENTRING THE LOCAL SINGAPOREAN CONTEXT IN AN UNDERGRADUATE
METHODS COURSE**

Rebecca Grace TAN

Department of Political Science

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

National University of Singapore

In 1991, the American Political Science Association (APSA) published a report *The Political Science Major in the Liberal Arts Curriculum*, popularly dubbed the “Wahlke Report”. In the report, it was recommended that “all political science majors should acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to read and comprehend contemporary political analyses and to develop their analytic capacity” (Wahlke 1991, 57). A more recent APSA report published in 2024 which examined the state of Political Science education in the light of contemporary challenges made a similar call. The taskforce led by John Ishiyama called for Political Science programmes to provide undergraduates with methods education to enhance their “capacity to rigorously analyze and interpret real-world data” (Rethinking Political Science Education 2024, 21). In line with these calls, there has been a rise in scholarship examining how research methods are taught to Political Science undergraduates, from reviews of how different institutes provide methods instruction (Lam and Hung 2024; Parker 2010; Thies and Hogan 2005) to examining what pedagogical approaches ensure effective instruction (Bergbower 2017; Fisher and Justwan 2018).

While there has been burgeoning scholarship on the teaching of research methods in Political Science, another growing area of interest within the scholarship on

teaching and learning within Political Science is the surrounding efforts to decolonise the curriculum. In 2015, the “Rhodes Must Fall” movement in South Africa led to the mainstreaming of efforts to decolonise higher education as a means to pursue social justice (Laakso and Hallberg Adu 2024, 186). A decolonial approach goes beyond “just replacing white scholars and scholarship with black scholars and scholarship, even while the increased presence of black scholars is urgently required” (Matthews 2019, 54), but instead interrogates the nature of the discipline’s “being” (Dube 2021). This critical engagement with how Political Science is imagined and reproduced in both the classroom and through research plays out in a variety of ways, such as exposing the colonial assumptions that underpin the concepts and worldviews within the discipline (Shilliam 2021) or the ways in which women and people of colour are underrepresented within the academy (Begum and Saini 2019).

While both these areas have been attracting growing interest within academic circles interested in interrogating how Political Science is taught, there is a surprising lack of overlap between them. There is some scholarship on the need to decolonise research methodologies starting with the need to interrogate the often West-centric worldviews that underpin our concepts (Abdi 2019) and more broadly incorporate decolonial learning into research methods (Ewing 2021; Thambinathan and Kinsella 2021). Nonetheless, there is a dearth of scholarship on how one can decolonise the teaching of research methods. For instance, Brown, Smith and Thies’ 2020 examination of the extant literature on the teaching of research methods within Political Science undergraduate education reveals that none examine how to teach research methods from a decolonial perspective (2020). A more recent article examines the need to decolonise the teaching of quantitative research methods but also notes the general absence of literature on the decolonisation of research methods pedagogy (Zwiener-Collins et al. 2023, 127) but there is little else that has been published on the subject.

This article thus seeks to add to this understudied area on the teaching of Political Science research methods through a practised-based reflection on the author’s experience designing and teaching an undergraduate research methods course for final-year students entitled “Researching Singapore Politics”. It argues that the centring of the local context in a research methods course is decolonial because it decentres Western

epistemologies, challenges student-instructor hierarchies, and introduces discussions about the role of power in the production of knowledge.

Setting Up the Course

Students who major in Political Science at the National University of Singapore are given the option to undertake a semester-long Honours Thesis (HT) project in their graduating semester. This capstone research paper involves independent research and writing of a paper that is between 8,000 to 12,000 words, and, as is commonly observed in other institutions, is student driven in terms of the choice of research question and methodology (Hummer 2014, 233). Unsurprisingly, given the placement of the university in Singapore, a sizable number of students choose to undertake a research project on Singapore. A brief survey of the Political Science HT projects for the past five years shows that 45 out of 116 (38.7%) projects focused on Singapore politics, ranging from the role of religious institutions in advocating for policy changes to the politics of food.

As a faculty member who has a research and teaching focus on Singaporean politics, I have been approached to supervise HTs about Singapore on a number of occasions. However, I found that students were often ill-prepared to conduct fieldwork. For instance, a student whose HT I supervised sought to conduct interviews with migrant rights activists. However, she was unaware of the wariness that permeates the NGO sector in Singapore, which resulted in consent being rescinded mid-way through her interview process, throwing off the entire project. It was then that I realized that most of the students who were seeking to study Singapore had little to no knowledge about how to approach research in this specific context. While they are required to take a research methodology course, that course is an introductory one that simply provides a broad overview of the topic (PS3257 Political Inquiry n.d.), much like what is offered in many other institutions (Becker 2020). Of course, the HT supervisor has some responsibility to guide students in their research, but given faculty members' onerous teaching and research obligations, combined with the fact that not all supervisors have experience

conducting research in Singapore, it is implausible to expect that adequate supervision could be provided.

To that end, I sought to develop a course that provided students with an awareness of the skills necessary to navigate fieldwork in Singapore. This course was coded and titled: PS4332 – Researching Singapore Politics (hereafter referred to as PS4332). But rather than frame the course as a research methods course, this was framed more generally as a comparative politics course to encourage students to consider how academic study can influence politics and vice versa. For instance, much research has been done on how academic theories can influence public policy decisions, from the embracing of the ‘broken windows’ thesis which translated into significant changes to policing methods (Kramer 2012) to the rise of education policies seeking to tackle the pervasive idea that there exists a ‘30-million word gap’ between privileged and minoritized children (Cushing 2023). As discussed later on in this paper, this approach allowed me to push students to consider the politics of research and the place of the researcher amidst such politics.

The course content was structured into two broad themes. The first centred big questions that surround the research process, such as ‘what is the purpose of research?’ and ‘what assumptions do we make about who/what should be the primary unit of analysis in Political Science research?’. The second theme focused on introducing students to different research methodologies, from ethnography to survey methods. Key to this course was the centralization of Singapore in those conversations starting with the assigned course readings. Each week had a number of general readings about the topic to introduce students to key debates within research methods as well as at least two readings that brought in the Singaporean case study to show how the debates played out in research on Singapore. The table below shows an example of the course’s first topic which addressed the debate within academia about what the “point” of research is.

Topic	Essential Questions	Assigned Readings
The Purpose of Research	What is research? Why is research important? Is	Frazier, Michael L. “Activism and Objectivity in Political Research.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 21, No. 4 (2023): 1258-1269.

	activism antithetical to research? How does research fit within the political context of Singapore?	Ng, Kok Hoe. “Policy Research as Practising Dissent” in <i>We are Not the Enemy: The Practice of Advocacy in Singapore</i>. Ed. Constance Singam & Margaret Thomas. Singapore: Ethos Books, 2024. Pp. 35-49. George, Cherian, Chong, Ja Ian & Ang, Shannon. “The State of Academic Freedom in Singapore’s World-Beating Universities” in <i>New Threats to Academic Freedom in Asia</i>. Ed. Dimitar Gueorguiev. Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Asian Studies, 2022.
--	--	--

This use of readings allowed students to see how academics in Singapore grappled with the issue in the specific context of Singapore, such as the constraints placed on academic researchers within the settings of the neoliberal university setting in an authoritarian state.

In addition to the course materials that provide the foundation for an examination into what researching Singaporean politics might entail, the course revolved around students developing their own proposal to study a political issue in Singapore. Working off the weekly seminars and course readings and with regular opportunities for structured reflection through journalling exercises, students developed a 3,000-word proposal for a project to study a local issue based on students’ interest. Emphasis was placed on the need to be aware of the local context of research, such as challenges with accessing data in a closed regime (Loh and Liew 2010) and students’ awareness of their position as insiders/outsiders within the own research context (Kerstetter 2012). The first iteration of the course was run in the academic year of 2024/2025 and comprised twenty-two honours-year students. Their final proposals were varied in their focuses, from running experiments to determine if racial minorities face discrimination in the employment market to ethnographic research on stray dog management.

As mentioned earlier, the initial motivation for developing and convening the course was one that was driven by student need both for immediate research projects such as the Honours Thesis and research skills necessary for the workplace, such as in

conducting research to inform public policy. However, as I developed the course, I was increasingly convinced that this course also had a broader goal of decolonizing the way we teach and think about what Political Science research is and how it is carried out. This decolonization takes place in three ways: challenging taken-for-granted research paradigms, rethinking the student-instructor dynamic and highlighting the role of power in the research process.

Decentring Western Research Paradigms

In his book *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Dipesh Chakrabarty argues that Europe is often the “silent referent in historical knowledge” through which non-European scholars are expected to base their scholarship on (2000, 28). Using the example of capital, he highlights that the historical “particular” of European experience, such as concepts of capital or class, presents itself as “universal” (2000, 70) to which scholars writing about European and non-European cases alike are expected to defer. Chakrabarty thus argues for postcolonial scholarship to “provincialise” the European frame of reference that is often uncritically assumed to be universal and highlight that there are other alternate ways of “being human” (2000, 254). This does not mean a rejection of European frames of reference as having no value but recognizing that they were developed in their particular contexts. This echoes other scholarship on the decolonization of higher education as “an expression of the changing geopolitics of knowledge whereby the modern epistemological framework for knowing and understanding the world is no longer interpreted as universal and unbound by geo-historical and biographical contexts” (Baker 2012, 2).

PS4332 sought to challenge previously taken-for-granted universals about Political Science in two ways. The first was through an explicit discussion of ethnocentrism in the fourth seminar. Students were tasked to read a piece by Uday Chandra entitled “The Case for a Postcolonial Approach to the Study of Politics” (2013) and presented the case study of Chinese scholars’ efforts to build their own way of studying Chinese politics (Yang 2021). Through the close reading of two pieces which

discussed how democratic Singapore's political regime is (or not), students critically engaged with an examination of the assumptions underpinning efforts to classify Singapore within studies of democracy, such as whether there can exist alternative non-liberal ways to understand democratic governance. Students then went on to interrogate other concepts frequently used within Political Science research to consider their origins and applicability to non-Western cases. For instance, one student highlighted that the very fixation on states as the units of analysis within Southeast Asian politics ignores the fact that states are products of colonial drawing of boundaries, ignoring other ways of organizing within the region. Others highlighted that "race" in Singapore is an inherited idea from the British as a way of dividing and conquering practiced across the region (Reddy and Gleibs 2019). This discussion led to students interrogating their own assumptions about how to research politics in Singapore. One student wrote in their journal entry for the week:

"In my research on racial representation in Singapore's Parliament, I recognise how Eurocentrism could subtly shape my approach by embedding Western-centric frameworks, assumptions, and methods that may not fit Singapore's unique context. These biases could lead to an incomplete or skewed analysis of racial representation. For example, the CMIO (Chinese, Malay, Indian, Others) model, inherited from British colonial rule, exemplifies how colonial-era classifications continue to influence racial discourse in Singapore. If I rely solely on this rigid categorisation, I risk overlooking the fluidity and evolving nature of racial identities, such as the presence of mixed-race MPs. This could lead to conclusions that reinforce, rather than challenge, the racial essentialism inherent in the CMIO model."

The second approach to "provincializing" research methods in PS4332 took place during the discussions of different research methodologies in Political Science. Each week focused on one research method, from ethnography to discourse analysis and survey methods. Similar to other research methods courses, there were assigned readings introducing students to debates within the method. However, those more general readings were accompanied with at least two journal articles on Singaporean

politics that employed the research methods in question to provide exemplars on how these methods were applied in the Singaporean context. Hence, rather than discuss the methods in abstract, students considered how scholars had to negotiate the particularities of the Singaporean context in their research. For example, for the seminar on archival research, students examined two pieces of scholarship on the history of the pro-communist movement in Singapore. One scholar had access to archival data stored by the state while the other was unable to gain this data and hence had to find a “side door” through colonial records. A more general methods course discussion might not consider the specific peculiarities of local contexts. For instance, Kim’s article on digital archives highlights that one of the issues faced by researchers is the that of “excess abundance” (2022, 531). However, this assumes a context in which there is mass digitalization and declassification of records, an assumption that she never actually makes explicit. In a country like Singapore in which information is heavily regulated, access to archival data is gatekept and often very hard to access (Loh and Liew 2010). By bringing in the local context, students were provided vital information on how to navigate the Singaporean research landscape. But more than providing practical tips on local research, students became more aware of how the often general and abstract teaching of research methods obscured assumptions about where and how the research was taking place, such as in Western countries where freedom of information is set up as a right and researchers given the freedom to access data. This awareness allowed them to more effectively tailor their proposals when considering how to craft their methodologies. While they were still expected to draw on the broader literature on research methods, students were sensitized to consider how they needed to carefully apply recommendations in the scholarship on Political Science research methodologies to their specific projects.

Ultimately, if the decolonial project is about recognizing that what was previously assumed as universal experience is in fact informed by local experience, the first step is simply to pull aside that veil of presumed universality. Decolonization then requires the foregrounding of the experience of the non-Western. In the case of this course, it is about making the Singaporean research context the primary frame of reference to better understand that knowledge is generated as a function of local norms, constraints and

practices while also supporting students' learning needs as the next section goes on to discuss.

Challenging the Student-Instructor Dynamic

Decolonial pedagogy is about becoming more “attentive to both the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic modes of knowing about power” (Caivano and Deo 2025, 5). While this reconsideration of power should involve challenging the epistemological bases of the Western canon, whether it be revising reading lists or “provincializing” concepts that were previously presented as “universal” as discussed in the previous section of this paper, it cannot stop there. If we are committed to the decolonial idea that knowledge is “plural, subjective and locally situated”, we ultimately are also committed to the principle which drives efforts to decolonize research methodologies which “asserts the agency of people from all backgrounds to theorise and interrogate the presumptions of academic research” (Ewing 2021, 26). If so, then where do our students and their knowledge come into the decolonization of the methods classroom?

I posit that decolonizing the classroom requires us as educators to rethink the hierarchical structures of instruction and education. Thus, decolonial pedagogy can be usefully informed by broader critical pedagogical ideas, such as efforts to democratize the classroom. For instance, Paolo Freire presents an alternative approach to education from a dialogical perspective. Where the traditional “banking approach” to teaching imagines students as passive, empty containers into which the “expert” instructor pours their knowledge and expertise, a dialogical frame flattens the hierarchy. As to quote Freire, through dialogue “the teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach” (2017, 53).

In the PS4332 setting, this required me to reimagine my role in the classroom as less of an educator but more a facilitator of conversations. First, this involved me explaining at multiple points in the semester that I was teaching a topic that I was less familiar with. For instance, I had to admit that I was a scholar who has had limited hands-

on experience with many of the methodologies that we were discussing in class, such as statistical modelling and discourse analysis. This broke down the often-unspoken hierarchy of intelligences that we imagine in the university classroom between the expert academic and the student in need of instruction. I discovered that this admission of ignorance had a surprising and welcomed effect on the classroom dynamics – students felt more able to speak up in class, including to challenge the ideas from the assigned readings or points that came up in class discussion. As Nancy Luxon explains, “when being taught by someone who likewise does not know with absolute certainty, students learn to model that posture as something other than incapacity: they learn to take themselves seriously, develop a process of inquiry, and move their claims into the world. If the teacher is not an expert, the student cannot be an ingénue” (2015, 45). This led to numerous opportunities in which students in PS4332 were able to take on the role of “educator” in the classroom to share from their own experiences to teach me and the rest of the class. These opportunities ranged from a student from an ethnic minority background who was able to explain that official state racial categories did not measure up to the lived experiences and self-identification of minority groups to another student who used her work experience to explain how Gen-AI can be used productively to supplement existing research methods.

Another way in which the hierarchy of the classroom was disrupted came through allowing students to be assessed on knowledge that was important to them. As mentioned in the introductory section of this paper, the central assessment for the course was a research proposal that students were asked to work on throughout the course. In the first seminar, they brainstormed issues within Singaporean politics that they would like to research, and then continuously engaged with the topics of the weekly seminars through the lens of their project. This lengthy process of reflection, dialogue and feedback would finally culminate in their 3,000-word research proposal. While students were not required to go out into the field for this assignment (some did go on to write an Honours Thesis based off their PS4332 proposal), the act of reflectively and critically designing a research project allowed them a significant amount of pride and ownership in the final submission, a finding echoed by other scholarship on engaging students in the practice of research (Ishiyama and Breuning 2003). However, by using such a method of

assessment, I was unable to evaluate students' competencies in all the research methods covered, unlike in other research methods courses where instructors might craft more standardized assessments testing skills such as use of statistical programmes (Ishiyama 2022, 44). In the latter approach, the focus for research methods courses is to teach Political Science undergraduates how to *do* Political Science and thus provide them with what has been deemed the necessary skills and knowledge, whether it be to learn how to operate SPSS, determine what is a dependent or independent variable or consider the ethical implications of their research methods. Being proficient in the language of Political Science research has its place, but as Gee notes, these displays of proficiency are not neutral but “ways of displaying (through words, actions, values and beliefs) membership in a particular social group or social network” (2014, 158) which are mediated by existing power structures, such as Western positivism. If that is the case, then can a decolonial approach be squared with this sort of gatekeeping? To try to reconcile my twin goals of both introducing students to research methods while maintaining a commitment to decolonizing the teaching of research methods, I adopted a hybrid approach. Students were educated on the various debates on research methods and the different methodologies through course materials and seminar topics. However, when it came to an assessment of their “competency” as Political Scientists through their proposal, students could decide on which areas to demonstrate that proficiency through a selection of research methods that best fit with their research goals. This differentiated assessment format allowed a more inclusive approach to assessment while also promoting student engagement more broadly.

I found that rethinking and redesigning the student-instructor dynamic in PS4332 to be very challenging especially in the Singaporean context in which hierarchy is emphasized heavily in much of public education in Singapore (Liu and Hong 2009, 10). However, a commitment to decolonizing the classroom requires an effort not just to interrogate the power dynamics between Western and non-Western scholars, ideas and ways of understanding the political world, but to take those normative commitments and translate them into our classrooms as well.

Uncovering the Role of Power in Political Science Research

Since the project of decolonizing the curriculum is about uncovering the hegemonic discourses and frames of references that entrench a particular Western way of thinking about the political world, it thus follows that the decolonizing project needs to also be concerned with how researchers themselves continue to produce such systems of power. This has been tackled in a wide range of ways. For instance, Zweiner-Collins et al argue that while counting and statistical analysis is often vital for marginalized population's claims for self-determination, they also highlight that researchers using quantitative methods must be cognizant of the use and abuse of statistics for colonial projects, such as the use of statistics to argue that there exists a racial hierarchy based on different intelligence levels of groups (2023, 125–26).

Along a similar vein, in PS4332, students were not merely encouraged to consider the non-Western canon on research methods, but challenged to think more generally about how research can reinforce existing power imbalances. A common theme that emerged from class discussions, especially in the context of how research in Singapore takes place within a competitive authoritarian regime, was how powerful actors, especially the state, uses data to further its own political ends. In a discussion on statistics, students considered the implications of the state's reticence to set an official poverty line (Donaldson et al. 2013, 60), but instead relies on other measures of economic success to make the case that Singaporeans are better-off as a result of state policy, such as looking at GDP per capita. The broader lesson that students were encouraged to draw from these discussions was that power is not merely determined by access to political institutions or material resources but if one is able to access data and control the flow of information.

To recognise that power can come from access to the processes and institutions that produce data thus highlights the role of the researcher to consider their role in this “power struggle”. Students were encouraged to reflexively interrogate their positionality as researchers while crafting their proposals. Early on in the semester, students were introduced to the idea of the “insider/outsider” dichotomy (Breen 2007) and asked to consider where they might be placed and move on this spectrum in during their project.

For instance, a student who wanted to study the political attitudes of recent migrants from China recorded their reflections on how being an insider/outsider might create both opportunities and challenges to researching the topic. They noted in a journal entry: “My Chinese heritage, fluency in Chinese, and migrant experience offer an insider perspective but also position me as an outsider to China. This dual perspective can both enrich and complicate my analysis, as my insider knowledge of the diaspora contrasts with my outsider status regarding mainland China.”

In addition to considering the researcher’s various identities such as gender, class or race in shaping the research process, students were encouraged to consider how the identity of “researcher” might be affect the research process. Most of the students enrolled in PS4332 had never been in a position of a researcher before, and thus it was the first time that they had to think about how a researcher’s presence can shape outcomes. For instance, if researchers are seen as “well-educated” or “experts”, interlocuters might defer to the researcher or be more reticent in sharing what they might think is an “uneducated” opinion (Pacheco-Vega and Parizeau 2018, 7). Bringing to light the researcher-researched power dynamic provided a window into broader discussions about the duty that the researcher owes to the researched, especially if there already exists a power imbalance weighted in favour of the researcher (though this is not always the case). Students grappled with ethical questions in their proposals, from how can researchers put in place safeguards to protect vulnerable interlocuters, to what responsibility did they have to “give back” to the community being studied so that the research process was not simply a one-sided extractive one. Thus, students themselves started becoming engaged in the processes and goals of the project of decolonization.

Conclusion

The projects of decolonizing the Political Science curriculum and reflecting on how we equip students with the necessary skills and knowledge on research methodologies are ultimately examinations of how we can ensure that Political Science undergraduates are equipped to go out into a world that is increasingly messy. Bringing them together ensures

that students do not merely have the skills to make sense of the data, but also the sensitivity of understanding the origins and implications of such data in a world with ever increasing inequalities of power. This paper provided an overview of one such approach of the bringing together of these two projects, albeit an exploratory one. PS4332 situated the teaching of research methods within the local Singaporean context and in doing so, allowed both students and the instructor to consider how we might challenge what might have previously been taken-for-granted as universal, centred students' needs and uncover the role of power in the production and reproduction of power in the classroom and academic study.

Works Cited

- Abdi, Nimo M. 2019. '7. Researching from the Margin: Challenges and Tensions of Doing Research within One's Own Refugee Community'. In *Critical Reflections on Research Methods: Power and Equity in Complex Multilingual Contexts*, eds. Doris S. Warriner and Martha Bigelow. Multilingual Matters, 98–109. doi:10.21832/9781788922562-009.
- Baker, Michael. 2012. 'Decolonial Education: Meanings, Contexts & Possibilities'. In *Interpreting, Researching, & Transforming Colonial/Imperial Legacies in Education*, Seattle. https://www.academia.edu/3266939/Decolonial_Education_Meanings_Contexts_and_Possibilities (March 27, 2025).
- Becker, Megan. 2020. 'Research for All: Creating Opportunities for Undergraduate Research Experiences Across the Curriculum'. doi:10.33774/apsa-2020-30zr5.
- Begum, Neema, and Rima Saini. 2019. 'Decolonising the Curriculum'. *Political Studies Review* 17(2): 196–201. doi:10.1177/1478929918808459.
- Bergbower, Matthew L. 2017. 'When Are Students Ready for Research Methods? A Curriculum Mapping Argument for the Political Science Major'. *Journal of Political Science Education* 13(2): 200–210. doi:10.1080/15512169.2017.1292917.
- Breen, Lauren J. 2007. 'The Researcher "in the Middle": Negotiating the Insider/Outsider Dichotomy'. *The Australian Community Psychologist* 19(1): 163–74.
- Brown, Mitchell, Bob Smith, and Cameron Thies. 2020. 'A Meta-Analysis of Extant Literature on Teaching Research Methods: Preliminary Analysis Findings'. doi:10.33774/apsa-2020-4cstc.
- Caivano, D. C., and Nandini Deo. 2025. 'Decolonizing Political Science Teaching: Students Matter'. doi:10.33774/apsa-2025-h9bzs.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chandra, Uday. 2013. 'The Case for a Postcolonial Approach to the Study of Politics'. *New Political Science* 35(3): 479–91. doi:10.1080/07393148.2013.813700.
- Cushing, Ian. 2023. 'Word Rich or Word Poor? Deficit Discourses, Raciolinguistic Ideologies and the Resurgence of the "Word Gap" in England's Education Policy'. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 20(4): 305–31. doi:10.1080/15427587.2022.2102014.
- Donaldson, John A., Jacqueline Loh, Sanushka Mudaliar, Mumtaz Md Kadir, Biqi Wu, and Lam Keong Yeoh. 2013. 'Measuring Poverty in Singapore: Frameworks for Consideration'. *Social Space*: 58–66.

- Dube, Siphiwe I. 2021. 'The Decoloniality of Being Political Studies/Science: Legitimising a(Nother) Way of Being'. *CriStal* 9(1): 58–77. doi:10.14426/cristal.v9i1.391.
- Ewing, Sara. 2021. 'Decolonising Research Methodologies'. In *Narrative Expansions: Interpreting Decolonisation in Academic Libraries*, eds. Jess Crilly and Regina Everitt. Facet, 25–38. doi:10.29085/9781783304998.005.
- Fisher, Sarah, and Florian Justwan. 2018. 'Scaffolding Assignments and Activities for Undergraduate Research Methods'. *Journal of Political Science Education* 14(1): 63–71. doi:10.1080/15512169.2017.1367301.
- Freire, Paulo. 2017. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin Random House.
- Gee, James. 2014. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. 4th ed. London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203814444.
- Hummer, Jill Abraham. 2014. 'The Content and Integrative Component of Capstone Experiences: An Analysis of Political Science Undergraduate Programs'. *Journal of Political Science Education* 10(2): 222–42. doi:10.1080/15512169.2014.894366.
- Ishiyama, John. 2022. 'Chapter 4: Teaching Political Methodology to Undergraduate Students'. <https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781800885479/book-part-9781800885479-13.xml> (March 28, 2025).
- Ishiyama, John, and Marijke Breuning. 2003. 'Does Participation in Undergraduate Research Affect Political Science Students?' *Politics & Policy* 31(1): 163–80. doi:10.1111/j.1747-1346.2003.tb00892.x.
- Kerstetter, Katie. 2012. 'Insider, Outsider, or Somewhere in Between: The Impact of Researchers' Identities on the Community-Based Research Process*'. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences* 27(2): 99–117.
- Kim, Diana S. 2022. 'Taming Abundance: Doing Digital Archival Research (as Political Scientists)'. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55(3): 530–38. doi:10.1017/S104909652100192X.
- Kramer, Ronald. 2012. 'Political Elites, "Broken Windows", and the Commodification of Urban Space'. *Critical Criminology* 20(3): 229–48. doi:10.1007/s10612-011-9137-9.
- Laakso, Liisa, and Kajsa Hallberg Adu. 2024. "The Unofficial Curriculum Is Where the Real Teaching Takes Place": Faculty Experiences of Decolonising the Curriculum in Africa'. *Higher Education* 87(1): 185–200. doi:10.1007/s10734-023-01000-4.
- Lam, Man Ho Adrian, and Ho Ting (Bosco) Hung. 2024. 'Comparative Analysis of the Undergraduate Political Science Research Methodology Course Syllabi among

- Hong Kong Universities'. *Journal of Political Science Education* 20(4): 572–601. doi:10.1080/15512169.2024.2306325.
- Liu, Yongbing, and Huaqing and Hong. 2009. 'Regulative Discourse in Singapore Primary English Classrooms: Teachers' Choices of Directives'. *Language and Education* 23(1): 1–13. doi:10.1080/09500780802152812.
- Loh, Kah Seng, and Kai Khiun Liew, eds. 2010. *The Makers & Keepers of Singapore History*. Singapore: Ethos Books. <https://www.ethosbooks.com.sg/products/the-makers-and-keepers-of-singapore-history>.
- Luxon, Nancy. 2015. 'Teaching What We Don't Know'. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48(1): 44–47. doi:10.1017/S1049096514001589.
- Matthews, Sally. 2019. 'Confronting the Colonial Library: Teaching Political Studies Amidst Calls for a Decolonised Curriculum'. In *Decolonisation after Democracy*, ed. Laurence Piper. London: Routledge, 48–65.
- Pacheco-Vega, Raul, and Kate Parizeau. 2018. 'Doubly Engaged Ethnography: Opportunities and Challenges When Working With Vulnerable Communities'. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 17(1): 1609406918790653. doi:10.1177/1609406918790653.
- Parker, Jonathan. 2010. 'Undergraduate Research-Methods Training in Political Science: A Comparative Perspective'. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43(1): 121–25. doi:10.1017/S1049096510990677.
- 'PS3257 Political Inquiry'. *NUSMods*. <https://nusmods.com/courses/PS3257/political-inquiry> (April 1, 2025).
- Reddy, Geetha, and Ilka H. Gleibs. 2019. 'The Endurance and Contestations of Colonial Constructions of Race Among Malaysians and Singaporeans'. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10: 792. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00792.
- Rethinking Political Science Education*. 2024. American Political Science Association. <https://educate.apsanet.org/wp-content/uploads/APSA-Presidential-Task-Force-Report-on-Rethinking-Political-Science-Education-March-2024.pdf>.
- Shilliam, Robbie. 2021. *Decolonizing Politics: An Introduction* | Wiley. Cambridge, UK: Polity. <https://www.wiley.com/en-in/Decolonizing+Politics%3A+An+Introduction-p-9781509539406> (March 14, 2025).
- Thambinathan, Vivetha, and Elizabeth Anne Kinsella. 2021. 'Decolonizing Methodologies in Qualitative Research: Creating Spaces for Transformative Praxis'. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 20: 16094069211014766. doi:10.1177/16094069211014766.

- Thies, Cameron G., and Robert E. Hogan. 2005. 'The State of Undergraduate Research Methods Training in Political Science'. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38(2): 293–97. doi:10.1017/S1049096505056519.
- Wahlke, John C. 1991. 'Liberal Learning and the Political Science Major: A Report to the Profession'. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 24(1): 48–60. doi:10.2307/419376.
- Yang, Guangbin. 2021. "China as a Method" for Chinese Political Science Research'. *Chinese Political Science Review* 6(4): 546–74. doi:10.1007/s41111-021-00189-y.
- Zwiener-Collins, Nadine, Juvaria Jafri, Rima Saini, and Tabitha Poulter. 2023. 'Decolonising Quantitative Research Methods Pedagogy: Teaching Contemporary Politics to Challenge Hierarchies from Data'. *Politics* 43(1): 122–38. doi:10.1177/02633957211041449.