



COURSE OUTLINE
CHL5131H – Theoretical Foundations
of Qualitative Health Research
Fall 2017
Thursday, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.
(Location TBD)

Course Instructor

Dr. Brenda Gladstone

Contact: 416-978-4904

brenda.gladstone@utoronto.ca

Pre-requisites

To be a PhD student developing health-related research

Course Context

The history of qualitative research is one of confrontations between essential paradigmatic differences. In the health sciences, an early preoccupation with a polemic bifurcation between qualitative/interpretive and quantitative/positivistic approaches to inquiry has given way to debates that denote powerful tensions within the field of qualitative research itself. The cross-disciplinary nature of current qualitative research has added distinctive elements to the academic debate and consensus on many issues is not forthcoming. Despite these tensions, qualitative research thrives, as evidenced by an abundance of books, journals and articles dealing with a vast range of themes and approaches to scientific inquiry.

Course Description

This course examines the paradigmatic bases of qualitative research. In a series of seminars, instructor and students will explore the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of specific theoretical frameworks and consider the methodological implications that emanate from these foundations. Specific debates related to theories employed in the field of health, research questions, designs, the positionality of the researcher, epistemological rigour, and ethics will be discussed. This course addresses current debates, which are relevant to students in all health science disciplines and includes examples of qualitative research developed in many countries.

Course Objectives

- To understand paradigms for knowledge production and key theoretical foundations that inform qualitative studies in the health sciences
- To describe the link between epistemology and methodology and to show how interpretivist and critical epistemologies are connected to decisions about how social phenomena in the health

sciences are studied

- To examine well-established and innovative methodologies for qualitative health research
- To discuss elements for epistemological and methodological rigour (epistemological congruence) and ethics as process in qualitative health research
- To explore qualitative approaches that address individual research interests

Teaching and Learning Strategies

This course will involve lectures, seminars and group discussion. Learning will take place both inside and outside the classroom. Students are expected to come to class prepared to participate and contribute to the development of topics. Assignments are to be submitted on the specified dates; extensions must be negotiated with the course instructor one week prior to the due date. A penalty of 2% per day will be applied to late assignments. Written work should adhere to a particular bibliographic format (e.g. Vancouver, APA, etc.) and the specified page length.

Each student will be responsible for the work assigned in the following areas:

1. Class Seminar (25%)

Each student will plan and lead one presentation and group discussion that elaborates on one facet of the topic in a given week. This one-hour discussion is based on a critical analysis of the required class readings and an empirical research article selected by the student(s) to illustrate the topic discussed. The student(s) leading the seminar must make the suggested article available to class members *at least one week* before the class and provide a brief outline of the topic, including objectives for discussion. If more than one student leads the seminar the presentation will be assigned a group grade.

2. Paper One (25%)

This paper provides a critical analysis in response to the question: “who am I as a researcher?” Students should consider the personal, professional and conceptual/theoretical orientations that shape the positionality of the researcher and its influence on study design. The paper should be 4 pages long, double-spaced, Times New Roman font size 12; references on additional pages. The paper is due on **October 19** (prior to drop date). Electronic copies of the paper should be submitted to: Brenda.gladstone@utoronto.ca, and hard copies submitted in class on the day they are due.

3. Final Paper (50%)

This paper examines “the onto-epistemological congruence of my study”. Students should describe the particular paradigm they are oriented toward, and the theoretical framework they are using, and make a clear argument explaining how this approach is aligned with their research question and methodology. They should address questions of rigour and ethics as relevant to their study. Some students may want to discuss specific methods for data generation, but this is not required. The paper should be 10 pages long, double spaced, Times New Roman, font size 12; references on additional pages. The paper is due one week after the last class on **December 7th**. Electronic copies should be submitted to: Brenda.gladstone@utoronto.ca and hard copies should be submitted to the Graduate office, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, 155 College Street, room #620, no later than 4:30 p.m.

Grading

The criteria for evaluation in all three assignments include: the key argument or objective(s) is stated; status of information is clearly addressed; theoretical orientation is explored; key concepts/ themes are

introduced and contextualized; critiques to the topic under discussion are raised; presentation is clear and stimulating, or the document is well-written; and, references include but go beyond course material. Grading of assignments will follow the School of Graduate Studies grading and evaluation policy (A+ to B- or FZ). The grading plan for the course is:

Class Seminar	25%
Paper One	25%
Final paper	50%

Grading of Written Papers

All written assignments are subject to the grading regulations as outlined by the School of Graduate Studies. In this course, late assignments are subject to a penalty of 3% per day. Late assignments will not be accepted after 14 days of the due date.

Academic Offenses (from the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, University of Toronto Governing Council, July 1, 2016)

It shall be an offence for a student knowingly:

- (a) to forge or in any other way alter or falsify any document or evidence required by the University, or to utter, circulate or make use of any such forged, altered or falsified document, whether the record be in print or electronic form;
- (b) to use or possess an unauthorized aid or aids or obtain unauthorized assistance in any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work;
- (c) to personate another person, or to have another person personate, at any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work;
- (d) to represent as one's own any idea or expression of an idea or work of another in any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work, i.e. to commit plagiarism (for a more detailed account of plagiarism, see Appendix "A") ;
- (e) to submit, without the knowledge and approval of the instructor to whom it is submitted, any academic work for which credit has previously been obtained or is being sought in another course or program of study in the University or elsewhere;
- (f) to submit any academic work containing a purported statement of fact or reference to a source which has been concocted.

Accessibility Statement

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcomed in this course. In particular, if you have a disability/health consideration that may require accommodations, please contact the Accessibility Services Office as soon as possible.

Accessibility Services Office Location

455 Spadina Avenue, 4th Floor, Suite 400
(Just north of College Street)
Toronto, Ontario, M5S 2G8
Phone: 416-978-8060
Email: accessibility.services@utoronto.ca

Course Communication

Please ensure that you have an active “your.name@mail.utoronto.ca” email address as this is the only one to which faculty will respond.

Health Sciences Writing Centre

1. BN317: rm.317, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, 55 Harbord St.
 2. HS151: rm.151, Faculty of Nursing, 155 College St.
 3. PB416: rm.416, Faculty of Pharmacy, 144 College St.
 4. SK326: rm.326, Faculty of Social Work, 246 Bloor St. W.
- URL: <http://www.hswriting.ca/> (use this site to book an appointment)

The Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research (‘CQ’) at the University of Toronto



This course is part of CQ’s Essentials of Qualitative Research curriculum. CQ is an extra-departmental unit in the Dalla Lana School of Public Health also supported by the Faculties of Kinesiology and Physical Education, Nursing, Pharmacy, Social Work, and the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute. CQ builds capacity in the health sciences to advance critical and theoretically informed qualitative inquiry. As a hub for researchers, graduate students, and professors teaching qualitative methodology, its academic fellows promote research that addresses the socio-political dimensions of health and questions prevailing assumptions that naturalize health, for example, as individual and biological phenomena.

Visit the CQ website www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca to learn more about CQ’s resources and activities, which include other QR courses (Essentials of Qualitative Research Course Series), free methodology seminars (At the Centre Speaker Series; 3-4 seminars per term), the Certificate in Advanced Training in Qualitative Health Research Methodology for PhD students, and the Joan Eakin Award for Methodological Excellence in a Qualitative Doctoral Dissertation.

Useful Qualitative Links and Online Journals

International Collaboration for Participatory Health Research Methodology: <http://www.icphr.org/>
International Institute for Qualitative Methodology: <http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/iiqm/index.cfm>
The Qualitative Report: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/index.html>
FQS: Online International Journal: <http://qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm>

Some Journals of Interest for this Class

Critical Public Health
Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine
Journal of Contemporary Ethnography

Nursing Inquiry
Research in Nursing and Health
Qualitative Health Research
Qualitative Inquiry
Qualitative Research
Social Science and Medicine
Sociology of Health and Illness

DRAFT

**Graduate Department of Public Health Sciences
Dalla Lana School of Public Health
University of Toronto**

CHL5131H – Theoretical Foundations of Qualitative Health Research

Class Schedule

Fall 2017, Thursday, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.
Location: TDB

September **14** Introduction to the course & documentary “Window of the Soul”. Discussion of documentary as a metaphor for knowledge production

Part I: Foundations

21 Paradigms for knowledge production: What are the major approaches? What is qualitative research? (Students should select their class seminars)

28 Will this be a qualitative study? Creating a research question and developing a proposal (Group discussion: Analysing some research projects and their questions)

October **05** Interpretivist approaches: Symbolic interactionist and social constructionist orientations to methodology
(Group discussion: Research employing interpretivist orientations in the health sciences)

12 Critical-social approaches: Which are feminist, emancipatory agendas and methodologies? (Group discussion: Research employing feminist and critical orientations in the health sciences)

19 Critical-social approaches: Is there a poststructuralist/postmodern methodology? (Group discussion: Research employing postmodern theory in the health sciences)

Paper # 1 due October 19th (submit in class)

Part II: Methodological and Design Issues

October **26** Qualitative designs 1: Well-established traditions – Ethnography
(Group discussion: Ethnography and participant observation in health research)

November **02** Qualitative designs 2: Well-established traditions – Case Study and Grounded Theory (Group discussion: Case study and grounded theory in health research)

09 Qualitative designs 3: Innovative approaches
(Group discussion: Community-based research and arts-based research in health)

16 Qualitative designs 4: Guidance or constraint? Generic qualitative approaches
(Group discussion: Examining health studies with and without a specified design)

23 Epistemological and methodological rigour: Reflexivity, positionality and the quality of qualitative research
(Group discussion: The “researcher as the main research tool”)

30 Ethics as process
(Group discussion: Thinking ethics from diverse theoretical perspectives)

* *Final paper due December 7th (submit electronic copy to: Brenda.gladstone@utoronto.ca and a hard copy to DLSPH Grad office Room 620 HSB by 4:30 pm).*

Required Readings

September 14 - The role of the researcher: Positioning yourself as a qualitative health researcher

1. Becker, H. (1967). Whose side are you on? <https://www.sfu.ca/~palys/Becker1967-WhoseSideAreWeOn.pdf>
2. Reimer-Kirkham, S. & Anderson, J.M. (2010). The advocate-analyst dialectic in critical and post-colonial feminist research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 33 (3): 196-205.

September 21 – Paradigms for knowledge production: What are the major approaches? What is qualitative research?

1. Denzin, Norman. What is critical qualitative inquiry? In G.S. Canella, M. Salazar-Pérez and P.A. Pasque (Eds). *Critical Qualitative Inquiry – Foundations and Futures*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, pp. 31-49.
2. Giacomini, M. (2010). Theory matters in qualitative health research. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Methods in Health Research*. Bourgeault, I., Dingwall, R., deVries, R. (Eds.). Sage: London, pp. 125-156.
3. Frank, A., Corman, M.K., Gish, J.A. & Lawton, P. Healer-patient interaction: new mediations in clinical relationships. In I. Bourgeault, R. Dingwall & R. de Vries (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Methods in Health Research*. Sage: London, pp. 34-52.
4. Gastaldo, D. (2015). Research Paradigms: http://www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/Research%20Paradigms_2011_DG.pdf. (2015 version available on Blackboard)

Optional Readings:

5. Given, L., (2017). It’s a new year...so let’s stop the paradigm wars. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1-2.
6. Crotty, M. (1998). Introduction: the research process. *The Foundations of Social Research*:

Meaning and Perspective. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapter 1, pp. 1 – 17.

7. Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (2018). Paradigms and perspectives in contention. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, 5th Edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 97 -107.
8. Lincoln, Y.S., Lynham, S.A. & Guba, E.G. (2018) Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, 5th Edition. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, Eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 108-150. (See in particular the table re paradigmatic approaches).
9. Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (2015). The constructivist credo. Sections on Theoretical Paradigms (p. 85-90), Paradigms (pp. 59-61) and Inquiry (pp. 62-65), and Presumptions (pp. 37-41). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
10. Green, J. & Thorogood, N. (2014). Chapter 1. Qualitative methodology and health research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 3-33.

September 28 – Will this be a qualitative study? Creating a research question and developing a proposal

1. Eakin, J., Robertson, A., Poland, B., Coburn, D., Edwards, R. (1996). Towards a critical social science perspective on health promotion research. *Health Promotion International*. 11(2): 157-165.
2. Sandelowski, M. and Barroso, J. (2003). Writing the proposal for a qualitative research methodology project. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13 (6): 781-820.
3. TBA – reading re research purpose; creating a research question.

October 05 – Interpretivist approaches to qualitative health research methodology

1. Denzin, N. K. (2004). Symbolic interactionism. In U. Flick, E. von Kardorff, I. Steinke, A Companion to Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 81 – 86.
2. Crotty, M. (1998). Constructionism: the making of meaning. *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapter 3, pp. 42 – 65.
3. Berger, P.L. & Luckmann, T. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Introduction and Chapter 1, *The Foundations of Knowledge in Everyday Life*. Penguin Books, London. pp. 11- 49.

Optional Readings:

4. Ward, K., Hoare, K., & Gott, M. (2015). Evolving from a positivist to constructionist epistemology while using grounded theory: reflections of a novice researcher. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 20(6), 449-462. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/507968>
5. Paolucci, P. & Richardson, M. (2006). Sociology of humor and a critical dramaturgy. *Symbolic*

Interaction, 29(3): 331-348.

October 12 – Critical-social approaches: Which are feminist, emancipatory agendas and methodologies?

1. Sim, S. & Van Loon, B. (2012). *Introducing critical theory – A graphic guide*. London: Icon Books (p. 3-15 and 164-165).
2. Doucet, A. & Mauthner, N. (2006). Feminist methodologies and epistemology. In C. D. Bryant and D. L. Peck (Eds.). *Handbook of 21st Century Sociology*, pp. 26-32. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
3. Ramazanoglu, C. with Holland, J. (2002). Introduction, (pp. 1-16); and, From truth/reality to knowledge power: taking a feminist standpoint, (pp. 60 -79). *Feminist Methodology – Challenges and Choices*. London: Sage.

Optional Readings:

4. Olesen, V. (2018). Feminist qualitative research in the millennium's first decade: Developments, challenges, prospects. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 5th Edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Chapter 6.
5. Kincheloe, J. and McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage, Chapter 12.

October 19 – Critical-social approaches: Is there a poststructuralist/postmodern methodology?

1. Cheek, J. (2000). Situating postmodern thought (pp. 17-38). Thinking and researching poststructurally (pp. 39-66). In, *Postmodern and Poststructural Approaches to Nursing Research*. London: Sage (e-book).
2. Ramazanoglu, C. with Holland, J. (2002). Escape from epistemology? The impact of postmodern thought on feminist methodology. *Feminist Methodology – Challenges and Choices*. London: Sage, pp. 83 – 104.
3. Nicholls, D.A. (2012). Postmodernism and physiotherapy research. *Physical Therapy Reviews*, 17(6): 360 – 368.

Optional Readings:

4. Jackson, A.Y. & Mazzei, L.A. Plugging one text into another: Thinking with theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(4): 261 – 271.

October 26 – Qualitative designs 2: Well-established traditions (Ethnography)

1. Prentice, R. (2010). Ethnographic approaches to health and development research: the contributions of anthropology. In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Health Research*, I.

Bourgeault, R. Dingwall, R. de Vries (Eds.), pp. 157-173.

2. Wall, S. (2015). Focused ethnography: A methodological adaptation for social research in emerging contexts. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum Qualitative Research* 16(1), Art. 1, <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/2182>
3. Mulhall, A. (2003). In the field: notes on observation in qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 41(3), 306-313.

Optional Reading:

4. Delamont, S. (2004). Ethnography and participant observation. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 217-229.
5. Green, J. & Thorogood, N. (2014). *Observational methods. Qualitative Methods for Health Research*. Sage Publications, Third Edition, pp. 151-178.
6. Emerson, R., Fretz, R., Shaw, L. “Participant observation and fieldnotes”, Chap 24 in *Handbook of Ethnography*, Edited by P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, L.
7. Wolfinger, N. “On writing fieldnotes: collection strategies and background expectancies, *Qualitative Research*, 2002, 2(1)85-89.
8. Thoresen, L & Ohlen, J. (2015). Lived observation: Linking the researcher’s personal experiences to knowledge development. *Qualitative Health Research*, DOI: 10.1177/1049732315573011

November 02 – Qualitative designs 3: Well-established traditions (Case Study and Grounded Theory)

1. Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage, Chapter 17.
2. Sandelowski, M. (2011). “Casing” the research case study. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 34: 153-159.
3. Charmaz, K. (2017). Special invited paper: Continuities, contradictions and critical inquiry in Grounded Theory, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16:1-8.
4. Clarke, A. (2005). Pushing and being pulled around the postmodern turn. *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn*, Sage, pp. 2-36.

Optional Readings

5. Charmaz, K. (2006). An invitation to grounded theory (Chapter 1), *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
6. Jardine, D. [The fecundity of the individual case: considerations of the pedagogic heart of interpretive work](#)”, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 1992, 26 (1) 51-61.
7. Greenhalgh, T., Russell, J., Ashcroft, R.E., & Parsons, W. (2011). Why national e-health programs need dead philosophers: Wittgensteinian reflections on policymakers’ reluctance to learn from history, *Millbank Quarterly*, 89(4): 533-563.

November 09 – Qualitative designs 4: Innovative approaches (Community-based and visual arts-based research methodologies)

1. Wallerstein, N. & Duran, B. (2010). Community-based participatory research contributions to intervention research. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100: S40-S46.
2. Wang, C. (1999). Photovoice: A participatory action research strategy applied to women’s health. *Journal of Women’s Health*, 8(2): 185-191.
3. Gladstone, B.M., and Stasiulis, E. (in press). Digital Story-telling Method. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*, Vol 1. Singapore: Springer.

Optional Readings:

4. Pink, S. (2004). Visual methods. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp. 361-377). London: Sage Publications.
5. Guillemin, M. (2004). Understanding illness: using drawings as a research method. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(2): 272-289.

November 16 – Qualitative designs 1: Guidance or constraint?

1. Kahlke, R. (2014). Generic qualitative approaches: Pitfalls and benefits of methodological mixology. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 13: 37-52.
2. Sandelowski, M. (2010). What’s in a name? Qualitative Description Revisited. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 33:77-84.
(*Note: written in response to ideas first formulated in a 2000 paper on ‘qualitative description’ - see optional readings).
3. Carter, S. M. & Little, M. (2007). Justifying knowledge, justifying method, taking action: Epistemologies, methodologies, and methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17 (10): 1316 – 1328.

Optional Reading:

4. Sandelowski, M. (2000). What ever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23:334-340.

November 23 – Epistemological and methodological rigour: Reflexivity, positionality and the quality qualitative research

1. Finlay, L. (2002). “Outing” the researcher: The provenance, process and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12 (4), 531-545.
2. Morrow, S. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counselling psychology. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 52 (2): 250-260.
3. Eakin, M. & Mykhalovskiy, E. Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health research: reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in health sciences. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 9(2): 187-194.

Optional Reading:

4. Tracy, S. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10):837-851.

November 30 – Ethics as process

1. Guillemin, M. & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity and “ethically important moments” in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10 (2): 261-280.
2. Liamputtong, P. (2007). Moral and ethical issues in researching vulnerable people. *Researching the Vulnerable*, London: Sage, pp. 23-46.
3. Cox, S., Drew, S., Guillemin, M., Howell, C., Warr, D. & Waycott, J. (2014). *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne.

Optional Readings:

4. Ramcharan, P. and Cutcliffe, J. (2001). Judging the ethics of qualitative research: considering “ethics as process” model. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 9 (6): 358-366.
5. Green, J. & Thorogood, N. (2014). Responsibilities, ethics and values. *Qualitative Methods for Health Research*. Sage Publications, Third Edition, pp. 64-92.
6. Tuhiwai-Smith, L. Choosing the margins: The role of research in indigenous struggles for social justice (2006). In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.) *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.