

**University of Toronto  
Rehabilitation Science Institute**

**JRP 1000 (Winter Term 2017)  
Theory and Method for Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction**

Wednesday 9:00 am-12:00 pm  
Room 428 Rehab Sciences Building, 500 University Avenue

**Course Instructor:** Gail Teachman

**Location:** Department of Physical Therapy, 500 University Avenue, Room 847 (8th floor)

**Email:** [gail.teachman@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:gail.teachman@mail.mcgill.ca)

**Office Hours:** By appointment

**Course Teaching Associate: Patrick Jachyra**

**Office Location:** Department of Physical Therapy, 500 University Avenue, Room 847 (8th floor)

**Email:** [patrick.jachyra@utoronto.ca](mailto:patrick.jachyra@utoronto.ca)

**Office Hours:** By appointment

**RSI Course Director:** Janet Parsons

**Email:** [ParsonsJ@smh.ca](mailto:ParsonsJ@smh.ca)

**ESSENTIALS OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH (EQR) COURSE SERIES**

This course is part of the *Essentials in Qualitative Research* course series -

(<http://www.phs.utoronto.ca/qualmethod>) - an integrated graduate-level set of courses in qualitative research methodology offered collaboratively between the Dalla Lana School of Public Health and the Rehabilitation Science Institute.

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course introduces a range of qualitative research methods and theoretical perspectives, with emphasis on the role that theory plays across the different stages of the research process. Students will examine the underlying theoretical assumptions of qualitative research methods, and the implications that these assumptions have for framing a research problem, data collection, analysis, and dissemination strategies including traditional and arts-based approaches. The course provides opportunities to attain practical, hands-on experience with developing research questions, data collection, and data analysis. It was designed in 2009 by Dr. Pia Kontos (Dalla Lana School of Public Health) and Dr. Barbara Gibson (Rehabilitation Science Institute), and is being offered in 2016/17 by Gail Teachman (RSI). The course is an introductory level course and has no prerequisites. Preference will be given to students enrolled in a thesis-based graduate program. Some knowledge of social theory is preferred. Permission of the instructor is required for enrollment. Audits are not generally accepted. Priority is given to students in departments/faculties that are 'contributing' members in CQ, and to those with optimal backgrounds and current research situations for benefiting and contributing to the course.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

This course aims to provide students with an introduction to the theory and method of qualitative inquiry. Students will be expected to engage in critical reflection and debate of the ideas presented. At the completion of the course students will:

- Appreciate the scope and complexity of qualitative inquiry
- Understand the role of theory across the research process
- Be familiar with different paradigms and theoretical perspectives in qualitative research
- Understand how to choose different data gathering techniques and acquire basic skills in their use
- Understand the notion and practice of reflexivity and its role in the research process
- Understand the various ways that rigour is enhanced in qualitative research
- Be familiar with the basics of qualitative analysis
- Identify ethical issues related to the use of qualitative methods
- Have an introductory understanding of how to write up qualitative research
- Be aware of arts-based approaches to the dissemination of qualitative research findings

### COURSE FORMAT

This course utilizes a variety of approaches to teaching and learning about qualitative research: lectures, group discussion of readings, in-class exercises, and assignments. Weekly seminar discussions and presentations are best when they are dynamic, informed, creative, stimulating and collective. This requires that students **read** and **think about** the required material assigned for each week's class and attend seminars fully prepared to participate. The success of this course relies on the active participation of students; you will be expected to attend all classes, to participate in group discussions and share your research and reading experiences. Recommended readings are to be used as needed for assignments, and will also be useful as resources for students who wish to follow up on ideas introduced in the course.

### SUMMARY OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Activity/Assignment	% FINAL GRADE	Due Date
Class preparation and participation (including leading one class discussion of the readings assigned for that week)	10%	N/A
Theoretical Application Paper (3-5 pages)	15%	February 8 (before drop deadline)
Data Collection, Description and Analysis Paper (5 pages)	35%	Mar 15
Critical Annotated Bibliography (8 pages)	40%	April 12

**Due Dates and Formatting:** All assignments are due on the dates specified emailed to [gail.teachman@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:gail.teachman@mail.mcgill.ca) or hard copy to reception on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor of 500 University Ave (Department of Physical Therapy). Page limits should be strictly adhered to. Use a minimum of 12pt font. Late assignments will be accepted **only** in exceptional circumstances and with prior discussion with the instructor.

### DETAILS OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS

**1. Class Preparation, Attendance, and Participation (10%):** (1) Attendance, preparation, informed

participation in class discussions; you will be expected to reflect on assigned readings, prepare for in-class exercises, and share your questions and comments; (2) Leading a seminar discussion based on a week's readings, summarizing main points, including some critical reflection about the arguments put forward, how they are constructed, their coherence, and how the readings compare and contrast regarding the week's topic.

## **2. Theoretical Application Paper (15%)**

***DUE DATE: February 8***

**Length: 3-5 pages (double spaced)**

This project requires you to creatively review some aspect of our culture's representation of a health-related topic of your choice. Right from the beginning of the course students should watch in the media and popular press, public texts, etc. for items related to health, illness, the body, and health care. Books, stories, movies, health campaigns, popular literatures (e.g., financial, leisure, marketing), print media, cyberspace, film, social/public spaces, fashion, music, sports, government policies, poetry, and fairy tales are possible sources of cultural representations.

Students should select one item or observation for analytic theoretical commentary. Some questions that may guide your analysis (you do not have to specifically answer these, they are meant to give some direction): What is it an instance of, or what assumptions are made about health, illness, the body, and/or health care? What's going on in the text/image? What is the intent or effects? What is taken for granted? What is left out? How else could the object have been portrayed? What would the effects be? What are implicit or explicit assumptions in the text? What concepts from the course does it invoke, what theoretical problems are raised?

- Explain terms. Don't assume meanings of terms are shared with your reader.
- Not necessary to invoke the paradigms, either as implicit in the object or in your explanation
- Do not need to bring in outside theories (but if you do then explain them)
- Students should include the item (e.g. a photocopy, photograph, video) with their written analysis.

## **3. Data Collection Description and Analysis Paper\* (35%)**

***DUE DATE: Mar 15***

**Length: 5 pages (double spaced) + required appendices**

For this assignment, you must either carry out an observation of a health-related setting **OR** conduct an in-depth one-to-one interview with a friend about a topic of your mutual choosing. Each option is described below. The assignment is designed to give you an opportunity to engage in and reflect on a qualitative data collection strategy. Because of university ethics requirements, the work you do for this assignment cannot be part of a research study that will be published in any form. You cannot draw on this exercise as part of your thesis or dissertation project.

### **Option One: Observation**

For this option, you will carry out an observation of a public setting i.e a setting where one could normally sit and observe activity that does not require permission. You are encouraged to choose a health-related setting. Suitable settings include a hospital lobby or waiting room, a clinic waiting room

---

\* Assignment adapted from Eric Mykhalovskiy, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, Dalhousie University

(physiotherapy, massage, chiropractic, naturopathic, walk-in), a research lab (research institute, university), sports club (gym, yoga studio, Pilates studio), health spa (bodywork, esthetics, wellness classes), community centre (recreational, health clinic). You should carry out two separate occasions of observation of the same setting, each of approximately 20-30 minutes in duration.

Draw on what you have learned about ethnographic observation through your readings and class discussions to conduct your observation. As part of your observation you might ask yourself the following questions (this is **not** an exhaustive list nor do you necessarily have to cover all the points): What is the setting as a physical/social space? Who are the people in the setting? How are they different? What are they doing? How? With or/to whom? What social class, gender, race or other differences can you see? What physical “props” are being used? How?

**You are to submit the following:**

1. Any rough notes taken during observation
2. Your field notes
3. A diagram of the setting
4. An analytic memo (**maximum** 5 pages, double spaced) in which you:

a) *Produce an account of what you observed.* Include a description of the setting. In addition, try to address questions such as the following: What patterns emerged in the setting? What forms of interaction did you observe? How did they take place, who did what how, etc.? What struck you as particularly interesting and or curious about what you observed? What did you learn about social life from the observation you conducted? If you were to conduct a full study of the setting, what might you focus on? As much as is possible you should try to provide an account of what you have learned about how the setting works. In other words, what analytic insights about the setting do you take away from the exercise?

b) *Reflect on the experience of doing observation.* Try to address the following type of questions (remember this list is not exhaustive nor do you have to cover all the points): What did you observe that you might not have seen as a casual observer or participant in the setting? How did your personal history, identity, and theoretical presuppositions shape your observation? How did you feel in the setting? What issues arose for you in writing up your field notes?

You will be evaluated on how well you engage in detailed ethnographic description of your setting. The character of your field notes and the connections between your field notes and the account you make of the setting in your analytic memo, and your capacity to raise interesting questions about the process of observation will be evaluated.

**Option Two: In-Depth Interview**

For this option, you will conduct an in-depth one-to-one interview with a friend about a topic you mutually agree upon. For example, this may be a health-related experience, perspectives on the health system, what health means to him/her etc. Non-health related topics are also fine. For example, a meaningful or life changing experience, or the experiences of being a graduate student. Draft some specific research questions or purposes to guide your inquiry. Your interview should last about 45 minutes. You should draw on readings and class discussions of interviewing to carry out an interview that draws from **an interview guide** that might address the following: The details of the experience; how it came to happen; in what ways did the event/activity involve others? in what ways it affected your

respondent's attitudes, self-perception, relationships, and interactions with others? how was it perceived by others? how did the respondent feel about the experience?

You should tape record the interview and transcribe it verbatim.

**You are to submit the following:**

1. The interview guide
2. The tape recording of the interview and transcript
3. An analytic memo (**maximum** five double-spaced pages) in which you:

*a) Offer a brief analysis of the interview (about 4 pages)*

You need to produce a brief analytic commentary about the experience of your respondent. What did you learn about the respondent? You are not required to conduct a full-scale analysis of the transcript but you must at least suggest some directions for analysis of the interview. You can, for example, point to interesting passages of interview text and reflect analytically on what has been said. What did you learn about the person that you didn't know previously? What kind of an impression was the person trying to achieve? What is missing from the interview? In other words, what lines of inquiry would you need to undertake to extend your understanding of the respondent or on interviews with other respondents? What if anything does your interview tell us about relationships between life events and identities (gender, class, ethno-cultural identity, SES, work roles, age etc)?

*b) Reflect on your experience with this exercise (about 1 page)*

You might consider the following issues (this is not exhaustive nor do you have to cover all the points): what thoughts and feelings did you bring to the interview exercise? What feelings came up for you as part of the experience? What are your strengths and weaknesses as an interviewer? What worked? How so? What would you do differently the next time? Why? What impact did your choice of respondent have on the interview you conducted? How did the interview interaction proceed? Did you detect moments of conversational tension or "power" struggle in the conversation? Were you speaking the same "language?" What work did you have to do to keep the interview talk focused appropriately? What was the experience of transcription like?

You will be evaluated on how well you engage in detailed interviewing about your interview participant's work activities including how well you can engage in the approach to interviewing that we will have discussed in class. The care you take in producing your transcript, the quality of the analytic discussion in relation to the data, and intellectual creativity (i.e. interpretation rather than summarizing), and your capacity to raise interesting questions about the interview process that draw on and extend class readings and discussions will be considered.

**4. Critical Annotated Bibliography\* (40%)**

***DUE DATE: April 12***

**Length: 8 pages (double spaced) + copies of the publications that you have reviewed**

For the final assignment, you must identify, read and write about **three** high quality published **empirical** qualitative research articles (not mixed methods and not a conceptual or review article) on a topic of your choice. Using what you have learned in the course, you will write a critical response to each article and an overall statement about how the research area has been explored by the work you have reviewed.

---

\* Assignment adapted from Eric Mykhalovskiy, Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, Dalhousie University

The point is not to simply summarize the article (although you will need to give a general account about it) but to engage in a critical reflection about what the article tells you about how the topic has been researched. To do this well you need to reflect and write about how the authors have researched the topic, analyzed their data, and represented their research practice in writing.

Some suggestions for issues to consider in writing individual critiques include the following (this is not an exhaustive list nor do you have to cover all the points; it is meant as a starting place for your own thinking about how a topic has been researched qualitatively):

1. How are the authors constructing a given topic as an object of investigation? How do the authors discuss the purpose of their research? How are the authors representing/treating a topic as a problem or as something that needs to be known? There are, for example, many ways of treating “teen-aged smoking” as an object of inquiry. Policy-oriented health promoters might approach it as a health problem that needs to be changed. Social psychologists might look at it in terms of a knowledge-attitude-behaviour framework. An ethnographer may be interested in the culture of teen smoking. A grounded theorist may be concerned with the meaning that smoking has for teen-aged smokers. Some authors draw on more than one organizing framework to make sense of, or “produce” their topic as a specific type of problem that, in turn, calls for a particular kind of research response. You need to write about how the authors constitute their object of inquiry.
2. Is the work located within a specific paradigm and/or tradition of inquiry? How so? Do the authors explicitly locate their work within a set of theoretical concerns or preoccupations? Do the authors name their work as an instance of, or something informed by, an organized approach to qualitative research (e.g. phenomenological study, ethnography). Is that naming warranted? Is the study a good/bad example of this tradition of inquiry? Why? How do the authors use the various research labels we have discussed in class? Is their usage a good one?
3. Research process: How much do the authors tell you about how they have gone about their research? Are you satisfied with what you know about how they carried out their inquiry? What did they leave out of their account? What, if anything, do you want to know about how they proceeded? What difference would it make? How do they represent the research process in the first place? How did they conceptualize and collect their data? Do their data collection strategies make sense to you? In other words, have they produced useful data? Will the data help them speak to the research problem they have set for themselves?
4. What does the text look like? What sections and subsections are being used here? What is being said in the introduction? In the conclusion? And in other sections? What is being given most “air-time” in this text? What does this tell you? What does this exclude? How is quoted material being represented and commented on here? Where is the analysis being accomplished? What does this tell you about how the author is communicating? What does the text’s visual appearance tell you?
5. What argument is being made? In qualitative research making an argument involves writing about empirical findings in some way. What kind of argument is the author making? What is the scope of the argument? What specific claims are being made? How are these claims and/or the overall argument supported? How is data being used and commented upon? How were they expressed by the authors and used to support their argument? Are data theorized? Is the theorization convincing? What kind of analysis is being done in the text? What story is being communicated? Is it plausible?

In addition to your individual critiques you need to include an overview where you offer some analytic commentary about the overall treatment of the research area within the literature you have read. What

work are you most drawn to and why? What methodological perspectives did you find most compelling? How do different traditions of inquiry construct different objects? What might methodological perspectives not represented in your selection of reading add to the investigation of your topic area? What are the similarities and differences in how authors working from different traditions have researched this area? What works and what doesn't? Given what you've read, how might you go about researching your area?

In evaluating this assignment your ability to draw on class readings and discussion to produce original, thoughtful and creative commentary on specific examples of qualitative research will be evaluated. Simply summarizing what the authors have done and said will not be enough. Nor will simply pointing out what is missing. Your ability to critically assess the articles and how well you convey an understanding of the implications of different ways of researching a topic area from a qualitative perspective will be considered.

**COURSE SCHEDULE/TIMETABLE**

<b>SESSION</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>
1. January 11	Introduction
2. January 18	Paradigms & Traditions of Inquiry 1
3. January 25	Paradigms & Traditions of Inquiry 2
4. February 1	Research Design
5. February 8	Interviews & Focus Groups
6. February 15	Participant Observation
<b>February 22</b>	<b>READING WEEK NO CLASS</b>
7. March 1	Analysis and Interpretation 1
8. March 8	Analysis and Interpretation 2
9. March 15	Analysis and Interpretation 3
10. March 22	Revisiting Theory: Introducing Postmodernism and Post-structuralism
11. March 29	Ethical Issues
12. April 5	Evaluating Qualitative Research

**SESSION BY SESSION OUTLINE (sub-topics, assigned and optional readings)**

**S1 Introduction**

- Overview of the course: objectives, assignments, evaluation, etc.
- Self-introductions
- Mapping our experiences with/of qualitative research
- What kinds of claims do authors make about qualitative research?
- How is the specificity of qualitative research typically represented?
- What can be said of the central principles or defining features of qualitative research?

- The historical background of qualitative research and its growing popularity within the health sciences

### **Required Readings**

[Reisetter, M., Yexley, M., Bonds, D., Nikels, H., & McHenry, W.I. \(2003\). Shifting paradigms and mapping the process: Graduate students respond to qualitative research. \*Qualitative Report\*, 8\(3\), 462-480.](#)

### **S2 Paradigms & Traditions of Inquiry (Part I)**

- What is a theoretical perspective?
- How do you 'see' a theoretical perspective?
- What difference does a theoretical perspective make?
- Key ways in which theoretical perspectives differ
- What systems of classification are used to make sense of qualitative research?

### **Required Readings**

Green, J. and Thorogood, N. (2009). Qualitative methodology and health research. *Qualitative Methods for Health Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition London: Sage. (Chapter 1). **(PDF with Prof)**

Grant, B. M., & Giddings, L. S. (2002). Making sense of methodologies: A paradigm framework for the novice researcher. *Contemporary Nurse*, 13(1), 10-28**(PDF with Prof)**

Good, B. J. (1994). How medicine constructs its objects. *Medicine, rationality, and experience* (pp. 65-87). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **(PDF with Prof)**

### **Additional readings**

Nicholls, D. (2009) Qualitative research: Part one – Philosophies. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, Vol 16, No 10.

Sandelowski, M. (1993). Theory unmasked: The uses and guises of theory in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing*, 16, 213-218.

Carter, S. M., & Little, M. (2007). Justifying knowledge, justifying method, taking action: Epistemologies, methodologies and methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17, 1316-1328.

Reeves, S., Albert, M., Kuper, A., and Hodges, B.D. (2008). Why use theories in qualitative research? *British Medical Journal*, 337(Sept 13), 631-634.

Bengtson, V.L., Burgess, E.O., and Parrott, T.M. (1997). Theory, explanation, and a third generation of theoretical development in social gerontology. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 52B(2), S72-S88.

Green, J. and Thorogood, N. (2004). Qualitative methodology and health research. *Qualitative Methods for Health Research* (pp.3-26). London: Sage.

Willis, K., Daly, J., Kealy, M., Small, R., Koutroulis, G., Green, J., Gibbs, L., Thomas, S. (2007). The essential role of social theory in qualitative public health research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 31(5), 438-443.



Upshur, R.E.G. (2001). The status of qualitative research as evidence. In J. M. Morse, J. M. Swanson & A. J. Kuzel (Eds.), *The nature of qualitative evidence* (pp. 5-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Guba, E.G., Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 183-191). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Willis, J.W. (2007). History and context of paradigm development. In *Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches* (pp. 27-65). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). Introduction: The research process. *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

### **S3 Paradigms & Traditions of Inquiry (Part II)**

- The interpretivist paradigm up close
- The critical paradigm up close
- Methods associated with these paradigms

#### **Required Readings**

[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.](#)

[Gibson B.E., Teachman G. \(2012\). Critical Approaches in Physical Therapy Research: Investigating the Symbolic Value of Walking. \*Special Issue of Physiotherapy Theory and Practice: Philosophy and Physiotherapy\*, 28\(6\), 474-484](#)

[Hunt MR. \(2009\). Strengths and challenges in the use of interpretive description: Reflections arising from a study of the moral experience of health professionals in humanitarian work. \*Qualitative Health Research\*, 19\(9\), 1284-1292.](#)

[Shaw JA, Connelly DM \(2012\) Phenomenology and physiotherapy: meaning in research and practice. \*Physical therapy reviews\*, 17, 398-408.](#)

#### **Additional Readings**

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In *Handbook of qualitative research* (509-535). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Poland B. (1992). Learning to 'walk our talk': The Implications of sociological theory for research methodologies in health promotion. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 83(Supplement 1), S31-S46.

Lopez, K.A., Willis, D.G. (2004). Descriptive versus interpretive phenomenology: Their contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(5), 726-735.

Robertson, A. (1990). The politics of Alzheimer's disease: A case study in apocalyptic demography. *International Journal of Health Services*, 20(3), 429-442.

Willis, J.W. (2007). History and Foundations of Interpretivist Research. In *Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches* (pp. 27-65). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Layder, D. (1994). Meanings, situations and experience. In *Understanding social theory* (pp. 57-74). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Rock, M., McIntyre, L., Rondeau, K. (2008). Discomforting comfort foods: Stirring the pot on Kraft Dinner and social inequality in Canada. *Agriculture and Human Values*.

Alasuutari, P. (1996). Theorizing in qualitative research: A cultural studies perspective. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2(4), 371-384.

Grahame, P. R. (1998). Ethnography, institutions, and the problematic of the everyday world. *Human Studies*, 21, 347-360.

Prasad, P. (2005). Qualitative research as craft: Postpositivist traditions and research styles. In *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions* (pp. 3-42). New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Kincheloe, J.L., McLaren, P. Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), (pp. 303-342). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lock, M., & Kaufert, P.A. (1998). Introduction. In M. Lock, & P.A. Kaufert (Eds.), *Pragmatic women and body politics* (pp. 1-27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wacquant, L. (1992). Toward a social praxeology: The structure and logic of Bourdieu's sociology. In P. Bourdieu, & L. Wacquant (Eds.), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (pp. 2-59). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 203-217.

#### **S4 Research Design**

- How does research design relate to traditions of inquiry?
- Developing research questions (positivist and interpretivist)
- Choosing the appropriate qualitative methods

#### **Required Readings**

Green, J. and Thorogood, N. (2004). Qualitative methodology and health research. *Qualitative Methods for Health Research* (pp.3-34). London: Sage. **(PDF with Prof)**

Patton, M.Q. (2002). Qualitative designs and data collection. In *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (pp. 207-257). Thousand Oaks: Sage. **(PDF with Prof)**

#### **Additional Readings**

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. Sage. (Chapter 2: Designing a qualitative study).

O'Reilly, M., Parker, N. (2012). 'Unsatisfactory saturation': A critical exploration of the notion of saturated sample sizes in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research* 13(2), 190-197.

Silverman, D. (1985). *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology*. Gower. (Chapter 1: The research process).

Kuzel, A. (1992). Sampling in qualitative inquiry. In B. F. Crabtree, & W. L. Miller (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research* (pp. 31-44). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Janesick, V. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design. In Denzin, N., and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Focusing and bounding the collection of data: The substantive start. *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.) (pp. 16-39). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

## **S5 Learning from Doing: Interviews and Focus Groups**

- Why choose these methods?
- What interviews and focus groups allow you to access that other methods do not
- Constructing an interview and a focus group guide (open-ended vs. closed-ended questions)
- Conducting an interview and a focus group
- How do gender, race, class and other social relations shape the interview process for both the interviewer and the interviewee?
- Reflexivity

### **Required Readings**

[Hermanovicz, J.C. \(2002\). The great interview: 25 strategies for studying people in bed. \*Qualitative Sociology\*, 25\(4\), 479-499.](#)

[Manderson, L., Bennett, E., and Andajani-Sutjahjo S. \(2006\). The social dynamics of the interview: Age, class, and gender. \*Qualitative Health Research\*, 16\(10\), 1317-1334](#)

[Kitzinger, J. \(1995\). Qualitative research: Introducing focus groups. \*British Medical Journal\*, 311\(7000\), 299-302.](#)

[Lehoux, P., Poland, B., & Daudelin, G. \(2006\). Focus group research and "the patient's view". \*Social Science & Medicine\*, 63, 2091-2104.](#)

### **Additional Readings**

Belzile, J.A., Óberg, G. (2012). Where to begin? Grappling with how to use participant interaction in focus group design. *Qualitative Research* 12(4), 459-472.

Carey, M.A. & Casey, M.A. (2000). Capturing the group effect in focus groups: A special concern in analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 4(1), 123-127.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In NK Denzin & YS Lincoln (Eds), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3d ed.) (pp. 695-727). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Kvale, S. (1996). The interview situation. *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing* (pp. 124-143). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Holstein, J., & Gubrium, J. F. (1997). Active interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 113-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kvale, S. (1996). The interview as a conversation. *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing* (pp. 19-37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, J., & Glassner, B. (1997). The 'inside' and the 'outside': Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 97-112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sullivan, K. (1998). Managing the 'sensitive' research interview: A personal account. *Nurse Researcher*, 6(2), 72-85.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). Qualitative interviewing. In *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (pp. 339-427). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Morgan, D.L., and Bottorff, J.L. (2010). Advancing our craft: Focus group methods and practice. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(5), 6579-581.

Wilkinson, S. (1998) Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 21, 1, 111-125.

## **S6 Learning from doing: Participant Observation**

- Why choose participant observation?
- What participant observation allows you to access that other methods cannot
- How and what to observe?
- What are ethnographic fieldnotes? How are they made, what do they look like, and what role do they play in ethnographic research?
- Experiencing and addressing tensions in the field
- Reflexivity

### **Required Readings**

Green, J. and Thorogood, N. (2004). Observational methods. *Qualitative Methods for Health Research* (pp. 131-154). London: Sage. **(PDF with Prof)**

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I., & Shaw, L.L. (1995). Fieldnotes in ethnographic research. In *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* (pp1-16). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **(PDF with Prof)**

[Carpiano, R.M. \(2009\). Come take a walk with me: The 'go-along' interview as a novel method for studying the implications of place for health and well-being. \*Health & Place\*, 15, 263-272.](#)

### **Additional Readings**

Monahan, T., and Fisher, J.A. (2010). Benefits of 'observer effects': Lessons from the field. *Qualitative Research*, 10(3), 357-376.

Bogdewic, S.P. (1999). Participant observation. In B.F. Crabtree, & W.L. Miller (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research* (pp. 47-69). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Wind, G. (2008). Negotiated interactive observation: Doing fieldwork in hospital settings. *Anthropology & Medicine*, 15(2), 79-89.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures* (pp 3-30). New York: Basic Books.

Pope, C. (2005). Conducting ethnography in medical settings. *Medical Education*, 39, 1180-1187.

McDonald, S. (2005). Studying actions in context: A qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. *Qualitative Research*, 5(4), 455-473.

Prasad, P. (2005). Ethnography: Cultural Understandings of Natives (pp. 75-90). *Crafting Qualitative Research*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Kusenback, M. (2003). Street phenomenology: The go-along as ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*, 4(3), 455-485.

Guillemin, M. (2004) Understanding Illness: Using Drawings as a Research Method *Qual Health Res* 14: 272

## **S7 Strategies for Analysis and Interpretation (Part I)**

- What is involved in analyzing qualitative data?
- Analytic devices: coding, memoing, constant comparison, negative cases
- Problems of meaning – the ways in which meaning relates to how data is collected

### **Required Readings**

[Braun, V., & Clarke, V. \(2006\). Using thematic analysis in psychology. \*Qualitative Research in Psychology\*, 3\(2\), 77-101.](#)

Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). Concepts and coding. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data* (pp. 26-53), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc. **(PDF with Prof)**

[Dierckx de Casterle, B., Gastmans, C., Bryon, E., Denier, Y. \(2011\). QUAGOL: A guide for qualitative data analysis. \*International Journal of Nursing Studies\* doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.09.012.](#)

### **Additional Readings**

Sandelowski, M. (2011). When a cigar is not just a cigar: Alternative takes on data and data analysis. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 34, 342-352.

Olaogun, JA, and Fatoki, OI (2009) Theory building approach using qualitative data analysis. *The Social Sciences*, 4(1), 12-23.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Making good sense: Drawing and verifying conclusions. *Qualitative data analysis* (pp. 245-287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Early steps in analysis. *Qualitative data analysis* (pp. 50-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Perakyla, A. (2005). Analyzing talk and text. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 869-886). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Open coding. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (pp. 101-121). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basic operations: Asking questions and making comparisons. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (pp. 73-85). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Carey, M. A. (1995). Comment: Concerns in the analysis of focus group data. *Qualitative Health Research*, 5(4), 487-495.

Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 703-715). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pamphilon, B. (1999). The zoom model: A dynamic framework for the analysis of life histories. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(3), 393-410.

Jarvinen, M. (2000). The biographical illusion: Constructing meaning in qualitative interviews. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(3), 370-391.

## **S8 Strategies for Analysis and Interpretation (Part II)**

- Theorizing: pulling it all together
- Connecting data, research questions and theory

### **Required Readings**

Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J. (2004). Context: Working it up, down and across. Chapter 19 in C. Seale, G. Gobo, J.F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*. Sage. **(PDF with Prof)**

Maxwell, J. (1996). Conceptual context: What do you think is going on? *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (pp. 22-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc. **(PDF with Prof)**

[Finlay, L. \(2002\). 'Outing' the researcher: The provenance, process and practice of reflexivity. \*Qualitative Health Research\*, 12\(4\), 531-545.](#)

### **Additional Readings**

James, A. (2013) Seeking the analytic imagination: Reflections on the process of interpreting qualitative data. *Qualitative Research*, 13, 562-577.

Kontos, P., & Naglie, G. (2009). Tacit knowledge of caring and embodied selfhood. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 31(5), 688-704.

Gibson, B.E. & Techman, G. (2012). Critical approaches in physical therapy research: Investigating the symbolic value of walking. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice* doi:10.3109/09593985.2012.676936 [Epub ahead of print]

Danermark, B., Ekstrom, M., Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. C. (2002). Theory in the methodology of social science. *Explaining society: Critical realism in the social sciences* (pp. 115-149). New York, NY: Routledge.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Description, conceptual ordering, and theorizing. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (pp. 15-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zitzelsberger, H. (2005). (In)visibility: Accounts of embodiment of women with physical disabilities and differences. *Disability & Society, 20*(4), 389-403.

Eakin, J.M., MacEachen, E., & Clarke, J. (2003). 'Playing it smart' with return to work: Small workplace experience under Ontario's policy of Self-reliance and early return. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety* 1(2), 19-39.

Kontos, P. (2004). Ethnographic reflections on selfhood, embodiment and Alzheimer's disease. *Ageing and Society* 24, 829-849.

## **S9 Strategies for Analysis and Interpretation (Part III)**

- Writing up the data
- Choosing the data to represent your participants
- Constructing an argument with the data

### **Required Readings**

[Sandelowski, M. \(1998\). Writing a good read: Strategies for re-presenting qualitative data. \*Research in Nursing & Health, 21\*, 375-382.](#)

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1989). Writing ethnography. *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (pp. 207-232). London: Routledge. **(PDF with Prof)**

Bischoping, K. (2005). Quote, unquote: From transcript to text in ethnographic research. In D. Pawluch, W. Shaffir, C. Miall (Eds.), *Doing ethnography: Studying everyday life* (pp.141-156). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press. **(PDF with Prof)**

### **Additional Readings**

Rabinow, P. (1986). Representations are social facts: Modernity and post-modernity in anthropology. In J. Clifford, & G.E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography* (pp. 234-261). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Frank, A.W. (2004). After methods, the story: From incongruity to truth in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*(3), 430-440.

Radley, A., & Billig, M. (1996). Accounts of health and illness: Dilemmas and representations. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 18*(2), 220-240.

Werner, A., Isaksen, L.W., and Malterud, K. (2003). 'I am not the kind of woman who complains of everything': Illness stories on self and shame in women with chronic pain. *Social Science & Medicine*, 59, 1035-1045.

Kvale, S. (1996). Improving interview reports. *InterViews* (pp. 253-276). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

### **S10 Revisiting Theory: Introducing Postmodernism and Post-structuralism**

- Review the implications of theory for the conduct of qualitative research
- Discuss postmodernism and post-structuralism as distinct theoretical approaches to qualitative research

#### **Required Readings**

[Bochner, A. \(2000\). Criteria against ourselves. \*Qualitative Inquiry\*, 6\(2\), 266-272.](#)

[Holmes, D., Murray, S., & Perron, A. \(2006\). Deconstructing the evidence-based discourse in health sciences: Truth, power, and fascism. \*International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare\*, 4, 180-186.](#)

[Nicholls, D. \(2012\). Foucault and physiotherapy. \*Physiotherapy Theory and Practice\*, 28\(6\), 447-453.](#)

[Rolfé, G. \(2006\). Judgments without rules: Toward a postmodern ironist concept of research validity. \*Nursing Inquiry\*, 13\(1\), 7-15.](#)

#### **Additional Readings**

\*\*Please see course instructors for additional readings on this topic.

### **S11 Ethical Issues in Qualitative Research**

- What are some of the ethical challenges in designing and conducting qualitative research?
- The ethics of representation

#### **Required Readings**

[Hammersley M \(2014\) On the ethics of interviewing for discourse analysis. \*Qualitative Research\* 14\(5\): 529–541](#)

Kvale, S. (1996). Ethical issues in interview inquiries. *InterViews* (pp. 109-123). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc. **(PDF with Prof)**

Green, J. and Thorogood, N. (2004). Responsibilities, ethics and values. *Qualitative Methods for Health Research* (pp.51-76). London: Sage. **(PDF with Prof)**

#### **Additional Readings**

Clarke A. (2006). Qualitative interviewing: Encountering ethical issues and challenges. *Nurse Research*, 13(4), 19-29.



Dickson-Swift, V., James, E.L., Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2007). Doing sensitive research: What challenges do qualitative researchers face? *Qualitative Research*, 7(3), 327-353.

DeVault, M.L. (1995). Ethnicity and expertise: Racial-ethnic knowledge in sociological research. *Gender & Society*, 9(5), 612-631.

Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007). Informed consent, anticipatory regulation and ethnographic practice. *Social Science and Medicine*, 65, 2223-2234.

Ramcharan, P., & Cutcliffe, J. R. (2001). Judging the ethics of qualitative research: Considering the 'ethics as process' model. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 9(6), 358-366.

## **S12 Evaluating Qualitative Research**

- What constitutes evidence?
- What makes something convincing?
- Different approaches to the evaluation of qualitative research
- What assumptions are apparent in the different approaches to the evaluation of qualitative research?

### **Required Readings**

[Mays, N., & Pope, C. \(2000\). Assessing quality in qualitative research. \*British Medical Journal\*, 320\(7226\), 50-52.](#)

[Eakin, J., Mykhalovskiy, E. \(2003\). Reframing judgment of qualitative research: Reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences. \*Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice\*, 9\(2\), 187-194.](#)

[Tracy, S. J. \(2010\). Qualitative quality: Eight “Big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. \*Qualitative Inquiry\*, 16\(10\), 837-851.](#)

### **Additional Readings**

Hammell, K.W. (2002). Informing client-centred practice through qualitative inquiry: Evaluating the quality of qualitative research. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 65(4), 175-184.

Peregrine Scwhartz-Shea (2009). Judging Quality: Evaluative criteria and epistemic communities (pp. 89-113). In Yanow, D. & P. Schwartz-Shea (Eds). *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. M.E. Sharpe: NY & London.

Stige, B., Malterud, K., and Midtgarden, T. (2009). Toward an agenda for evaluation of qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(10), 1504-1516.

Miyata, H., and Kai, I. (2009). Reconsidering evaluation criteria for scientific adequacy in health care research: An integrative framework of quantitative and qualitative criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(1), 64-75.

Morse, J.M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., and Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(2), 1-19.

Lincoln, Y.S., and Guba, E.G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. In Y.S. Lincoln, and E.G. Guba, *Naturalistic inquiry* (pp. 289-331). Newbury Park: Sage Publications Inc.

Kuper, A., Lingard, L., and Levinson, W. (2008). Critically appraising qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 337(Sept 20), 687-689.

Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research*, 34(5), 1189-1208.

Yates, L. (2003). Interpretive claims and methodological warrant in small-number qualitative, longitudinal research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6(3):223-232.

Meadows, L.M., Morse, J.M. (2001). Constructing evidence within the qualitative project. In J. M. Morse, J. M. Swanson & A. J. Kuzel (Eds.), *The nature of qualitative evidence* (pp. 187-200). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Angen, M.J. (2000) Evaluating Interpretive Inquiry: Reviewing the Validity Debate and Opening the Dialogue. *Qualitative Health Research* 10(3), 378.

Devers, K.J. (1999). How will we know 'good' qualitative research when we see it? Beginning the dialogue in health services research. *Health Services Research*, 34(5 Part II), 1153-1188.

---