

SWK 6307 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS
Fall 2016

Lecture & discussion: 9am – 12pm (Faculty of Social Work -700)
Lab: 1pm – 3pm (Faculty of Social Work -700)

Course Instructor: Rupaleem Bhuyan, PhD
Office room 346, Faculty of Social Work, 246 Bloor Street West
Office hours: Mon. and Thurs., noon to 1 pm or by appointment
r.bhuyan@utoronto.ca

Lab Instructor: Stephanie Baird, MSW, Ph.D. Candidate
Office hours: Thursday, noon to 1 pm or by appointment
stephanie.baird@mail.utoronto.ca

Rationale and Significance

This introductory course to qualitative research is part of the foundation curriculum for first year PhD students in Social Work. This course is also part of the “Essentials of Qualitative Research” series offered through the Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research.

The course will begin with an overview of the history of qualitative research in social work and the social sciences. We will examine philosophical debates and paradigms that inform qualitative methodology including: positivism and scientific inquiry, the influence of interpretivism, tensions between subjectivity and objectivity, research positionality, reflexivity, ethics, participatory research, and representation of research results.

The course will also focus on data collection and analysis techniques that include: defining the research question, selecting the research setting, choosing data collection methods (i.e. in-depth interviews, observation, document analysis, arts-based methods), using software for data management and data coding (i.e. NVivo, HyperResearch), and analysis writing. Each of these techniques will be discussed in relation to theoretical and methodological approaches (e.g. narrative analysis, discourse analysis, ethnography and grounded theory).

The lab component will involve hands-on exercises and peer consultation to help students design and conduct original qualitative research. Major assignments will include: 1) developing a research proposal and ethics protocol, 2) preparing a sample of data for analysis (i.e. field notes and transcript of an in-depth interview), and 3) preparing an analysis report of key findings.

Educational Philosophy

This course will be guided by the practice of engaged pedagogy—as developed by scholars like Paulo Freire and bell hooks— and focuses on education as a process towards critical consciousness. This teaching approach presumes that students come to the classroom with lived experience that informs how they engage in the subject matter and the worlds in which they live.

Instructors will seek to facilitate and encourage students to understand different perspectives, to analyze how knowledge is constructed and situated in the world, and to address issues of social justice, including gender, around the world. In this process, students are invited to analyze assumptions that underlie key concepts, engage in dialogue about the strengths and limitations of operating assumptions, while introducing new information with which to strengthen their own knowledge base.

Instead of identifying a single truth, course members will critically examine what various concepts can ‘do’; what social realities they reveal; how we can use different methodologies and methods to expand social work knowledge, practice, and research.

The course design has two required components; the morning session will include lecture, discussion, and practical activities. The afternoon session will involve hands-on experiential exercises including demonstrations using qualitative data analysis software. The in-class and lab sessions generally complement but do not duplicate reading assignments.

Course Learning Objectives

- To be familiar with qualitative research methods and design
- To recognize epistemological orientations in qualitative research
- To be familiar with identifying and generating different types of qualitative data
- To learn about the research process (identification of relevant theoretical frameworks, formulation of research question, data collection and analysis), and how to shape an interpretive and constructivist study, including concrete tasks and relational considerations (ethics and power)
- To describe how intersecting social identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, indigenous identity, social class, immigration status, sexual orientation, age, ability) affect the production of knowledge, access to resources, and intersubjective meaning making.

Positive Learning Environment

Knowledge sharing and learning can be an enlightening and unsettling experience. Therefore we may be surprised by what we share and how we communicate with one another. We will be approaching this learning as a journey with multiple itineraries that we will aim to honour and respect.

Because the classroom is a microcosm of larger social relations, class discussions may manifest some aspects of social difference and inequality. Examining course concepts

from multiple perspectives will likely highlight differences among course members as well as common interests and aims. This process can be difficult and even personally challenging. While group process is not the subject of this course, the classroom climate inevitably impacts the quality of learning for all. Thus it is expected that all course members, including the instructor, are mindful of their participation and take seriously the individual and collective task of respectful dialogue. Identifying and understanding our various differences in understanding and subjectivities can also lead to deeper learning.

Use of Electronic Devices in the Classroom

In consideration of your classmates and your own learning please turn off all cell phones and pagers during class. If you must receive messages or be on call for an emergency, please discretely excuse yourself from the classroom.

Computers and electronic tablets may be used to support the learning activities in the classroom. These include such activities as taking notes and accessing course readings under discussion. However, non-academic use of laptops and other devices are distracting and seriously disrupt the learning process for everyone. Neither computers nor other electronic devices are to be used in the classroom for non-academic reasons. This includes emailing, texting, social networking, shopping, and other creative uses of the Internet.

ASSIGNMENTS AND EVALUATION

<u>Assignment Overview:</u>	<u>% of Grade</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
1. Course Engagement		
Participation & Learning Goals	--	Sep. 22, 2016
Self-Evaluation	10%	Dec. 8, 2016
2. Leading Discussion	10%	TBD
3. Qualitative Research Project		
a. Research Proposal—Draft for Peer Review	--	Sep. 29, 2016
Final to Instructor	25%	Oct. 6, 2016
b. Ethics Application—Draft for Peer Review	--	Oct. 13, 2016
Final to Instructor	15%	Oct. 20, 2016
c. Final Report—Draft for Peer Review	--	Dec. 1, 2016
Final to Instructor	40%	Dec. 8, 2016

Grading Criteria

Written assignments will be graded on their clarity, comprehensiveness, originality, appropriate use of reference materials and technical adequacy. Papers are expected to be of sufficient quality as to represent your growing professionalism. All written work must be typewritten in APA format.

The University Grading Practices Policy is available at:

[http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Assets/SGS+Digital+Assets/governance/policies/GPP+-+Effective+July+1\\$!2c+2012/universitygpp.pdf](http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/Assets/SGS+Digital+Assets/governance/policies/GPP+-+Effective+July+1$!2c+2012/universitygpp.pdf) . It defines the grade scale as follows:

Letter Grade Scale	Scale of Marks
A+	90 - 100%
A	85 - 89%
A-	80 - 84%
B+	77 - 79%
B	73 - 76%
B-	70 - 72%
FZ*	0-69%

*FZ = Fail

What the Grades Mean

- *A+*: *Exceptional work*. The writing demonstrates exceptional mastery of the material and writing. Introduces innovative approaches or theories using a broad range of sources.
- *A/A-*: *Excellent Work*. Work is very well conceptualized, is well written, and integrates knowledge from various sources using a critical perspective.
- *B+*: *Very Good Work*. Work draws upon various knowledge sources, addresses relevant issues and theory, and is well written.
- *B*: *Average Work*. Work meets basic requirements.
- *B-*: *Overall performance is unsatisfactory*. Work draws upon limited knowledge sources without a critical perspective, demonstrates a general understanding of the issues and is poorly written.
- *FZ*: *Inadequate*. Work does not reflect understanding of issues, is poorly written, and has major misunderstandings about context and theory.

Writing Style Requirements

Please follow the guidelines in the 6th edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) publication manual for format and citations in your written assignments. This manual is available at the campus bookstore, the library, and the Writing Centre (www.hswriting.ca). Some basic information for using APA is available on the American Psychological Association website at <http://www.apastyle.org/index.aspx>. The instructors encourage students to set up individual appointments with the Writing Lab if you anticipate experiencing challenges with the writing assignments.

Late Papers

Any written assignment that is handed in 1-7 days late will receive a one grade point deduction (eg. A to A-). Any paper more than one week late will not be accepted without clear documentation of illness (see absence due to illness section) or another personal situation that may merit academic consideration.

Students should make every effort to discuss anticipated late papers with instructors IN ADVANCE of due dates. Make a copy of everything you submit for course assignments. Please refer to the Faculty website for regulations regarding extensions, late papers, etc. available at <http://www.socialwork.utoronto.ca/students/reg/grading.htm>

Academic Dishonesty & Plagiarism

Students in graduate studies are expected to commit to the highest standards of integrity, and to understand the importance of protecting and acknowledging intellectual property. It is assumed that they bring to their graduate studies a clear understanding of how to cite references appropriately, thereby avoiding plagiarism. Common examples of problematic academic practices that lead to consequences for plagiarism include:

- Copying and pasting from a source and providing a citation but forgetting to put quotation marks around the content;
- Using material from a source and making changes in specific words or sentence structure but not citing the original source.
- Using ideas from a source without citing the original source.

Graduate students are understood to be capable of expressing ideas that are original and distinct from those of the sources to which they refer. The consequences for academic dishonesty are very high at the graduate level; suspected plagiarism is immediately reported to the Associate Dean's Office and referred to the School of Graduate Studies. Please take the time to review your work carefully to avoid these consequences.

Two excellent documents entitled: How Not to Plagiarize <http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/how-not-to-plagiarize> and the Code on Behavior and Academic Matters is available for you to review on the FSW web site or at www.sgs.utoronto.ca

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities or Medical conditions

If you need or desire an accommodation for a disability or medical condition, please inform the instructor/s so we are able to modify the way the course is taught to facilitate participation and/or use resources available to us, such as Services for Students with Disabilities and Adaptive Technology to facilitate learning. If assistance is required, we will treat that information as private and confidential.

Religious Observances

Please notify the instructor if religious observances conflict with class attendance or due dates for assignments so we can make appropriate arrangements for alternate scheduling of evaluations or make up of missed work.

Absence Due to Illness

If illness is likely to interfere with your meeting a due date for an assignment or other requirements, you should have your physician or health care provider complete a Verification of Student Illness or Injury Form (<http://www.illnessverification.utoronto.ca/getattachment/index/Verification-of-Illness-or-Injury-form-Jan-22-2013.pdf.aspx>) at the time of your illness and submit it to the instructor. You must inform the instructor of the illness **on or before** the deadline date.

The usual procedures for absence due to illness apply in this course. (see <http://www.socialwork.utoronto.ca/students/reg/illness.htm>).

Course Evaluation

Course evaluations for this course will be completed through an online system. You will receive an email invitation at your **mail.utoronto.ca** email address that will direct you to where you can complete the evaluations for all courses that are in the online system.

The University of Toronto has updated course evaluation procedures to make them more convenient for students. Course evaluations are very important to ensuring the quality of education at this Faculty and informing the development of its curriculum.

The survey used to evaluate this course have been developed in collaboration between faculty and students and the university's teaching and learning experts to ensure that it will provide information about teaching and learning that can be used to enhance and assure the quality of education here at the University of Toronto. If you would like more information about the development of course evaluation at the University of Toronto, please consult these websites:

- <http://www.courseevaluations.utoronto.ca/>
- <http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework.htm>

ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS

1. Course Engagement (10%)

Your preparation, presence and participation are integral components of your individual and collective learning, many learning activities in this class are directed by course members. You are expected to complete the required reading and contribute to class discussion.

Class preparation and participation also includes the provision of peer feedback on field work assignments in class and via posting on Blackboard. If you cannot attend class, please notify your instructor through e-mail (or phone) as soon as you can.

Evaluation Criteria: Students will generate participation and learning goals by week two, which will serve as a guide to self-evaluate their course engagement mark at the end of the term. The self-evaluation form is located at the end of the syllabus (see Appendix A) and will involve: a) a self-assessment of your participation and b) an assessment of your group work (for the fieldwork support triad). Your comments will be considered by the instructor for the final mark for Course Engagement.

2. Leading Discussion (10%)

Students will be expected to lead discussion on weekly readings on a rotating basis. On the day you are leading (or co-leading) discussion, you will be responsible for the following:

- 1) Writing up a one-page synthesis of the assigned reading to share with the class. This document may be in bullet form and should address the following: a) main concepts/theories, b) underlying or operating assumptions undergirding the methodology, and c) discussion questions for class. Your one-page document should be emailed at least 24 hours prior to class time (i.e. the Wednesday morning before class on Thursday).
- 2) Presenting your synthesis and critical analysis of the readings (10 minute oral presentation; time will vary depending on the number of students per week; students may work collaboratively when scheduled to present together).
- 3) Facilitating (or co-facilitating) the classroom discussion (20-30 minutes).

Evaluation Criteria: Students will be evaluated on the following:

- Written work demonstrates critical analysis of the assigned reading in connection with one’s developing epistemological orientation and substantive interests.
- Organization: Oral presentation and facilitated discussion presents information in a logical, interesting sequence which the class can follow.
- Engagement: Oral presentation involves the class. Student uses clear voice and maintains eye contact and interaction with peers.
- Professional writing: Correct use of spelling, grammar and APA style were appropriate.

2. Qualitative Research Project, A, B & C

Fieldwork support triad: For each of the following assignments you will turn in a draft for peer review in the lab, then submit the final assignment one week later for instructor review, due by 9 am the day of class. During the second week of class/lab, we will form groups of three that will provide support and constructive feedback on your field work and written assignments (described below). On weeks where short essays are submitted, we will set aside 60 minutes of lab time for triad meetings.

	<u>Draft due in class for Peer Review</u>	<u>Final to Instructor</u>
A. Research Proposal	September 29, 2016	October 6, 2016
B. Ethics Protocol	October 13, 2016	October, 20, 2016
C. Final Report	December 1, 2016	December 8, 2016

A. Research proposal & epistemological stance (6 pages; double spaced):

For this assignment, students will develop a proposal for your course-based research. Through this assignment, you will formulate a research question and develop a qualitative research design to address this question. You will carry out this research study during the fall term, so keep in mind the time constraints and scope when developing your research design. Your proposed research with human participants must stay within the “low” risk category in the research ethics matrix (to be included in the ethics application later in the term) <http://www.research.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Using-the-Risk-Matrix.pdf>

Proposal Requirements:

- a) Problem statement and its relevance to social work
- b) Theoretical framework and a statement of your epistemological stance/orientation (you must cite at least two of the course readings)
- c) Research question and proposed research methods
- d) Work plan and timeline
- e) Potential challenges or ethical issues

Research Methods:

All students must incorporate at least one interview and one observation as part of your research methods. You may also choose from the following options or discuss with the instructor additional methods to include in your proposal (keeping in mind the scope and time frame of the study).

Individual Interview (required): Conduct at least one individual interview with a person of your choosing on a topic of your choosing. The interview should last at least 30 minutes. Students must submit a full, verbatim written transcript of the interview, and a typed version of notes taken during and after the interview as part of your final report analysis.

“Naturalistic” observation (required). Identify a public setting (meeting, event) where you can observe people’s interactions and use of discourse. Your setting should be linked with your research question, as a way to understand who is present, what kinds of “texts” or information is circulating in the setting, and how this shapes your topic of inquiry. Students must submit a full, typed version of your field notes as an appendix to the final report.

Discourse analysis I: Perform a discourse analysis of a major, paradigm-defining book within a subfield of your discipline. Your paper should be approximately 2200 words.

Discourse analysis II: Conduct a review of qualitative studies in your area of interest using a critical and/or interpretive theoretical framework to guide your analysis. See Saini and Shlonsky (2012) (see suggested reading list) for an example of a “systematic qualitative review”. What epistemologies undergird this

area of research? What types of methodology are guiding this area of inquiry? How does the methodology shape what findings, results or conclusions are identified through this research?

Archival work. If you have access to original documents that you would like to evaluate/analyze, you may choose this option. These may include policy documents, agency documents, professional organization documents.

Evaluation Criteria:

- Evidence of knowledge, understanding of the literature; major epistemological concepts, and application of the research methods/design discussed in the course.
- Evidence of an understanding of design application, the research process and relevance to social work practice and policy implications.
- The ability to demonstrate critical thinking about the research method chosen in terms of strengths and limitations.
- Presentation of the development of your analysis, both reflexive and theoretical, from the fieldwork observations/data.
- Professional writing style that is well supported by cited literature (e.g. reports, academic journals, newspaper articles), well organized and grammatically concise.

B. Ethics Application

For this assignment, you will develop an ethics application for your proposed research. The course has an ethics protocol that has been approved by the University of Toronto, Office of Research Ethics. Use this protocol as a template to develop a detailed protocol that is specific to your proposed research.

Ethics Application Requirements:

- a. Ethics protocol
- b. Recruitment email and/or recruitment script
- c. Consent form
- d. Interview guide

Evaluation Criteria:

- Evidence of understanding research ethics as it pertains to the proposed research;
- Clear presentation of fieldwork methods, recruitment procedures, risks, benefits, and steps to ensure confidentiality for each method;
- Presentation of relevant appendices that correspond to the proposed research (e.g. consent form, recruitment email/script, interview guide)

- Written product will be assessed on the paper's organization, quality of content, grammatical presentation, including spelling, clarity, and appropriate citing and referencing (e.g., APA style).

C. Final Report

In the final report, briefly present your question of inquiry, the research setting, and an overview of the research process. The report should also present your research methods, key findings, unexpected events and how they may have impacted your research, and a discussion of possible future research.

10 pages double-spaced + the research question interview guide (as an Appendix) and a five page (double-spaced) coded transcription (as an Appendix).

Things to include in your report:

- *The research setting – how was this conducive to the interview process; did it interfere; body language; non-verbal cues; affective cues; your biases and expectations coming into the interview; did these change over the course of the interview*
- A transcribed portion of the interview (as an Appendix, approximately 5 pages of double-spaced transcription)
- Your analytic strategy
- Preliminary results (your interpretation of the interview data based on the thematic analysis)
- Reflections on the research process

Evaluation Criteria

The assignment will be assessed on the development of the research question and interview guide, clarity of the description of the interview process and observations, interview methods employed, coding and thematic analysis of the data, and your preliminary interpretations. The paper should be done in full written form, with proper citations and references. The paper should include an introduction, body with sub-headings and conclusion. Readings from the course should be used to meet the assignment criteria and referenced appropriately.

- Evidence of knowledge, understanding of the literature; major epistemological concepts, and application of the research methods/design discussed in the course.

- Evidence of an understanding of design application, the research process and relevance to social work practice and policy implications.
- The ability to demonstrate critical thinking about the research method chosen in terms of strengths and limitations.
- Written product will be assessed on the paper's organization, quality of content, grammatical presentation, including spelling, clarity, and appropriate citing and referencing (e.g., APA style).

REQUIRED READING

Required Text and Reading:

1) Flick, U. (2015). *An introduction to qualitative research* (5th ed.). London: Sage.

Available for purchase at the Bob Miller Book Room
180 Bloor Street West, Lower Concourse
Toronto, ON M5S 2V6, Telephone: (416) 922-3557
(Store hours: Monday to Friday 9:00am - 6:00pm; Saturday 10:00am - 5:00pm)

The 4th edition of this text is available (for library use only) at the Industrial Relations and Human Resources Library at 121 St. George St.

https://onesearch.library.utoronto.ca/library-info/INDUST_REL

2) **Portal/ Blackboard:** Links to journal articles and book chapters that are available through the University of Toronto libraries will be posted on Blackboard. Details on how to obtain a course reader for all other readings will be provided in class.

3) A **course reader** will be made available in class.

Recommended Books:

Bentz, V. M. & Shapiro, J. J. (1998). *Mindful inquiry in social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kvale, S. (1996). The interview situation. In: S. Kvale (Ed.), *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing* (pp. 124-143). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Padgett, D. K. (1998). *Qualitative methods in social work research: Challenges and rewards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saini, M., & Shlonsky, A. (2012). *Systematic synthesis of qualitative research*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2001/2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books Ltd: London & New York.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

COURSE SCHEDULE

**Indicates chapters in the required text by Flick, U. (2014)*

Week 1, September 15 Course Overview and Introduction

Recommended Reading:

Lincoln, Y. S. (2010). “What a long, strange trip it’s been...”: Twenty-five years of qualitative and new paradigm research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(1), 3-9.

Morse, J. M. (2004). Using the right tool for the job. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(8), 1029-1031.

Lab Topic: Qualitative Research Topics & Questions

What topics lend themselves to qualitative inquiry for the first assignment? What does a qualitative question look like? What are the types of qualitative research questions?

Week 2, September 22 Epistemological Orientations

Required Reading:

*Flick, U. (2014). Chapters 6 and 7; pp. 63-94.

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.

Denzin, N. (2002). Social work in the seventh moment. *Qualitative Social Work*, 1(1), 25-38.

Gilgun, J. F., & Abrams, L. S. (2002). The nature and usefulness of qualitative social work research: Some thoughts and an invitation to dialogue. *Qualitative Social Work*, 1(1), 39-65.

Recommended Reading:

Gringeri, C., Barusch, A., & Cambron, C. (2013). Epistemology in qualitative social work research: A review of published articles, 2008-2010. *Social Work Research*, 37(1), 55-63.

Lab Topic: Developing research questions (Part 1)

Constructing research questions for qualitative interviews

Week 3, September 29 De-Centering Methodologies

Required Reading:

Chilsa, B. (2012). Situating knowledge systems. In *Indigenous research methodologies* (pp. 1-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Staller, K., Block, E. & Horner, P. S. (2009). History of methods in social science research. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of Emergent Methods* (pp. 25-52). New York & London: Guilford Press.

Smith, L. T. (1999). Introduction. In *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Kovach, M. (2015). Emerging from the margins: Indigenous methodologies. In S. Strega & L. Brown (Eds.), *Research as resistance: Revisiting critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches* (2nd ed.) (pp. 43-64). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, Women's Press.

Recommended Reading:

Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and de-colonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7-8), 1-23.

Lab: Developing Research Questions (Part 2)

Developing research questions continued
Approaches to developing interview guides/questions

Week 4, October 6 Research Design, Ethics, and Proposal Writing

Required Reading:

*Flick, U. (2014). Chapters 4, 5, and 9; pp. 39-62 and 111-135.

Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Clark Plano, V. L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research designs. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35(2), 236-264.

~~Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Ethical issues in analysis. In *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (pp. 288-297). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.~~

Shaw, I. (2008). Ethics and the practice of qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, 7(4), 400-414.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Cannella, G. S. (2009). Ethics and the broader rethinking/reconceptualization of research as construct. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, 9(2), 273-285.

Recommended Reading:

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). Chapter 7: Research proposals: Presenting and justifying a qualitative study. In *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.) (pp. 99-115). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Padgett, D. (1998). Guidelines for writing up a qualitative research proposal. In *Qualitative methods in social work research* (pp. 152-153). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sandelowski, M., & Barroso, J. (2003). Writing the proposal for a qualitative research methodology project. *Qualitative Health Research, 13*, 781-820.

National Institute of Health (2009). Qualitative Methods in Health Research. Report available online at <https://obsr-archive.od.nih.gov/pdf/Qualitative.PDF>

Lab Topic: Research Ethics & Consent Forms

Guest Speaker—Daniel Gyewu, Research Ethics Manager
Health Sciences, Office of Research Ethics, University of Toronto

See U of T Ethics guidelines: <http://www.research.utoronto.ca/-researchers-administrators/ethics/human/> (application & instructions)

Week 5, October 13 Interviewing and Generating Verbal Data

Required Reading:

*Flick, U. (2014). Chapters 15, 16 and 17; pp. 193-262.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research interviews as speech acts. *Research interviewing: Context & narrative* (pp. 35-65). Boston: Harvard University Press.

Seidman, I. (2006). Technique isn't everything: But it is a lot. In *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 78-94). New York: Columbia University Press.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., & Zoran, A. G. (2009). Toward more rigor in focus group research: A new framework for collecting and analyzing focus group data. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(3), 1-21.

DeRoche, K. K., & Lahman, M. K. (2008, August). Methodological considerations for conducting qualitative interviews with youth receiving mental health services. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 9*(3), 1-20. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/1016/2189>

Recommended Reading:

Hsiung, Ping-Chun (2010). *Lives and Legacies: A guide to qualitative interviewing*.
<http://utsc.utoronto.ca/~pchsiung/LAL/home> (Web-based resource)

Sandelowski, M. (1993). Theory unmasked: The uses and guises of theory in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 16(3), 213-218.

Giske, T., & Artinian, B. (2007). A personal experience of working with classical grounded theory: From beginner to experienced grounded theorist. *International Journal for Qualitative Methods*, 6(4), 67-80.

Lab: Interview Guide Development

Week 6, October 20 Entering the Field: Rapport & Participant/Observation

Required Reading:

*Flick, U. (2014). Chapters 19 and 20 (pp. 293-333)

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books. Retrieved April 12, 2010 from
http://www.sociosite.net/topics/texts/Geertz_Thick_Description.php

De Montigny, G. A. J. (2007). Ethnomethodology for social work. *Qualitative Social Work*, 6(1), 95-120.

Reeves, S., Kuper, A., & Hodges, B. D. (2008). Qualitative research methodologies: Ethnography. *British Journal of Medicine*, 337(30 August), a1020-a1020.

Bourgois P., Prince, B., & Moss, A. (2004). The everyday violence of hepatitis C among young women who inject drugs in San Francisco. *Human Organization*, 63(3), 253-264.

Recommended Reading:

Anthony, A. K., & Danaher, W. F. (2016). Rules of the road: Doing fieldwork and negotiating interactions with hesitant public figures. *Qualitative Research*, 16(4), 392-410.

Harrowing, J. N., Mill, J., Spiers, J., Kulig, J., & Kipp, W. (2010). Critical ethnography, cultural safety, and international nursing research [Online open access article]. *International Journal of Qualitative Research*, 9(3), 240-251. Available at
<https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/download/6507/7368>.

Lab Topic: Practice Observation Field Notes

Week 7, October 27 Textual and Visual Data

Required Reading:

*Flick, U. (2014). Chapters 21 and 22; pp. 334-364.

Gee, P. J. (2011). *Discourse analysis: An introduction to theory and method* (3rd ed.) (Chapters 1-3, pp. 1-42). New York and London: Routledge.

Jeyapal, D. (2013). “Since when did we have 100,000 Tamils?” Media representations of race thinking, spatiality, and the 2009 Tamil diaspora protests. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 38(4), 557-578.

Didkowsky, N., Ungar, M., & Liebenberg, L. (2010). Using visual methods to capture embedded processes of resilience for youth across cultures and contexts. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19(1), 12.

Lab: Interview Practice

Week 8, November 3 Approaches to Data Analysis

Required Reading:

*Flick, U. (2014). Chapters 23 and 24; pp. 365-383.

Bailey, J. (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: Transcribing. *Family Practice*, 25(2), 127-131.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Open coding. In *Basics of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 101-121). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jobling, H. (2013). Using ethnography to explore causality in mental health policy and practice. *Qualitative Social Work*, 13(1), 49-68.

McCracken, G. (2011). The four step method of inquiry. In *The Long Interview—Qualitative Research Methods Series* (pp. 29-47). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lab: Transcripts and data management

Week 9, November 10 Phenomenology & Grounded Theories

Required Reading:

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Baker, C., Wuest, J., & Stern, P. N. (1992). Method slurring: The grounded theory/phenomenology example. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 17(11), 1355-1360.
- Starks, H., & Trinidad, S. B. (2007). Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1372-1380.
- Finlay, L. (2014). Engaging phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(2), 121-141. doi:10.1080/14780887.2013.807899
- Tufford, L., & Newman, P. (2010). Bracketing in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, 11(1), 80-96.

Recommended Reading:

- Alaggia, R., & Millington, G. (2008). Male child sexual abuse: A phenomenology of betrayal. *Clinical Journal of Social Work*, 36(3), 265-275.
- Ray, M. (1994). The richness of phenomenology: Philosophic, theoretic and methodologic concerns. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 117-135). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Manen, M. (1997). Turning to the nature of lived experience. *Researching lived experience* (2nd ed.) (pp. 35-51). London, ON: The Athlone Press.
- Lab: Reflexive Praxis in Research: “Bracketing”, journaling, and other methods to address researcher bias and subjectivity.**

Week 10, November 17 Narrative, Discourse & Hermeneutics

- *Flick, U. (2014). Chapter 27, pp. 439-460.
- Gee, P. J. (2011). *Discourse analysis: An introduction to theory and method* (3rd ed.) (Chapters 9-10, pp. 127-163). New York and London: Routledge.
- Carbó, P. A., Ahumada, M. A. V., Caballero, A. D., & Argüelles, G. A. L. (2016). “How do I do Discourse Analysis?” Teaching Discourse Analysis to novice researchers through a study of intimate partner gender violence among migrant women. *Qualitative Social Work*, 15(3), 363-379.
- Riessman, C. K., & Quinney, L. (2005). Narrative in social work: A critical review. *Qualitative Social Work*, 4(4), 391-412.
- Lee, E., & Bhuyan, R. (2013). Negotiating within whiteness in cross cultural clinical encounters. *Social Service Review*, 87(1), 98-130.

Lab: Approaches to Data Coding & Analysis

Week 11, November 24 Ethical Issues in Subjectivity and Representation

Required Reading:

Kirsch, G. E. (1999). What do you know about my life, anyway? Ethical dilemmas in researcher-participant relations. In G. E. Kirsch, *Ethical dilemmas in feminist research* (pp. 25-44). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Kanuha, V. K. (2000). “Being” native versus “going native”: Conducting social work research as an insider. *Social Work, 45*(5), 439-447.

Bain, A. L., & Payne, W. J. (2016). Queer de-participation: reframing the co-production of scholarly knowledge. *Qualitative Research, 16*(3), 330-340.

McCall, L. (2005). Complexity of intersectionality. *Signs, 30*(3), 1771-1800.

Recommended Reading:

Pitner, R., & Sakamoto, I. (2005). Examining the role of critical consciousness in multicultural practice: Its promises and limitations. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 75*(4), 684-694.

Schnarch, B. (2004). *Ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP) or Self-determination applied to research: A critical analysis of contemporary First Nations research and some options for First Nations communities*. Ottawa: First Nations Centre, National Aboriginal Health Organization. Retrieved from http://www.naho.ca/documents/fnc/english/FNC_OCAPCriticalAnalysis.pdf

Lab: Approaches to Qualitative Data Analysis Software

Week 12, December 1 Writing and Assessing Quality

Required Reading:

*Flick, U. (2014). Chapters 29 and 30; pp. 479-519.

Schwartz-Shea, P. (2009). Judging quality: Evaluative criteria and epistemic communities. In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea (Eds). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Ch. 5. (pp. 89-114). M. E. Sharpe: New York & London.

Lab: TBA

Week 13, December 8 Wrap up & Presentations

TBA

~~ The End ~~
APPENDIX A

Field Work Triad Reflection Form

Your Name:

Name of group members:

This form is designed to capture what contributed (or detracted) from your learning as part of the field work triad. This form is due the end of the course, as part of the “course engagement” assignment.

Please describe how each member of the group contributed to the field work triad. You may rank group members, or provide examples of activities or roles that each person offered to support the group.

Where they any challenges that the group faced and in what ways did you (personally) address these challenges?

What lessons do you take away from this group work (things to do in the future, things you would like to do differently)?

Appendix B

Participation Self-Assessment

Name: _____

This form will be used to generate your “course engagement” mark. Insert the participation goals you developed at the beginning of the term and fill out the quantitative and qualitative assessment below. The completed form is due by the last day of class.

Insert **BELOW** the goals you identified for yourself at the beginning of the term:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

How **often** were you able to address your participation goals in class? (Check the box that fits the best)

Your Participation Goals	All of the time	Most of the time	Some of the time	Almost none of the time	None of the time
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

How **well** were you able to realize your participation goals in class? (Check the box that fits the best)

Your Participation Goals	Extremely well	Very well	Somewhat well	Not so well	Not well at all
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

What is your overall suggested letter grade for your participation: _____

Comments on your participation in class: