FACTOR-INWENTASH
FACULTY OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

SWK 6007: Advanced Qualitative Research Methods in Social Work—
Critical Discourse & Narrative Approaches for Interpretive Policy Analysis

Summer 2020
Wednesdays: 9 am to 1 pm | April 29 to June 24
Draft April 15, 2020
(During the first day, we will discuss if/how to adjust the schedule for remote/online learning)

Instructor: Rupaleem Bhuyan, PhD
r.bhuyan@utoronto.ca
Office Hours: Wednesdays, 1- 2 pm or by appointment

Rationale and Significance

This methodology course will focus on concepts, techniques and practices for critical discourse and narrative approaches to interpretive policy analysis, which an emphasis on feminist, post-colonial, and critical race methodologies.

Interpretive analysis—conceptually distinct from the more ubiquitous term 'qualitative'—signals an attention to the philosophical presuppositions that guide the production of knowledge and meaning making; given different understandings of the nature of human or social reality and whether and how that reality might be known (Yanow, 2006). Critical discourse analysis similarly examines the production and use of language as means to understand social practices, relations of power in relation to the study of social and health policies and related social problems.

During the first two seminar meetings, students will examine the contemporary debates in the area of interpretive research and ground these debates in their epistemological and ontological origins. In particular, we will examine the 'linguistic turn' in social science and how theories of language complicate the research process. We will also explore the 'cultural turn' in social science which reflect debates of how human life is lived across multiple cultural contexts. And finally, we will address the 'critical turn', which engages how power and knowledge are embedded in the process of research.

The remaining seminar meetings examine specific methods for generating data and conducting analysis using discourse and narrative methodologies (we may explore other methodologies depending on student interest and as time permits). In addition to addressing philosophical foundations, will discuss and practice common strategies to access and collect data (e.g. observation, interviewing, finding existing documents), methods of organizing and representing different forms/genres of data for analysis (e.g. transcripts, electronic texts, images, hand-written notes); and strategies to analyze and represent your analyses for different audiences.

Students will be involved in making a substantial and ongoing contribution to the group learning process through providing peer feedback, constructing/critiquing conceptual models and theoretical frameworks, and learning how to critically evaluate and enhance the methodological rigor in the projects of those involved in the seminar.

This advanced graduate course seeks to support social work and health science doctoral students to develop appropriate research designs and research proposals for either their comprehensive paper or their doctoral dissertation research. **Prior coursework in epistemology and introductory level qualitative methods are required.**

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.

As the instructor, I 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.

Course Learning Objectives

This course is designed to build upon students' prior learning towards be able to understand and successfully perform the following:

1) To be able to differentiate among different epistemologies, theories, and applications to policy analysis research using critical and interpretive methodologies.
2) To discuss and apply interpretive and/or critical paradigms to the carry out research design, data collection and data analysis steps.
3) To generate and analyze different forms of data for use in interpretive policy analysis.
4) To discuss and articulate one's subjectivity in relation to the research process and the production of knowledge.
5) To articulate the role of theory in your work and the strategic or deliberate use or extension of theory at all stages of the research process.
6) To understand and implement ethical decision-making in the context of interpretive policy research.

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.

Guidelines for using Zoom for our Online Classes
*Adapted from Plante, T. (2020, March 20). Top 10 tips for good zoom hygiene and etiquette in education. Psychology Today.

As we shift to online learning, here are some general guidelines for participation via Zoom.

Getting Started
- *If you have not used zoom before, you can connect via the internet or phone.* **See this Zoom tutorial for students**
- If you haven't used Zoom before click the link to download Zoom prior to the day of the meeting and familiarise yourself with any features you may need to use on the day – mute/unmute microphone, stop/start video, screenshare etc.
- Plan to join the zoom class on time. We will use the first 5 minutes for everyone to log in.
- For more information see Zoom best practices.

Connectivity
- Students are encouraged to connect via a computer when possible but may connect via the phone as needed.
- When using the Zoom platform on your computer, close unneeded applications during class, to keep the video functioning optimally.
- If you are experience connection problems, turn off the video to increase sound quality.
- When possible, use a headset with an external mic to improve audio.
- Students can also join via phone, in cases where connecting by computer is not possible.

Video & Audio
- Students will be asked to mute their mics at the start of class at when they are not speaking to reduce background noise.

- Students will be asked to turn on their video at the start of class or when speaking. Please contact the instructor if you are unable to turn on your video for technical reasons or due to privacy concerns or other disruptions in your home environment.
- Be mindful of your background lighting. If you are sitting in front of a window or light, you may be completely darkened on the screen. Using an overhead light or placing a light in front is recommended.
- Check your background to reduce distractions (moving cars; TV) or that nothing private is showing up on the screen.

Participating
- When you want to speak you can physically raise your hand (on video), or use the 'raise hand' feature that is located at the bottom of your screen.
- Students may also post comments or questions in the chat box, also located at the bottom of the screen.
- When you are done speaking it helps to let others know by saying "that's all" or "I'm done" or "thank you", to avoid confusion or over talking.
- When you are schedule to present, the instructor will add you as a co-host. You can use the 'share screen' feature, so show us a PowerPoint or other visual aides for your presentation. See instructions for sharing screen here. http://web5.lib.pacificu.edu/zoom/students/
- For students who planning to connect via the phone, your instructor can share PowerPoint slides via Quercus in advance, so you can follow along.
-

Security & Privacy
- The zoom platform is user friendly, but also has security and privacy weaknesses.
- Towards preventing 'zoom bombing', students will be provided a unique zoom link and password for this course.

ASSIGNMENTS AND EVALUATION

Assignment Overview:			_% of Grade_	_Due Date_
1. Course Engagement				
	Weekly Memos		20%	Weekly
2. Leading Discussion			20%	TBA
3. Practicing Interpretive Analysis & Writing				
	Essay 1	Draft for Peer Review	--	June 6
		Final to Instructor	20%	June 13
	Essay 2	Draft for Peer Review	--	June 27
		Final to Instructor	40%	July 4

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 (i.e. double spaced, 12-point font, in-text citations and references).

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 . 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%

What the Grades Mean
- A+: _Exceptional work._ 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 7th 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

Purdue Writing Lab is also a helpful online resource for APA formatting and writing styel. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/general_format.html

Students are encouraged to set up individual appointments with the Writing Centre, as a resource to support your written assignments. You can sign up for a virtual meeting with the Writing https://www.hswriting.ca/

Late Papers

The teaching team for this course has agreed that any paper 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

Turnitin

Students will be required to submit their course essays to Turnitin via Quercus for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. Students can upload their papers as many times as they like to review their work before submitting a final version to the instructor. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism.

It has, on occasion, taken over 72 hours for a Turnitin originality report to generate and be sent to students. Please keep this in mind should you wish to review a report before submitting for grading.

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 repeated 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: 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 FIFSW web site or at http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/calendar/Pages/Policies-and-Guidelines.aspx

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 or Disruptions due to COVID-19 Pandemic

Please notify the instructor if you are unable to attend class or complete assignments due to an illness or disruptions in your life related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The University of Toronto is working to address concerns related to COVID-19. Procedures are subject to change as new information becomes available. Students are encouraged to check travel and public health advisories on the University of Toronto's website as the situation evolves.

For COVID-19 related symptoms, the University is temporarily suspending the need for a doctor's note or medical certificate for absences and students must declare through the Absence Declaration tool on ACORN.

The tool can be found in the ACORN Profile and Settings menu and you are required to declare your absence **daily up until the day before you return** to classes or other academic activities. For step-by-step instructions, please refer to the UTSC Absence Self-Declaration Steps. The University will use this information to provide academic accommodation and to monitor overall absences.

You are required to declare your absence from academic activities if:
- you are experiencing cold or flu-like symptoms
- due to self-isolation requirements
- You are registered in the current session

Absences for other illnesses should continue to be documented through the Verification Of Illness (VOI) form and normal divisional process.

While the University will make every effort to provide needed academic accommodation, you are responsible for meeting course requirements as determined by your instructors.

Course Evaluation: Student Feedback Matters

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.

ASSIGNMENT DETAILS

1.   Course Engagement (20%)

Your preparation, presence (virtual or in person) and participation are integral components of your individual and collective learning. You are expected to complete the required reading and contribute to class discussion, including participation in in-class activities.

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.

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.

During class, each student will write a brief **analytic memo,** based on the assigned readings and class activities for that day. This memo will be written and emailed to the instructor at the end of class (option to hand write the memo and send an image via email). Memos should be approximately 100-200 words in length. Analytic memos are a common practice for researchers to capture where you are in your learning throughout the class.

The memos can capture your reflections on the readings, class discussion, and our how the weekly topic relates to your program of research.

*Evaluation Criteria***:** Course Engagement will be a reflection of your engagement in class, participation in the weekly memos, participation in the peer-review process, and the self-assessment of your learning and participation goals. Memos will be marked as credit/no credit towards the overall Course Engagement grade. The self-evaluation form is located at the end of the syllabus 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 (20%)

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

1) *Writing a one-page synthesis* of the assigned reading to share with the class. This document 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 distributed via email at least 24 hours prior to class time (i.e. the Tuesday morning before class on Wednesday).
2) *Presentation of reading synthesis* (10 minute)
3) *Leading discussion & facilitated activity* (20-30 min) for the class to practice applying the concepts from the reading. For example, you could bring a data sample

(media; interview excerpt, policy document) and facilitate an activity where the class analyzes this data using theories presented in the weekly topic.

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.   Conducting & Writing Interpretive Policy Analysis

Essay 1 – Project Proposal (5 page max) = 20%
Essay 2 – Analysis Paper (10 page max) = 40%

	In Class Draft for Peer Review	*Final to Instructor*
Essay 1	May 27	June 3
Essay 2	June 17	June 24

*Fieldwork support triad***:** During the second week of class, we will form groups of three that will provide support and constructive feedback on your field work and written work (described below). On weeks where short essays are submitted, we will set aside 60 minutes of class time for triad meetings.

Essay 1—Project Proposal: This essay should include: a) presentation of a research question and initial choice of 'methods' for the final two essays (this may change during the term with instructor consultation); b) a statement of your epistemological stance/orientation, c) your methodology discussion must engage with at least two of the readings from the syllabus.

Essays 2—Analysis Paper: This essay will include your analysis of two or more types of data that correspond to the project you proposed in essay 1. This data analysis essay should include a brief overview of the rationale for the study, context of the study, the methodology, overview of the data, and preliminary analysis of the data.

Suggested approaches for interpretive policy analysis:

A) *Analysis of media and/or policy documents:* Choose a discrete body of written work (e.g., newspaper articles, organizational document, policy document, parliamentary records etc.) and conduct an analysis of language, metaphors and/or symbols used therein. What discourses does this 'text' employ? What theories of language are you

using to analyze this text? What "work" do the discourses in this text "do" and for whom?

B) *Analysis of Interview data:* Using previously collected interview data, conduct secondary data analysis on one or more individual interview transcripts. (See instructor for details as this option is ideal for people who are working under and existing ethics protocol but may require Ethics Review approval for secondary data analysis).

C) *Archival work.* If you have access to original documents that you would like to evaluate/analyze, you may choose this exercise. Students submit a full, typed version of their notes, as well as a write-up analysis. (May count as 2 assignments. Contact instructor for details).

Evaluation Criteria:

- Ability to demonstrate critical analysis of research methodology and how these relate to your epistemological stance;
- Clear, 'thick' description (Geertz, 1973) of the context in which the 'research' took place and how this relates to the social issue(s) you are studying;
- Clear presentation of fieldwork methods (i.e. date, time, duration) and ethical considerations for each method;
- 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.

Required Text and Readings:

1) Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

   An electronic version of this text is available in the University of Toronto Library. Available at http://go.utlib.ca/cat/8577041

2) Quercus: Links to journal articles and book chapters are posted under "modules" on the Quercus course.

Recommended Texts (not required):

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

Crotty, Michal (1998). *The foundations of social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Denzin, Norman K., Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Smith Linda Tuhiwai (2008) *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

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

Hesse-Biber, S. N. & Leavy, P. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of emergent methods*. New York: Guilford.

Mishler, Elliot G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Schatz, Edward. (2009) (Ed.). *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power*. University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai (2001/2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* Zed Books Ltd: London & New York.

Strega, Susan and Leslie Brown (Eds.)(2015). *Research as resistance: Revisiting critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches* (Second edition). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, Women's Press.

Wetherell, Margaret, Stephanie Taylor, and Simoeon J. Yates (2001). *Discourse theory and practice.* London: Sage Publications.

Yanow, Dvora and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (Eds.) (2006). *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn.* Armonk, NY and London: M.E. Sharpe.

COURSE SCHEDULE
Subject to change

Week 1, April 29, 2020   **Epistemological Foundations for Critical Qualitative Research**
Recommended Reading:

Fonow, Margaret and Judith A. Cook (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in academy and public policy. *Signs, 30*(4), 2211-2286.

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

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

Kovach, Margaret (2015). Emerging from the margins: Indigenous methodologies (pp. 43-64). In Strega, Susan and Leslie Brown (Eds). *Research as resistance: Revisting critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches* (Second edition). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, Women's Press.

Week 2, May 6, 2020   **Introduction to Interpretive Policy Analysis: What is Knowing? How do we know? Who is a knowing subject?**

Philosophical Perspectives:

Pachirat, Timothy (2009). We call it a grain of sand: The interpretive orientation and a human social science. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (Eds). *Interpretation and Method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. Ch. 21 (pp. 426-432). New York & London: M.E. Sharpe.

Schutte, Ofelia (1998). Cultural alterity: Cross-cultural communication and feminist theory in North-South contexts. *Hypatia*, *13*(2), 53-72.

Dabashi, Hamid (2013). Can non-Europeans think? [Opinion]. *Aljazeera.* Available at http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/01/2013114142638797542.html

Thinking Interpretively

Yanow, Dvora (2000). Conducting Interpretive policy analysis (Chapters 1 & 2, pp. 1-41). Thousand Oaks & London: Sage Publications.

Geertz, Clifford (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

Week 3, May 13, 2020   Semiotics and the Linguistic Turn in the Social Sciences

Theory

Gee, Paul James (2011). *Discourse analysis: An introduction to theory and method, Third Edition* (Chapters 1-3, pp. 1-42). New York and London: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther (2001). From Saussure to critical sociolinguistics: The turn towards a social view of language. In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simoeon J. Yates (Eds.) *Discourse Theory and Practice* (pp. 29-38). London: Sage publications.

Sandoval, Chela (2000). Semiotics and languages of emancipation. In *Methodology of the oppressed* (Chapter 4, pp. 80-113). University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.

Method & Illustration

Schaffer, F.C. (2015). Ordinary language interviewing. In Yanow, D. and Schwartz-Shea, P. (Eds). Interpretation and method (pp. 183-193). Routledge.

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

Urek, M. (2005). Making a Case in Social Work: The Construction of an Unsuitable Mother. *Qualitative Social Work, 4*(4), 451–467. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325005058646

Recommended Reading:

Ricour, P. (1971). The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as text. *Social Research, 38(2)*, 529-562.

Hall, Christopher and Sue White (2005). Looking inside the professional practice: Discourse, narrative and ethnographic approaches to social work and counseling. *Qualitative Social Work, 4*(4), 379-390.

Week 4, May 20, 2020   Critical Discourse Analysis

Theory & Method
Gee, Paul James (2011). *Discourse analysis: An introduction to theory and method, Third Edition* (Chapters 4-5, & 8; pp. 43-74 & 116-126). New York and London: Routledge.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4(2)*, 249-283.

Fairclough, Norman (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse Society, 3*(2), 193-217.

Waugh, L.R., Catalano, T., Al Masaeed, K., Hong Do, T., and Renigar, P.G. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis: Definition, Approaches, Relation to Pragmatics, Critique, and Trends. Capone, A. and Mey J.L. (Eds).*Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society.* Pp. 71-135. New York, NY and London, UK: Springer.

Illustration

Wetherall, Margaret and Neil Edley (2014). A discursive psychological framework for analyzing men and masculinities. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(4), 355-364.

Week 5, May 27, 2020   Critical Metaphor Analysis & Stories as Framing Devices

Theory & Method

Yanow, D. (2000). Symbolic language. In *Conducting interpretive policy analysis (Ch. 4, pp. 41-62).* Sage publications.

Nguyen, L. and McCallum, K. (2015). Critical Metaphor Analysis from a Communication perspective: A case study of Australian news media discourse on Immigration and Asylum Seekers. In D. D. Paterno, D. M. Bourk, & D. D. Matheson (Eds.), *ANZCA 2015: Rethinking Communication, Space and Identity* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-11). Australia and New Zealand: ANZCA.

van Hulst, M. and Yanow, D. (2016). From Policy "Frames" to "Framing": Theorizing a More Dynamic, Political Approach. *American Review of Public Administration, 46*(1) 92–112.

Illustration

Bhuyan, R., Jeyapal, D., Ku, J., Sakamoto, I., Chou, E. (2017). Branding "Canadian Experience" in Immigration Policy: Nation-building in a neoliberal era. *Journal of International Migration and Integration, 18*(1), 47-62.

Iannantuono, A. and Eylse, J. (1997). Meanings in policy: A textual analysis of Canada's Achieving Health for All" document. *Social Science & Medicine, 44*(11), 1611-1621.

Schmidt, Ronald, Sr. 2006. Value-critical policy analysis: The case of language policy in the United States. In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine SchwartzShea, (2009) (Eds). *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn (300-15).* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Week 6, June 3, 2020   Narrativity & Embodiment

Theory & Method
Csordas, Thomas J. (1993). Somatic modes of attention. *Cultural Anthropology, 8*(2), 135-156.

Clandinin, D. Jean (2006). Narrative inquiry: A methodology for studying lived experience. *Research Studies in Music Education, 27,* 44-54.

Chadwick, R. (2017). Embodied methodologies: Challenges, reflections and strategies. *Qualitative Research, 17*(1) 54–74

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *8*(1), 23–44.

Illustration
Poindexter, Cynthia C. (2002). Meaning from methods: Re-presenting narratives of an HIV-affected caregiver. *Qualitative Social Work, 1*(1), 59-78.

Fusco, Coco (2005). The other history of intercultural performance. In *English is broken here: Nothes on cultural fusion in the Americas* (pp. 37-63). *New York: The New Press*

Recommended:

Mishler, Elliot G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative* (Chapters 2 & 3, pp. 35-65). Cambridge : Harvard University Press.

Week 7, June 10, 2020   Analyzing Narrative Data

Theory, Method & Illustration
Arduser, L. (2014). Agency in illness narratives: A pluralistic analysis. *Narrative Inquiry, 24*(1), 1, 27.

Lynn Sorsoli and Deborah L. Tolman (2009). Hearing voices: Listening for multiplicity and movement in interview data. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Leavy (Eds.) *Handbook of Emergent Methods* (pp. 495-516). New York & London: Guilford Press.

Matoesian, Gregory M. and James R. Coldren Jr. (2002). Language and bodily conduct in focus group evaluations of legal policy. *Discourse & Society, 14*(4), 469-493.

Hu, R. (2019). Examining Social Service Providers' Representation of Trafficking Victims: A Feminist Postcolonial Lens. *Affilia*, *34*(4), 421–438.

Horton-Salway, Mary (2001). The construction of M.E.: The discursive action model. In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon J. Yates (Eds) *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 147-188). London: The Open University.

Week 8, June 17, 2018   Analyzing Narratives – Beyond Interviews

Bartlett, R. (2012). Modifying the diary interview method to research the lives of people with

dementia. *Qualitative Health Research, 22*(12), 1717-1726.

Simmonds, S. Roux, C. ter Avest, Ina (2017). Blurring the Boundaries between Photovoice and Narrative Inquiry: A Narrative-Photovoice Methodology for Gender-Based Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 14*(3), 33-49.

Märtsin, M. (2018). Beyond Verbal Narratives: Using Timeline Images in the Semiotic Cultural Study of Meaning Making. *Integrative Psychological Behavior, 52*, 116–128

Conrad, Diane (2004). Exploring risky youth experiences: Popular theatre as participatory, performative research method. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 3*(1), 12-25.

Week 9, June 24, 2018   Reflexivity and Writing

Stewart, S. (2009). One Indigenous academic's evolution: a personal narrative of native health research and competing ways of knowing. *First Peoples Child & Family* Review, 4(1), 57-65.

Khan, Shahnaz (2005). Reconfiguring the native informant: Positionality in the global age. *Signs, 30*(4), 2017-2036.

Bolam, B., Gleeson, K., & Murphy, S. (2003). "Lay person" or "health expert"? Exploring theoretical and practical aspects of reflexivity in qualitative health research, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*.

Madison, Soyini (2011). It's time to write: Writing as performance. *In Critical ethnography: Method, Ethics and Performance (Chapter 8, pp. 209-232).* Thousand Oaks & London: Sage Publications.

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

Unger, Michael (2006). "Too ambitious": What happens when funders misunderstand the strengths of qualitative research design. *Qualitative Social Work, Vol. 5*(2), pp. 261-277.

Staller, Karen M. (2002). Musings of a skeptical software junkie and the HyperRESEARCH fix. *Qualitative Social Work, 1*(4), 473-487.

The End

APPENDIX A

SWK 6007—Field Work Triad Reflection Form

This form is designed to capture what contributed (or detracted) from your learning as part of the field work triad. Please compete this form at the end of the course, as part of the "course engagement" assignment.

Your Name:
Name of group members:

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 participation mark. Insert the participation goals you developed at the beginning of the term and fill out the quantitative and qualitative assessment of your participation below. The completed form is due at the last class (December 6, 2012).

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 numeric assessment of your participation: _____ out of total 100%

Comments on your participation in class: