CHL 5115 Qualitative Analysis and Interpretation

Winter 2021, Thursday 1- 4 p.m.
Online via Zoom[1]
Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto[2]

Course Instructor

Brenda Gladstone, PhD (she/her)
Associate Professor
Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto
155 College Street, #580
E-Mail: Brenda.gladstone@utoronto.ca

Office hours: by arrangement (on zoom)

Purpose

This is an advanced graduate-level course in qualitative research methodology that focuses on the theory, techniques and issues of data analysis and interpretation[3]. The course is designed for students taking qualitative approaches to their thesis research *i.e., using both qualitative forms of data and qualitative (non-numeric, interpretive) forms of analysis*. Ideally students should be in the late data gathering and analysis phase of their research, although students at the proposal writing and pre-data generation stage also benefit from the course. The course aims to give students knowledge and experience in concrete analysis practices, but also to enhance their ability to articulate and address the core theoretical and methodological issues of qualitative inquiry. Although the topics discussed are generic to qualitative methodology, the literature and class instruction draw

---

[1] Appendix A – guideline for using Zoom

[2] I acknowledge the traditional territories of the Mississauga of the New Credit First Nation, Anishnawbe, Wendat, Huron, and Haudenosaunee Indigenous Peoples on which the Dalla Lana School of Public Health now stands. The territory was the subject of the Dish With One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, an agreement between the Iroquois Confederacy and Confederacy of the Ojibwe and allied nations to peaceably share and care for the resources around the Great Lakes. I also pay my respects to all our ancestors and to our present Elders.

[3] I am indebted to Professor Joan Eakin who developed this unique graduate course in advanced qualitative analysis and interpretation. Course content was refined over the many years that Dr. Eakin taught graduate students and mentored emerging qualitative scholars in the health and social sciences, like me, and through her commitment to critical qualitative methodology in health research more broadly.

heavily on the field of health, and on the instructor's own disciplinary background in the sociology of health and illness, and childhood, and substantive topic area of mental health.

Course Prerequisites

Students taking this course are expected to have:

- Knowledge of the theoretical and philosophical foundations of qualitative inquiry, and of data generation (CHL5131; JRP1000; SWK6307, or equivalent)
- Prior training and/or experience with qualitative research.
- Their own data/research plan to use in the course.

Permission from the instructor is required for enrollment. A maximum of 15 students can be in the course at one time. Audits are not generally accepted. Priority is given to students in departments/faculties that are 'contributing' members to CQ (see pg. 10)*, and to those with optimal backgrounds and current research situations for benefiting and contributing to the course.

Course Objectives

This course aims to develop in students a deeper marvel for, enjoyment of, and skill in qualitative research. At the end of the course students should have made significant progress towards being able to understand and articulate:

1. What it means to *critically* analyze and interpret qualitative data, including the difference between value-added analysis and primary description.
2. The role, place, significance and timing of theory in the analysis process
3. The implications for analysis and interpretation of the data generation, transformation and management process
4. The complexity and implications of the interpretation of 'meaning'
5. The role of the researcher in analysis, and the significance of standpoint
6. The notion, practice and significance of methodological reflexivity, and its role in the research process
7. The constitutive effects of writing on the analysis, and the different ways of representing the results of qualitative inquiry and their implications
8. Issues associated with judging research quality in qualitative inquiry
9. The importance of being able to write and articulate convincingly the nature, value, and limitations of your analytic process and of qualitative methodology more generally.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

There are three (3) requirements for this course. All are designed to facilitate students' own research-in-progress (accommodating different interests, topics, and stage of research) while developing generic methodological knowledge and skills.

Grading of all written assignments will follow the School of Graduate Studies grading and evaluation policy (A+ to B- or FZ). Written work should adhere to a particular bibliographic format (e.g., Vancouver, APA, etc.) and the specified page length.

*Because we are living through unprecedented times due to COVID-19 requests to extend the due date for assignments (listed below) may be necessary. If this is your situation, please don't hesitate to contact me to make alternative arrangements; ideally one week prior to the due date, if possible.

Weighting of Assignments and Due Dates:

Assignment # 1	Reflection Paper	20% of final grade	Due: February 15th
Assignment # 2	Reflection Paper	30 % of final grade	Due: March 18th
Assignment # 3	Major Paper	50 % of final grade	Due: April 19th

Criteria for Grading Written Assignments:

B+	Understanding of the central ideas/arguments covered in the course readings, class presentations and discussions, applied to the student's research interests; Well-written –coherent, well organized and concise.
A-	The above, plus the ability to integrate and analyze the ideas/arguments covered in the course readings, class presentations and discussions, applied to the student's research interests.
A	The above, plus the ability to go beyond the ideas/arguments covered in the course readings, class presentations and discussions, in a critical and constructive manner (i.e., compare and contrast them, consider their implications, articulate your own position in relation to the central ideas/arguments; and the ability to support your own position).
A+	The above, plus intellectual creativity and flexibility (e.g., a new synthesis, insight or application).

Assignments 1 and 2: Reflection Papers

For these assignments you are expected to engage actively with the required course readings and with class presentations and discussions <u>and to *relate the readings and the class material to your own research.*</u> They are a sort of '*digest-and-relate'* exercise intended to get you thinking and writing about analysis theoretically, and to be able to bring analytic ideas and practices to bear on your own research data and situation.

For these papers you are expected to draw on *both* readings and class presentations and discussion, as relevant. You are expected to ***use*** ideas/approaches/analysis elements from the readings and the class discussions, to ***think about your own research analysis, or to take up (and further develop) the methodological issue in general***.

For example, when you read the literature each week and hear what is presented and discussed in class make it a practice to ask yourself such things as:

- What does this have to offer *me* for my process of analysis?

- What is *generic/general* about the particular article/class content that has relevance to me?
- Are there key concepts or ideas that grab me?
- Does it make me *think differently* about my own data, analysis, research problem? How and why?
- Does it suggest a different approach to my analysis than I am currently taking?
- Do my research questions as currently framed "fit' with such analytic approaches? (Why, why not?)
- What does (or does not) resonate with my past experience/existing knowledge and current practices of qualitative analysis?
- Can I try out a concept/technique/approach on my own material?

You can take up any aspect of the readings /class material – whatever is most useful to you and relevant to your own on-going research. This can be, for example, an issue raised in one article or a theme running through several readings, a key methodological point, a particular strategy or analytic device, etc. *The point is to 'try out', experiment with, critique, elaborate or otherwise reflect on what the readings and class might have to offer your own research.*

Emphasis should be on depth rather than on breadth – i.e., consider a particular matter carefully and thoughtfully, rather than writing a general, non-specific piece. The papers will be assessed on your grasp of the reading material and of the issues (as reflected in your discussion of its relevance to your own work), your methodological insight and sophistication (as reflected in how you identify, frame, focus and construct the issue, evidence that you are going beyond elementary grasp of the method), and your ability to articulate matters of method (extent to which you can explain/make clear what your main point is, what you know and mean). Ideally, some of you will be able to use some of these reflections when you are actually writing your thesis proposal or your methods chapter in your dissertation.

The papers can relate to any reading/class topic (or combination of) up to and including the day the paper is due. However, the two papers **must deal with different topics/issues** and not draw centrally on the same readings. Be sure to start the paper with a brief but very clear layout of the specific matter you are focusing on. That is, get it straight what you are aiming to do/achieve in the paper. Ensure that you make it clear what author(s) or idea(s) or class content you are drawing on or orienting yourself towards.

Each paper should be no longer than 5 pages (1 ½ spacing), not counting references. Electronic copies of assignments must be submitted to: Brenda.gladstone@utoronto.ca on the day they are due.

Assignment 3: Major Paper
You have three options for this assignment (details below). All must be **based on and demonstrate** what you have learned in this course. Choose *one* of:

Option 1 annotated (methodological) analysis of data

Option 2 Draft the analysis section (or part of it) for your proposal or thesis
Option 3 Analysis of a published empirical article with a focus on analysis, interpretation and writing

Option 1: Annotated analysis of data
For this option you are asked to:
a) Analyze (or re-analyze) some of your own data (current or past work that you have done yourself (like a Master's thesis, or data from another project you have worked on extensively and are intimate with, perhaps as an RA), *and*
b) Comment *methodologically* and reflexively on what you do.

You can situate yourself at any stage/location of analysis. Take on whatever is most relevant to you – early coding and analysis, using particular analytic strategies or devices, identifying themes, memo writing, developing concepts, theorizing, writing etc. Describe the process and/or the result of your analysis and then reflect critically on what you have done from a methodological point of view (e.g., what difficulties did you have? What seemed to work or not? Do you have any concerns about what you have done?). Of course, it is recognized that the piece of analysis offered in this assignment might only be a small, partial fragment of the overall analysis, and still "half baked" and in-progress.

It is expected that you will actively draw on this course to do this assignment. Thus, it is not sufficient for this assignment to just plug in some analysis that you have already done without evidencing the specific knowledge/perspective gained in the course. Take on something new or re-do something you might already have done but in the light of the course. This is the place to take some risks with your analysis – you will be graded less on the end result as much as on *the methodological insight and reflexivity which you bring to the effort*, and on the *grounding of your comments in the course*. This option can involve development of material presented in class, incorporating new ideas gleaned in the process.

Option 2: Draft the analysis part of methods section/chapter for your thesis
This option is for those students who are in the midst of analyzing their own thesis data. Here you will try to characterize, describe and discuss the approach and procedures you used/are taking for *analyzing and interpreting your data*. Do not take on the thesis' methodology as a whole, just the *section dealing with analysis/interpretation,* although it is expected that you link your discussion of analysis with other elements/stages of the research (e.g., to how the data were generated, and to the theoretical perspective of the study etc.). Your discussion of the analysis should be referenced (including course materials), provide a rationale/logic for the approach being taken (or not taken), and show a grasp of the methodological process and issues involved. Ask yourself questions like:

- What general approach to analysis am I taking?
- Am I taking a relatively homogeneous approach, or combining various elements from different strategies? Are they compatible?
- Are there alternatives? What is the logic for approaching the data this way?
- What specific analytic methods/procedures am I taking, with what effect?

- Are there particular or special issues of analysis and interpretation related to my topic/situation and how am I handling them?
- What aspects of the data collection situation/context have significance for analysis and interpretation?
- What are the strengths/limitations of the approach and procedures I am taking to analysis?
- How am I using literature and existing theory in my analysis? How do I write this into the description of the method?

Clearly you will not all be at the end point of the analysis, so your account of what you did and how you got there will be incomplete. It is an unfinished story – but at least you will get some start on thinking about how you will write your method.

Option 3: Analysis of published empirical article in relation to analysis, interpretation and writing

A third option is for students (especially those who are at the proposal stage and do not yet have their own data and analysis underway). Students should choose a recent qualitative paper from the list of journals listed in the reference section of this outline. The paper should be one that reports on an empirical (involving 'data') qualitative research project (*not* a mixed method one (**at least not one that mixes positivist and interpretive methods)**, nor a conceptual or review article) that you *consider (at least at the outset of the exercise) an excellent* paper. Using what you have learned in the course (from course readings, in-class discussions), describe the following aspects of the paper (some will be more relevant than others). Be sure to indicate how you know or recognize these things (i.e., give examples/evidence from the text). Comment on how effective/satisfactory (or not) you find the particular feature or aspect you are discussing.

- Is there a main 'story' or point of the article? What kind of a story is it?
- How is the article positioned (audience? theory or problem/practice oriented?)
- How is the researcher/author positioned in the analysis?
- How is the paper structured/framed (how is the story told)?
- What general theoretical perspective frames the analysis?
- What approach to analysis and interpretation was taken and how was this communicated in the paper? What was not included (with what effect?)?
- What rhetorical/literary devices are used in writing?
- How are data presented and used?
- Are data/findings theorized? Is the theorization convincing? (Why, why not?)
- How are the subjects of research represented?
- What made you consider the article 'excellent'? (Or, if you changed your mind as you got into it, what did you not end up liking about it?).

Finish your paper with a short paragraph saying what is the most important thing that you learned from this exercise that informs your own ability to analyze, interpret and write/publish.

Assignment 3, whatever option, should be *no longer* than 12 pages (1 ½ spaced). If you chose option 3, be sure to include with the paper a hard copy (easily legible) of the article analyzed. If you are analyzing some data, as in Option 1, you should include as appendix the material you are working on, or part of it, or an example of it. An electronic copy submitted to: Brenda.gladstone@utoronto.ca, April 19th.

Student In-Class Presentations

The final hour of all classes will be devoted to class discussion of students' own work. One student per class will present some aspect of their research, which has previously been discussed with the instructor. ***Presentations will not contribute to the final grade.*** They will, however, require some extra time commitment to the course, above and beyond the weekly readings and assignments.

Presentations can be made in any class session, from week 2 on. Who will present when will be discussed on the first day of class and confirmed the second week. However, because there are only 11 sessions in the course (after the first week), only 11 students can present. If enrolment is more than that, priority will be given to students on the following basis:

1. Doctoral students who are at the stage of analyzing their own thesis data
2. Those who are working on data not their own but from a study they were deeply involved in
3. Other students who are considered by the instructor to be at a stage (or have a topic) that might be suited to this exercise and benefit the class.

Unfortunately, this may leave out students who are taking the course in the pre-proposal stage of their programs and others who might like to put their research up for discussion.

The purposes of the student presentations in this course are multiple, and pertain to both the students presenting and to those in the class listening/participating:

• to help students get a handle on their own analyses
• to enhance students' ability to speak about and articulate methodological issues in qualitative research
• to give students ideas from others regarding their own research projects
• to inform students' thinking and preparation of assignments during the course
• to give the instructor a teaching 'prop' to address common issues and points as they arise, and in relation to concrete projects (i.e., it is vehicle for teaching).

Process for Presentation: Presenting students can speak to any on-going problem or issue they are having with their own research as long as it is either directly about analysis or has significant implications for analysis and interpretation. ***All presentations must be discussed with the instructor in person or by e-mail beforehand*** to ensure that the presenting student and the class as whole get the maximum benefit from comments and questions from the instructor and the others in the class. What typically happens is that

the week before the session at which a student will present, she/he will contact the instructor (usually by e-mail) laying out what they have in mind. The instructor will write back, suggesting things to think about, other possibilities etc. and the student will revise accordingly. There might be some back and forth. The intent is to offer the students some 'private' one-on-one consultation on their own research, and to help the student develop a session that makes sense for the one-hour session and that 'works' to engage the other students in the class. Thus, it has to be clear what the presenter is seeking input on, and the setup must be right for the listeners to engage, make suggestions, offer alternatives from their own experience etc. The e-mail exchanges, and the class discussions, can be frank and sometimes unsettling for the presenters because they can raise difficult questions, but they also can provide fresh insight and stimulating alternatives that are highly useful to student presenter.

Note that since the instructor will use the student presentation as a teaching opportunity, students should expect interjections and commentary from the instructor that will draw out generic issues, link to past/future topics, ask key questions etc. These are thus informal *working* sessions and not formal presentations of end products (i.e., this is not an uninterrupted presentation like at a conference or to a committee).

Presenting students should try to do the following:

- Try not to cover too much. If you do too much, useful discussion rarely ensues (this is the most typical mistake students make – taking on too much for the time)
- Have a clear focus, make it clear what you want to do, and what sort of input/feedback you might like from the group.
- Get the class into your project and head space VERY succinctly – give just enough so they know where you are and where you are coming from – but do not spend much time in a general introduction to your topic (e.g., no need to provide the entire rationale/background for the study)
- Plan presentation material that takes about 15 minutes, no more, to allow for lots of discussion, student and instructor comments etc. Issues will be raised that are new or that you hadn't anticipated so you want to have time to discuss as they arise.

<div align="center">*************</div>

1. **A) Writing Support**

   University of Toronto: Health Sciences Writing Centre
   The following departments/Faculties offer their own writing support for graduate students through one-on-one consultations: DLSPH, Nursing, Pharmacy, KPE and Social Work. To learn more and to book an appointment see:
   https://www.hswriting.ca/

   [Please note: Students in other departments/Faculties should see:
   https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/resources-supports/gcac/writing-centre/]

B) Writing Resources

Graduate Centre for Academic Communication (GCAC)
The GCAC also offers a wide range of resources, free non-credit courses, workshops and writing intensives throughout the academic year. To learn more about CCAC offerings see: https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/resources-supports/gcac/

2. **Accessibility and Accommodation**:
    The University provides academic accommodations for students with disabilities in accordance with the terms of the Ontario Human Rights Code. This occurs through a collaborative process that acknowledges a collective obligation to develop an accessible learning environment that both meets the needs of students and preserves the essential academic requirements of the University's courses and programs. For more information, or to register with Accessibility Services, please visit: http://studentlife.utoronto.ca/as

3. **Academic Integrity**:
    Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship in a university, and to ensuring that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of each student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the processes for addressing academic offences:
    (http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppjun011995.pdf)
- University of Toronto's policy regarding plagiarism:
  http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources/how-not-to-plagiarize
- Potential offences include, but are not limited to:
- *In papers and assignments:*
- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
- Making up sources or facts.
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.

4. **Acknowledgement of Pandemics**
    We are in the midst of massive external constraints as we grapple with COVID-19 and solidarity efforts confronting systemic racism, violence, and structural inequalities globally. Please be kind to yourselves and each other as we are all living our own unique challenges because of these pandemics. If you require any support, please reach out to myself, or utilize the non-exclusive University of Toronto resources listed below.

    > **24/7 Emergency counselling services:**
    > U of T My Student Support
    > Program: https://studentlife.utoronto.ca/service/myssp/
    > Good2Talk Student Helpline: https://good2talk.ca

Mental health distress contacts during University hours (9am-5pm):
St. George Health & Wellness
Centre: https://studentlife.utoronto.ca/department/health-wellness/
UTM Health & Counselling Centre: https://www.utm.utoronto.ca/health/
UTSC Health & Wellness Centre: https://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/hwc/

Mental health distress contacts in the community:
Anishnawbe Health Toronto Mental Health Crisis Line: http://aht.ca
Black Youth Helpline: https://blackyouth.ca
ConnexOntario: https://www.connexontario.ca
Distress Centres of Greater Toronto: https://www.dcogt.com
LGBTQ Youthline: https://www.youthline.ca

The Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research ('CQ') at U of T

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

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

****

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

CHL5115 – Qualitative Analysis & Interpretation

Class Schedule
Winter 2021, Thursday, 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.
Online via Zoom

1. **Jan 14**   **Introduction**
   Introduction to interpretive qualitative analysis; varieties of analytic approaches; 'value-added' analysis; place in the research process; key features; exemplar; overview of course; how to 'do' the course; resources.

2. **Jan 21**   **Key considerations in analysis & interpretation**
   What is (not) 'analysis'? Significance of the researcher, theoretical perspective, how data are generated, and context. Core concepts and assumptions; double (triple?) hermeneutics; the '*everything is data*' maxim.

3. **Jan 28**   **Data transformations**
   From *in vivo*-to-tape-to-transcription-to-analysis: what is lost and changed; politics and practicalities; implications for interpretation.

4. **Feb 04**   **Reading and interrogating data**
   Meaning and its interpretation; notion of 'analytic devices'; making strange; reflexivity as resource; different approaches to understanding data; layered, relational, narrative readings; contradiction; negation.

5. **Feb 11**   **Coding**
   Theory, practice, and implications of coding: types of codes; codebooks; coding, as means, not end.

   *Assignment 1 due Feb 15th (submit online)

NOTE: No Class February 18th [Reading Week]

6. **Feb 25**   **Working with and beyond codes**
   Capturing the gestalt; reconstituting, re-contextualizing & summarizing data.

7. **Mar 04**   **Conceptualizing I**
   Analytic memoing; analytic and conceptual generalization; types/levels of concepts; generating concepts.

8. **Mar 11**   **Conceptualizing II**
   Developing, situating and linking concepts; pursuing hunches; comparison; thought operations; situational analysis; reading(s) & writing as analysis from a 'post-coding world'.

9. **Mar 18**   **Analyzing different types of data: Visual data**

Explore insights generated by analytic questioning of images, their production, and intended/imagined audiences: three interrelated meaning-making sites

Assignment 2 due March 18th (submit online)

10. Mar 25   Theorizing
Different sites, types, sources and uses of theory and their combination; transforming data and concepts into 'findings'; abductive thinking; linking macro and micro level data/ideas.

11. April 01   Writing I: The Story
Writing as analysis; finding the story; strategies and approaches; audience; the politics of representation; positioning the story; taking sides.

12. April 08   Writing II: The Words; Describing the analytic process
Significance of word-craft and grammar; providing evidence; confidentiality; incorporating literature.

Writing about method of analysis; claiming your own inventions; key contested issues including scientific legitimacy and authority; issues of quality and rigor.

* Assignment 3 due April 19th (submit online)

****

Readings

For each session there are "***Required***" readings, which are listed below by session. For most sessions there is also a section following the list of required readings called "***Additional***" readings. The Additional readings include other readings on the topic that might be useful for students wishing to go further. They consist largely of readings the instructor has found useful, and/or have been used in previous years of teaching the course. Some additional references are annotated to give you some sense of what they offer or focus on.
A variety of "G***eneral***" readings and resources regarding qualitative analysis (journals, methodology texts, special topics) are also listed at the end of the course syllabus.

1. Introduction

Required:

Jardine, D. (1992). The fecundity of the individual case: Considerations of the pedagogic heart of interpretive work. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 26 (1) 51-61.

[*a beautifully expressed reflection on the nature of interpretation to be read at the beginning and again at the end of the course when it will have much more resonance*]

Freeman, M. (2014). The hermeneutical aesthetics of thick description, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6): 827-833.
[*a reading using a common concept in qualitative research - 'thick description' – here applied to thinking about qualitative analysis <u>and interpretation</u>, which will be useful throughout the course*]

Eakin, J. and Gladstone, B. (2020). "Value-adding" analysis: doing more with qualitative data. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19: 1-13.
[*a background reading by CHL5115 instructors covering core course topics*]

<u>Additional:</u>

Atkinson,P. and Delamont, S. (2005). Analytic perspectives, Chapter 32, in N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd edition, Sage, Pp. 821-840.
[*Worthwhile but challenging; not all will 'get' this paper, but return to it again towards the end of the course and it will make more sense*]

2. <u>Key considerations in analysis and interpretation</u>

<u>Required:</u>
Frost, N. et al (2010). Pluralisms in qualitative research: the impact of different researchers and qualitative approaches on the analysis of qualitative data, *Qualitative Research*, 10 (4): 441-460.

Funk, L., Stajduhar, K. (2009). Interviewing family caregivers: Implications of the caregiving context for the research interview, *Qualitative Health Research*, 2009, 19 (6):859-867.

Ribbens McCarthy, J., Holland, J. and Gillies, V. (2003). Multiple perspectives on the 'family' lives of young people: Methodological and theoretical issues in case study research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2003,6,1:1-23

<u>Additional:</u>
General overview
Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. 'Varieties of data and varieties of analysis', in *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*, Sage, 1996. Pp 1-10.

Significance of interviewing for interpretation
Rapley, T. "The art(fullness) of open-ended interviewing: some considerations on analyzing interviews", *Qualitative Research*, 2001 1(3) 3003-323.

Role, place and significance of theory in qualitative research

Giacomini, M. "Theory matters in qualitative health research", in Bourgeault, I. Dingwall, R. and deVries, R. *Qualitative Methods in Health Research*, Sage, 2010: pp 125-156. (*A comprehensive overview of the nature/uses of 'theory' in qualitative health research)*

Reeves, S. M. Albert, A. Kuper, B.Hodges "Why use theories in qualitative research" *BMJ* 13 September 2008, 337:631-634.

Gubrium & Holstein: Chapters 2,3 & 5 from *The New Language of Qualitative Method*, 1997, NY, Oxford University Press (good overview with illustration from the sociological literature of major theoretical approaches to research).

Feldman, M. *Strategies for Interpreting Qualitative Data*, Sage Qualitative Research Methods Series 33, 1995. (demonstrates what 4 different approaches would look like, ethnomethodology, semiotic analysis, dramaturgical analysis, deconstruction).

Honan, E, Knobel, M., Baker, C., Davies, B. "Producing possible Hannahs: Theory and the subject of research", *Qualitative Inquiry* 6 (1), 2000:9-32

Starks, H. and Trinidad, S.B. "Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory", *Qualitative Health Research* 207, 17 (10):1372-1380.

Wilkinson, S. "Women with breast cancer talking causes: Comparing content, biographical and discursive analyses", *Feminism and Psychology*, 2000, 10(4):431-460.

3. <u>**Data transformations**</u>

<u>**Required:**</u>

Tilley, S. (2003). Challenging research practices: Turning a critical lens on the work of transcription, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9 (5): 750-773.

Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription, *Journal of Pragmatics,* 32: 1439-1465.

Bischoping, K. (2005). Quote, unquote: From transcript to text in ethnographic research, Chapter 10, in, D. Pawluck, W. Shaffir, and C. Miall, *Doing Ethnography*, Canadian Scholar's Press, Pp.141-154.

<u>**Additional:**</u>

Atkinson, P. "Transcriptions", in *Understanding Ethnographic Texts*, Sage QRM Series 25, 1992: 22-29

Edwards, J. & Lampert, M. (Eds*) Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, Hillsdale, NJ: Eribaum, 1993.

Kowal, S. and D. O'Connell, "The transcription of conversations", pp 248-252 in U. Flick et al. (Eds.) *A Companion to Qualitative Research*, Sage, 2004.

Kvale, S., 'From Speech to Text' Chap 9 in *Interviews* by S. Kvale, Sage, 1996: 160-175.

Lapadat, J. "Problematizing transcription: Purpose, paradigm and quality", *Int.J.Social Research Methodology*, 2000, 3,3,203-219.

Lapadat, J. Lindsay, A. Transcription in research and practice: From standardization of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5 (1),1999: 64-86.

Poland, B. Transcript quality as an aspect of rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 1(3), 1995: 290-310

4. <u>Reading and interrogating data</u>

<u>**Required:**</u>
Kvale, S. (1996). The plurality of interpretations, Chapter 12, *Interviews*, Sage, Pp. 210-228.

Becker, H. (1993). How I learned what a crock was, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 1993, 22 (1): 28-35.

Mauthner, N. and Doucet, A. (1998). Reflections on a voice-centred relational method, Chapter 8, in J. Ribbens, & R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research*, Sage, Pp. 119-145.

Stenvoll, D. and Svensson, P. (2011). Contestable contexts: the transparent anchoring of contextualization in text-as-data, *Qualitative Research*, 11 (5): 570-586.

<u>**Additional:**</u>
Holstein J. & Gubrium J. "Context: working it up, down and across". In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium & D. Silverman (Eds), *Qualitative Research Practice*, Ch. 19. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
Cooper, N. & Burnett, S. "Using discursive reflexivity to enhance the qualitative research process", *Qualitative Social Work*, 2006, 5(1): 111-129
Excerpt (pp 1760-62) on reflexivity from Lessard, C. "Complexity and reflexivity: Two important issues for economic evaluation in health care", *Social Science and Medicine*, 2007, 65(8):1754-1765.
Weick, K. "Essai: Real-time reflexivity: Prods to reflection", *Organization Studies*, 2002, 23(6):893-898 (very interesting critique of reflexivity, calling for a less narcissistic version that takes into account that life is lived forward, but understood backwards).
Agar, M. "An ethnography by any other name…" *FQS*, 7 (4) Art. 36 - September 2006 [on-line journal] available at : http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/4-06/06-4-36-e.htm (about context, meaning, abductive logic as defining features of ethnography)
Baker, C. "Ethnomethodological analyses of interviews", Chap.37, Gubrium, J. & Holstein,J. (Eds) *Handbook of Interview Research*, Sage, 2002:777-795
Coffey & Atkinson Chap 4 "Meanings and metaphors" in *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*, Sage,1996
Devault, M. (1990). Talking and listening from women's standpoint: Feminist strategies for interviewing and analysis. *Social Problems, 37*(1), 96-116.
DeVault, M. "Ethnicity and expertise: racial-ethnic knowledge in sociological research" *Gender and Society*, 1995, 9 (5), 612-631
Dey, I. *Qualitative Data Analysis*, Routledge, 1993 Chap 14 [corroborating evidence, the quality of data, lies, different interpretations]
Gubrium, J. *Analyzing Field Reality*, Sage Qualitative Research Methods Series #8, 1988, pp.9-39
Jarvinen, M. 'The biographical illusion: Constructing meaning in qualitative interviews', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(3), 2000:370-391

Lofland and Lofland, "Developing analysis", Chap 9, *Analyzing Social Settings*, Wadsworth, 1995 , 2nd Edition.
Oinas, P. "Voices and silences: the problem of access to embeddedness", Geoforum, 30, 4, 1999, pp. 351-361
Parr, J. "Theoretical voices and women's own voices", Chap 6 in Ribbens, J. and Edwards, R. (Eds), *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research*, Sage, 1998, pp87-102 [challenges of shifing mid-thesis from positivist to ethnographic, feminist approach.]
Poland, B. and Pederson, A. "Reading between the lines: Interpreting silences in qualitative research", *Qualitative Inquiry,* 4 (2), 1998, 293-312
Radley, A. & Billig, M. "Accounts of health and illness: Dilemmas and representations", *Sociology of Health & Illness* 1996, 18 (2): 220-240 [distinguishing accounts from facts].
Riessman, C. "Analysis of personal narratives", in Gubrium J. & Holstein, R. *Handbook of Interview Research*, Sage 2002: 695-709.

5. **Coding**

Required:
Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). Concepts and coding, Chapter. 2, in *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*, Sage, Pp. 26-53.

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

Additional: (Note: for both 5. Coding, and 6. Working with Codes and Beyond)
Taber, N. "Institutional ethnography, autoethnography, and narrative: an argument for incorporating multiple methodologies" Qualitative Research 2010, 10 Feb:5-25
Baxter, J. 1992 The Hagerville tire fire: interpreting risk through a qualitative research design" *QHR* 2(2): 208-37 (example of use of typologies)
Charmaz, K. 'Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis", selection beginning on pg 683, in Chapter 32 in Gubrium, J. and Holstein, J. (Eds) *Handbook of Interviewing*, Sage, 2002: 675-694
Campbell, M. "Institutional ethnography and experience as data", in W. Carroll (Ed.) *Critical Strategies for Social Research*, Canadian Scholars' Press Inc, 2004: 206-219
Clarke, V. Braun, V. "Using thematic analysis in psychology", *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2006, 3: 77-101 (clear, accessible, basic text on steps of thematic analysis).
Figueroa, Silvana K.(2007)'The Grounded Theory and the Analysis of Audio-Visual Texts', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*,11:1,1 — 12 (critique and reconsideration of grounded theory coding)
Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. Chap 8 "The process of analysis" in *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, Routledge, London, 1983, 1989:174-206.
Kvale, S. 'Methods of analysis', in *InterViews*, Sage, 1996, pp187-204
Rees, C., Knight, L., Wilkinson, C. "Doctors being up there and we being down here: A metaphorical analysis of talk about student/doctor-patient relationships", *Social Science and Medicine*, 65 (2007) 725-737.(example of focus on metaphors and their interpretation/use)

Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L. "Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research", in
Seale, C. "Using numbers" in *The Quality of Qualitative Research*, Sage, 1999: 119-139.
Seidel, J. & Kelle, U. 1995. Different functions of coding in the analysis of textual data.
In U. Kelle, (Ed) *Computer-Aided qualitative Data Analysis: Theory, Methods and
Practice* (pp 52-61. London, Sage.
Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Sage, 1990, pp.57-
115(detailed procedures for coding and analyzing in grounded theory analysis)

6. <u>Working with codes and beyond</u>

<u>Required:</u>
Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T. (2000). Analysing data produced with defended subjects,
Chapter 4, in *Doing Qualitative Research Differently*, Sage, Pp.55-82.

Frost, N. (2009). Do you know what I mean? The use of a pluralistic narrative analysis
approach in the interpretation of an interview, *Qualitative Research*, 9 (1): 9-29.

Atkinson, P. (1992). The ethnography of a medical setting: Reading, writing and
rhetoric, *Qualitative Health Research,* 2(4): 451-474.

<u>Additional</u>:
On dealing with contradictions & inconsistencies in data
Blumenthal, D. "Representing the divided self", *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(3), 1999, 377-392.
Seale, C. "Accounting for contradictions" in *The Quality of Qualitative Research*, Sage,
1999:73-86.
Power, E. "Toward understanding in postmodern interview analysis: Interpreting the
contradictory remarks of a research participant", *Qualitative Health Research*, 2004, 14
(6): 858-865. (paper based on an assignment in this course!)
Watson, C. "Unreliable narrators? 'Inconsistency' (and some inconstancy) in interviews",
Qualitative Research, 2006, 6(3): 367-384.
West, P. (1990). 'The status and validity of accounts obtained at interview: a contrast
between two studies of families with a disabled child'. *Social Science and Medicine*,
30*(11), 1229-1239***.**

7. <u>Conceptualizing I</u>

<u>Required:</u>
Becker, H. (1998). Concepts, in Chapter 4, *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your
Research While You're Doing It*, University of Chicago Press, Pp. 109-145.

Halkier, B. (2011). Methodological practicalities in analytic generalization, *Qualitative
Inquiry*, 17 (9): 787-797.

***Empirical example*:**

Gladstone, B., McKeever, P., Seeman, M. & Boydell, K. (2014). Analysis of a support group for children of parents with mental illnesses: Managing stressful situations, *Qualitative Health Research,* 24(9): 1171-1182.

Additional: (Note: for Conceptualizing I, II and Theorizing)
Alvesson, M. and Skoldberg, K. "Illustrations of a reflexive interpretation", pp 285-293 in *Reflexive Methodology*, 2nd ed. Sage, 2009. [*very useful example of application of 'reflexive' interpretation, using an example from business research*]
Allen, D. and Cloyes, K. "The language of 'experience' in nursing research", *Nursing Inquiry*, 2005, 12 (2): 98-105. [*critical analytic dissection of the concept of 'experience', unsettling examination of a much-used concept*]
Angus, J., Kontos, P. Dyck, I. McKeever, P., Poland, B. "The personal significance of home: Habitus and the experience of receiving long-term home care", Sociology of Health and Illness, 27(2), 2005:161-187. [*using a theoretical construct to makes sense of/frame findings].*
Ansprach, R., "Notes on the sociology of medical discourse: The language of case presentation", *J. Health and Social Behavior*, 1988. Vol 29 (December): 357-375 [Note: *Empirical example – read for style/content of conceptualizations]*
Danermark, B. et al. section on thought operations starting p 79 in Chap 4 "Generalization, scientific inference and models for an explanatory social science" pp 73-114 in Danermark, B. Ekstrom, M. Jakobsen, L. & Karlsson, J. Explaining Society, Routledge, 1997. [*methodological theory – fairly challenging but illuminating*].
De la Cuesta, C. "The craft of care: Family care of relatives with advanced dementia", Qualitative Health Research 2005, 15(7):881-896. (nice example of straightforward conceptualization of findings, medium-intensity theorization).
Eakin, J., E. MacEachen, J. Clarke, "'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,* 01(2),2003:19-41 [empirical example]
Frank, A. "What is dialogical research and why should we do it?" *Qualitative Health Research*, 2005 15 (7) 964-974.
Puddephatt, A., W. Shaffir and S. Kleinknecht, *Ethnographies Revisited: Constructing Theory in the Field*, Routledge, London & New York, 2009
Miller, G. & K. Fox, "The possibility of analytic dialogue between ethnography, conversation analysis and Foucault", Chap.3 pp 35-55, in D. Silverman (Ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 2nd Ed., Sage, 2004 [*very good but may be challenging for some*]
Orona, C. Temporality and identity loss due to Alzheimer's disease", *Social Science and Medicine* 30(11) 1247-1256, 1990 (classic description of conceptualization process).
Pawluch, D. "Conceptualizing a profession in process: the New Pediatrics revisited", in Puddephatt, A., W. Shaffir and S. Kleinknecht, Ethnographies Revisited: Constructing Theory in the Field, Routledge, London & New York, 2009, pp. 318-330 [*finding the focus in a dissertation project; re-conceptualizing a study mid-stream].*

8. <u>Conceptualizing II</u>

<u>Required:</u>

Clarke, A. (2005). Chap 3. "Doing situational maps and analysis" in, Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn, Sage Publications, Pp. 83-144.

Augustine, S. (2014). Living in a post-coding world: analysis as assemblage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6): 747-753.

Mazzei, L.A. (2014). Beyond an easy sense: A diffractive analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6): 742-746.

Empirical example: TBA

9. <u>Analytic questioning and the interpretation of visual data</u>

<u>Required:</u>
Piper, H. and Frankham, J. (2007). Seeing voices and hearing pictures: Image as discourse and the framing of image-based research, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 28(3): 373-387.

Yates, L. (2010). The story they want to tell, and the visual story as evidence: Young people, research authority and research purposes in the education and health domains, *Visual Studies*, 25(3): 280-291.

<u>Additional:</u>
Barker, J. and Smith, F. (2012). What's in focus? A critical discussion of photography, children and young people, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 15 (2) March, 91-103.
Clarke, A. Mapping visual discourses, Chap 6 in A. Clarke, *Situational Analysis*, Sage, 2005, Pp. 205-260.
Harper, D. "Reimagining visual methods", Denzin & Lincoln, *Handbook*, 2000: 717-732
Harrison, B. (2002). Seeing health and illness worlds - using visual methodologies in a sociology of health and illness: a methodological review. *Sociology of Health And Illness*, 24, 856-872
Heath, C. & Hindmarsh, J. (2002). Analysing interaction: Video, ethnography and situated conduct. In T.May (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Action* (Thousand Oaks: Sage
Banks, M. (2001*). Visual Methods in Social Research*. London, Sage.

10. <u>Theorizing</u>
<u>Required:</u>

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

Childers, S.M. (2014). Promiscuous analysis in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 20(6), 2014: 819-826.

***Empirical examples*: (*read /skim* and *looking for different types of theorizations*)**
Antoniou T, Loutfy, MR, Glazier RH, et al. Waiting at the dinner table for scraps: A qualitative study of the help-seeking experiences of heterosexual men living with HIV infection, *BMJ Open* 2:e000697. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2011-000697.

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

Wheatley, E. (2005). Discipline and resistance: Order and disorder in a cardiac rehabilitation clinic, *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(4): 438-459.

Moore, D. (2009). Workers, clients and the struggle over needs: Understanding encounters between service providers and injecting drug users in an Australian city, *Social Science and Medicine* 68 (6): 1161-1168.

Additional:
See 'additional' readings under Conceptualizing I.
Kontos, P., Miller, K-L., Mitchell, G., Cott, C. "Dementia Care at the Intersection of Regulation and Reflexivity: A Critical Realist Perspective", *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 2012, 10.1093 [*additional example of theorizing; useful laying out of critical realism as an approach]*]

11. Writing I: The Story

Required:
Sandelowski, M. (1998). Writing a good read: Strategies for re-presenting qualitative data, *Research in Nursing and Health*, 21: 375-382.

Golden-Biddle, K and Locke, K., (1997). Crafting the storyline, Chapter 2, *Composing Qualitative Research*, Sage, Pp. 21-70.

Evans, P. (2000). Boundary oscillations: Epistemological and genre transformation during the 'method' of thesis writing, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3 (4): 267-286.

Empirical example :
Kamoche, K, and K. Maguire. (2010). Pit sense: Appropriation of practice-based knowledge in a UK coalmine, *Human Relations*, 64 (5) 725-744.

Additional:

Ellis, C. & Berger, L. "Their story/my story/our story: Including the researcher's experience in interview research", Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. *Handbook of Interview Research*, Sage 2002: 849-875.

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. (Eds) *Composing Ethnography: Alternative Forms of Qualitative Writing*, Ethnographic alternative Series vol 1, Alta Mira Press

Garman, N., and Piantanida, M. (Eds) *The Authority to Imagine: The Struggle Towards Representation in Dissertation Writing*, New York, P.Lang, 2006.

Fine, M. Weis, L. Weseen, S. Wong, L. "For Whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities", in Denzin & Lincoln, Handbook, 2000:107-131

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

Goodley, D. and Moore, M. "Doing disability research; Activist lives and the academy", *Disability and Society*, 15 (6). 2000:861-882

Hammersley and Atkinson, "Writing ethnography", Chap 9 in *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, Routledge,1983, 1986, 1987:207-232

Lumsden, K. "'You are what you research": Researcher partisanship and the sociology of the 'underdog'", *Qualitative Research*, 2012: 13(1), 3-18.

Perriton, L. 'Sleeping with the enemy? Exploiting the textual turn in management research', *Int. J. of Social Research Methodology*, 2001, 4, 1, 35-50 (strategies for incorporating reflexivity in research texts).

Rhodes, C. "Ghostwriting research: Positioning the interviewer in the interview text" *Qualitative Inquiry* 6(4)511-525

Richardson, L. "Writing: A Method of Inquiry", In Denzin & Lincoln, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd Ed. 2000:923-948

Snyder, L. "The question of "whose truth"?: The privileging of participant and researcher voices in qualitative research", Chapter 9 in Pawluck, D., W. Shaffir, C. Miall, *Doing Ethnography*, Canadian Scholar's Press, 2005, 129-139.

Van Maanen, J. *Representation in Ethnography*, Sage, 1995.

Van Maanen, J. 1988 *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press [*forms of ethnography, realist, confessional, critical tales*].

12. <u>Writing II Part A: The words</u>

<u>**Required**</u>:
Review all 'empirical example' papers from previous weeks and identify features of the *writing form:* ie use of evidence, use of literature, metaphors, general structure, confidentiality style, grammatical features (eg verb tense), voice, features that make the paper particularly effective (or not so) etc.

***For exercise in class bring the article* (**assigned in session on Conceptualizing I):
Gladstone, B., McKeever, P., Seeman, M. & Boydell, K. (2014). Analysis of a support group for children of parents with mental illnesses: Managing stressful situations, *Qualitative Health Research,* 24(9): 1171-1182.

<u>**Additional:**</u>

Sandelowski, M. 1994. "The use of quotes in qualitative research", *Research in Nursing and Health* 17:479-482.

Bringer, J., Johnston, L. and Brackenridge, C. "Maximizing transparency in a doctoral thesis 1: The complexities of writing about the use of QSRNVIVO within a grounded theory study", *Qualitative Research*, Aug 2004 4(2) PP 247-265 (19)

Nespor, J. "Anonymity and place in qualitative inquiry", *Qualitative Inquiry* 6(4), 2000:546-569.

Rosenblatt, P. "Interviewing at the border of fact and fiction", Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. *Handbook of Interview Research*, Sage, 2002, 893-909.

Saukko, P. (2000). Between voice and discourse: Quilting interviews on anorexia. *Qualitative Inquiry, 6*(3), 299-317.(tension between analyst and subject voices; alternative representational forms)

Sandelowski, M. "Finding the findings in qualitative studies", *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, Third Quarter, 2002:213-219.

Smith, P. "Food truck's party hat", *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5,2,1999, 244-261. (issues of representation; textual practices and different ways to write; the problem of representing people, eg representing the mentally retarded)

Standing, K. "Writing the voices of the less powerful", Chap. 11, in Ribbens, J. and Edwards, R. (Eds) *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research*, Sage, 1998.

Writing II Part B: Describing the analytic process

Required:

Pratt, M.G., (2009). For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research, *Academy of Management Journal*, *From the Editors*, 52(5): 856-62.

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

Caelli, K., Ray, I., Mill,J. (2003). Clear as mud: Towards greater clarity in generic qualitative research, International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 2(2).
[*Addresses the problem of 'generic' qualitative research (common in many applied QR settings) that is not rooted in a named tradition or theoretical position, and suggests core minimal quality requirements*]

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

Additional:
Burman, E. "Minding the gap: Positivism, psychology, and the politics of qualitative methods", *Journal of Social Issues*, 1997, 53 (4):785-801.[*excellent discussion of the fundamental differences between positivism and interpretive qualitative inquiry*]

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

Williams, M. "Generalization in interpretive research", Chapter 5 in May. T. *Qualitative Research in Action*, Sage, 2002:126-143

Murphy, E., Dingwall, R., Greatbatch, D., Parker, S. Watson, P., Chapter 5 "Criteria for assessing qualitative research", in *Qualitative research methods in health technology assessment: a review of the literature*, 1998; 2 (16):167-198.

Corden, A. & Sainsbury, R. "Exploring 'quality': Research participants' perspectives on verbatim quotations", *Int. J. Social Research Methodology*, 2006, 9(2):97-110.

Donald E. Polkinghorne, "Validity Issues in Narrative Research", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 471-486 (2007)

Chamberlain, K. "Methodolatry and qualitative health research", *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2000, 5(3): 285-296

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

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). Judging the quality of fourth generation evaluation, *Fourth Generation Evaluation* (pp. 228-251). Newbury Park: Sage Publications [*influential but highly critiqued model of assessing quality in qualitative research*].

Hammersley, M. Chap 3 "Standards for assessing ethnographic research" *in Reading Ethnographic Research: A Critical Guide*, London, Longman, 2nd Edition, 1998, p 58-77.

Kvale, S. "The social construction of validity", Interviews, Sage, 1996:229-204

Lincoln, Y. "Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research", *Qualitative Inquiry* 1(3) 1995: 275-89.

Mays, N. and Pope, C. "Assessing quality in qualitative research", *British Medical Journal* 2000; 320-52 (1January).

Patton, M. "Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis", *Health Services Research,* 34 (5) part II 1999: 1189-1208 [*straightforward introduction to some core ideas and cautions*].

Reference Materials for Qualitative Analysis & Interpretation

Texts on analysis, or that include significant discussion of analysis & interpretation

Alvesson, M. and K. Sköldberg, *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, 2009.

Bryman & Burgess *Analyzing Qualitative Data*, Routledge, 1994

Bryman, A. & Burgess, R. (Eds) *Analyzing Qualitative Data*, Routledge, London, 1994.

Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications (1996).

Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (1991). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications [*revised grounded theory practice*].

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd Ed. Sage, 2000

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine [*original version of grounded theory*]

Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. *Handbook of Interview Research*, Sage, 2002.

Gubrium, J. & Holstein, *The New Language of Qualitative Method*, 1997, NY, Oxford University Press.

Hollway, W. Jefferson, T. *Doing Qualitative Research Differently*, Sage, 2007.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, 2nd Ed. London, Routledge, 1995.
Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings*. (3rd ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.
May, T. *Qualitative Research in Action*, Sage, 2002
Morse, *Critical Issues in Qualitative Health Research*
Packer, M. *The Science of Qualitative Research*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
Patton, M. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* 2nd Ed. Sage, 1990
Ribbens, J. and Edwards, R. *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research*, Sage, 1998 [*very nice set of essays, mostly by young scholars reflecting on the methodological issues of their dissertations, concerning a range of data collection and analysis issues*].
Sage *Qualitative Research Methods Series* (slim, multi volume series)
Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J. & Silverman, D. *Qualitative Research Practice*, Sage, 2004
Silverman, D. (Ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 2nd Ed., Sage, 2004
Silverman, D. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Action*, Sage, 1993.
Willis, J. *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive and Critical Approaches*. Sage, 2007.

Some References for Particular Forms & Topics of Qualitative Analysis

Analysing interview data
Online Interviewing Exercise available through the website of the Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research, www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca (under Teaching). Dr. Ping-Chun Hsiung (University of Toronto, Sociology) has developed an internet accessible courseware on teaching and learning qualitative interviewing. With 37 annotated interview transcripts, the courseware facilitates teaching/learning of analytical skills and critical thinking.
Dierckz de Casterle et al "QUAGOL: A guide for qualitative data analysis", *Int. J. of Nursing Studies*, 2011, doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.09.012

Critique/development of Grounded Theory
Clarke, A. *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn*, Sage, 2005
Fendt, J. "Grounded theory method in management research: Users' perspectives", *Organizational Research Methods* 2008 11 (3):430-455.
Dey, I. "Grounded theory" in Seale, C.,G. Gobo, J.Gubrium and D. Silverman (Eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice*, Sage, 2004:80-93.
Charmaz, K. *Constructing grounded theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*, Sage, 2006.

Discourse Analysis

Allender, S., D. Colquhoun and P. Kelly, "Competing discourses of workplace health", *health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine,* 2006**,** Vol 10(1): 75–93 [empirical example]

Atkinson, P. and Coffey, A. "Analysing documentary realities", Chap. 4 in D. Silverman (Ed) *Qualitative Research*, 2nd Edition Sage, 2004:56-75.

Clarke, A. "Turning to discourse", Chapter 4 in *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn*, Sage, 2005

Crawshaw, P. "Governing the healthy male citizen: Men, masculinity and popular health in *Men's Health* magazine", *Social Science and Medicine* 65,8 Oct 2007: 1606-1618. (example)

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Polity

Prior, L. "Documents in health research" in Bourgeault, R. Dingwall and R. de Vries, *Qualitative Methods in Health Research*, Sage, 2010: 417-422

Potter, J. "Discourse analysis as a way of analyzing naturally occurring talk", Chap 11, pp 200-221 in D. Silverman (Ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 2nd Ed., Sage, 2004

Wetherell, M, Taylor, S. & Yates, S (Eds) (2001). *Discourse as Data: A Guide For Analysis*, London, Sage

Watson, T. "Rhetoric, discourse and argument in organizational sense-making: A reflexive tale" *Organizational Studies* 1995, 16 (5):805-821

Kusenbach, M. (2003). "Street phenomenology: the go-along as ethnographic research tool." Ethnography 43(3): 455-485.

Zoller, H. "Health on the line: Identity and disciplinary control in employee occupational health and safety discourse" *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. 31 (2) 2003: 118-139. [empirical example of discourse analysis]

Observation, Field Ethnography

Emerson, R., Fretz, R., Shaw, L. "Participant observation and fieldnotes", Chap 24 in Handbook of Ethnography, Edited by P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, L. Kontos, Pia "Ethnographic reflections on selfhood, embodiment and Alzheimer's disease", Aging & Society, 2004:829-849

Lofland, Sage, 2001:352-368.

Lofland and Lofland, Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis, Wadsworth, 1995 , 3rd Edition.

Okely, J. "Thinking through fieldwork:, Chap 1 in A Bryman, A. & Burgess, R. Analyzing Qualitative Data, Routledge, London/New York, 1994: 18-45

Puddephatt, Shaffir, W., Kleinknecht, S. Ethnographies Revisited: Constructing Theory in the Field Routledge, 2009.

Sanchez-Jankowski, M. "Representation, responsibility and reliability in participant-observation", in May, T. (Ed), Qualitative Research in Action, Sage, 2002, Chapter 6.

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology, Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Wolfinger, N. "On writing fieldnotes: collection strategies and background expectancies, Qualitative Research, 2002, 2(1)85-89

Critical assessment of qualitative research

Morse, J. "A review committee's guide for evaluating qualitative proposals" *Qualitative Health Research* 2003, 13 (6):833-851.

Popay, J. A. Rogers, and G. Williams, "Rationale and standards for the systematic review of qualitative literature in health services research", *Qualitative Health Research*, 1998, 8 (3): 341-351.

Sandelowski, M. "Rigor or rigor mortis: the problem of rigor in qualitative research revisited", *Advanced Nursing Science*, 1993, 16(2):1-8

Sandelowski, M. and Barroso, J. (2002) "Reading Qualitative Studies", International Journal of Qualitative Methods" 1 (1) Article 5. http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/

Seale, C. *The Quality of Qualitative Research*, Sage, 2000 "Guiding Ideals" p.32-

Sparkes, A. "Myth 94: Qualitative health researchers will agree about validity", *Qualitative Health Research*, 2001, 11(4):538-552.

Spencer, L, Richie, J. Lewis, J. & Dillon, L., "Framework for Assessing Qualitative Evaluations" in *Quality in Qualitative Evaluation: A framework for assessing research evidence*, Government Chief Social Researcher's Office (UK), Occasional Papers Series No.2, June, 2003: pp 16-22

Focus Group analysis

Qualitative Health Research (journal) collection of articles (2010) on "Collecting Qualitative Data" – most are about data gathering through focus groups.

Halkier, B. "Focus group as social enactments: integrating interaction and content in the analysis of focus group data" *Qualitative Research*, 2010 10 (1):71-89.

Lehoux, P., Poland, B., Daudelin, G. "Focus group research and 'the patient's view', *Social Science and Medicine* 63 (2006) 2091-2104 (empirical paper illustrating results of taking into account the interactive context of data).

Barbour, R., Kitzinger, J. *Developing Focus Group Research: Politics, Theory and Practice,* Sage.

Hydén, L.-C. and Bülow, P. "Who's talking: drawing conclusions from focus groups – some methodological considerations", International Journal of Social Research methodology, 2003, 6 (4): 305-321.

Kitzinger, J. "The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants" *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 1994, 16(1)103-121

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

Useful Qualitative Links, Online Resources and Journals

Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research, Facey, M., Gastaldo, D., Gladstone, B., & Gagnon, M. (2018). Learning and Teaching Qualitative Research in Ontario: A Resource Guide. Toronto: eCampusOntario: http://qualitativeresearchontario.openetext.utoronto.ca/

International Collaboration for Participatory Health Research Methodology: http://www.icphr.org/

International Institute for Qualitative Methodology: https://www.ualberta.ca/international-institute-for-qualitative-methodology/index.html

Some Journals Regularly Publishing Qualitative Research (mostly in health field)

- Qualitative Inquiry
- Qualitative Research
- Qualitative Health Research
- International Journal of Qualitative Methods
- Social Science and Medicine
- Sociology of Health and Illness
- Journal of Contemporary Ethnography
- FQS Forum Qualitative Social Research < http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqu-eng.htm> (peer reviewed online journal –international)
- Qualitative Sociology
- Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry
- Medical Anthropology
- Ethnography
- health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine

Appendix A

GUIDELINES FOR USING ZOOM[4]

Getting Started
If you have not used zoom before, you can connect via the Internet or phone. See for example, this
Zoom tutorial (and there are others): https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/206618765-Zoom-video-tutorials. (Consider experimenting on the zoom platform ahead of time if you can, how to mute your microphone, turn your video on and off, use the 'raise hand' and other features listed under 'participants' at the bottom of the zoom screen. We will also go over this briefly in class.) Plan to join the Zoom class on time.

Connectivity
Students are encouraged to connect via computer, if there is a problem then connecting by phone is possible, as needed.   When using the Zoom platform on your computer, close unneeded applications during class, to keep the video functioning optimally. If you are experiencing connection problems, try turning off the video to increase sound quality until connectivity is better, then turn your video back on. When possible, use a headset with an external microphone to improve audio.

Video & Audio
Students will be asked to unmute their microphones at the start of class, to encourage interaction and dialogue amongst us; of course, mute your microphone as needed to reduce unwanted background noise. If possible, students will ideally turn on their video at the start of class, to create a sense of community. However, if this is not possible at times, due to technical reasons, or due to privacy concerns, or other disruptions in your environment, I understand. 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 of you is recommended. Check your background to reduce distractions (moving cars, TV) or that nothing private is showing up on the screen.

Participating
We will not be using the chat feature while in class, except to post links to resources we want to share with each other. At times we will find ourselves speaking over one another, but we will get used to this, and more comfortable as we go. Sometimes it helps to let others know we are finished by saying, "that's all" or "I'm done" or "thank you", but I have found this becomes less necessary over time. With a smallish seminar group of 15 we will learn to manage the confusion that can come with the initial tendency to talk over one another (there is often a short delay on Zoom that makes it hard to know when someone is finished speaking).

Security & Privacy
The zoom platform is user friendly but can also have some security and privacy weaknesses. To prevent interference from the outside, or 'zoom bombing', students will be provided a unique zoom link and password for this course.

---

[4] Adapted from: CHL7001H F1: *Public Health Perspectives on COVID-19*, Instructor: Blake Poland, which was originally adapted from: *Advanced Qualitative Research Methods in Social Work— Critical Discourse & Narrative Approaches for Interpretive Policy Analysis*. Instructor: Rupaleem Bhuyan & Plante, T. (2020, March 20). Top 10 tips for good zoom hygiene and etiquette education. Psychology Today.

Student Code of Conduct
As we all adjust to online classes and lectures, and increasingly participate in virtual learning environments, students are reminded of the expectation that we all demonstrate respect for one another. As outlined in the Student Code of Conduct, the University of Toronto does not condone discrimination or harassment against any persons or communities especially when based on grounds protected under the Ontario Human Rights Code. The University of Toronto recognizes its commitment to human rights, equity and inclusion and acknowledges the disproportionate impact COVID-19 has on various parts of our community. COVID-19 is not isolated to people of any particular ethnic origin, place of origin or race. Equity, diversity and respect must remain integral as we continue to transition during these challenging times. The institution will monitor and address discriminatory comments or behavior including on U of T's online platforms and classrooms. In accordance with the Ontario Human Rights Code, no person shall engage in a course of vexatious conduct that is directed at one or more specific individuals, and that is based on the race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age marital status, family status or disability. This includes:

- Racial slurs or "jokes"
- Insults due to racial identity
- Online posts of cartoons or pictures, in a workplace or school that degrade persons of a particular racial group
- Name-calling due to race, colour, citizenship, place of origin, ancestry, ethnic background or creed
- Pseudonyms or handles that are inappropriate about ancestry, colour, citizenship, ethnicity, place of origin, race, or religion

The University of Toronto's Equity Offices remain available to students to provide support on equity issues that arise as a result of COVID-19. Students are encouraged to support one another and the University's commitment to human rights and our values of diversity, inclusion, and respect in managing any inappropriate comments or disruptive behaviours. If you experience or witness inappropriate comments or behaviours in your classes, you are encouraged to contact your instructor. If you can, take and share a screenshot of the inappropriate content with your instructor so they can follow-up with you and address the conduct.

Session Recordings
Session recordings for asynchronous review by students <u>may be</u> made available, archived and posted to Quercus. Recording decisions will be decided on a session-by-session basis. For example, exemptions may include guest lecturers who prefer not to be recorded, and instances where the instructor may use unpublished study data for teaching purposes. Recording decisions will be clarified during class, including whether or not it is viable to record full class discussions or a portion thereof, depending on the teaching and learning plan for each session. These resources are intended for use as a student study aid and are not a substitute for class participation.