



NUR1025H

Doing Qualitative Research: Design and Data Collection

Fall 2024

Day, Time and Location: Tuesday, 1-4pm, HSB 270

Website: <https://q.utoronto.ca> (log in using your UTORid)

Prerequisites: This course was designed for 2nd year PhD students who are writing their qualitative research proposal. Students must have taken CHL5131, JRP1000 or equivalent doctoral level qualitative research course prior to taking this course. Please see the CQ curriculum doctoral pathways for additional information:

<https://ccqhr.utoronto.ca/education/about-course-series/core-curriculum/>

This qualitative course is intended for doctoral students in Nursing, Public Health Sciences (SBSH), Pharmacy, Kinesiology & Physical Education, Rehabilitation Science, and Social Work as well as other health sciences programs, if space permits.

Total Lecture and Seminar Hours: 36

Faculty Instructor: Denise Gastaldo, PhD

Office Location: HSB, room 338

Telephone: 416.9784953

Email: denise.gastaldo@utoronto.ca

Office Hours: preferably before & after class on Tuesday

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

As this course instructor, I acknowledge the traditional territories of the Mississauga of the New Credit First Nation, Anishnawbe, Wendat, Huron, and Haudenosaunee Indigenous Peoples on which the University of Toronto 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 peacefully share and care for the resources around the Great Lakes.

A. COURSE DESCRIPTION

Qualitative inquiry offers a crucial approach to knowledge production in the health sciences because many health issues are social in nature, requiring the investigation of meanings and processes. It is a continually evolving field, characterized as much by creativity as by rules and procedural conventions. Researchers are challenged to make many choices as they define a problem area or question within an appropriate tradition or method, frame a design, and develop a proposal. Engagement in fieldwork is often accompanied by many dilemmas and the researcher's decisions shape the study design. These choices are accomplished in the context of continuing debates about the role of theory, the possibility of finding common indicators of rigour and the merit of various data collection techniques, among others.

In this context, this course will deal with the issues and activities involved in the design and conduct of qualitative research studies in the health sciences. It will build on courses in the CQ interdisciplinary PhD curriculum that covers the theoretical foundations of methods

([http://www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/Course%20map_rev6%20with%20link%20\(PhD\).pdf](http://www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/Course%20map_rev6%20with%20link%20(PhD).pdf)). It emphasizes the considerations associated with designing qualitative studies, coordinating fieldwork, field relations, techniques of data generation, data management, and data analysis. We will also consider the implications of the activities of knowledge construction by addressing the issues associated with reflexivity, positionality and rigour at various points in the design and conduct of qualitative studies. We will explore literature from the health and social sciences to gain insights into the fertile ground of the qualitative research nexus, where axiology, onto-epistemology, theory, methodology, and methods intersect. This course is guided by the value of epistemic justice, and denounces the production of absences and the reduction of human and natural life to scientific problems (Fricker, 2007). Classes will include discussions of weekly topics and readings, in addition to small group and individual exercises that encourage reflexive experiential learning.

B. COURSE OBJECTIVES

Several learning objectives will guide seminar discussions and activities. These will strongly emphasize preparation for designing and conducting a qualitative research project. On completion of the course the learner will be able to:

- Examine the qualitative research process as a series of key decisions with multiple implications related to values, theory, methodology, and methods;
- Appreciate qualitative design issues associated with establishing goals, sampling, entering the field, coordinating fieldwork, approaches to data collection, and data analysis;
- Identify strategies for ensuring rigour in qualitative research design and conduct from a perspective of “doing science differently”;
- Deepen engagement with a methodological perspective that is appropriate for the learner’s doctoral research;
- Practice data generation methods and critically reflect about their possibilities and limits.

C. EXPECTATIONS

As a seminar participant, you are expected to:

- Take responsibility for your own learning and support the learning efforts of others;
- Prepare for seminars in advance, giving careful thought to assigned readings;
- Attend on time and fully prepared to contribute to seminar activities – in case of extenuating circumstances for absence, please notify instructor prior to the seminar;
- Turn off cell phones during the seminar meeting and, when in class, use computers exclusively for attending seminars, accessing readings and note taking.

You can expect the instructor to:

- Establish and maintain a collaborative and constructive learning environment;
- Create opportunities for you to discuss your work and to receive suggestions from other seminar participants;
- Provide constructive oral feedback in class and in written format for assignments;
- Seek and act on your feedback related to the course activities.

D. EVALUATION METHODS

Students will be graded based on three individual learning activities. These components will be weighted as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Seminar facilitation | 10% |
| 2. Interview reflexive exercise and paper (due Wednesday, October 16) | 30% |
| 3. Final Paper and Presentation (due Friday, December 13) | 60% |

1. Seminar facilitation (10%)

Each student is responsible to plan and lead a 60-minute portion of one seminar meeting, selecting a reading to guide the discussion. The reading should be an example from a doctoral thesis methodology chapter related to the class content (an example of how to do research). The facilitator will collaborate with the course instructor to select a doctoral dissertation chapter as a heuristic device to generate discussion. The facilitator will use the chapter as the foundation to discuss “how to” design and undertake research (e.g. how to write your positionality; how to show your reflexivity; how to conduct data generation in groups).

Important tips for facilitation:

- a) Meet with course instructor at least a week prior to your session to review your facilitation plan.
- b) All seminar participants will read the chapter and should be familiar with it. Select key points and issues that you wish to discuss in depth. In the introduction and discussion, link it to your own work, whenever possible.
- c) Encourage discussion by asking open-ended questions, or even providing tasks for short group activity.
- d) If you plan to use additional AV such as a video or PowerPoint, ensure that it is a brief segment (3 slides maximum) and there is a clear and strong connection with your content. Plan a discussion activity around it to ensure the group is able to see this connection. Avoid using AV that is only tangentially related to the topic because it will waste time that could be better spent in discussion.
- e) Use the session as a problem-solving opportunity. Former students have used the session to consider alternative ways to link their methods with their theoretical foundations and better understand fieldwork issues they may face during their research.
- f) Be open to and encourage friendly debate – not all students will approach topics from the same philosophical and theoretical foundations and it is helpful to explore these differences.

The criteria for evaluation are: (a) promoted participation and engagement in a respectful and stimulating manner; (b) applied class content to discuss the example selected (theoretical, methodological and feasibility considerations are discussed); (c) made connections between the example and their/her/his own research (optional criterion).

2. Interview Reflexive Exercise (30% - Due Wednesday, Oct 16, 23:59)

You will team up with a colleague to conduct an interview and be an interviewee. Topics recommended for interviews in this course include health promotion practices (e.g., eating habits and food preparation) and strategies for being a successful graduate student. Other topics (excluding any sensitive issue) can be selected with instructor's approval.

Students will create an interview guide in advance, reflecting a specific theoretical perspective (see readings for class 9 on interviews). Interviews should last approximately one hour; they should occur between weeks 3 and 5. Interviews will be audio or video recorded (in person or online). Students will keep the recordings during the preparation of the paper and erase them after the paper is submitted.

The paper should be **four pages long** (excluding appendices and reference list), double-spaced, using 12-point Times New Roman font, with one-inch margins at all edges of the page. Use APA or similar “author-date” format for in-text citations and references.

The structure of the paper should include:

- a brief introduction to interview methods and the research question guiding your interview(s) (½ page);
- a section on epistemological/theoretical considerations regarding your interview approach (1 and a ½ pages), including choices made in the development of the interview guide;
- a section on methodology and method, including considerations about quality and rigour (e.g., reflexivity and positionality during the interview process, participant-interviewee interactions, quality of data generated) (1 and a ½ pages);
- final remarks/conclusions integrating the theoretical and methodological issues previously described (½ page);
- references and appendix of the interview guide.

3. Proposal presentation and final paper (60% - Proposal presentation Tuesday, Dec 10 and Final paper due

Tuesday, Dec 17)

The final assignment requires an integration of your learning in the course with your doctoral research project in two components: (1) a **five-page paper** (half of the grade) and (2) a **10-minute oral presentation followed by discussion (20 minutes)** with the course instructor about your proposed design (the other half of the grade).

Written component:

The paper should be **five pages long**, double-spaced, using 12-point Times New Roman font, with one-inch margins. Use APA or similar “author-date” format for in-text citations and references. Append relevant information as appropriate; appendices are not included in page limit. Use relevant course literature to support your methodological decisions and discussion throughout the paper.

Recommended structure for your doctoral research project document:

- a) Introduction and background: (1/2 page): For a research project format, state the problem you wish to study. You may include a short review of the most pertinent literature that inspires your thinking in this area, but also your reflexive “entry-level” thinking about it.
- b) Paradigmatic/theoretical foundations (1 page): This section should briefly state the paradigmatic, theoretical or conceptual basis you are working from, based on a rationale that aligns with your background section. You can frame this as a continuing dialogue with the axiological and theoretical foundations of the methodology/methods pertaining to the theory-method nexus for your thesis.
- c) Purpose and goals (1 paragraph): This short section will clearly state your research question(s) or objectives. These should be consistent with the issues identified in the previous two sections.
- d) Methodology, methods choices, and rigour (3 pages): Describe how you plan to answer your question or meet your objectives through your research design (methodological considerations). Explain specific strategies you will employ for entering the field/recruitment, data generation and analysis, and cite literature to support it (description and justification for methods selected). Finally, describe issues of rigour related to the theory-method nexus (e.g., reflexivity, positionality, trustworthiness). For instance, will you employ a generic qualitative design or a specific methodology? Who are the study participants and how you and they engage in the study? What methods will you use and how they relate? What are key issues regarding to the trustworthiness of your study?
- e) Relevance/potential contributions and conclusion (1 paragraph): Provide arguments to support your research proposal – what are the major potential contributions of your study? Some comments about knowledge mobilization could also be included.

Evaluation Criteria:

- The five areas proposed above are clearly presented;
- Qualitative research literature is used to support claims and justify decisions;
- Evidence of integration of course content in the development of the proposal;
- Achievement of the first four course objectives is demonstrated in the written document.

Oral component:

Presentation of the research proposal in 10 minutes with visual support (PowerPoint or any other software), followed by discussion with instructor of theoretical-methodological decisions made in the development of the design (20 minutes).

Evaluation Criteria:

- An overview of the five areas proposed above are clearly presented;
- Questions are responded in an objective manner, utilizing course content and qualitative research literature to support claims and justify decisions;
- Comments go beyond the proposal content, revealing mastery of qualitative research design content;
- Achievement of the first four course objectives is demonstrated in the oral defense of the proposal.

E. TEACHING/LEARNING METHODS

Each class is intended to support proposal development and progress in the first and second years of the doctoral program. In this course, instructor, guest lecturers and students will develop a collaborative learning environment so that students can teach and learn from instructor(s) and each other, deepening their knowledge of qualitative health research.

F. IMPORTANT UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY POLICIES

Key Dates

Monday, October 28, 2024: Final drop date to drop Fall 2024 session courses without academic penalties.

Graduate Sessional Dates 2024-25 - [Sessional Dates - Lawrence Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing](#)

Writing Support for Students

The [Health Sciences Writing Centre](#) provides one-on-one sessions for graduate nursing students. Both in-person and online support is available. Writing Centre instructors teach academic writing and provide students with feedback on written assignments. They do not offer proofreading or editing services.

We strongly recommend a visit to the [U of T Writing Centre Website](#). This website has a wealth of information regarding academic writing including information about writing when English is not a first language, writing courses and workshops, and information about using other Writing Centres at the U of T. The “Writing Advice” tab contains a host of online writing support resources. Sample topics include: preparing an outline, revising an essay, developing coherent paragraphs, style and editing, grammar and punctuation, etc.

Other Writing Resources

- [Writing in the Health Sciences: A Comprehensive Guide](#)
- [How to Avoid Plagiarism](#)
- [Purdue Online Writing Lab](#) provides a helpful overview of the General APA guidelines

Assignments

Grading of Written Assignments

All written assignments are subject to the grading regulations as outlined in the Bloomberg Nursing calendar and the School of Graduate Studies Calendar: [Current Students - Lawrence Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing \(utoronto.ca\)](#).

The ability to communicate in a scholarly manner, both verbally and in written form, is an expectation of the baccalaureate nurse and will be a consideration in the grading of assignments. All submitted papers and assignments remain the intellectual property of the individual student.

Submitting Assignments

The required style manual for the formatting of essays and assignments at Bloomberg Nursing is *Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.)*. Washington: American Psychological Association, 2019.

Assignments that do not meet the required maximum page limits will be subject to grading restrictions. Only the assigned numbers of pages will be read and graded. Material beyond the assigned maximum page limit will not be read or graded unless otherwise indicated by the course instructor. Students are advised that altering fonts, margins, and spacing to fit an assignment within the required page minimum and maximum will lose grades accordingly. For example, the course instructor may reformat the paper based on the assignment guidelines, then mark only the portion of the paper within the page limit.

Course Instructors for each course are responsible for collecting and returning all written assignments either online or in-person. For in-person submission, Course Instructors must set up an arrangement whereby papers can be signed in upon receipt. Students are responsible for ensuring that the teacher receives the submitted paper.

Students are advised to make a copy of their assignments before submitting them.

Reviewing Assignments

Students wishing to review their assignment should arrange to meet directly with the instructor (or Teaching Assistant) virtually or in-person.

Due Dates

The course instructor for each course will determine the due date for assignments and consider individual requests for an extension of the due date.

- Negotiation to submit an assignment after the due date because of extenuating circumstances must be discussed with the course instructor. The student must make this request in writing prior to the due date. A medical certificate may be required in the case of illness. If a student is requesting, and the course

instructor is considering granting an extension that is greater than 1 week, the course instructor will consult with the Program Director.

- The final grade for late assignments, where no alternate due date has been granted, or when submitted after the renegotiated due date, will be lowered by 5% for each day that the paper is late, weekends included. Late penalties applied to assignments will be calculated in final grades, even if this results in the course failure.
- An oral presentation, for which no alternate date has been negotiated, which is not presented on the assigned date, will receive a grade of 0.
- The above extension policies do not apply to matters that require a petition (e.g., final exam/final assessments). Students seeking academic consideration due to chronic health issues, or a disability should contact the Student Life [Accessibility Services Office](#). Religious observances will be accommodated according to [Policy on Scheduling of Classes and Examinations and Other Accommodations for Religious Observances](#).

Course Work Extensions Beyond the End Date of the Course

Students are expected to complete coursework by the deadline(s) of both the School of Graduate Studies and Bloomberg Nursing and are advised to plan their projects and assignments accordingly.

The authority to grant an extension for the completion of work in a course beyond the original SGS deadline for that course (end of course as stated in the SGS Calendar) rests with the graduate unit in which the course was offered, not the instructor of the course. Students should still discuss extensions with the course instructor, but the student must also submit a formal request for a course extension using a standard form provided by SGS at: [Extension to Complete Coursework](#). The completed form should be submitted to the appropriate Program Director for approval. A student on extension who is unable to complete the required course work in the extension period specified by the graduate unit may apply to the Program Director for a continuation of the extension however, the student must make such a request before the expiry date of the extension period in place. Additional information about timelines, guidelines and processes for [Coursework Extensions](#) can be found on the SGS website.

Procedure for the Re-Assessment of an Assignment

A graduate student can initiate the reassessment of an assignment process when the student disputes a grade received on an in-course assignment (e.g., midterm paper, in-course test); Quizzes, discussion posts, presentations, final assignments, and final examinations are not included in this process.

This procedure has been developed to ensure that a standard procedure is followed for the reassessment of assignments for graduate students. It draws from the [University of Toronto Governing Council University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy](#) for rereading an examination (Item 2.3.2) and aligns with the [SGS procedural guidelines](#) for the external rereading of an examination.

If a student fails a course and disputes the grade, the student should initiate an academic appeal through the Graduate Department Academic Appeals Committee-GDAAC. Steps for this process are outlined below and in the SGS calendar (general regulations #10).

The review of term work begins with an informal review and culminates in a formal reassessment if needed as follows:

Informal Review

- Students may discuss with the course instructor the feedback and grade on a piece of term work regardless of its value.
- Individual pieces of work may include: in-course tests, essays, written group projects.
- A request to meet with the course instructor is to be made within 7 days of a student receiving the grade for the piece of work.
- Meetings with the course instructor/professor will provide the student with an opportunity to clarify feedback on their piece of term work and to discuss strategies to assist the student to be successful in the course.

Formal Re-Assessment

- If a student is not satisfied with the outcome of the preliminary step toward resolution referenced above, a formal request for re-assessment of an in-course piece of work may be made. A request for a formal re-assessment is made to the Program Director after the student has discussed the piece of work with the Course Instructor.
- A request for a formal re-assessment of a piece of work can be made provided that the piece of work is

worth 20% or more of the final grade in the course.

- The entire piece of work will be subject to re-assessment; students cannot request that only certain sections or components of an assignment be reread.
- To initiate a formal request for a re-assessment (i.e., re-grading) of a piece of work, students are to submit the request in a word document by email to the Program Director within 10 days of the completion of the informal review process.
- When requesting the re-assessment, students must provide details of the informal review process undertaken and clearly detail the specific components of the assignment grade they are challenging. In the case where the assignment has a grading rubric, students must submit the rubric and identify the criteria on the rubric they believe was graded incorrectly along with an explanation of why the criteria should be evaluated higher. Without such documentation, or with insufficient rationale for re-evaluation, the Program Director may decline the request for review of the assignment/test. Please note that students should provide a rationale for a 10% or greater improvement in their grade in order for the re-assessment procedure to be justified.
- The Program Director will send an anonymized and clean (no grading comments) copy of the assignment to a faculty member familiar with the content being evaluated in the assignment. The average of the course instructor's assigned grade and the grade assigned by the faculty reviewer will stand as the student's final grade on the assignment, which may be higher, lower, or the same.
- The student and the instructor/professor involved in the original evaluation will remain anonymous with respect to the rereading process, as much as possible, and the administration of the rereading procedure should be independent of the student instructor/professor.

Writing an Exam Out of Sequence

Deferred Examinations

If a makeup sitting for an exam deadline extension is granted, an alternate date will be set as close to the date of the original exam date as possible. Students will be required to complete and abide by the Declaration of Confidentiality for Students Sitting Tests/Examinations at Other Than the Regular Specified Time.

Missed Examinations and Tests

Examinations and tests should be missed only in the case of extraordinary circumstances. Students are expected to contact the course instructor prior to the exam/test if extraordinary circumstances arise that would prevent taking the exam/test as scheduled and students must provide appropriate documentation to the course instructor immediately upon return.

Examinations/tests are rescheduled as close to the date of the original exam/test as possible. Normally only one make-up exam date is set which could be during reading or break weeks, and students are expected to be available. Prior to writing the exam students will sign a Declaration of Confidentiality indicating that they have not discussed the exam with others.

Reporting Practicum Absences in Courses that Have a Practicum Component

Some graduate courses have a mandatory practicum component that must be completed to pass the course. The process of reporting absences from clinical practicum is outlined below:

Process of Student Reporting:

- To report absences in practicum, students are required to notify their preceptor, practicum unit/organization (if appropriate), and course instructor in a timely way (i.e., before a scheduled shift).
- Students are required to document missed placement hours and/or days in the CORE system for tracking and other purposes. Students must report their absences from practicum in the CORE system within one week (7 days) of their missed shift/practicum.
- Students who require extensive absences from practicum should reach out to their course instructor in a timely way to discuss the progression of their learning, number of hours completed, and a plan for the remainder of the practicum.

Plagiarism & Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity is a fundamental component of teaching and research at the University of Toronto. The university has policies and procedures to ensure that academic work is produced with integrity and honesty. Cases of cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of misconduct are taken seriously and dealt with formally. It is important for all students to familiarize themselves with both the [Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters](#) and the [Code of Student Conduct](#).

Code of Behavior on Academic Matters

The preamble of the Code of Behaviour states:

The concern of the [Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters](#) is with the responsibilities of all parties to the integrity of the teaching and learning relationship. Honesty and fairness must inform this relationship, whose basis remains one of mutual respect for the aims of education and for those ethical principles which must characterize the pursuit and transmission of knowledge in the University.

What distinguishes the University from other centres of research is the central place which the relationship between teaching and learning holds. It is by virtue of this relationship that the University fulfills an essential part of its traditional mandate from society, and, indeed, from history: to be an expression of, and by so doing to encourage, a habit of mind which is discriminating at the same time as it remains curious, which is at once equitable and audacious, valuing openness, honesty and courtesy before any private interests.

This mandate is more than a mere pious hope. It represents a condition necessary for free enquiry, which is the University's life blood. Its fulfillment depends upon the well-being of that relationship whose parties define one another's roles as teacher and student, based upon differences in expertise, knowledge and experience, though bonded by respect, by a common passion for truth and by mutual responsibility to those principles and ideals that continue to characterize the University.

This Code is concerned, then, with the responsibilities of faculty members and students, not as they belong to administrative or professional or social groups, but as they co-operate in all phases of the teaching and learning relationship.

Such co-operation is threatened when teacher or student forsakes respect for the other--and for others involved in learning--in favour of self-interest, when truth becomes a hostage of expediency. On behalf of teacher and student and in fulfillment of its own principles and ideals, the University has a responsibility to ensure that academic achievement is not obscured or undermined by cheating or misrepresentation, that the evaluative process meets the highest standards of fairness and honesty, and that malevolent or even mischievous disruption is not allowed to threaten the educational process.

These are areas in which teacher and student necessarily share a common interest as well as common responsibilities.

Sanctions

[Sanctions and offences under the Code](#) - The University imposes sanctions on those who are found to have committed an academic offence. A sanction is the penalty that can be imposed by the Chair, Dean, or the University Tribunal.

Determining the appropriate sanction for an academic offence depends on many factors, including but not limited to:

- The context and seriousness of the offence
- The number of times a student has committed an academic offence
- The point at which a student admits to an offence and thereby demonstrate insight and remorse.

Plagiarism

When completing written assignments, it is important that students are aware that the Faculty and the University regard incidents of plagiarism as very serious academic offences and penalties can be severe. Guidelines related to academic honesty and how to guard against plagiarism can be found in the Academic Integrity section of this Calendar and on the [U of T Academic Integrity website](#).

Use of Generative AI

The use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools and apps is strictly prohibited in all course assignments unless explicitly stated otherwise by the Course Instructor. This includes:

- ChatGPT
- Gemini
- Microsoft Copilot and
- other AI writing and coding assistants.

Use of generative AI in a course may be considered use of an unauthorized aid, which is an academic offence (see the Academic Integrity section of the Calendar). This policy is designed to promote student learning and intellectual development and to help students achieve the course learning outcomes.

Risky Situations & Smart Solutions

The University of Toronto has resources to help students avoid academic misconduct. The [Academic Integrity at U of T](#) website contains information about policies, procedures, and resources related to Academic Integrity.

Risky Situations

Smart Strategies

<p>Examples of situations that can raise a serious risk of academic misconduct and violation of the University's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters</p>	<p>The following Smart Strategies are designed to provide students and instructors with information, tips, and resources to help them promote and maintain academic integrity at the University of Toronto.</p>
<p>Be careful of these real academic integrity risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering test answers • Cellphone in your pocket during an exam • Crediting or citing sources • Failing to appropriately cite information • Forgery of a death certificate • Having a friend write a test • Hidden study notes • Improperly cited sources • Resubmitting a previous assignment • Submitting a friend's old assignment • Submitting a purchased assignment • Submitting shared work • Submitting someone else's work as your own • Unreferenced quotes and passages • Unreferenced sources • Using a fake or forged medical form • Using answer-providing sites such as Chegg on a marked assessment • Using ChatGPT or other generative AI tool on a marked assessment 	<p>Strategies for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding your own voice to a research assignment • Asking questions about academic integrity • Cell phones in an exam • Citations, quoting and paraphrasing • Formulating research questions • Group work • Personal care and wellness • Plagiarism detection software • Recording lectures • Sharing academic work • Taking notes • Writing help and academic integrity • Writing tests or exams

Writing Advice

Students at Bloomberg Nursing can access writing support through the [Health Sciences Writing Centre](#). U of T also has advice for students on '[How Not to Plagiarize](#)'.

Guidelines for Ethical & Professional Conduct for Nursing Students

Nursing students are expected to commit to learning and accepting the ethical standards of conduct of the profession. The Bloomberg Nursing's [Guidelines for Ethical and Professional Conduct for Nursing Students](#) were designed to assist students to provide ethical nursing care and to meet the Faculty's expectations regarding ethical and professional conduct.

University Policies

Bloomberg Nursing Guidelines complement the following University Policies:

- [Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1995 \(July 1 2019\)](#)
- [Code of Student Conduct \(Dec 13 2019\)](#)
- [Professional Practice Behaviour for all Health Professional Students \(March 2015\)](#)

Online Proctoring Guidelines

Online exam(s) within this course may use online invigilation provided by [ProctorU®](#)

General Process Description for Using ProctorU Live+: Students must first confirm their identity with photo ID with the human proctor and write their exam in a private location. The proctor then closely monitors students and their immediate environment throughout the entire exam using webcams and remote desktop monitoring through high-speed Internet connections. All components of proctoring must be maintained for the duration of the exam. During the exam, the proctor may reach out to the student if they lose the ability to proctor the exam (camera view obstructed/loss of remote desktop view). If the proctor contacts the student during the exam through a pop-up message, voice, or a loud beep, the student is required to respond to the proctor. Failure to respond to the proctor to allow proctoring compromises the integrity of the exam. Non-compliance with exam protocols flagged by the invigilator will be investigated to determine whether an academic offence has been committed as per the University of Toronto Governing Council Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. At the completion of the exam, a report of student exam-taking behaviours is generated and reviewed by the instructor, program coordinator/lead faculty, and

IT staff. Exam grades will not be released to students until the integrity of the exam has been verified through ProctorU®, Bloomberg Nursing staff, and the instructor(s)

Privacy and Information Security

Bloomberg Nursing has a contract with [ProctorU®](#) that protects the privacy of the recordings, and other personal information. Students will be video recorded while writing the exam, students may want to consider preparing the background (room/walls) so that personal details are removed or take the exam in a room with a neutral background. It is recommended that students using ProctorU services remove the Guardian Secure Proctoring Browser and LogMeInRescue chat tool after completion of the exam.

Retention of Video Content

Recordings captured via the ProctorU® system are available to the University and the instructor for one year after a recording is made. After this period of time has passed, recordings are purged. For additional information and the [Privacy and Security Notice for Proctor U](#).

Accessibility Statement

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcomed in this course. 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. In particular, if students have a disability/health consideration that may require accommodations, they should contact the Accessibility Services Office as soon as possible. The St. George Campus Accessibility Services staff (located in Robarts Library, First Floor) are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals and arrange appropriate accommodations (416-978-8060) or accessibility.services@utoronto.ca.

Health and Wellness

Bloomberg Nursing has a Wellness Counsellor & Coordinator available to its students Monday-Friday by appointment only.

- Contact Health & Wellness, 416-978-8030 ext. 5, to book an appointment with a Wellness Counsellor or for questions about the counselling service. Students can request that they would like to meet with the “Nursing Wellness Counsellor” for an in person or virtual appointment.
- Students can also choose to see a counsellor during the academic year and over the summer at the Health & Wellness Centre, located at 700 Bay St., during its [hours of operation](#).

Numerous additional health, wellness and counselling services are offered through the University of Toronto’s Health and Wellness Centre.

- Students can access free mental health and wellbeing services at [Health & Wellness](#) such as [same day counselling](#), brief counselling, medical care, [skill-building workshops](#) and [drop-in peer support](#). Students can also meet with a Wellness Navigation Advisor who can connect students with other campus and community services and support.

Call the mental health clinic at 416-978-8030 ext. 5 to book an appointment or learn more at uoft.me/mentalhealthcare

- The Health & Wellness Centre’s Medical Services Clinic provides a wide range of medical services for U of T students. These services include routine health care services, such as [sexual and reproductive health counselling](#), [allergy care](#), [nutrition consultation](#), and support with many other health concerns. Call the medical services clinic at 416-978-8030 ext. 2 to schedule an appointment or [explore services online](#).

Navi

[Navi](#) is a chat-based virtual assistant for students wanting to learn more about mental health supports available at the U of T. Students can click on the chat button and tell Navi what they need help with or how they are feeling. From stress and anxiety to feelings of discrimination or loneliness and everything in between, Navi is able to help by quickly searching for and providing contact information and direct links to U of T and community resources.

Students can access Navi at uoft.me/navi.

U of T Telus Health Student Support (formerly U of T My SPP)

U of T Telus Health Student Support provides students with real-time and/or appointment-based confidential, 24-hour support for any school, health, or general life concern at no cost. Students can call or chat with a counsellor

directly from their phone whenever, wherever they are. Students can access 24/7 by calling 1-844-451-9700. A web option is also available at

[Telus Health Student Support - Student Mental Health Resource \(utoronto.ca\)](https://utoronto.ca/telushealth)

Family Care Office

The U of T has a [Family Care office](#) that provides education and various supports to student parents including emergency childcare passes, toy rentals, and the location of breastfeeding and family-friendly study spaces on campus.

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Indigenous Reconciliation

The University of Toronto and Bloomberg Nursing are committed to equity, human rights and respect for diversity. All members of the U of T community should strive to create an atmosphere of mutual respect where all members of our community can express themselves, engage with each other, and respect one another's differences.

Students are reminded of the expectation that we all demonstrate respect for one another. As outlined in the [Student Code of Conduct](#), U of T does not condone discrimination or harassment against any persons or communities especially when based on grounds protected under the Ontario Human Rights Code. 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.

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 students experience or witness inappropriate comments or behaviours, they are encouraged to contact the instructor or follow the Student Disclosure Process.

Student Disclosure Process

Students who have witnessed or experienced harassment, discrimination or harmful unprofessionalism can use the Faculty's disclosure protocol by either submitting an entry on the confidential [Event Disclosure Form \(EDF\)](#) or contacting the Faculty's designated intake officer Kristen Reichold, Director Office of the Dean (Kristen.reichold@utoronto.ca).

Student Evaluation of Courses

Student evaluation of courses is an essential component of our educational programs at the Bloomberg Nursing. Student feedback enables us to continue to improve our teaching effectiveness to enhance student learning. Bloomberg Nursing participates in the U of T's centralized 'Student Evaluation of Courses' system. Towards the end of this course, students will receive an email inviting them to complete an online evaluation of this course. The email will provide students with the specific information and links needed to access and complete course evaluations. Student ratings and comments will be anonymous but will be aggregated for summary across evaluations. Summarized course evaluations will be made available within the faculty and university community. Read here for more information about the U of T [Provostial Guidelines on the Student Evaluations of Teaching in Courses](#).

Please review the Bloomberg Nursing [guidelines](#) on the student evaluation of teaching in courses.

Technical Requirements for Online Academic Activities

There are technical requirements that will allow students to participate in the course. The course may include online webinars, online examinations, and assignments that are submitted online.

Minimum Recommended Computer System Requirements

- Laptop or Desktop
- 4 GB RAM
- Windows 10 or MacOS 10.15
- Screen Resolution of 1280 x 720
- Webcam
- Headphones

- Microphone (Built-in, on headphones, or external)
- DSL or Cable Internet with 10 Mbps upload and download
- A smartphone or other video recording capable device as some assignments may require submitting recorded video
- Basic video editing software included with a PC, Mac, or Smartphone

Additional Nursing Recommendations

Where possible, in addition to the above requirements, we recommend that students:

- Have a webcam that supports a resolution of 720p or above and access to a high-speed internet connection with a minimum connectivity of 10-25 Mbps download and 5 – 10 Mbps upload. This should be the students' own personal internet connection, as public internet access such as a library or coffee shop is not reliable or private. Internet speed can be checked at <https://www.speedtest.net>.
- Have 8 GB or 16 GB of memory - While 4 GB of RAM is the minimum amount of memory, 8 GB or 16 GB will provide better performance across a range of software and computing tasks.
- Use headphones - Headphones can be useful for maintaining focus and privacy while on live web sessions.
- Use Windows 10 or macOS devices - Some of the software students may use does not support Chromebooks or iPads.
- Installing additional free software or becoming familiar with would be Adobe Reader (for reading PDF documents) and the recording functionality and apps of smartphones or other cameras that may be used.
- Having two web browsers installed with Firefox and Chrome being the most widely supported options.

These requirements are relatively low in terms of modern computing standards and as much as possible we do our best to accommodate these requirements with equipment students already own and internet services they already have access to.

Students may follow up with it.nursing@utoronto.ca if they have any questions related to these requirements.

Please note: If students access the Internet through a large organization (e.g., a hospital) or are using organizational equipment, they may need to contact their organization's IT department to arrange software downloads, installation of applications, confirm internet access, and confirm internet speed. Please be aware that some organizations may also have firewalls that prevent access to certain content, applications, and application functionality.

Notice of Video Recording and Sharing

(including permissible download; prohibited re-use)

This course, including student participation, may be recorded and made available to students in the course for viewing.

Course videos and materials belong to the instructor, the University, and/or other source depending on the specific facts of each situation and are protected by copyright. In this course, students may be permitted to download session videos and materials for their own academic use, but should not copy, share, or use them for any other purpose without the explicit permission of the instructor.

For questions about recording and use of videos in which students appear please contact the instructor.

Copyright in Instructional Settings

If a student wishes to record, photograph, or otherwise reproduce lecture presentations, course notes or other similar materials provided by the instructor, they must obtain the written consent of the instructor beforehand. Otherwise, all such reproduction is an infringement of copyright and is absolutely prohibited. In the case of private use by students with disabilities, the instructor's consent will not be unreasonably withheld.

No materials from any course (e.g., syllabus, assignment rubrics, PowerPoints or case studies) can be uploaded to other internet sites (e.g., Course Hero) without written permission from the instructor as this is considered academic misconduct.

G. COURSE READINGS

Useful Web Links

1. Quercus Portal: <https://q.utoronto.ca>
2. University of Toronto Library System: <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/>
3. Writing Centre: <http://bloomberg.nursing.utoronto.ca/students/resources/writing.htm>
4. Information on plagiarism: <http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/governance/policies/academicmisconduct.htm>
5. School of Graduate Studies: <http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/>

Useful Qualitative Links

1. Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research (CCQHR), University of Toronto: <http://www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca/>
2. International Institute for Qualitative Methodology: <http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/iiqm/index.cfm>
3. International Collaboration for Participatory Health Research: <http://www.icphr.org/>

Journals of Interest (that publish qualitative research)

Critical Public Health

Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine

International Journal of Qualitative Methods

Journal of Advanced Nursing

Journal of Contemporary Ethnography

Nursing Inquiry

Canadian Journal of Public Health

Qualitative Health Research

Qualitative Inquiry

Qualitative Research

Social Science and Medicine

Sociology of Health and Illness

FQS: Online International Journal: <http://qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-eng.htm>

Self-selected required resource:

Each student should select a textbook that is relevant to the methodology they plan to use in their study. Make sure it is a text that helps with all stages of your research, from posing appropriately framed questions or goals to handling data analysis. **Some examples are listed here** but make your own choice and do get into the habit of collecting a range of references in your methodological area, as well as several general books on qualitative research. This will help you to write your proposal, thesis, and publications with greater ease.

Case Study – Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ethnography – Pelto, P.J. (2013). *Applied Ethnography: Guidelines for Field Research*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Grounded Theory – Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London; Sage.

Institutional Ethnography – Campbell, M. & Gregor, F. (2002). *Mapping social relations. A primer in doing Institutional Ethnography*. Toronto: Garamond.

Narrative Inquiry – Kim, J-H. (2015). *Understanding narrative inquiry*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Some students might prefer to work from more generic textbooks. Here are some options:

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2018). *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Flick, U. (Ed.). (2017). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data collection*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Green, J. & Thorogood, N. (2014). *Qualitative methods for health research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Liamputtong, P. & Ezzy, D. (2013). *Qualitative research methods* (4th ed.). Victoria: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative Research Practice. A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Taylor, B. & Francis, K. (2013). *Qualitative research in the health sciences – Methodologies, methods and processes*. New York, Routledge.

Additional Resources (dictionaries, encyclopedias):

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (2013). *The constructivist credo*. Walnut Creek: Left Coats Press.

Schwandt, T. A. (2015). *The Sage Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry* (4th ed). Los Angeles: Sage.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy <https://plato.stanford.edu/contents.html>

Weekly Seminars & Readings

Week & Date	Topic	Student-Facilitated Topic	Discussion & Activities
Week 1 – Sept 10	Beginning a thoughtful, just and rigorous inquiry	Students present their research problem, question, literature and theory	Introductions, course introduction, and ‘quality’ of qualitative research
Week 2 – Sept 17	Systematizing the inquiry	Students present their research problem, question, literature and theory	Situating your study: problem, questions, finding a place in <i>your</i> field, identifying your theoretical stance
Week 3 – Sept 24	Generic and specific qualitative designs	Students present their proposed methodologies	What characterizes a methodology? Connections to theory, purpose, values, and methods
Week 4 – Oct 1	Sampling and recruitment to generate rich data	Students discuss their sampling and recruitment strategy	Qualitative sampling; justifying sample size; criteria for inclusion and exclusion; strategies for recruitment
Week 5 – Oct 8	Entering the field: the researcher as the main instrument for data generation	Students present the context and setting of their study and their positionality in the study	Positionality; fear of bias or active engagement in the field? What will you do and why?
Reading Week		Assignment due Oct 16	
Week 6 – Oct 22	Ethics and power relations in qualitative research	Students discuss the power relations and ethical challenges that may occur in their qualitative research	Power relations; ethical field relationships in health science studies
Week 7 – Oct 29	Reflexivity and participant engagement	Students discuss how they will engage with reflexivity throughout the study	Reflexive about what? Participants’ intellectual engagement and politics of participation
Week 8 – Nov 5	Observation and document analysis	Guest lecturers	Types of observation; observations in health care settings; insider-outsider debate
Week 9 – Nov 12	Individual interviews and arts-based approaches	Guest lecturers	Conducting interviews; strategies to facilitate expression; arts-based elicitation and co-production
Week10 – Nov 19	Focus and discussion groups	Guest lecturers	What is the focus? Participant interactions as the focus; facilitations skills
Week11 – Nov 26	Data analysis	Guest lecturer	What are your strategies to produce quality data? Strategies for data analysis (reflexive thematic analysis; value-adding strategies)
Week12 – Dec 3	Rigour and the quality of the research: Design implications	Summary of learning	Different “takes” on rigour and quality; doing rigorous research vs evaluating research
	Proposal due Dec 17	Final Presentation Dec 10	

Preliminary Readings:

- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349-357. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/492511>
- Buus, N., & Perron, A. (2020). The quality of quality criteria: Replicating the development of the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ). *International journal of nursing studies*, 102, 103452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2019.103452>
- Gastaldo, D. (2015). Elements for writing up a qualitative methodology chapter in a doctoral dissertation. https://ccqhr.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Elements-for-a-qualitative-methodology-chapter-2015_final_0.pdf
- Gastaldo, D. (2018). Theoretical congruence and rigour in qualitative research. Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research. <https://youtu.be/BpgyxPx0RC8>

Week 1 – Beginning a thoughtful, just and rigorous inquiry

Read the introductory chapter in your chosen textbook. Explore criteria for trustworthiness and notions of rigour for your methodology.

- Gastaldo, D. (2018). Theoretical congruence and rigour in qualitative research. Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research. <https://youtu.be/BpgyxPx0RC8>
- Kitto, S., Chesters, J. & Grbich, C. (2008). Quality in qualitative research – Criteria for authors and assessors in the submission and assessment of qualitative research articles for the Medical Journal of Australia. *The Medical Journal of Australia*, 188 (4): 243-246. (PDF)

Additional Readings:

- Aspers, P., Corte, U. What is Qualitative in Qualitative Research. *Qual Sociol* 42, 139–160 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7>
- Barbour, R. (2001). Checklists for improving rigour in qualitative research: A case of the tail wagging the dog? *British Medical Journal*, 322 (7294), 1115-1117. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/126209>
- Eakin, J. & Mykhalovskiy, E. (2003). Reframing the evaluation of qualitative health research: reflections on a review of appraisal guidelines in the health sciences. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 9(2), 187-94 <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/38411>
- Gastaldo, D. (2015). Research Paradigms: http://www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/Research%20Paradigms_2011_DG.pdf
- Gastaldo, D. Re: An open letter to The BMJ editors on qualitative research. *Rapid Responses. BMJ* <http://www.bmj.com/content/352/bmj.i563/rr-21> Epub February 12, 2016.
- International Collaboration for Participatory Health Research (ICPHR) (2013) Position Paper 1: What is Participatory Health Research? Version: May 2013. Berlin: International Collaboration for Participatory Health Research. <http://www.icphr.org/position-papers--discussion-papers/position-paper-no-1>
- Levitt, H. M., Motulsky, S. L., Wertz, F. J., Morrow, S. L., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2017). Recommendations for designing and reviewing qualitative research in psychology: Promoting methodological integrity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(1), 2–22. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000082>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2020). The Value of Qualitative Inquiry for Public Policy. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 26(2), 177–186.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800419857093>

- Jackson, A.Y. and Mazzei, L.A. (2013). Plugging one text into another: Thinking with theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(4), 261-271.
http://resolver.scholarsportal.info.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/resolve/10778004/v19i0004/261_potiatwtigr.xml
- Patton, M. (2002). Designing qualitative studies (p. 209-257). In *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks; Sage.
- Rizvi, S. (2022). Racially-just epistemologies and methodologies that disrupts whiteness. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 45:3, 225-231. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2022.2073141>
- Santos, B. S. (2018). Degrees of separation: Building new homes for thinking and acting (p.12-16) + Cognitive decolonization: An introduction (p. 107-142). In *The end of the cognitive empire*. Durham: Duke University Press. (online copy at UofT library)
- Smith, L. T. (2012). Colonizing knowledges (chapter 3, pp. 61-80). In *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/lib/utoronto/detail.action?pq-origsite=primo&docID=3563227#goto_toc
- Varpio, L. et al (2017). Shedding the cobra effect: problematising thematic emergence, triangulation, saturation and member checking. *Medical Education*, 51(1):40-50, <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13124>

Week 2 – Systematizing the inquiry: Conceptual framework, purpose and research question

Your selected reading: *What does your chosen text say about focusing your research plans? How does the research methodology affect the framing of a research problem and questions? What can your review of the literature contribute? Be prepared to bring key points for discussion.*

- Silverman, D. (2013). Focusing a research project (pp. 17-39) and Formulating a research question (pp. 77-99). In *Doing qualitative research* (4th Edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage. (PDF)
- Stake, R.E. (2010). Review of literature: Zooming in to see the problem. In *Qualitative Research: Studying How Things Work*. New York: Guilford Press. (PDF)

Additional Readings:

- Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. (2006) 'In the roiling smoke': qualitative inquiry and contested fields. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6), 747-755.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85415>
- Bryman, A. (2006). Paradigm peace and implications for quality. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(2), 111-126.
- Schram, T. (2003). Engaging problem and purpose (pp.17-28). In *Conceptualizing qualitative inquiry: Mindwork for fieldwork in education and the social sciences*. Columbus: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Silverman, D. (2006). Beginning research. In *Interpreting qualitative data* (3rd Ed) (pp. 3-61). London; Sage
- Stake, R.E. (2010). Chapter 4: Stating the problem – questioning how this thing works. In *Qualitative research: Studying how things work* (pp. 71-87). New York: Guilford Publications.
- Watts, M. The holy grail: In pursuit of the dissertation proposal. Institute of International Studies, University of California Berkeley. (PDF)

Week 3 – Generic and specific qualitative designs

Your selected reading: *Read the chapter of your book that describes the methodology you are considering for your*

research project and prepare a summary of the key features of this design to share in class.

Kahlke, R. (2014). Generic qualitative approaches: Pitfalls and benefits of methodological mixology. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 13: 37-52.

<https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/view/19590/16141>

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2016). The how of the study (chapter 5, p. 99-138). In *Designing Qualitative Research* (6th edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage (PDF).

Additional Readings:

Caelli, K., Ray, L. & Mill, J. (2003). 'Clear as Mud': Toward a greater clarity in generic qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2 (2): 1-13.

http://www.ualberta.ca/~ijqm/backissues/2_2/pdf/caellietal.pdf

Video: Drs. Craig Dale, Denise Gastaldo, Shan Mohammed, Shiva Sadeghi, and Anne Simmonds. Generic qualitative design – a debate. September 2015.

<https://media.library.utoronto.ca/play.php?YTnbVTbPHOhI&id=29661&access=public>

Week 4 – Sampling and recruitment to generate rich data

Your selected reading: *What will you do to answer your research questions? Check your own reference book(s) to see what sampling and recruitment entails. What will constitute an adequate sample? Consider how to generate rich data for your inquiry and how to recruit the participants/institutions you need to conduct the study.*

Malterud, K., Siersmal, V. & Guassora, A. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: Guided by information power. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26 (13): 1753-1760 https://journals-scholarsportal-info.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/details/10497323/v26i0013/1753_ssiqis.xml

Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (2003). Designing and selecting samples (chapter 4, p. 77-104). In: *Qualitative Research Practice. A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage. (PDF)

Additional Readings:

Becker, H. S. (1998). Chapter 3: Sampling (p.67-108). In *Tricks of the trade: how to think about your research while you're doing it*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Curtis S., Gesler W., Smith G. & Washburn S. (2000). Approaches to sampling and case selection in qualitative research: Examples in the geography of health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 50(7-8), 1000-1014.

<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85424>

Draucker, CB., Martsof, DS., Ross, R. & Rusk, TB. (2007). Theoretical sampling and category development in Grounded Theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17 (8), 1137-1148.

<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85427>

Gibbs, L., Kealy, M., Willis, K., Green, J., Welch, N. & Daly, J. (2007). "What have sampling and data collection got to do with good qualitative research?" *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 31(6), 540-544. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85420>

López-Deflory, C., Perron, A., & Miró-Bonet, M. (2022). A methodological and practical guide to study peripheral voices in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, 16094069221100639.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/16094069221100639>

Malterud, K., Siersma, V., & Guassora, A. D. (2021). Information power: Sample content and size in qualitative studies. In P. M. Camic (Ed.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 67–81). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000252-004>

- Marshall & Rossman (2010). Primary data collection methods (chapter 6, pp.137-170). In *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- Maxwell, J. (2006). What will you actually do? In J. Maxwell, *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.) (79-103). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- Noy, C. (2008). Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(4), 327-344.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85423>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). A call for qualitative power analyses. *Quality and Quantity*, 41(1), 105-121.
- Reybold, L., Lammert, J. & Stribling, S. (2013). Participant selection as a conscious research method: thinking forward and the deliberation of 'emergent' findings. *Qualitative Research*, 13(6), 699-716
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/432262>

Week 5 – Entering the field and the researcher as the main instrument for data generation

Your selected reading: Consider how you will enter the field and present yourself as a researcher. Look for content on how the researcher interacts with participants, introduces her/himself/themselves, and the duration of fieldwork. Explore how the “role of the researcher” is conceived according to different theoretical perspectives.

- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2003). Field relations (chapter 4, pp.63-96). *Ethnography*. Principles in practice (3rd edition). London: Routledge.
- Rodney, R., Hinds, M., Bonilla-Dampney, J., Boissoneau, D., Khan, A., & Forde, A. (2023). Anti-oppression as praxis in the research field: Implementing emancipatory approaches for researchers and community partners. *Qualitative Research*, 24(4), 872-893. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941231196382>

Additional Readings:

- Chughtai, H., & Myers, M. D. (2017). Entering the field in qualitative field research: A rite of passage into a complex practice world. *Information Systems Journal*, 27(6), 795-817.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/isj.12124>
- Cunliffe, A. & Karunanayake, G. (2013). Working within hyphen-spaces in ethnographic research: Implications for research identities and practice. *Organization Research Methods*, 16 (3): 364-392.
- Ganga, D., & Scott, S. (2006, May). Cultural "insiders" and the issue of positionality in qualitative migration research: Moving "across" and moving "along" researcher-participant divides. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 7, No. 3) <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/134>
- Jacobson, D., & Mustafa, N. (2019). Social identity map: A reflexivity tool for practicing explicit positionality in critical qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, 1609406919870075.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1609406919870075>
- Mason-Bish, H. (2018). The elite delusion: reflexivity, identity and positionality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 19(3): 263–276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794118770078>
- Milner IV, H. R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational researcher*, 36(7), 388-400.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0013189x07309471>
- McLean, A. (2007). When the borders of research and personal life become blurred: Thorny issues in conducting dementia research. In A. McLean and A. Leibing (Eds). *The shadow side of fieldwork. Exploring the blurred borders between ethnography and life*. Oxford: Blackwell (p. 263-287).

- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and Using Reflective Journals in the Qualitative Research Process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 695-705. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol13/iss4/8>
- Santos, B.S. (2018). On non-extractivist methodologies (chapter 7). In *The end of the cognitive empire*. Durham: Duke University Press. (online copy at UofT library)

Week 6 – Ethics and power relations in qualitative research

Your selected reading: *Read chapters or sections in your reference book(s) on ethics and power relations in qualitative research. Which aspects of your interaction with participants may shape the study results? What ethical issues must be considered as you plan for your doctoral research? You can also explore the UofT Life Sciences REB form.*

Video: Peter, Elizabeth (2018). Ethics in Qualitative Research. Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research, University of Toronto <https://youtu.be/CAquVX1bF7U>

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. (2018). Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans. Chapter 10 https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/tcps2-eptc2_2018_chapter10-chapitre10.html

Muhammad, M., Wallerstein, N., Sussman, A. L., Avila, M., Belone, L., & Duran, B. (2015). Reflections on Researcher Identity and Power: The Impact of Positionality on Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) Processes and Outcomes. *Critical Sociology*, 41(7-8), 1045-1063. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920513516025>

Additional Readings:

- Bourdieu, P. (2003). Participant Objectification. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9(2): 281-294.
- Dickson-Swift, V., James, E. L., Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2007). Doing sensitive research: what challenges do qualitative researchers face? *Qualitative Research*, 7(3), 327–353. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/493826>
- Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007). Informed consent, anticipatory regulation and ethnographic practice. *Social science & medicine*, 65(11), 2223-2234.
- Fisher, K. T. (2015). Positionality, subjectivity, and race in transnational and transcultural geographical research. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 22(4), 456-473. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0966369X.2013.879097>
- Frers, L. & Meier, L (2022). Hierarchy and inequality in research: Practices, ethics and experiences. *Qualitative research*, 22(5): <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/14687941221098920>
- Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2), 261–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403262360>
- Lancaster, K. (2017). Confidentiality, anonymity and power relations in elite interviewing: conducting qualitative policy research in a politicised domain. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/493730>
- Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007). Informed consent, anticipatory regulation and ethnographic practice. *Social Science & Medicine*, 65(11), 2223-2234.
- Reid, A. M., Brown, J. M., Smith, J. M., Cope, A. C., & Jamieson, S. (2018). Ethical dilemmas and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 7, 69-75. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40037-018-0412-2>
- Ryen, A. (2004). Ethical issues. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (Eds). *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 231-247). London: Sage.

- Watts, J. (2006). 'The outsider within': dilemmas of qualitative feminist research within a culture of resistance. *Qualitative Research*, 6 (3), 385-402
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85969>
- Wiles, R., Charles, V., Crow, G. P., & Heath, S. J. (2006). Researching researchers: Lessons for research ethics. *Qualitative Research*, 6(3), 283-299.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/125536>

Week 7 – Reflexivity and participant engagement

Your selected reading: *What do you think about “participants’ roles” in research? Are they “passive information donors”, “experts”, “talking heads” or “political agents” trying to shape what is known about the topic under study? How will you use reflexivity to think and practice this cornerstone of rigour and quality in qualitative inquiry during fieldwork? To add to the problem, there are many definitions and approaches to reflexivity. What does your reference book say about reflexivity? What does it mean in your theoretical framework and research methodology?*

England, K. (1994) Getting Personal: Reflexivity, Positionality, and Feminist Research. *The Professional Geographer*, 46:1, 80-89, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1994.00080.x>

Francisco M. Olmos-Vega, Renée E. Stalmeijer, Lara Varpio & Renate Kahlke (2023). A practical guide to reflexivity in qualitative research: AMEE Guide No. 149, *Medical Teacher*, 45:3, 241-251, DOI: 10.1080/0142159X.2022.2057287 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0142159X.2022.2057287>

Additional Readings:

Ben-Ari, A., & Enosh, G. (2013). Power Relations and Reciprocity: Dialectics of Knowledge Construction. *Qualitative Health Research*, 23(3), 422–429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732312470030>

Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative research*, 15(2), 219-234.

Charmaz, K. (2006). Memo-writing. In K. Charmaz, *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis* (pp. 72-95). London: Sage.

Clark, T. (2008). 'We're Over-Researched Here!': Exploring Accounts of Research Fatigue within Qualitative Research Engagements. *Sociology*, 42(5), 953–970. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038508094573>

Clark, T. (2010). On 'being researched': why do people engage with qualitative research? *Qualitative Research*, 10(4), 399–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794110366796>

Day, S. (2012). A reflexive lens: Exploring dilemmas of qualitative methodology through the concept of reflexivity. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 8(1), 60-85.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/491718>

Defenbaugh, N.L. (2008). "Under erasure": The absent ill body in doctor-patient dialogue. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(8), 1402-1424. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/494696>

Drew, S., & Guillemin, M. (2014). From photographs to findings: Visual meaning-making and interpretive engagement in the analysis of participant-generated images. *Visual Studies*, 29(1), 54-67.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1472586X.2014.862994>

Gabriel, Y. (2018). Interpretation, Reflexivity and Imagination in Qualitative Research. In: Ciesielska, M., Jemielniak, D. (eds). *Qualitative Methodologies in Organization Studies*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65217-7_8

- Gorli, M., Nicolini, D., & Scaratti, G. (2015). Reflexivity in practice: Tools and conditions for developing organizational authorship. *Human Relations*, 68(8), 1347-1375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726714556156>
- Holland, S., Renold, E., Ross, N. J., & Hillman, A. (2010). Power, agency and participatory agendas: A critical exploration of young people's engagement in participative qualitative research. *Childhood*, 17(3), 360-375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568210369310>
- Kohl, E. & McCutcheon, P. (2015) Kitchen table reflexivity: negotiating positionality through everyday talk. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 22:6, 747-763, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0966369X.2014.958063>
- Maton, K. (2003). Reflexivity, relationism, and research: Pierre Bourdieu and the epistemic conditions of social scientific knowledge. *Space and Culture*, 6(1), 52-65. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/125526>
- Mauthner, N. & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology*, 37 (3), 413-431. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/38774>
- McCabe, J.L. and Holmes, D. (2009), Reflexivity, critical qualitative research and emancipation: a Foucauldian perspective. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 65: 1518-1526. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.04978.x>
- Ramazanoglu, C. with Holland, J. (2003). *Feminist methodologies – challenges and choices*. London: Sage.
- Sword, W. (1999). Accounting for presence of self: reflections on doing qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 9 (2), 270-278. <http://journals.sagepub.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1177/104973299129121839>
- Watt, D. (2007). On Becoming a Qualitative Researcher: The Value of Reflexivity. *Qualitative Report*, 21(1), 82-101. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ800164>

Week 8 – Observation

Your selected reading *about observation as a research method. How to conduct observations in public settings? How to conduct observations in clinical settings? What kinds of data you can (and cannot) generate through observation?*

Green, J. & Thorogood, N. (2014). Observational Methods (chapter 6, 3rd ed.). *Qualitative Methods for Health Research*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Bogdewick, S. (1999). Participant Observation (chapter 3). In B. Crabtree & W. Miller. *Doing Qualitative Research* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Additional Readings:

Atkinson, P. & Coffey, A. (2003). Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.). *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 415-427). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I. & Shaw, L.L. (2001). Participant observation and fieldnotes (p.352-367). In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland & L. Lofland (2001). *Ethnography*. London; Sage.

Mobilio, M. H., Paradis, E., & Moulton, C. A. (2022). "Some version, most of the time": The surgical safety checklist, patient safety, and the everyday experience of practice variation. *The American Journal of Surgery*, 223(6), 1105-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2021.11.002>

Mulhall, A. (2003). In the field: notes on observation in qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 41(3), 306-313 <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/38765>

Pelto, P.J. (2013). Note taking and other recording: Capturing and managing the data (p. 103-125). In *Applied Ethnography: Guidelines for Field Research*. Walnut Creek, CA; Left Coast Press Inc.

Richard, V. M., & Lahman, M. K. E. (2015). Photo-elicitation: Reflexivity on method, analysis, and graphic portraits. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 38(1), 3-22
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1743727X.2013.843073?needAccess=true>

Wheatley, E. (2005). Discipline and resistance: Order and disorder in a cardiac rehabilitation clinic. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15 (4), 438-459. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85462>

Week 9 – Interviews and Arts-based/Creative Approaches

Your selected reading *about interview as a research method*

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). Conducting an interview (chapter 7, pp.123-141). In *Interviews. Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage. (PDF)

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). Interview quality (chapter 9, pp.161-176). In *Interviews. Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage. (PDF)

Gastaldo, D. Rivas-Quarneti, N. & Magalhães, L. (2018). Body-map Storytelling as a health research methodology: Blurred lines creating clear pictures. *FQS – Forum Qualitative Social Research*, 19 (2),
<http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/2858>

Additional Readings:

Catalani C, Minkler M. Photovoice: A Review of the Literature in Health and Public Health. *Health Education & Behavior*. 2010;37(3):424-451. DOI: [10.1177/1090198109342084](https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198109342084)

Carpiano, R. M. (2009). Come take a walk with me: The "Go-Along" interview as a novel method for studying the implications of place for health and well-being. *Health and Place*, 15(1), 263-272.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/492491>

Coar, L. & Sim, J. (2006). Interviewing one's peers: methodological issues in a study of health professionals. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*, 24(4), 251-256.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/497848>

Elwood, SA. & Martin, DG. (2000). Placing interviews: Location and scales of power in qualitative research. *Professional Geographer*, 52(4), 649-657. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/85432>

Harvey, W. S. (2011). Strategies for conducting elite interviews. 11(4), 431–441.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794111404329>

Holstein, J. & Gubrium, J. (2003). Active interviewing. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern Interviewing* (pp. 67-80). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.

Johnson, B. & Clarke, J. (2003). Collecting sensitive data: The impact on researchers. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13(3), 421-434. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/38761>

Kierans, C. (2005). Narrating kidney disease: The significance of sensation and time in the emplotment of patient experience [Review]. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 29(3), 341-359.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/492481>

Lavee, E., & Itzhakov, G. (2023). Good listening: A key element in establishing quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 23(3), 614-631. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941211039402>

- Liamputtong, P. & Ezzy, D. (2005). In depth interviews. In P. Liamputtong & Ezzy, D., *Qualitative research methods (2nd ed.)* (pp.54-73). Victoria, AU; Oxford.
- Manderson, L., Bennett, E. & Andajani-Sutjahjo, S. (2006). The Social Dynamics of the Interview: Age, Class, and Gender. *Qualitative Health Research*, 16(10), 1317-1334. doi:10.1177/1049732306294512
- McCoy, L. (2006). Keeping the institution in view: Working with interview accounts of everyday experience. In D. Smith (Ed.) *Institutional Ethnography as Practice* (pp. 109-125) Lanham, MD; Rowman & Littlefield.
- Medeiros, K. de, & Rubinstein, R. L. (2015). "Shadow stories" in oral interviews: Narrative care through careful listening. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 34, 162-168. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/492487>
- Santos, B.S. (2018). Authorship, writing and orality (p. 53-62). In *The end of the cognitive empire*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Schwalbe, ML. & Wolkomir, M. (2003). Interviewing men. JA. Holstein & JF. Gubrium (Eds), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (p. 55-71). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- Wang, Q. et al (2017). Arts-based Methods in Socially Engaged Research Practice: A Classification Framework. *Art/Research International: A Transdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 2 No. 2, <https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/ari/index.php/ari/article/view/27370>
- Warren, C., Barnes-Brus, T., Burgess, H. & Wiebold-Lippisch, T. (2003). After the interview. *Qualitative Sociology*, 26 (1), 93-110. <http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/38757>

Week 10 – Focus Groups and Discussion Groups

Your selected reading *about focus group as a research method*

- Krueger, R. (1998) Developing questions for focus groups (book 3). In D. Morgan & R. Krueger (Eds). *The Focus Group Kit*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. (PDF)
- Kitzinger, J. & Barbour, R. (1999). Introduction: the challenge and promise of focus group (chapter 1). In Barbour, R. & Kitzinger, J. (Eds) (1999). *Developing focus group research – politics, theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. (PDF)
- Example: Rodney, R., Gastaldo, D., Trotz, D. A., & Crooks, C. V. (2022). Sex as Boys' Fame, But Girls' Shame: Adversarial Adolescent Gender Roles and Gender-based Violence in Guyana. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(21-22), NP19237-NP19264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211043585>
- Video: Solbjor, Marit (2024). Hegemonic masculinity in focus groups on men's health. Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qAiywZodNxw> (starts at 8:10)

Additional Readings:

- Barbour, R. (2007). Uses and abuses of focus groups (chapter 2). In *Doing Focus Groups*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. (PDF)
- Barbour, R. & Kitzinger, J. (Eds) (1999). *Developing focus group research – politics, theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Baskin, C. Storytelling circles. (2005). Reflections of Aboriginal protocols in research. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 22 (2): 171-187 https://www-jstor-org.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/stable/41669834?casa_token=5tOiF5r2foMAAAAAA%3AHU4XLAhi7SmTfgaQniuHyOPNhK0_gS1qXdVF6apswXU_gCh4GOPM728bIzG-VieF0A6FRuVz4nqZ5O0IYkh08Uq5nSbYZH0Xm-Vtmsz65JAEtu89WNnE-w&seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Daniels, N., Gillen, P., Casson, K., & Wilson, I. (2019). STEER: Factors to consider when designing online focus groups using audiovisual technology in health research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, 1609406919885786 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1609406919885786>

Falter, M., Arenas, A. A., Maples, G. W., Smith, C. T., Lamb, L. J., Anderson, M. G., Uzzell, E. M., Jacobs, L. E., Cason, X. L., Griffis, T. A., Polzin, M., & Wafa, N. Z. (2022). Making Room for Zoom in Focus Group Methods: Opportunities and Challenges for Novice Researchers (During and Beyond COVID-19). *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-23.1.3768>

Green, J & Hart, L. (1999). The impact of context on data (chapter 2). In Barbour, R. & Kitzinger, J. (Eds) (1999). *Developing focus group research – politics, theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Liamputtong, P. (2011). *The focus group methodology: principles and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

D. Morgan & R. Krueger (Eds) (1998). *The Focus Group Kit*. Thousand Oaks: Sage (7 volumes).

MacNaghten, P. & Myers, Greg. (2004). Focus groups (chapter 4). In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium & D. Silverman (Eds). *Qualitative research practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sim, J., & Waterfield, J. (2019). Focus group methodology: some ethical challenges. *Quality & quantity*, 53(6), 3003-3022. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11135-019-00914-5>

Tachine, A. R., Bird, E. Y., & Cabrera, N. L. (2016). Sharing circles: An Indigenous methodological approach for researching with groups of Indigenous peoples. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 9(3), 277-295. <https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2016.9.3.277>

Van de Ven, A. H., & Delbecq, A. L. (1972). The nominal group as a research instrument for exploratory health studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 62(3), 337-342. <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/pdf/10.2105/AJPH.62.3.337>

Week 11 – Data Analysis

Your selected reading about quality data analysis according to your methodology.

Eakin, J. M., & Gladstone, B. (2020). “Value-adding” analysis: Doing more with qualitative data. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 1609406920949333. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1609406920949333>

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2023). Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common problems and becoming a knowing researcher. *International Journal of Transgender Health*, 24(1), 1-6. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597>

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2019) Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11:4, 589-597, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>

Example: Thulien, N.S., Hwang, S.W., Kozloff, N. et al. (2023). “When I think about my future, I just see darkness”: How youth exiting homelessness navigate the hazy, liminal space between socioeconomic exclusion and inclusion. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 114, 893–905 <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-023-00804-2>

Additional Readings: (see CQ’s course on qualitative analysis and interpretation CHL5115)

Birt L, Scott S, Cavers D, Campbell C, Walter F. (2016). Member Checking: A Tool to Enhance Trustworthiness or Merely a Nod to Validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, 26 (13): 1802-1811. doi: 10.1177/1049732316654870. Epub 2016 Jul 10. PMID: 27340178.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27340178/#:~:text=Member%20checking%2C%20also%20known%20as,and%20resonance%20with%20their%20experiences>

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3:2, 77-101, DOI: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa?needAccess=true>

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Sage Publications.

Buckley, R. (2022). Ten steps for specifying saturation in qualitative research. *Social Science & Medicine*, 309, 115217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115217>

Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical teacher*, 42(8), 846-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030>

Sebele-Mpofu, Favourate Y. & Serpa, Sandro (2020). Saturation controversy in qualitative research: Complexities and underlying assumptions. A literature review. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 6:1, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/23311886.2020.1838706?needAccess=true&role=button>

Week 12 – Rigour and the quality of research: Strategies and Design Implications

Your selected reading about rigour and quality in qualitative research according to your methodology. Make a summary of what constitutes quality in your methodology and, in particular, in your study.

Ohito, E. O., & Nyachae, T. M. (2019). Poetically poking at language and power: Using Black feminist poetry to conduct rigorous feminist critical discourse analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 25(9-10), 839-850.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418786303>

Seale, C. (1999). Accounting for contradiction (chapter 6). *The quality of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. (PDF)

Additional Readings:

Giacomini, M., Cook, D., & DeJean, D. (2009). Life support decision making in critical care: Identifying and appraising the qualitative research evidence. *Critical Care Medicine*, 37(4), 1475-1482.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/125593>

Porter, S. (2007). Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: Reasserting realism in qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60(1), 79-86.
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/125595>

Additional Readings About Qualitative Researchers' Academic Careers:

Hall, J. M. (2013). The power of qualitative inquiry – Traumatic experiences of marginalized groups (Chapter 4). In C. T. Beck (Ed). *Routledge International Handbook of Qualitative Nursing Research*. New York: Routledge.
<https://www-routledgehandbooks-com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doi/10.4324/9780203409527.ch4>

Webster, F., Gastaldo, D., Durant, S., Eakin, J., Gladstone, B., Parsons, J., Peter, E. & Shaw, J. Doing science differently: A framework for assessing the careers of qualitative scholars in the health sciences. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18:1-7.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1609406919838676>

Shaw J, Gagnon M, Carson A, et al. Advancing the Impact of Critical Qualitative Research on Policy, Practice, and Science. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. January 2022
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/16094069221076929>

Brinkmann, S. (2011). Qualitative research between craftsmanship and McDonalidization. A keynote address from

the 17th Qualitative Health Research Conference. (PDF)

Hart, C., Poole, J., Facey, M. & Parsons, J. (2017). Holding firm: power, push back, and opportunities in navigating the liminal space of critical qualitative health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(12): 1765-1774. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1049732317715631>

Nolen, A., & Talbert, T. (2011). Qualitative assertions as prescriptive statements. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(2), 263-271. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10648-011-9159-6>



The Centre for Critical Qualitative Health Research ('CQ') at the University of Toronto
This course is part of CQ's Essentials of Qualitative Research curriculum. CQ is an extra-departmental unit in the Dalla Lana School of Public Health also supported by the Faculties of Kinesiology and Physical Education, Nursing, Pharmacy, Social Work, and the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute. CQ builds capacity in the health sciences to advance critical and theoretically informed qualitative inquiry. As a hub for researchers, graduate students, and professors teaching qualitative methodology, its academic fellows promote research that addresses the socio-political dimensions of health and questions prevailing assumptions that naturalize health, for example, as individual and biological phenomena. Visit the CQ website www.ccqhr.utoronto.ca to learn more about CQ's resources and activities, which include other QR courses (Essentials of Qualitative Research Course Series), free methodology seminars (At the Centre Speaker Series; 3-4 seminars per term), the Certificate in Advanced Training in Qualitative Health Research Methodology for PhD students, and the Joan Eakin Award for Methodological Excellence in a Qualitative Doctoral Dissertation.