



The University of British Columbia
School of Social Work
 Course Outline - 554C

School Vision: Building upon a foundation of social justice and an ethic of care, we are a community of learners actively engaged in the development of critical, transformative knowledge for social work practice.

Year/Term	2016-2017 (Term 1)
Course Title	SOWK 554C (Sec 002) - Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research
Course Schedule	Fridays, 9 a.m. – 12 p.m.
Course Location	Jack Bell Building, Room 223

Instructor	Office Location	Office Phone	E-mail address
Dr. Gloria Puurveen			gloriapurveen@gmail.com

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course provides an overview of the art and science of qualitative research. The first term will focus on the theoretical and methodological foundations of qualitative research. We will pay close attention to knowledge construction, the different approaches to qualitative inquiry, and conducting ethically sound and rigorous research along the research process. We will also focus on developing a research proposal. The second term will provide the opportunity to apply this understanding through the implementation of the student’s proposed study. We will pay close attention to the different elements of conducting fieldwork, analysing data, and representation of that data.

This section of the course may be useful for students interested in critical, participatory, and arts-based approaches to doing qualitative research.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

- Understand and articulate the ontological, epistemological, methodological, and ethical issues in qualitative research.
- Distinguish amongst strategies of inquiry used in qualitative research.
- Evaluate qualitative research.
- Formulate research questions and construct a research plan to examine those questions.
- Design and conduct field research including participant observation, interviews, and arts-based elicitation methods.
- Analyze and effectively represent data.
- Critically examining issues such as ethics, the role of the researcher, and representation.
- Write an effective research report and prepare an effective presentation.

COURSE STRUCTURE:

The course is structured as a participatory seminar and will consist of group discussions, lectures, guest presentations, practical and arts-based exercises, small group work, peer review, and the completion of research assignments. Seminar participants will conduct a small research project (in term 2), and will be responsible for the design, implementation, write-up, and presentation of the project.

COURSE MATERIALS:

There is no required textbook for the course. Required weekly readings are indicated in the course schedule, and students are welcome to make suggestions for alternative readings.

RELEVANT JOURNALS:

Arts in Health

Qualitative Health Research

Qualitative Inquiry

Qualitative Social Work

Visual Methodologies

EVALUATION

Methods of Evaluation (Term 1):

All written assignments for this course must be in 12-point font, double spacing, and one-inch margin on all sides. All assignments should be in MS Word (or Mac Pages) format. APA citation and referencing style is required. I also recommend referring to the APA style guide. Purdue University has useful quick guides for APA:
<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

1. Ethics Review Tutorial (5%)

Due: October 21st

It is a requirement for this tutorial to be completed before you can submit your ethics application for review. It will take you about 2-3 hours to complete. A certificate is available in English or French for printing upon completion and will be evidence of your completion of this assignment.

You can access the tutorial from: www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/education/tutorial-didacticiel/ or from: <http://ethics.research.ubc.ca/education-training/online-tutorials-training>

2. Literature Review: Conceptual Context and Research Questions (15%) Due: October 28th

The purpose of this assignment is to help you synthesize the literature into a conceptual story that lays the rationale and foundation for your research and research questions. Review ten recent scholarly sources relevant to your project. Use these to develop a map of the literature related to your topic and an outline of the conceptual context. Conclude by identifying your research question(s).

Length: 8-10 pages (double-spaced) excluding references

3. Ethics Review (5%)

Due: November 18th

Submit request for ethical review for UBC Behavioural Ethics Review Board (BREB), including consent form, introductory letter, and letter from agency agreeing to participation (if applicable). The BREB deadline to approve application at December meeting is November 25th, 2016.

4. Research Proposal (25%)

Due: December 11th

Submit a research proposal according to attached guidelines.

Length: 18-20 pages including references and appendices

5. Participation (5%)

Ongoing

As it is vital that students attend and actively take part in each class, course participation is a key element of evaluation. In addition to contributing to the discussion in each class, students will lead a discussion on one reading (per term) from the required reading list (or you can suggest an alternative reading, but let the instructor know before hand, so the reading can be given to the class in advance). You will provide a verbal summary of the reading (you may use Prezi or PowerPoint as a presentation aid) and provide a couple questions that provoke a discussion; experiential activities are also welcomed.

Submitting Assignments

Assign a file name to your assignments with your name and assignment number. Paper copy is not needed. Please send your assignments electronically to my email: gloriapurveen@gmail.com

I will comment and mark assignments using track changes and comments. Assignments and grade will be returned to the student via email.

At-a-Glance Course Outline (Term One)

NB: Course schedule is subject to change.

WEEK	TOPIC	REQUIRED READINGS
September 9	Introduction to course; the place of qualitative research in health and social care	There are no required readings for this class
September 16	Conceptual location of qualitative research	<p>Lincoln, Y.S., Lynham, S.A., & Guba, E.G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences revisited. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). <i>The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research</i>, (4th ed.) (pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (On reserve)</p> <p>Campbell, R., & Wasco, S.M. (2000). Feminist approaches to social science: Epistemological and methodological tenets. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i>, 28(6), 773-791. doi: 10.1023/A:1005159716099</p> <p>Eisner, E. (2008). Art and knowledge. In J.G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), <i>Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspective, methodologies, examples, and issues</i> (pp. 3-12). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. (ebook)</p> <p>Wilson, S. (2001). What is an indigenous research methodology? <i>Canadian Journal of Native Education</i>, 25(2), 175-179.</p>
September 23	Use of library resources	MEET IN KOERNER LIBRARY ROOM 217 (2 nd Floor)
	Initial steps in the research process: Developing a literature review and conceptual framework	<p>Maxwell, J.A. (2013). <i>Qualitative research design: An interactive approach</i> (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (see Chapters 3 & 4).</p> <p>Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedures. <i>International Institute for Qualitative Methodology</i>. Retrieved from: https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/viewFile/6118/5892</p> <p>Janesick, V.J. (2001). Intuition and creativity: A pas de deux for qualitative researchers. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i>, 7(5). doi: 10.1177/107780040100700501</p>
October 7	Strategies of Inquiry 1: Case study, ethnography and	Luck, L., Jackson, D., Usher, K. (2006). Case study: A bridge across the paradigms. <i>Nursing Inquiry</i> , 13(2), 103-109. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1800.2006.00309

	arts-based methods	Adler, P.A., & Adler, P. (2008). Of rhetoric and representation: the four faces of ethnography <i>The Sociological Quarterly</i> , 49, pp. 1-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00104. Fraser, K. D., & al Sayah, F. (2011). Arts-based methods in health research: A systematic review of the literature. <i>Arts & Health</i> , 3(2), 110–145. doi:10.1080/17533015.2011.561357
October 13	Research Presentations by former SOWK students (combined class with other sections). Time TBA.	
October 14	Strategies of Inquiry 2: Phenomenology, Grounded Theory	Laverty, S.M. (2003). Hermeneutic phenomenology and phenomenology: a comparison of historical and methodological considerations. <i>International Journal of Qualitative Methods</i> , 2(3), 1-25. http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/2_3final/pdf/laverty.pdf Charmaz, K. (2008). Constructionism and the grounded theory method. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), <i>Handbook of constructionist research</i> (pp.397-412). New York, NY: Guildford Press. (ebook) Mills, J, Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). Adopting a constructivist approach to grounded theory: Implications for research design. <i>International Journal of Nursing Practice</i> , 12, 8-13.
October 21	Applying Critical Theory: From methodology to analysis to knowledge translation	Guest Lecture: Bindy Kang Readings TBD
ASSIGNMENT ONE: ETHICS TUTORIAL DUE		
October 28	Ethics in qualitative research	Guillman, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and “ethically important moments” in research. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i> 10(2), 261-280. Morse, J.M. (2007). Ethics in action: Ethical principles for doing qualitative health research. <i>Qualitative Health Research</i> , 17, 1003-1006. doi: 10.1177/1049732307308197 UBC Ethics Review: Review guidelines and instructions: http://research.ubc.ca/ore/breb-forms-guidance-notes
ASSIGNMENT TWO: CONCEPTUAL CONTEXT AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS (October 28)		
November 4	Research Methods	Guest Speaker: Lillian Hung

		<p>Gergen, K.J. From mirroring to world-making: Research as future forming. <i>Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour</i>, 45(3), 287-310. doi: 10.1111/jtsb.12075.</p> <p>Given, L. (2008). <i>Sage encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods</i>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. See chapters on interview guides/interviewing/unstructured interviews, participant observation, visual research, and arts-based research. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.4135/9781412963909.n17</p> <p>Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough?: An experiment with data saturation and variability. <i>Field Methods</i>, 18, 59-82. doi: 10.1177/1525822X05279903</p>
November 11 REMEMBRANCE DAY – NO CLASS		
November 18	Critical Reflexivity and Trustworthiness	<p>Ben-Ari, A., & Enosh, G. (2010). Process of reflectivity: Knowledge construction in qualitative research. <i>Qualitative Social Work</i>, 10(2), 152-171.</p> <p>McCorkel, J., & Meyers, K. (2003). What difference does difference make? Position and privilege in the field. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 26(2): 199-231. doi: 10.1023/A:1022967012774</p> <p>Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education</i>, 16(2), 175-196. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000060635</p> <p>Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Leech, N.L. (2007). Validity and qualitative research: An oxymoron? <i>Quality and Quantity</i>, 41, 233-249. doi: 10.1007/s11135-006-9000-3</p> <p>Sandelowski, M. (1993). Rigor or rigor mortis. The problem of rigor in qualitative research revisited. <i>Advances in Nursing Science</i>, 16 (2), 1-8.</p> <p>Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i>, 5(4), 465-478. doi: 10.1177/107780049900500402</p> <p>Tracy, S.J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight ‘big-tent’ criteria for excellent qualitative research. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i>, 16(10), 837-851. doi: 10.1177/1077800420383121</p>
ASSIGNMENT TWO: ETHICS REVIEW (Due November 18)		
November 25	NO CLASS	Recommend using this time to work on your research proposals!
December 2	Being a qualitative researcher	No readings for this week.

ASSIGNMENT THREE DUE (DECEMBER 11)

Detailed Course Outline (Term One)

NB: Course schedule is subject to change.

Week One (September 9th): Introduction

- Discuss past experience with qualitative research, interests, expectations, and research interests
- Review of the course: content, assignments, and expectations
- Introduction to key concepts
- Usefulness of qualitative research in health and social care: Engaging with qualitative research that is relevant, respectful, transformative, and rigorous.

Readings (not required reading)

- Alasuutari, P. (2010). The rise and relevance of qualitative research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(2), 139-155. doi: 10.1080/13645570902966056
- Fraser, H. (2009). Trying to complete socially just, politically sensitive social work research. *Journal of Social Work*, 9(1), 87-98. doi: 10.1177/14668017308098433
- Wuff, D., & St. George, S. (2016). Researcher as practitioner: Practitioner as researcher. In S. St. George & D. Wuff (Eds.), *Family therapy as socially transformative practice* (pp. 25-40). Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-29188-8_3

Week Two (September 16th): Conceptual Location of Qualitative Research

This week we focus on the epistemologies and theories of qualitative research. We will address the debate about qualitative and quantitative research, examine different conceptual locations of research (i.e., theory and ways of knowing) and we will examine how theoretical frameworks affect our approach to research topics and questions. NB: Critical theory will be addressed in Week 7.

Required Readings:

- Lincoln, Y.S., Lynham, S.A., & Guba, E.G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences revisited. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (4th ed.) (pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (On reserve)
- Campbell, R., & Wasco, S.M. (2000). Feminist approaches to social science: Epistemological and methodological tenets. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(6), 773-791. doi: 10.1023/A:1005159716099
- Eisner, E. (2008). Art and knowledge. In J.G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspective, methodologies, examples, and issues* (pp. 3-12). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. (ebook)

Wilson, S. (2001). What is an indigenous research methodology? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 25(2), 175-179.

Additional Readings (not required):

Atkinson, P. (1995). Some perils of paradigms. *Qualitative Health Research*, 5(3), 117-124.

Browne, A. J., Smye, V. L., & Varcoe, C. (2005). The relevance of postcolonial theoretical perspectives to research in Aboriginal health. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 37(4), 16-37.

Boris, E. (1994). Dialogue - Gender, race, and rights: Listening to critical race theory. *Journal of Women's History*, 6 (2), 111-124.

Carter & Little (2007): Justifying knowledge, justifying method, taking action: Epistemologies, methodology, and methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10). doi: 10.1177/1049732307306927

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.

Getty G.A. (2010). The journey between Western and Indigenous research paradigms. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 21(1):5-14. doi: 10.1177/1043659609349062

Weinberg, D. (2008). The philosophical foundations of constructionist research. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *The handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 13-40). New York, NY: Guildford Press. (ebook)

Zavala, M. (2013). What do we mean by decolonizing research strategies? Lessons from decolonizing indigenous research projects in New Zealand and Latin America. *Decolonization Indigeneity Education & Society* 2(1), 55-71.

Week Three (September 23rd): Use of Library Resources

Meet in ROOM 217 (2nd Floor) of the KOERNER library at 9AM.

For orientation on social work research: <http://guides.library.ubc.ca/socialwork>

Week Four (September 30th): Initial Steps in the Research Process

In this session we will be exploring the conceptual basis for research proposals. Specifically, we will first discuss how your research ideas/topic informs the literature review and the conceptual groundings of your research. We then will explore the construction of research questions, their relationship to the conceptual foundation, and the role of curiosity and intuition in making connection between concepts and prompting research questions.

Required Readings:

Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (see Chapters 3 & 4).

Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedures. *International Institute for Qualitative Methodology*. Retrieved from: <https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/viewFile/6118/5892>

Janesick, V.J. (2001). Intuition and creativity: A pas de deux for qualitative researchers. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(5). doi: 10.1177/107780040100700501

Additional Readings (not required):

Kastner, M., Antony, J., Soobiah, C., Straus, S.E., Tricco, A.C. (2016). Conceptual recommendations for selecting the most appropriate knowledge synthesis method to answer research questions related to complex evidence. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 73, 43-49. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.11.022

Week Five and Six (October 7th and 14th): Strategies of Inquiry

**Please note that we will be meeting on October 13th (with students from the other 2 sections) for research presentations by former SOWK 554C students. We will still have class on the 14th, but as discussed, we will start at 10AM instead of 9AM.

In these sessions we will explore different strategies of inquiry associated with qualitative research. We will consider the issues related to research design, data collection and analysis, as well as the position of the researcher and the challenges and criticisms associated with the strategy. We will also discuss make linkages to the different theories/ways of knowing discussed in week two.

Required Readings:

Luck, L., Jackson, D., Usher, K. (2006). Case study: A bridge across the paradigms. *Nursing Inquiry*, 13(2), 103-109. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1800.2006.00309

Adler, P.A., & Adler, P. (2008). Of rhetoric and representation: the four faces of ethnography *The Sociological Quarterly*, 49, pp. 1-30. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00104.

Laverty, S.M. (2003). Hermeneutic phenomenology and phenomenology: a comparison of historical and methodological considerations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(3), 1-25. http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/2_3final/pdf/laverty.pdf

Fraser, K. D., & al Sayah, F. (2011). Arts-based methods in health research: A systematic review of the literature. *Arts & Health*, 3(2), 110–145. doi:10.1080/17533015.2011.561357

Charmaz, K. (2008). Constructionism and the grounded theory method. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp.397-412). New York, NY: Guildford Press. (ebook)

Mills, J, Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). Adopting a constructivist approach to grounded theory: Implications for research design. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 12, 8-13.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research (pp. 567-605). In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stanley, L. I. Z., & Temple, B. (2008). Narrative methodologies: subjects, silences, re-readings and analyses. *Qualitative Research*, 8(3), 275-281. doi: 10.1177/1468794106093622

Additional Readings (organized by strategy of inquiry, not required):

Arts-based Inquiries:

Clover, D. (2011). Success and challenges of feminist-arts-based participatory methodologies with homeless/street-involved women in Victoria. *Action Research*, 9, 12-26.

Dixon, A.D., Chapman, T.K., & Hill, D.A. (2005). Extending the portraiture methodology. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(1), 16-26. doi: 10.1177/107780040420836

Prendergast, M. (2009). "Poem is what?" Poetic inquiry in qualitative social science research. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 1(4), 541-568.

Szto, P., Furman, R., & Langer, C. (2005). Poetry and Photography: An exploration into expressive/creative qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, 4, 135-156. doi: 10.1177/1473325005052390

Springgay, S., Irwin, R.L., & Kind, S.W. (2005). A/r/tography as living inquiry through art and text. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11, 897-912. doi: 10.1177/1077/800405280696

Tolich, M. (2010). A critique of current practice: Ten foundational guidelines for autoethnographers. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20, 1599-1610. doi: 10.1177/1049732310376076

Wang, C., & Burris, M.A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education and Behavior*, 24(3), 369-387. doi: 10.1177/109019819702400309

Case Study Research:

Flyvberg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12, 219-245. doi: 10.1177/1077800405284363.

Sandelowski, M. (2011). "Casing" the research case study. *Research in Nursing and Health*. 34, 153-159. doi: 10.1002/nur.20421

Walshe, C.E., Caress, A.L., Chew-Graham, C., & Todd, C.J. (2004). Case studies: A research strategy appropriate for palliative care? *Palliative Medicine*, 18(8), 677-684. doi: 10.1191/0269216304pm962ra

Ethnography: Traditional, Critical, Focused, and Institutional

Campbell, M. L. (1998). Institutional ethnography and experience as data. *Qualitative Sociology*, 21(1), 55-73. doi: 10.1023/A:1022171325924

Cook, K. E. (2005). Using Critical Ethnography to Explore Issues in Health Promotion. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15, 129-138. doi: 10.1177/1049732304267751

Cruz, M. R. (2008). What if I just cite Graciela? Working toward decolonizing knowledge through a critical ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(4), 651-658. doi: 10.1177/1077800408314346

Devault, M. L. (2006). Introduction: What is Institutional Ethnography? *Social Problems*, 53(3), 294-298. doi: 10.1525/sp.2006.53.3.294

Diamond, T. (1986). Social policy and everyday life in nursing homes: A critical ethnography. *Social Science and Medicine*, 23(12), 1287-1295.

Hammersley, M. (1992). Chapter 1, What's wrong with ethnography, The myth of theoretical description. In *What's wrong with ethnography? Methodological explorations*, (pp. 11-31). London: Routledge.

- Hegelund, A. (2005). Objectivity and subjectivity in the ethnographic method. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(5), pp. 647-668. doi: 10.1177/1049732304273933
- Holstein, J.A., & Gubrium, J.F. (2008). Constructionist impulses in ethnographic fieldwork. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *The handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 373-397). New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Knoblauch, H. (2005). Focused ethnography. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, 6(3), Art.44, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0503440>.
- Lather, P. (2001). Postmodernism, post-structuralism, and post(critical) ethnography: Of ruins, aporias and angles. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 477-490). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Small, M. (2009). How many cases do I need?: On science and the logic of case selection in field based research. *Ethnography*
- Savage, J. (2006). Ethnographic evidence: The value of applied ethnography in healthcare. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 11(5), 383-393.
- Smith, D. (1986). Institutional ethnography: A feminist method. *Resources for Feminist Research*, 15(1), 6-13.
- Walby, K. (2007). On the social relations of research: a critical assessment of institutional ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(7), 1008-1030.
- Grounded Theory:**
- Anells, M. (1996). Grounded theory method: philosophical perspectives, paradigm of inquiry, and postmodernism. *Qualitative Health Research*, 6(3), 370-393.
- Charmaz, K. (1990). 'Discovering' chronic illness: Using grounded theory. *Social Science and Medicine*, 30(11), 1161-1172.
- Charmaz, K. (2016). The power of constructivist grounded theory for critical inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, doi: 10.1177/1077800416657105
- Legault, A., & Ducharme, F. (2009). Advocating for a parent with dementia in a long-term care facility: The process experienced by daughters. *Journal of Family Nursing*, 15(2), 198-219. Doi" 10.1177/107484-7-9332929
- Hall, W.A., & Callery, P (2001). Enhancing the rigor of grounded theory: Incorporating reflexivity and relationality. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11, 257-272. Doi: 10.1177/104973201129119082
- Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. San Francisco, CA: University of California.
- Glaser, B. (1992). *Emergence vs. forcing: Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G. (1999). The future of grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 9(6), 836-845.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago IL: Aldine.
- Miller, S. I., & Fredericks, M. (1999). How does grounded theory explain? *Qualitative Health Research*, 9(4), 538-551.
- Mills, J. Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). The development of constructivist grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), Article 3. http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_1/pdf/mills.pdf
- Walker, D., & Myrick, F. (2006). Grounded theory: an explanation of process and procedure. *Qualitative Health Research*, 16(4), 547-559. doi: 10.1177/1049732305285972

Wuest, J. (1995). Feminist grounded theory: An exploration of the congruency and tensions between two traditions in knowledge discovery. *Qualitative Health Research*, 5(1), 125-137.

Narrative Inquiry:

Sandelowski, M. (1991). Telling stories: Narrative approaches in qualitative research. *Image: Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 23(3), 161- 166.

Frank, A.W. (2012). Practicing dialogical narrative analysis. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis* (pp. 33-52.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Fraser, H. (2004). Doing narrative research: Analysing personal stories line by line. *Qualitative Social Work*, 3(2), 179-201.

Larsson, S. & Sjoblom, Y. (2010). Perspectives on narrative methods in social work research.

International Journal of Social Welfare, 19, 272-280. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2397-2009.00672.x

Reissman, C.K. & Quinney, L. (2005). Narrative in social work: A critical review. *Qualitative Social Work*, 4(4), 391-412. Doi: 10.1177/1473325005058643

Participatory Inquiry

Fear, F., Carter, K. and Thullen, M. (1985). Action research in community development: Concepts and principles. *Research in Rural Sociology and Development*, 2, 197-216.

Heron, J., & Reason, P. (1997). A participatory inquiry paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3 (3), 274-294. doi: 10.1177/107780049700300302

Lichy, J. R., and Kimball, W. J. (1985). Analysis of an action research project: A case study and consideration of principles. *Research in Rural Sociology and Development*, 2, 217-233.

Miskovic, M., & Hoop, K. (2006). Action research meets critical pedagogy: Theory, practice and reflection. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 269-293. doi: 10.1177/1077800405284367

Waterman, H. (1998). Embracing ambiguities and valuing ourselves: issues of validity in action research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 28(1), 101-105.

Westhues, A., Ochocka, J., Jacobson, N., Simich, L., Maiter, S. Janzen, R. & Fleuras, A. (2008). Developing themes from complexity: reflections on a collaborative mixed method participatory action research study. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(5), 701-717. doi: 10.1177/1049732308316531

Phenomenology:

Ajjawi, R., & Higgs, J. (2007). Using hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate how experienced practitioners learn to communicate clinical reasoning. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(4). Retrieved from: <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1616&context=tqr>

Clare, L., Rowlands, J., Bruce, E., Surr, C., & Downs, M. (2008). The experience of living with dementia in residential care: An interpretive phenomenological analysis. *The Gerontologist*, 48(6), 711-720.

Caelli, K. (2000). The changing face of phenomenological research: Traditional and American Phenomenology in Nursing. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(3), 366-377. doi: 10.1177/104973200129118507

Edwards, C., & Titchen, A. (2003). Research into patients' perspectives: relevance and usefulness of phenomenological sociology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 44(5), 450-460. doi: 10.1046/j.0309-2402.2003.02828

Hein, S.F., & Austin, W.J. (2001). Empirical and hermeneutical approaches to phenomenological research in psychology: a comparison. *Psychological Methods*, 6(1), 3-17. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.6.1.3

**Week Seven (October 21st): Applying Critical Theories: From Methodology to Analysis to Knowledge
Translation: Guest Lecture: Bindy Kang PhD Candidate, Interdisciplinary Studies**

This week will focus on critical theories (e.g., Critical Race, Decolonizing, Post-Colonial, & Feminist) and how to apply these frameworks to qualitative research. After a brief review of selected critical theories, we will consider how these theoretical perspective shape research design, data collection, analyses, and knowledge translation activities. Students will be encouraged to think through the challenges of applying theory into practice, and incorporate critical reflexivity throughout the research process.

Readings TBD

ASSIGNMENT ONE: ETHICS TUTORIAL In preparation for next class, please complete the ethics tutorial. This will enable you to start/complete your BREB application and it will provide a launching pad for next week's discussion.

Week Eight (October 28th): Ethics in Qualitative Research

This week we will explore what makes qualitative research ethically sound, the different challenges that emerge in conducting field research (e.g., research in the researcher's workplace), and specific ethical issues that are particularly germane to arts-based enquiries. We will also address some practical issues that are relevant to submitting a proposal for BREB such as consent and assent, risk and benefits, and storage of data.

Required Readings:

Guillman, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(2), 261-280.

Morse, J.M. (2007). Ethics in action: Ethical principles for doing qualitative health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17, 1003-1006. doi: 10.1177/1049732307308197

UBC Ethics Review: Review guidelines and instructions: <http://research.ubc.ca/ore/breb-forms-guidance-notes>

Additional Readings (not required):

Christians, C.G. (2011). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln

Cole P. (2004). trick(sters) of aboriginal research: or how to use ethical review strategies to perpetuate cultural genocide. *Native Studies Review*, 7-30.

Cox, S., Drew, S., Guillemin, M., Howell, C., Warr, D., & Waycott, J. (2014). *Guidelines for ethical visual research methods*. Melbourne, AU: University of Melbourne.

Duncan, R.E., Drew, S.E., Hodgson, J., & Sawyer, S.M. (2009). Is my mum going to hear this?

Methodological and ethical challenges in qualitative health research with young people. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69, 1691-1699.

Islam N. (2000). Research as an act of betrayal: Researching race in an Asian community in Los Angeles. In F. Winddance Twine & J. Warren (Eds.), *Racing research, researching race: Methodological dilemmas in critical race studies*, (pp. 32-66). New York: NYU Press. (ebook)

Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans:
http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2-2014/TCPS_2_FINAL_Web.pdf

ASSIGNMENT TWO DUE: Conceptual Context and Research Questions (October 28th)

Week Nine (November 4th): Research Methods: Guest speaker: Lillian Hung, PhD Candidate, School of Nursing

In this session we will first hear from Lillian Hung about her participatory action research in dementia care in the acute care setting. She will discuss how she conceptualized her project, decided what methods were most appropriate to answer her research questions, how she sought to meaningfully include people with dementia as co-producers of knowledge, and how her interactions with study participants continually reshaped the research process. As an exemplar for the technical aspects of a research project, we will then discuss the notion of sampling, gaining access to the field, and data collection strategies.

Required Readings:

Gergen, K.J. From mirroring to world-making: Research as future forming. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 45(3), 287-310. doi: 10.1111/jtsb.12075.

Given, L. (2008). *Sage Encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. See chapters on interview guides/interviewing/unstructured interviews, participant observation, visual research, and arts-based research.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.4135/9781412963909.n17>

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough?: An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18, 59-82. doi: 10.1177/1525822X05279903

Additional Readings (not required):

Bartkowiak-Theron, I., & Sappey, J.R., (2012). The methodological identity of shadowing in social science research. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 12(1), 7-16. doi: 10.1108/144398812112226897

Bell, K. (2011). Participant's motivations and co-construction of the qualitative research process. *Qualitative Social Work*, 12(4), 523-539.

Bowen, G.A., Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 8(1), 137-152.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Leech, N.L., & Collins, K.M.T. (2010). Innovative data collection strategies in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 696-726.

Sandelowski, M. (1989). Artful design: Writing the proposal for research in the naturalist paradigm. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 12, 77-84.

Sandelowski, M. (1995). Focus on qualitative methods: Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 18, 179-183.

Tjora, A.H. (2006). Writing small discoveries: An exploration of fresh observers' observations. *Qualitative Research*, 6(4), 429-451. doi: 10.1177/1468794106068012

Week Ten (November 11th): REMEMBRANCE DAY – NO CLASS

Week Eleven (November 18th): Critical Reflexivity AND Trustworthiness

Who is asking the questions; who is answering the questions? To what degree is the researchers' self written into the text? Whose voice is being foregrounded? Whose voice is being silenced? How do interlocutors shape the production of knowledge?

What makes qualitative research credible and trustworthy? Why should anyone believe you? What strategies can you adopt to convince your audience that you have not made things up?

Required Readings (Reflexivity):

Ben-Ari, A., & Enosh, G. (2010). Process of reflectivity: Knowledge construction in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, 10(2), 152-171.

McCorkel, J., & Meyers, K. (2003). What difference does difference make? Position and privilege in the field. *Qualitative Sociology* 26(2): 199-231. doi: 10.1023/A:1022967012774

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175-196. doi: 10.1080/0951839032000060635

Required Readings (Trustworthiness):

Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Leech, N.L. (2007). Validity and qualitative research: An oxymoron? *Quality and Quantity*, 41, 233-249. doi: 10.1007/s11135-006-9000-3

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

Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(4), 465-478. doi: 10.1177/107780049900500402

Tracy, S.J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight 'big-tent' criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851. doi: 10.1177/1077800420383121

Additional Readings about Reflexivity (not required):

Anderson, J.M. (1991). Reflexivity in fieldwork: Toward a feminist epistemology. *Image: The Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 23(2), 115-118. doi: 10.1111/j.1547- 5069.1991.tb00654

Bishop, E.C., & Shepherd, M.L. (2011). Ethical reflections: Examining reflexivity through the narrative paradigm. *Qualitative Health Research*, 21(9), 1283-1294. doi: 10.1177/1049732311405800

- Dickson-Swift, V., James, E.L., Kippen S., & Liamputtong, P. (2009). Researching sensitive topics: Qualitative research as emotion work. *Qualitative Research*, 9(1), 61-79. doi: 10.1177/1468794108098031
- Fine, M. (2004). Di-distance and other stances: Negotiations of power inside feminist research. In A. Gitlin (Ed.), *Power and methods* (pp. 13-55). New York: Routledge
- Fine, M., & Weiss, L. (1996). Writing the “wrongs” of fieldwork: Confronting our own research/writing dilemmas in urban ethnographies. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2(3), 251-275. doi: 10.1177/107780049600200301
- Valentine, C. (2007). Attending and tending to the role of the researcher in the construction of bereavement narratives. *Qualitative Social Work*, 6(2), 159-176. doi: 10.1177/1473325007077237.

Additional Readings about Trustworthiness (not required):

- Lietz, C.A., & Zayas, L.E., (2010). Evaluating qualitative research for social work practitioners. *Advances in Social Work*, 11(2), 188-202.
- Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75.
- Mantzoukas, S. (2004), Issues of representation within qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(7), 994-1007. doi: 10.1177/1049732304265959
- Thorne, S., & Darbyshire, P. (2005). Land mines in the field. A modest proposal for improving the craft of qualitative health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15, 1105-. doi: 10.1177/1049732305278502

ASSIGNMENT TWO: ETHICS REVIEW DUE

Week Twelve (November 25th): Working on your Proposal

Week Thirteen (December 2nd): Being a Qualitative Researcher

While we will spend a bit of time reviewing the content from previous weeks, we will also look ahead to the upcoming semester and the art and practice of being a qualitative researcher. This includes addressing being in the field and collecting data, analysis, representation, and writing of the findings.

There are no required readings for this class. For the purposes of receiving constructive feedback and an opportunity to hear about each others’ research, students are asked to prepare a brief (2-minute) verbal summary of their proposed research.

COURSE ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES:

1. Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Review ten *recent* sources relevant to your research topic. Use these to develop a sketch of the literature and an outline of the conceptual context which provides the grounding and rationale for your study.

This assignment should include:

- A rationale for your proposed study based on the relevant literature.
- An overview and analysis of some current findings in the area and the trends informing the thinking which has led to the formation of the research question(s).
- A map of connections between concepts and ideas from which your research is built upon, and identifies the gaps in the literature.
- Your research question(s).

The assignment is in essay format, and the use of a visual framework is welcome. It must include full references and follow APA style.

Criteria for grading (see below):

- Content/Analysis: 70 points
- Organization and Style: 30 points

2. Study Proposal

Your research proposal identifies a question that is worth pursuing through qualitative research methods, the justification of why it is a worthy pursuit, how you will answer the question (in terms of methods and analysis), and significant issues raised by your proposed study, including any anticipated ethical challenges. Your proposal will be evaluated along the following dimensions:

Content (40 points)

- Research problem is stated clearly
- Research questions are stated clearly and explained in relation to other components of the proposal
- Conceptual grounding and literature are discussed and located in context to your research questions
- How you as a researcher might shape the process and product of your research are addressed
- Potential ethical challenges are discussed
- Identify and discuss strategy of inquiry and research methods and research activities (e.g., recruitment) including the notion of rigour/trustworthiness and ways to validate your findings

- Citations and references align and follow APA format

Analysis (40 points)

- Justification for proposed study is well argued, including the importance and place of the proposed research in relation to practice.
- Critical evaluation of the literature and how theoretical concepts and ideas form the grounding for your research.
- Provided rationale for design and methods.

Organization (10 points). In general, your proposal should be organized by the following headings, though this is dependent on your proposed study:

- Title
- Introduction
- Context
- Research question(s)
- Design and methods of data collection
- Ethical and Validity issues
- Conclusion
- Timeline
- References
- Appendices (including consent forms)

Writing (10 points)

- Style: clear; well organized; logical development and flow; continuity and smooth transitions in sentences and paragraphs
- Technique: grammar; spelling; proper use of APA (6th ed.)

RECOMMENDED RESOURCES:

- Absolon, K.E (2011). *Kaandossiwin: How we come to know*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Campbell, M., & Gregor, F. (2002). *Mapping social relations: A primer in doing Institutional Ethnography*. Aurora, ON: Garamond.
- Bell, D., Caplan, P., and Karim, W. (Eds.). (1993). *Gendered fields: Women, men and ethnography*. London: Routledge.
- Boylorn, R., & Orbe, M.P (Eds.) (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press. (ebook)
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chilsa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Dey, I. (1999). *Grounding grounded theory: guidelines for qualitative inquiry*. London: Academic Press.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I., & Shaw, L.L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Kindon, S., Pain, R., Kesby, M. (2007). *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation, and place*. Taylor & Francis (ebook)
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knowles, G., & Cole, A. *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and Issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (ebook)
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L., & Lofland, L.H. (2006). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Madden, R. (2010). *Being ethnographic: A guide to the theory and practice of ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pink, S. (2009) *Doing sensory ethnography*. London, Sage.
- Pink, S. (2013). *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in research* (3rd Ed.). London: Sage.
- Prus, R. (1996). *Symbolic interaction and ethnographic research: Intersubjectivity and the study of human lived experience*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Reissman, C.K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saldana, J. (2014). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*.
- Sousa Santos, B.D. (Ed.) (2008). *Another knowledge is possible. Beyond northern epistemologies*. London: Verso.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Manen, M. (2001). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (2nd ed.). London, ON: Althouse Press.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

ASSIGNMENTS

Submitting assignments

Students must submit assignments at the beginning of the class period. If students foresee a problem with submitting assignments on time, they must contact the instructor immediately by telephone or email.

Return of marked student assignments

Instructors coordinate the return of marked assignments. The options are as follows: a) the instructor returns the paper to students in class; b) if the paper has been submitted electronically, the instructor will mark it on-line (with track changes) and return to the student on-line. Marked papers not returned by any of the options above will be held by the instructor. Marked papers will not be put in a box outside the instructor's office or at the main office.

Late assignments

Students needing an extension may, at their own discretion and no discussion with the instructor, take up to one additional week. Use of the extension does not impact the grading of the paper. Papers submitted on the final extension date are due at the beginning of the class period. Assignments submitted later than the *beginning* of the class period on the extension date will not be graded.

COURSE POLICIES [ATTENDANCE, PARTICIPATION, ACADEMIC DISHONESTY]:

Excerpt from the UBC calendar:

Regular attendance is expected of students in all their classes (including lectures, laboratories, tutorials, seminars, etc.). Students who neglect their academic work and assignments may be excluded from the final examinations. Students who are unavoidably absent because of illness or disability should report to their instructors on return to classes.

The University accommodates students with disabilities who have registered with the Disability Resource Centre. The University accommodates students whose religious obligations conflict with attendance, submitting assignments, or completing scheduled tests and examinations. Please let your instructor know in advance, preferably in the first week of class, if you will require any accommodation on these grounds. Students who plan to be absent for varsity athletics, family obligations, or other similar commitments, cannot assume they will be accommodated, and should discuss their commitments with the instructor before the drop date.

It is recommended that students retain a copy of all submitted assignments (in case of loss) and should also retain all their marked assignments in case they wish to apply for a Review of Assigned Standing. Students have the right to view their marked examinations with their instructor, providing they apply to do so within a month of receiving their final grades. This review is for pedagogic purposes. The examination remains the property of the university.

Academic Dishonesty:

Please review the UBC Calendar "Academic regulations" for the university policy on cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic dishonesty. Also visit www.arts.ubc.ca and go to the students' section for useful information on avoiding plagiarism and on correct documentation.

GRADING CRITERIA

Letter Grade	Percent Range	Mid-Point	
A+	90-100	95	Represents work of exceptional quality. Content, organization and style are all at a high level. Student demonstrates excellent research and reference to literature where appropriate. Also, student uses sound critical thinking, has innovative ideas on the subject and shows personal engagement with the topic
A	85-89	87	
A-	80-84	82	
B+	76-79	77.5	Represents work of good quality with no major weaknesses. Writing is clear and explicit and topic coverage and comprehension is more than adequate. Shows some degree of critical thinking and personal involvement in the work. Good use of existing knowledge on the subject.
B	72-75	73.5	
B-	68-71	69.5	
C+	64-67	65.5	Adequate and average work. Shows fair comprehension of the subject, but has some weaknesses in content, style and/or organization of the paper. Minimal critical awareness or personal involvement in the work. Adequate use of literature.
C	60-63	62.5	
C-	55-59	57	
D	50-54	52	Minimally adequate work, barely at a passing level. Serious flaws in content, organization and/or style. Poor comprehension of the subject, and minimal involvement in the paper. Poor use of research and existing literature.
F	0-49		Failing work. Inadequate for successful completion of the course or submitted beyond final date of acceptance for paper.