Winter 15

FRAN*6020 Qualitative Methods

Instructor: Olga Sutherland, Ph.D.
Office: CFT Centre, Room 252
Email: osutherl@uoguelph.ca
Phone: Ext. 56336
Office Hours: By appointment
Course Time and Location: MACs 331, Tuesdays 11:30 am to 2:20 pm

COURSE DESCRIPTION

During this course, students will learn about and apply the philosophical, theoretical, and empirical assumptions informing a variety of qualitative methodologies, with the end-product consisting of a written research report utilizing one approach to qualitative research. Students will learn to compare different research questions, theoretical frameworks, analytic assumptions, and methodological procedures. They will become familiar with the standards of empirical rigour underpinning these approaches and with how to practice emerging analytic skills relevant to each. Students will be able to articulate their preferred paradigm in conducting research in social sciences. The major focus will be on the following qualitative methodologies: grounded theory, phenomenology, narrative analysis, and discourse analysis.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. Become familiar with the characteristics, language, and philosophical and theoretical assumptions of qualitative research;
2. Delineate the differences between qualitative and quantitative research approaches and describe the theoretical and practical implications of these differences for a research project;
3. Understand the available techniques and procedures for qualitative data collection and analysis;
4. Be able to recognize and assess quality and rigour in evaluating a qualitative research study;
5. Understand the characteristics of different qualitative approaches and apply them to address a particular research topic;
6. Undertake analysis of qualitative data, including coding using computer assisted qualitative data analysis; and
7. Integrate qualitative research into a successful academic career by learning how to write qualitative research proposals and reports.

COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES *(based on the 2013 University of Guelph Graduate Degree Learning Outcomes)*

1. Identify the key question or problem.
2. Gather data relevant to the key question or problem.
3. Interpret or evaluate data effectively (e.g., reading comprehension).
4. Recognize and critique assumptions, theories, and ideas relevant to the question or problem.
5. Develop informed conclusions or solutions.
6. Articulate implications and consequences that emerge from the conclusions and solutions.
7. Demonstrate depth and breadth of understanding in the critique and application of knowledge.
8. Demonstrate creativity and originality in the critique and application of knowledge.
9. Demonstrate the knowledge of cultural similarities and differences, the context (historical, geographical, political and environmental) from which these arise, and how they are manifest in modern society.
10. Demonstrate qualitative, information, and technological literacy.
11. Demonstrate professional and ethical behaviour, teamwork, leadership, and personal organization (time management).
12. Communicate effectively, orally and in writing, any or all parts of the above process.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY: EQUITABLE AND JUST LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Social justice education involves creating (as much as possible) equitable and just learning environment. It is about: (a) orienting the curriculum or *content* of teaching to issues of power and privilege (e.g., critical/feminist perspectives in qualitative research), and (b) co-creating a distinct equitable and just learning *process* or environment. Students and instructor work together to help each other recognize and minimize the ways of being and seeing that lend themselves to prejudice, oppression, and marginalization. Bringing complex socializations and identities, they strive to identify and work to eliminate their biases, prejudices, and assumptions about various groups of people and challenge stereotypes (on self, relationships, sexuality, etc.) in themselves, learning environment, discipline, and society. Stereotypes imply that some ways of being or relating are better or more apt than others and can contribute to derogation and isolation of non-dominant ideas, identities, and relationships (e.g., LGBTTQ). Students and instructor attend to and work to minimize their own and others' actions and relationships that reflect stereotypical roles and ideas. The focus is on co-creating *a safe and supportive environment* for students and instructor to learn and share vulnerabilities associated with not always being able to recognize and eliminate biases, prejudices, and assumptions.

COURSE FORMAT

Class meetings will be conducted as seminars. The course will combine lecture, discussion, and in-class group activities, facilitating an atmosphere where ideas are exchanged and research experiences are shared. On occasion, class time will be an opportunity for students to engage in data analysis.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

There is 1 assignment (a qualitative study) in this course comprised of 5 components:

Assignment	Weight
1. Initial Submission of Research Proposal	5% (pass/fail)
2. Links to Online Data	5%
3. Review of Peer Proposals (4 proposals)	20%
4. Final Submission of Research Proposal	25%
5. Research Report	45%

Initial Submission of Research Proposal – DUE Jan 27

The proposal resembles a published qualitative study without the results and discussion sections (see sample qualitative studies). Students are asked to identify a research problem/topic, discuss the significance of examining this topic, provide background information on the topic and rationale for the study, specify their philosophical & theoretical framework, and describe methodology and research plan (i.e., steps and procedures). The substantive focus for a research project is open but it should be a topic that is within the broad parameters of family relations, human development, psychology, family therapy, and applied nutrition. Students are encouraged to consult with the instructors if they want help puzzling through the focus of their project. Samples of how to describe a philosophical and theoretical framework can be found at the end of this outline.

Students are asked to choose a methodology (grounded theory analysis, phenomenological analysis, narrative analysis, discourse analysis), adopt the *social constructionist paradigm* and select from the list of *theories*:

Feminism(s)
Racialized discourses
Critical and Marxist perspectives
Cultural studies perspectives
Queer theory
Post-colonialism
Post-modern and post-structural perspectives
Social constructionist perspectives

Each student's initial proposal will be evaluated by 4 other students. *Proposals will be submitted anonymously to other students (no names will be attached to submissions). In order to ensure the anonymity of submissions, students are encouraged to refrain from disclosing their topics to their peers.*

Organization: Students can use the *Criteria for Peers' Evaluation of Initial Proposal* as a guide.
Length: 3 pages, excluding references and title page. *The peers will not read beyond this page limit.*

Format: Double-spaced, Times New Roman 12 font, with 1" margins, APA (6th ed.), .doc (any version).
Submit: PEAR: Peer Evaluation, Assessment, & Review: http://www.uoguelph.ca/peartool/ (scroll down to student log in – same as UofG login & password – and follow instructions)
Grading: Pass/fail basis – full mark (5%) is given if the proposal is submitted on time & 0% is given if it is not (unless there are extenuating circumstances supported by documentation).

Final Submission of Research Proposal – DUE Feb 17

After receiving feedback from other students, each student will integrate and address peers' comments and resubmit the proposal to the instructor for grading. They will also submit, as a separate attachment, a summary of how they responded to and integrated peers' feedback. Students will be able to *access peers' reviews of their initial proposal on Feb 11* and the instructor's evaluation of their final (revised) proposal on Mar 7.

Length: 4 pages, excluding references and title page & summary of 1 page or less. *The instructor will not read beyond this page limit.*
Format: Students are asked to: (a) use the *Microsoft Word Reviewing* feature to make changes to the initial proposal to ensure that they are visible to the instructor, and (b) use bullet points in the summary.
Submit: PEAR
Grading: Students will be graded both on the quality of their proposal and their ability to improve their work in light of feedback. See the *Instructor's Evaluation of Final Proposal* grading rubric.

Links to Online Data – DUE Feb 3

Students will identify easily accessible *online* data relevant to their topic. Data should:
* **be in the public domain** (i.e., users are not required to log in);
* be qualitative (texts, narratives, and other expressions of meaning, such as poems, pictures);
* reflect participants' experiences and perspectives, not general or scientific knowledge;
* not be from forums and chat rooms that serve as self-help groups for individuals suffering from emotional and physical issues or social injustices;
* not involve vulnerable participants (e.g., children, persons who are not legally competent to consent, mentally incompetent persons) or address personal, sensitive, or incriminating topics or questions.

Students are expected to: (a) upload a list of links to online data to the Dropbox as one document (Microsoft Word) and (b) add a brief (1-3 sentences) description of their topic/question. Some sites may contain the *Privacy and Copyright Terms* that may prohibit the use of data due to copyright or privacy issues. In this case, students are encouraged to either avoid these sites or consult with the instructor to determine if these data can be analyzed. Once the instructor approves links, students are free to begin data analysis.

If students wish to conduct *narrative analysis*, they can do a case study. If taking this approach, it may wise to focus on one participant but consider examining multiple stories and/or use other sources of information (visual) to triangulate their understanding of the case. Those who wish to carry out *discourse analysis* can select 5-15 segments of text, depending on the length and whether they intend to analyse large portions of a single source or certain segments from several sources. More data would be needed if phenomenological analysis is used and even more data in case of grounded theory analysis. Students are encouraged to consult with the instructor to determine the amount of data to analyse for their course-based project (to balance feasibility and rigour).

Submit: CourseLink/Dropbox
Format: Word document (.doc)

Review of Peer Proposals – DUE Feb 10

Each student will review 4 three-page proposals written by other students. They will be asked to provide qualitative feedback using the *Criteria For Peers' Evaluation Of Initial Proposal* (see *Grading Rubrics*). Students are asked to:
* *Offer balanced feedback:* Tell students what they did well and include clear suggestions for improvement.
* *Avoid critical tone/remarks*: Suggest how students can improve the next draft rather than focus on what is done poorly in this submission. The comments should focus on the assignment and not on students' ability.

- *Be specific:* Avoid vague comments such as "good" or "expand"; instead identify what is good about a specific section and what section or area needs to be expanded.

Submit: PEAR. Students will be able to *access their peers' proposals on Jan 28.*
Grading: see *the Instructor's Evaluation of Reviews grading rubric*

Research Report – DUE Mar 31

Research report should resemble in structure a published qualitative study (e.g., introduction, literature review, results, discussion). Some aspects of the project students have already addressed in their proposals; therefore, they should streamline the Introduction by giving only the briefest framing of the literature before listing research questions or aims. The major emphasis is on *the results or analyses* of the data. But it is important that students are selective so they are not taking on too much for the assignment. That is, even if grounded theory analysis has generated four or five major categories, a student should mention all four but be selective and choose only two (for example) to showcase in the research report. Let's say you a student I conducting a discourse analysis of interviews on food preferences. Four different discursive strategies participants use to justify non-healthy food choices identified. In the write-up, the student can briefly list the four strategies but show the analyses of only two of the strategies in the report paper.

Length: 15 pages, excluding references and title page. *The instructor will not read beyond this page limit.*
Format: Double-spaced, Times New Roman 12 font, with 1" margins, APA (6th ed.), .doc (any version)
Submit: CourseLink/Dropbox
Grading: see the *Instructor's Evaluation of Research Report* grading rubric.

Summary of Due Dates

Initial Proposal	*Jan 27*
Links	*Feb 3*
Review of Peer Proposals	*Feb 10 (students will be able to access proposals of other students on Jan 28)*
Final Proposal	*Feb 17 (students will be able to access peers' reviews of their initial proposal on Feb 11)*
Research Report	*Mar 31*

INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION OF LINKS TO ONLINE DATA (5 points)

	F (0-64%; 0-6.4) *inadequate*	C (65-69%; 6.5-6.9) *minimally acceptable*	B (70-79% 7-7.9) *acceptable to good*	A- to A (80-89%, 8-8.9) *very good to excellent*	A+ (90-100%; 9-10) *outstanding*
Ethical Reasoning (2 points) *Includes moral maturity; a moral sense of mind behind decision-making*	Demonstrates no evidence of knowledge of research ethics and ethical judgment	Demonstrates adequate evidence of knowledge of research ethics and ethical judgment	Demonstrates good evidence of knowledge of research ethics and ethical judgment Reflects on personal or others' judgment and analyzes ethical reasoning or lack of reasoning.	Demonstrates very good evidence of knowledge of research ethics and ethical judgment.	Outstanding understanding application of ethics. Applies depth and consistency of moral judgment. Shows knowledge that the solution to a problem is complex and requires thought and time to consider all involved. Examines problems from a moral perspective. Demonstrates behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.
Depth and Breadth of Understanding (3) *Demonstrates detailed knowledge and integrates knowledge across disciplinary boundaries*	Demonstrates no evidence of knowledge and critical evaluation of information.	Demonstrates minimal evidence of knowledge and critical evaluation of information.	Applies basic concepts.	Extracts and integrates information and perspectives well.	Gathers, reviews, evaluates and interprets information; compares the merits of alternate hypotheses. Demonstrates mastery of a body of knowledge and critically evaluates the limits of their own knowledge and how these limits influence analyses.

CRITERIA FOR PEERS' EVALUATION OF INITIAL PROPOSAL

Criterion	Description
Aim & research question	Is the study's aim clear? Are research questions formulated consistently with a chosen methodology?
Methodological orientation, paradigm, and theory	What methodological orientation (e.g., phenomenology, discourse analysis, grounded theory), paradigm (e.g., social constructionist, interpretivist), & theoretical framework (critical/feminist/postmodern) underpin the study?
Rationale	Is the importance of the study well justified? Is there a link between exiting literature and proposed study?
Feasibility	Is the scope of the study appropriate for a course-based project?
Sampling & sample size	Is there a clear description of sampling and sample size? How many participants (data) are included? What are the important characteristics of the sample (e.g., demographic information)? Which criteria are used to include/exclude data?
Data collection & analysis	How are the data collected? What steps and procedures are used to analyze the data?
Rigour	How is the study's rigour/quality established (i.e., rigour criteria and strategies)?
Researcher characteristics	What characteristics are reported about the researcher (e.g., assumptions, interests, personal experiences with the topic)?
Quality of writing and APA style adherence	Is writing clear and cohesive? Does it contain little grammatical, APA style, spelling, or functional errors?

INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION OF REVIEWS (20 points)

	F (0-64%; 0-6.4) *inadequate*	C (65-69%; 6.5-6.9) *Minimally acceptable*	B (70-79% 7-7.9) *acceptable to good*	A- to A (80-89%, 8-8.9) *very good to excellent*	A+ (90-100%; 9-10) *outstanding*
Depth and Breadth of Understanding (8) *Demonstrates detailed knowledge and integrates knowledge across disciplinary boundaries*	Demonstrates no evidence of knowledge and critical evaluation of information.	Demonstrates minimal evidence of knowledge and critical evaluation of information.	Applies basic concepts.	Extracts and integrates information and perspectives well.	Gathers, reviews, evaluates and interprets information; compares the merits of alternate hypotheses. Demonstrates mastery of a body of knowledge and critically evaluates the limits of their own knowledge and how these limits influence analyses.
Inquiry and Analysis (8) *A systematic process of exploring issues through the collection and analysis of evidence that result in informed conclusions or judgments*	Shows no evidence of engagement in inquiry and analysis.	Shows minimal evidence of engagement in inquiry and analysis.	Asks appropriate questions and finds evidence related to inquiry of material with a critical eye.	Asks in-depth and specific questions regarding the material, including reliability of the source, and evaluates it critically. Includes evidence to back up statements.	Not only asks specific and in-depth questions, but also explores further possibilities with the aid of quality research. Asks and attempts to answer many questions from a critical perspective.
Written Communication (4) *The ability to express one's ideas through a variety of writing styles & offer helpful/constructive feedback*	Writing lacks clarity and contains substantial grammatical, APA style, spelling, or functional errors. The quality of feedback is poor	Writes mostly clearly with adequate vocabulary and many grammatical, APA style, spelling, or functional errors. The quality of feedback is adequate.	Writes clearly with good vocabulary and some grammatical, APA style, spelling or functional errors. The quality of feedback is good.	Writes a clear message with very good vocabulary and little grammatical, APA style, spelling, or functional errors. The quality of feedback is excellent.	Uses a breadth of vocabulary appropriate to discipline or context and writes in a sophisticated manner clearly conveying the message of the speaker. Grammar, spelling, APA style, and functional errors are almost non-existent. The quality of feedback is outstanding (e.g., specific, constructive).

INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION OF FINAL PROPOSAL & RESEARCH REPORT (25/45 points)

	F (0-64%; 0-6.4) *inadequate*	C (65-69%; 6.5-6.9) *minimally acceptable*	B (70-79% 7-7.9) *acceptable to good*	A- to A (80-89%, 8-8.9) *very good to excellent*	A+ (90-100%; 9-10) *outstanding*
Depth and Breadth of Understanding (4/8) *Demonstrates detailed knowledge and integrates knowledge across disciplinary boundaries*	Demonstrates no evidence of knowledge and critical evaluation of information.	Demonstrates minimal evidence of knowledge and critical evaluation of information.	Applies basic concepts.	Extracts and integrates information and perspectives well.	Gathers, reviews, evaluates and interprets information; compares the merits of alternate hypotheses. Demonstrates mastery of a body of knowledge and critically evaluates the limits of their own knowledge and how these limits influence analyses.

Problem Solving (4/8) *Is a process in which one works through a series of operations to come to a conclusion*	Demonstrates no evidence of ability to identify and solve issues in a creative manner.	Demonstrates minimal evidence of ability to identify and solve issues in a creative manner.	Identifies issues and creates a plan to manage the problem.	Identifies and solves issues in a creative manner. Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving the problem and creates and follows a plan.	Sets out to solve issues in creative ways that will not only solve a current issue, but also looks to the future to prevent similar problems. Evaluates the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems; devises arguments using these methods and articulates reasons for choosing the solution.
Inquiry and Analysis (4/8) *A systematic process of exploring issues through the collection and analysis of evidence that result in informed conclusions or judgments*	Shows no evidence of engagement in inquiry and analysis.	Shows minimal evidence of engagement in inquiry and analysis.	Asks appropriate questions and finds evidence related to inquiry of material with a critical eye.	Asks in-depth and specific questions regarding the material, including reliability of the source, and evaluates it critically. Includes evidence to back up statements.	Not only asks specific and in-depth questions, but also explores further possibilities with the aid of quality research. Asks and attempts to answer many questions from a critical perspective.
Sense of Historical Development (4/8) *Understanding of disciplines in a modern society; its limitations and developments*	Pays no attention to contextual factors.	Pays minimal attention to contextual factors.	Pays sufficient/good attention to contextual factors.	Pays very good attention to contextual factors.	Explains, in a sophisticated manner, the historical and contextual factors that affect human experience, social relations, and disciplinary perspectives and articulates the relativity of knowledge and understanding at a given time.
Creativity (3/5) *Involves the ability to adapt to situations of change, to initiate change and to take intellectual risks*	Shows no evidence of creativity and innovation.	Shows minimal evidence of creativity and innovation.	Recognizes creative solutions to problems and seeks for beneficial future changes.	Shows a creative mind that is also able to look at long-terms goals. Considers change in an innovative way.	Exemplifies the capacity to think in untested and innovative directions and take intellectual risks.
Written Communication (3/5) *The ability to express one's ideas through a variety of writing styles. Includes adherence to APA style.*	Writing lacks clarity and contains substantial grammatical, APA style, spelling, or functional errors.	Writes mostly clearly with adequate vocabulary and many grammatical, APA style, spelling, or functional errors.	Writes clearly with good vocabulary and some grammatical, APA style, spelling or functional errors.	Writes a clear message with very good vocabulary and little grammatical, APA style, spelling, or functional errors.	Uses a breadth of vocabulary appropriate to discipline or context and writes in a sophisticated manner clearly conveying the message of the speaker. Grammar, spelling, APA style, and functional errors are almost non-existent.
Time Management (3/3) *An ability to manage several tasks at once and prioritize*	Demonstrates no ability to manage time and prioritize.	Demonstrates minimal ability to manage time and prioritize.	Completes important tasks, and has a mind for organization.	Plans for completion of many tasks, and prioritizes them for ease of accomplishment.	Prioritizes events based on importance and urgency in a manner where tasks are organized and everything is accomplished. Is able to multi-task effectively.

Qualitative Analysis Software

Students are encouraged to use qualitative analysis software to analyse research data. The University of Guelph has a licence for **NVivo**: https://www.uoguelph.ca/ccs/software/supported-products/nvivo. A 30-day free trial or 6 month student license ($51 USD) of **MAXQDA** can be obtained from: http://www.maxqda.com/licenses/students

Readings

The *Class Schedule, Topics, and Readings* table outlines reading expectations. Students are expected to read assigned book chapters or articles *prior to* each class.

The textbooks are available from the **University Bookstore or the Library**. All other readings are available on D2L **CourseLink**.

In addition to textbooks and other readings, students are expected to read sample qualitative studies. Under each methodology (phenomenological analysis, grounded theory analysis, discourse analysis), there are a number of sample studies listed. Students are expected to read only **ONE** article (of their choice) from the list. There will be one week during the course when students are asked to read **ALL** sample studies (e.g., read all phenomenological studies if phenomenological analysis is used). Students are expected to read multiple articles to gain familiarity with writing and research conventions for specific methodologies and qualitative inquiry.

Textbooks:

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research.* London: Sage.
Willig, C (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Open University Press.

Other Readings:

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3,* 77-101.
Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* London: Sage. (Chs. 3 & 5).
DeLamater, J. D., & Hyde, J. S. (1998) Essentialism vs. social constructionism in the study of human sexuality. *The Journal of Sex Research, 35,* 10-18.
Ellingson, L. L. (2006). Embodied knowledge: Writing researchers' bodies into qualitative health research. *Qualitative Health Research, 16,* 298-310.
Gergen, K. J. (2001). Psychological science in a postmodern context. *American Psychologist, 56*, 803-813.
Hein, S. F., & Austin, W. J. (2001). Empirical and hermeneutic approaches to phenomenological research in psychology: A comparison. *Psychological Methods, 6*(1), 3-17.
Heritage, J. (2011). Conversation analysis: Practices and methods. In D. Silverman (Ed.), Qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 208-230). London: Sage.
Holtz, P., Kronberger, N., & Wagner, W. (2012). Analyzing internet forums: A practical guide. *Journal of Media Psychology, 24,* 55–66.
Leavy, P. (2008). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice.* New York: Guilford. (Chs. 1-2).
Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 250–260.
Potter, J. (2011). Discursive psychology and the study of naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), Qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 187-207). London: Sage.
Riessman, C. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. London: Sage. (Chs. 3-4).
Whitehead, L. C. (2007). Methodological and ethical issues in Internet-mediated research in the field of health: An integrated review of the literature. *Social Science & Medicine, 65*, 782–791.
Wilkerson, J. M., Iantaffi, A., Grey, J. A., Bockting, W. O., Rosser, B. R. S. (2014). Recommendations for internet-based qualitative health research with hard-to-reach populations. *Qualitative Health Research, 24,* 561–574.
Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chs. 1, 7-8)

<u>**Sample Qualitative Studies:**</u>

Discourse Analysis/Discursive Psychological Analysis

Brooks, S. (2009). Radio food disorder: The conversational constitution of eating disorders in radio phone-ins. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 19,* 360–373.

Diorinou, M., & Tseliou, E. (2014). Studying circular questioning "in situ": Discourse analysis of a first systemic family therapy session. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 40,* 106–121.

Guendouzi, J. (2006). The guilt thing: Balancing domestic and professional roles. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68,* 901–909.

Madill, A., & Barkham, M. (1997). Discourse analysis of a theme in one successful case of brief psychodynamic-interpersonal psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44,* 232-244.

Petrassi, D. (2012). 'For me, the children come first': A discursive psychological analysis of how mothers construct fathers' roles in childrearing and childcare. *Feminism & Psychology, 22,* 518–527.

Sneijder, P., & te Molder, H. (2009). Normalizing ideological food choice and eating practices. Identity work in online discussions on veganism. Appetite 52, 621–630.

Sutherland, O. A., Forbes, L., Hodgson, B., & McLaren, K. (2014). Digital actualizations of gender and embodiment: Microanalysis of online pregnancy discourse. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 47, 102–114.

Wiggins, S., Potter, J., & Wildsmith, A. (2001). Eating your words: Discursive psychology and the reconstruction of eating practices. *Journal of Health Psychology, 6,* 5–15.

Foucauldian/Critical Discourse Analysis

Finn, M. D., Tunariu, A. D., & Lee, K. C. (2012). A critical analysis of affirmative therapeutic engagements with consensual non-monogamy. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy, 27,* 205–216.

Jaynes, C. (2010). The influence of the family on interracial intimate relationships in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 40,* 396-413.

Pulos, A. (2013). Confronting heteronormativity in online games: A critical discourse analysis of LGBTQ sexuality in world of Warcraft. *Games and Culture, 8,* 77-97.

Rogers, R., & Elias, M. (2012). Storied selves: A critical discourse analysis of young children's literate identifications. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 12,* 259–292.

Staunæs, D. (2003). Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 11,* 101-110.

Wilson, B. (2013). Disciplining gay and lesbian family life. *Gay & Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review, 9,* 34-45.

Woolhouse, M., Day, K., Rickett, B. & Milnes, K. (2011). 'Cos girls aren't supposed to eat like pigs are they?' Young women negotiating gendered discursive constructions of food and eating. *Journal of Health Psychology, 17,* 46–56.

Zimmermann, C. (2012). Acceptance of dying: A discourse analysis of palliative care literature. *Social Science & Medicine, 75,* 217-224.

Grounded Theory Analysis

Allen, K. R., & Roberto, K. A. (2009). From sexism to sexy: Challenging young adults' ageism about older women's sexuality. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy, 6,* 13-24.

Goodwin, A. M., Kaestle, C. E., & Piercy, F. P. (2013). An exploration of feminist family therapists' resistance to and collusion with oppression. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 25,* 233-256.

Haselschwerdt, M. L., Hardesty, J. L., & Hans, J. D. (2011). Custody evaluators' beliefs about domestic violence allegations during divorce: Feminist and family violence perspectives. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26, 1694–1719.

Kearney, M. H., Murphy, S., & Rosenbaljm, M. (1994). Mothering on crack cocaine: A grounded theory analysis. *Social Science & Medicine, 38,* 351-361.

Kushner, K. E., & Harrison, M. J. (2011). Finding a balance: Toward a substantive theory of employed mothers' personal and family health decision making. *Journal of Holistic Nursing, 29,* 7-17.

Sorensen, P., & Coopera N. J. (2010). Reshaping the family man: A grounded theory study of the meaning of grandfatherhood. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 18,* 117-136.

Weaver, K., Wuest, J., & Ciliska, D. (2005). Understanding women's journey of recovering from anorexia nervosa *Qualitative Health Research, 15,* 188-206.

Ethnographic Analysis

Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L. T., Armstrong, E. M., & Seeley, J. L. (2014). ''Good girls'': Gender, social class, and slut discourse on campus. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 77,* 100–122.

Arts-Based Analysis

Nash, M. (2013). Shapes of motherhood: Exploring postnatal body image through photographs. *Journal of Gender Studies,* 1-20.

Phenomenological Analysis

Chmielewski, J. F., & Yost, M. R. (2013). Psychosocial influences on bisexual women's body image: Negotiating gender and sexuality. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37,* 224-241.

Connolly, C. M. (2004). Lesbian couples: A qualitative look at long-term love. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy: Innovations in Clinical and Educational Interventions, 3,* 13-26.

Ford, K., & Turner, deS. (2001). Stories seldom told: Paediatric nurses' experiences of caring for hospitalized children with special needs and their families. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 33,* 288-295.

Koonce, J. B. (2012). 'Oh, those loud black girls!': A phenomenological study of black girls talking with an attitude. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 8*, 26-46.

Kuo, Y., & Geraci, L. M. (2012). Sister's caregiving experience to a sibling with cerebral palsy - the impact to daughter-mother relationships. *Sex Roles, 66,* 544–557.

Lucero, N. M. (2014). 'It's not about place, it's about what's inside': American Indian women negotiating cultural connectedness and identity in urban spaces. *Women's Studies International Forum, 42,* 9-18.

McDougall, S. D., & McGeorge, C. R. (2014). Utilizing women's feminist identities in family therapy: A phenomenological exploration of the meaning women assign to their feminist identities. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 26*, 73-98.

Merrill, E., & Grassley, J. (2008). Women's stories of their experiences as overweight patients. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 64,* 139–146.

Millings, E. (2010). The role and influence of the father on his 'child' in biological and non-biological relationships: Part Two – Introduction and research findings – An interpretative phenomenological analysis study. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 23,* 177-188.

Narrative Analysis

Bally, J. M. J., Holtslander, L., Duggleby, W., Wright, K., Thomas, R., Spurr, S., & Mpofu, C. (2014). Understanding parental experiences through their narratives of restitution, chaos, and quest: Improving care for families experiencing childhood cancer. *Journal of Family Nursing, 20,* 287–312.

Dhillon, J. (2011). Social exclusion, gender, and access to education in Canada: Narrative accounts from girls on the street. *Feminist Formations, 23,* 110–134.

de Vet, E., Waitt, G., & Gorman-Murray, A. (2012). 'How dare you say that about my friend': Negotiating disability and identity within Australian high schools. *Australian Geographer, 43,* 377-391.

Gilbert, E., Ussher, J. M., & Perz, J. (2014). 'Not that I want to be thought of as a hero': Narrative analysis of performative masculinities and the experience of informal cancer caring. *Psychology & Health, 29,* 1442-1457.

Kaufmann, J. (2007). Transfiguration: A narrative analysis of male-to-female transsexual. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20,* 1-13.

Krumer-Nevo, M. (2005). 'I got married to get free of home': Young women living in poverty in Israel. *Qualitative Social Work, 4,* 51–73.

O'Connor, D., Phinney, A., & Hulko, W. (2010). Dementia at the intersections: A unique case study exploring social location. *Journal of Aging Studies, 24,* 30–39.

Sosulski, M. R., Buchanan, N. T., & Donnell, C. M. (2010). Life history and narrative analysis: Feminist methodologies contextualizing black women's experiences with severe mental illness. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 3,* 29-57.

Willemse, K. (2014). 'Everything I told you was true': The biographic narrative as a method of critical feminist knowledge production. *Women's Studies International Forum, 43,* 38-49.

CLASS SCHEDULE, TOPICS, & READINGS

Date	Topic	Required Readings	Required Sample Qualitative Studies *(see Course Outline for instructions)*	Optional Readings
Jan 6	Course Overview Introduction to Qualitative Research (QR)			
Jan 13	Introduction to Qualitative Research (QR) – Cont. Epistemological Bases of QR Online QR	Crotty (Chs. 1-2) Willig (Chs. 1-2) Wilkerson et al.		Holtz et al. Whitehead
Jan 20	Data Collection & Interpretation Research Proposal	Willig (Chs. 3-5) Ellingson		
Jan 27	Social Constructionism/Discursive Psychology Discourse Analysis	Crotty (Ch. 3) Willig (Ch. 10) Gergen DeLamater & Hyde	Brooks Diorinou & Tseliou Guendouzi Madill & Barkham Petrassi Sneijder & te Molder Sutherland et al. Wiggins at al.	Wood & Kroger (Chs. 1, 7-8) *(analytic steps in discourse analysis)* Potter *(description of discursive psychology)*
Feb 3	Postmodernism/Poststructuralism Foucauldian/Critical Discourse Analysis ***Guest lecturer Dr. Jeffrey Yen, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph***	Crotty (Ch. 9) Willig (Ch. 11 + Appendix 3)	Finn et al. Jaynes Pulos Rogers & Elias Staunaes Wilson Woolhouse et al. Zimmermann	
Feb 10	Critical Inquiry/Feminism Conversation Analysis	Crotty (Chs. 6-8)		Heritage *(description of conversation analysis)*
Feb 17	WINTER BREAK – No Class	*Winter Break*		
Feb 24	Interpretivism I Phenomenology & Thematic Analysis	Crotty (Ch. 4) Willig (Chs. 6 & 8 + Appendix 2)	Chmielewski & Yost Armstrong et al. Collony Ford & Turner Koonce Kuo & Gaeaci Lucero McDougall & McGeorge Merrill & Grasseu Millings	Hein & Austin *(description of phenomenology)* Braun & Clarke *(description & analytic steps in thematic analysis)*
Mar 3	Interpretivism II Grounded Theory Analysis	Crotty (Ch. 5) Willig (Ch. 11 + Appendix 1)	Allen & Roberto Goodwin et al. Haselschwerdt et al. Kearney et al. Kushner & Harrison Sorensen & Coopera Weaver et al.	Charmaz (Chs. 3 & 5) *(analytic steps in grounded theory analysis)*
Mar 10	**In-Class Group Data Analysis** *(bring your own data)*			

Mar 17	Narrative Analysis & Arts-Based Research	Willig (Chs. 12-13) Leavy (Chs. 1-2)	Bally et al. Dhillon De Vet et al. Gilbert et al. Kaufmann Krumer-Nevo O'Commor et al. Sosulski et al. Willemse Nash (arts-based analysis)	Riessman (Chs. 3-4) *(analytic steps in NA)*
Mar 24	Quality in QR	Willig (Ch 14.) Morrow		
Mar 31	*Last Class – Reflection on Learning*			

E-mail Communication
All students are required to check their University of Guelph e-mail account regularly.
E-mail is the official route of communication between the University and its students.

When You Cannot Meet a Course Requirement
Without appropriate documentation all late work will incur a penalty of 10% of the total marks per day late. When you find yourself unable to meet an in-course requirement because of illness or compassionate reasons, please advise the course in writing, with your name, id#, and e-mail contact. See the graduate calendar for information on regulations and procedures for Academic Consideration:
http://www.uoguelph.ca/registrar/calendars/graduate/current/genreg/sec_d0e1415.shtml

Drop Date
The last date to drop one-semester courses, without academic penalty, is Friday, March 6. Two-semester courses must be dropped by the last day of the add period in the second semester. Refer to the Graduate Calendar for the Schedule of Dates.

Academic Misconduct
The University of Guelph is committed to upholding the highest standards of academic integrity and it is the responsibility of all members of the University community – faculty, staff, and students – to be aware of what constitutes academic misconduct and to do as much as possible to prevent academic offences from occurring. University of Guelph students have the responsibility of abiding by the University's policy on academic misconduct regardless of their location of study; faculty, staff and students have the responsibility of supporting an environment that discourages misconduct. Students need to remain aware that instructors have access to and the right to use electronic and other means of detection. The Academic Misconduct Policy is detailed in the Graduate Calendar:
http://www.uoguelph.ca/registrar/calendars/graduate/current/genreg/sec_d0e1687.shtml

Recording of Materials
Presentations which are made in relation to course work—including lectures—cannot be recorded in any electronic media without the permission of the presenter, whether the instructor, a classmate or guest lecturer.

Resources
The Graduate Calendar is the source of information about the University of Guelph's procedures, policies and regulations that apply to graduate programs:
http://www.uoguelph.ca/registrar/calendars/graduate/current/

Sample Descriptions of Critical/Feminist Theoretical Lens

"Our theoretical framework can be characterised as being Foucauldian-informed in that we understand discourses – that is, bodies of constructed knowledge – as being embedded in their socio-historical and cultural contexts and hence not independent from wider ideologies. Discourses, then, operate as social practices and create the objects, realities, identities and experiences of which they speak (e.g. Foucault, 1976/1990)." (Finn, Tunariu, & Lee, 2012, p. 207).

"This research understands 'race' as a socially constructed term. Guillaumin (1999) emphatically eschews the existence of any scientific basis for the construct of 'race', yet firmly declares the existence of race in the world today…. The purpose then of discursive methodologies, is to attend to how institutional power relations are both reproduced and challenged within everyday contexts of talk and action. Within this critical perspective, discourse is viewed as inextricably linked to power, and is necessarily more than just a medium utilised to transmit information (Duncan, 2001)." (Jaynes, 2010, pp. 397-398).

"We approached this study from a feminist perspective, presuming that older women's experiences as sexual beings have been excluded from that which is idealized in the popular, as well as the academic, imagination. The standards on which people are judged—White, Western, educated, propertied, heterosexual, masculine, young, able-bodied—excludes women to one degree or more (Code, 2006)" (Allen & Roberto, 2009, p. 14).

"The feminist-critical approach used focuses on two aspects: marginality, i.e. the interpretation and contextualization of the personal stories within the social contract of gendered and classed inequality (Crenshaw, 1994; Etter-Lewis, 1991; Glenn, 1985; Polatnick, 1996), and complexity, i.e. the subjects' simultaneous acceptance and rejection of social norms (Bloom, 1996; Jacobs et al., 1995; Johnson-Powell, 1996) (see for a further description of the feminist-critical approach Krumer-Nevo, in press)." (Krumer-Nevo, 2005, p. 57).

"The topic of embodiment has been approached from a range of theories across various disciplines (see Weiss & Haber, 1999), including feminist perspectives (e.g., Alaimo & Hekman, 2008; Conboy, Medina, & Stanbury, 1997; Horner & Keane, 2000; Price & Shildrick, 1999; Schiebinger, 2000). In this study we primarily drew on postmodern feminist and poststructural writing. According to postmodern feminists, the body in the West has been conventionally treated as separate from and inferior to the mind (Davis & Walker, 2010)." (Sutherland et al., 2014, p. 118).

Sample Descriptions of Social Constructionist Philosophical Assumptions
(emphasis on active presence of the researcher and knowledge/reality as co-constructed)

"In line with the theoretical and epistemological foundations of discourse analysis, we would like to acknowledge the relative, situated, and constitutive character of our discourse in this article. Like in the case of the data above, the presented analysis is itself a discursive, action-oriented construction tied to our "identity." It reflects our interests and values, informed by our dual category membership: we are both systemic family therapists, trained in the Milan/Post-Milan approach and also have an affiliation with discourse analysis, with an ongoing interest and effort to contribute to their meeting (Tseliou & Eisler, 2007)." (Diorinou & Tseliou, 2014, p. 118).

"I (OS) completed the first round of the analysis with other authors subsequently commenting on, and expanding, and revising my interpretations. I was pregnant while analyzing the data. Making sense and negotiating my own pregnant embodiment while conducting the analysis may have been both an asset and liability. As an "insider" to the pregnancy experience, I may have been sensitized to certain aspects of women's constructions of their pregnancies while potentially overlooking aspects of embodiment that were outside of my understanding and experience. Similarly, privileges I have been socially afforded (e.g., White, able-bodied, educated, partnered, heterosexual) may have hindered my ability to grasp realities and experiences of less privileged individuals. Engaging in an ongoing reflexive inquiry by asking questions concerning how my positioning may be shaping the analysis and its outcomes was helpful in opening space for alternative interpretations. Group analyses involving all authors also helped enrich the study's conclusions and enhance its rigor."

(Sutherland et al., 2014, pp. 106-107).

"As an Aboriginal woman in a similar subject position as the participants in my study, and a participant in the study myself, I brought certain biases to the research…. I believed that knowledge of Aboriginal women's realities was best accessed from the privileged position of Aboriginal women themselves. Critically, the methodology had to be authentic for the contexts and practices of the women with whom I collaborated to develop a substantive theory of agency.Based on my ontological and epistemological assumptions, I identified a decolonizing methodological approach which suited my inquiry and ways of working. From this point of departure, I allowed the research to emerge quite intuitively and organically. In discussion with other researchers, I was alerted to the objectivist traditions and rhetoric of grounded theory, but I came to employ a constructivist grounded theory approach as advocated by Charmaz (2000, 2003, 2005, 2006)." (Bainbridge, Whiteside, & McCalman, 2013, p. 280 – not in the reference list).

"Given the importance of the issue, related to what is the relevant corporate governance concept, the study explores the issue using social constructionist epistemology. Social constructionist epistemology is guided by the philosophic assumptions of the present study that the research issue (i.e. understanding corporate governance) is subjective and complex." (Othman & Rahman, 2011, p. 124 – not in the reference list).

"This study rejects an objective epistemological stance in favour of a more relativist and interpretive approach, where "social actors are seen to jointly negotiate the meanings for actions and situations" (Blaikie, 1993, p.96). Within this epistemology, reality is conceived as highly subjective and interpretivist research accordingly adopts an inductive and theory-generating approach." (Bailey, 2011, p. 38 – not in the reference list).