

ERMA 7210.002
Theory and Methodology of Qualitative Research¹
Auburn University - College of Education
Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, & Technology
Spring 2013

1. **Class Time:** Thursdays, 5:00-8:50pm
Location: Haley Center, Room 3187
Instructor: Carey E. Andrzejewski
334.844.3012
dr.a@auburn.edu
Office Hours: Mondays 1:30-4:00pm, Tuesdays 1:30-4:00pm,
and by appointment
Credit Hours: 3 semester hours
Prerequisites: N/A
2. **Date Syllabus Prepared:** December 2012
3. **Special Accommodations.** Any participant needing special accommodations should contact Dr. Kelly Haynes, Director of the Program for Students with Disabilities, located in 1244 Haley Center, Telephone: 334-844-2096 (Voice/TDD). Office Hours: 7:45 –1145 a.m. and 12:45 – 4:45 p.m.
4. **Required Materials:** [1] Creswell, J. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [2] Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. [3] Web access. You must have access to a web browser, and you must check your email accounts (Tiger Mail and Canvas) several times a week. [4] Supplementary resources will be provided by the instructor via Canvas or in class. [5] Patience, time management, and a sense of humor (This course is time-intensive. I encourage you to consider your schedule before deciding to commit to this class.).
5. **Course Description:** This course is designed to give you an overview and introduction to the historical and theoretical underpinnings of qualitative inquiry. We will also compare and contrast the assumptions, design, and methods of difference “schools” of qualitative inquiry. The primary purposes of the course are to 1.) introduce you to the founding and prevailing principles and paradigms of qualitative inquiry; how these have been used to describe social phenomena; and their underlying assumptions; 2.) critique the limits and possibilities of the various paradigms of qualitative research; 3.) help you become “good consumers” of qualitative research; and 4.) give you an opportunity to begin honing your skills as qualitative researchers.

¹ This syllabus is based on syllabi by Daniel Henry, Jeffrey Brooks, Antoinette Errante, Ron Chenail and Aaron Kuntz.

6. **Course Objectives:** Upon completion of this course, you will be able to:
- Discuss the theoretical traditions undergirding qualitative research;
 - Discuss the relationship between theory and research;
 - Discuss the strengths and limitations of various approaches to qualitative inquiry;
 - Discuss the strengths and limitations of various techniques and procedures for collecting and analyzing qualitative data;
 - Discuss the strengths and limitations of various forms of writing up qualitative data;
 - Assess the quality of qualitative research; and
 - Conduct qualitative research.
7. **Course Format:** The class meetings will include small group discussions, class discussions, lectures, and student presentations. It is important to the collective enterprise that students keep current with the assigned readings, attend class meetings, and participate in the discussions as informed members. Your participation will ensure that our time together will be productive and worthwhile.
8. **Course Requirements and Evaluation (see weekly schedule for due dates):**
- A. **Reader's Questions/Ideas/Comments:** Two questions/ideas/comments are due each week based on the assigned readings. These should be submitted via Canvas before the start of class each week. The questions/ideas/comments should be genuine; that is, *questions for which you do not have an answer, ideas that go beyond or synthesize the reading, or comments that warrant class discussion*. They should also be as focused as possible and specific to the readings. As you read, ask yourself: Is there anything puzzling about what the author is saying? Is any of the terminology confusing? What don't I understand? What particular points would I like to know more about? These questions/ideas/comments, which I will collect and return on a weekly basis, will form the skeleton for much of our class discussion. Although not graded per se (only as part of the participation grade), questions/ideas/comments for the readings each week are a course requirement.
- B. **Reading Quizzes:** Quizzes based on the assigned reading for the week may be given during any class, at any time, without prior notice. It is your obligation to read and to work to understand the reading. I warn you, the reading for this class is not designed for casual reading. To understand it, you will need to devote adequate time. Scores on reading quizzes will be factored into the participation grade.
- C. **Facilitating Article Discussion:** For one of the empirical readings for class, you will be asked to facilitate the class discussion about its methodological merits and flaws. It will be helpful to use the CASP tool (See Appendix A) as a starting place. This assignment will be assessed based on the degree to which your discussion and critique are thorough; thoughtful; grounded in your growing understanding of qualitative research methodology; and inclusive of your classmates (See Appendix B). This assignment is intended to be formal in the sense that you will need to be prepared, but informal in the sense that you will *not* need to create a powerpoint presentation, write a formal paper, or

the like. Your task is to *lead our discussion* about the article, meaning that your job is to get your classmates talking.

- D. Article Critique Portfolio:** As a researcher it will be critical for you to collect, read, and assess published reports including ones employing qualitative research methods. Reading such papers can help you 1.) identify relevant evidence that can guide your practice, 2.) appreciate the utility of qualitative research when it comes to studying various topics, and 3.) select appropriate methods to address your own research questions.

When you locate pertinent research papers, it is critical that you can assess the quality of these published accounts and synthesize your understandings of these sources. This objective can be even more challenging in qualitative research given the variety of methodologies, styles, and philosophical approaches, as well as the uneven nature of the quality of some published results. To help you develop a critical eye for evaluating qualitative research you will be asked to appraise the quality of three qualitative research articles from *your* field: one from each of three different approaches discussed in class and outlined in Creswell's text. To help you discern the quality of your chosen papers, you will use the Modified Critical Appraisal Skills Programme's (CASP) *Making Sense of Evidence Tool: 10 Questions to Help You Make Sense of Qualitative Research* (see www.sph.nhs.uk/sph...appraisal-tools/Qualitative%20Appraisal%20Tool.pdf for the original, the modified version is included in Appendix A). You will need to submit a copy of the first page of each article, or more if required to capture an abstract, along with your appraisal, which should directly follow the format outlined in Appendix A. Please note that the format included in Appendix A includes 10 questions per critique. With the exception of the first two questions, which can be answered in one or two sentences, your responses to each of the remaining eight questions should be accompanied by a 'meaty' rationale for your assessment. That is, you should explicitly answer the question asked *and* provide support for your assessment.

Your article critique portfolio is due to Canvas before class Week 7 (February 21).

- E. Observation and/or Interview Study Proposal and Pilot:** Conduct an interview or observation pilot study. You have the requirement and the opportunity to experience doing fieldwork. I hope that you will engage with this project in ways that fulfill Shulamit Reinharz's² three criteria for worthwhile research: 1.) Contribute to substantive area of inquiry, 2.) flesh out your understanding of what it means to do "postpositivist" research (Don't worry if you don't know what this means. You will.), and 3.) learn about yourself as a researcher – that is, be reflective about methodological learning and ongoing questions. This project may be done solo or in groups of up to three. If you choose to complete this as a group project, each person in the group must complete their own CITI training and write their own reflective audit trail.

1. CITI Training. Online ethics in research training required by the university before your begin conducting research with human or animal subjects. **Your CITI**

² Reinharz, S. (2002). *On becoming a social scientist*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

training must be completed before the start of class Week 2 (January 17). Please upload a copy of your completion certificate to Canvas. Every person in this class must complete their CITI training.

2. Evolving 'Elevator' Speech. During the first class, you will create and deliver an 'elevator' speech about what it is you most want to know (i.e., a burning question you have about your field or environment). During weeks two, three, and four, you will work on revising that speech so that it grows into a question researchable through qualitative means. I encourage you to think about your 'elevator' speech through the lenses of the five research traditions we will read and talk about (see Creswell, 2012). I also encourage you to give thought to the tradition that is best aligned with what you want to know and your way of viewing the world. Once you have settled on a tradition (or a combination of traditions), you will want to begin drafting your letter of intent and proposal presentation. Your elevator speeches will not be graded, but they will help you to move from an initial research idea to a doable research design, as outlined in your proposed study. If you hope to do this project in a group, listen closely for classmates whose interests are similar to yours.

3. Letter of Intent. A letter outlining what it is you want to know and how you plan to answer your questions. Think of this as a pre-proposal proposal and evolution of your elevator speech. It should be addressed to me and be not more than one page. It should identify your research question or problem (1-3 sentences), provide a brief explanation regarding why this is important to you and/or your field (not more than 1 paragraph), a brief description of the small portion you will conduct as your pilot, and a fieldwork calendar for completing your pilot by the time of your presentation. Be sure your calendar leaves you adequate time to collect and analyze your data and prepare your presentation. Your letter of intent is due before the start of class Week 4 (January 31) and should be uploaded to Canvas. If you are planning a group project, your group should submit one letter of intent – this is how you will alert me to your decision to work alone or with a group. Each of the group members will receive the same grade for the letter of intent.

4. Reflective Audit Trail. This semester, you will be asked to keep a reflective audit trail. Your reflective audit trail is a place to document what you have done – what data did you collect, from/ with whom, when, where, etc? This is also a place to keep track of how your research question and proposed design have evolved. That is, your reflective audit trail may contain several drafts of these. It should also contain the materials/ data you collect. Much of this will come directly from/lead directly to your letter of intent. You should think of this as a precursor to writing a methods section for an article or the methods chapter of a dissertation. Trust me, you will be glad you developed the habit of documenting what you do during the conduct of a study; it is a nightmare to try to recreate it post hoc. As it is a *reflective* audit trail, it is also a place for you to document your methodological learning – What have you come to understand about research practice and yourself as a researcher? I encourage you to make notes here about your experiences before, during, and after each phase of the research process. Feel free to use

a personal tone; after all, this is about you. Please note, however, that your reflective audit trail should do more than rehash class and document your notes.

This assignment will be assessed based on the degree to which it is complete, comprehensive, and detailed and the extent to which it reveals your own thinking and growth as a researcher. It is due before the start of class the last week, Week 10 (or 11?) (March 21 (or 28?)) and should be uploaded to Canvas. This is an individual assignment. Every member of every group must write and submit their own reflective audit trail.

5. Proposal and Pilot Presentation. A conference-style, not-more-than-10-minute (or 12- or 14-minute) presentation of your proposed study describing its main features, results of your pilot study, and your methodological learning. The description of its main features should include: a definition of your proposed topic and brief rationale, the key assumptions you are making about this proposed topic, your proposed research questions or problem, what methods you propose to gather information (i.e., number, length, and focus of observations or interviews) and specifically how you propose to use these data (i.e., your analysis plan). The description of the pilot study should outline how your pilot relates to the larger proposed study, the nature of the data you collected, and your preliminary findings, which should be warranted with data. Your description of your methodological learning should focus on the following: What did you learn from conducting the pilot that will shape your conduct of the full study, and what have you learned about yourself as a researcher and about the conduct of qualitative research?

You will not be allowed more than 10 minutes (with 2 additional minutes each for the second and third group members), and you will not receive credit for the parts you are unable to share because you went over time. My advice is to organize the 10 (or 12 or 14) minutes in the following way: 1.) approximately four minutes to introduce and describe the proposed study 2.) approximately four minutes to share your pilot data and discuss preliminary findings and implications for future practice and research, and 3.) approximately two minutes each to share your methodological learning and lingering questions. This assignment will be assessed based on the following criteria: a) clarity and rationale of the research question(s), b) explanation of methods and approach and their alignment with the research question(s), c) clarity and appropriateness of the pilot study, d) coherent and warranted initial analyses and conclusions, e) level of preparation (i.e., attractiveness and usefulness of presentation materials), and f) reflective analysis (see Appendix C). Please plan to give your presentation in a manner consistent with paper presentations at scholarly conferences. And please plan to rehearse. This is a tight timeline, and I doubt you will be successful without practice. Presentations will be given during Week 10 (and 11?) (March 21 (and 28?)). Group projects will be graded as such. It is my expectation that each member of the group will contribute equally to the proposed design and the pilot data collection and analysis. Each member of the group will receive the same grade for the presentation with the exception of the methodological learning portion. That will be graded individually; each group member should plan to present their methodological learning alone.

Task	Points Possible
CITI Training	-
Evolving 'Elevator' Speech	-
Letter of Intent	7
Reflective Audit Trail	15
Proposal and Pilot Presentation	25
TOTAL	47

9. Final Grade:

Assignment	Points Possible
Facilitating Class Discussion	10
Article Critique Portfolio	33
Observation and/or Interview Study Proposal and Pilot	47
Attendance, Attitude, and Class Participation (including reading questions and reading quizzes)	10
TOTAL	100

Grading Scale

Points	Letter Grade
90 to 100 points	A
80 to 89.99 points	B
70 to 79.99 points	C
60 to 69.95 points	D
Below 60 points	F

10. Course Policies:

- A. Professionals show up on time and prepared every day for work. Yes, professionals occasionally have to take sick days (or personal days), but the best are always there. If you have to miss a class, you will be responsible for the notes, assignments, and other duties that have been discussed.
- B. Professionals complete assignments on time. Assignments are due in class on the date given. Assignments handed in after this time will be considered late. Late assignments will be penalized by 10% per day.
- C. Professionals use appropriate means for discussing disagreements. If you don't understand something, ask during class. If you still don't understand, email, phone, or catch me in the building. If you think you deserve a different grade, please contact me within 48 hours. Please don't be so unprofessional as to take class time to discuss grades or other points of contention.

- D. Professionals take responsibility for their own learning. That said, my purpose is to help class members become the very best they can possibly become at this point in their professional development. Please allow me to assist in any way possible including, but certainly not limited to: listening, providing feedback, answering questions, sharing and addressing concerns, brainstorming, clarifying course content or expectations, and mediating or facilitating work with collaborating peers. Always feel free to contact me by phone or by email. However, email is probably not the fastest way to get a response from me. If you contact me via email, allow two days response time. So, if you have an urgent concern or question, it is best to contact me by phone.
- E. Professionals give credit where credit is due. The University Academic Honesty Code and the Tiger Cub Rules and Regulations pertaining to Cheating will apply to this class. See also Student Policy eHandbook (www.auburn.edu/studentpolicies) for rules on academic honesty. Written assignments that include material that is similar to that from course reading materials or other sources should include a citation including source, author, and page number. Quotation marks should be used if the material is copied directly from the readings and text citations should be used (Author, year, page). If the material is paraphrased, (Author, year) should appear immediately following the paraphrased material. Failing to do so constitutes violation of the Auburn University Academic Honesty Code. In addition, written assignments that are similar or identical to those of other students in the class (past or present) is also a violation of the Code. Violations of the Auburn University Academic Honesty Code will be treated according to university policy. Rewriting and resubmission is not an option. **Finally, you may not submit the work of someone else or work that you have submitted for another class to satisfy a requirement of ERMA 7210.**
- F. Professionals understand that teaching and learning are ongoing processes for everyone. There are things I haven't thought of here. Understand that I am learning along with you and your classmates. Please help me take a collaborative approach to solving any problems that may arise.
- G. Professionals make others aware of what they need to be successful. Please inform me within the first week of class if you require adaptations or modifications to any assignment because of special needs (disabilities, religious observances, and so on).
11. **Disability Accommodations:** Students who need accommodations are asked to electronically submit their approved accommodations through AU Access and to arrange a meeting during office hours the first week of classes, or as soon as possible if accommodations are needed immediately. If you have a conflict with my office hours, an alternate time can be arranged. To set up this meeting, please contact me by e-mail. If you have not established accommodations through the Office of Accessibility, but need accommodations, make an appointment with the Office of Accessibility, 1228 Haley Center, 844-2096 (V/TT).

Weekly Calendar		
Date	Readings	Assignments
Week 1 January 10 Introduction: What is a paradigm anyway?	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Auditing, Methodology, Objectivity, Paradigm, Positivism, Postmodernism, Postpositivism, and Subjectivity <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapters 1, 2, and 6	
Week 2 January 17 Reflexivity Narrative and Phenomenological Research	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Ethics of qualitative inquiry, Field journal Informed consent, Institutional review board, Narrative, Phenomenology, and Reflexivity <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapter 4, pp. 70-83; Chapter 10, pp. 258-260 <u>Narrative Examples:</u> Choose <i>one</i> Blackbeard & Lindegger (2007) Eisenberg et al. (2006) Kelchtermans & Ballet (2002) Subreenduth (2006) <u>Phenomenology Examples:</u> Choose <i>one</i> Johansson et al. (2009) Rossiter (1999) Seedat et al. (2006) Vagle (2011)	CITI training Article Discussions
Week 3 January 24 Grounded Theory and Ethnographic Research	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Ethnography, and Grounded theory methodology <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapter 4, pp. 83-96; Chapter 10, pp. 260-263 <u>Grounded Theory Examples:</u> Choose <i>one</i> Barfod et al. (2006) Givon & Court (2010) Kan & Parry (2004) Kearney et al. (1994) <u>Ethnography Examples:</u> Choose <i>one</i> Brooks & Jean-Marie (2007) Hopson et al. (2001) Mohan (2004) Stretesky & Pogrebin (2007)	Article Discussions
Week 4 January 31 Case Studies and Hybrids	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Case study research, Emergent design, and Mixed methods <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapter 4, pp. 97-107; Chapter 10, pp. 264-265; Chapter 3 <u>Case Study Examples:</u> Choose <i>one</i> Boykoff & Boykoff (2007) Dupagne & Garrison (2006) Kim (2011) Stieha (2010)	Article Discussions Letter of Intent due

Week 5 February 7 Documents and Observations	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Data; Data management, storage, retrieval; Description; Document analysis; and Generating data <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapters 3 (revisit) and 7 <u>Supplementary Reading:</u> Lichtman (2010)	
Week 6 February 14 NO CLASS	<p style="text-align: center;">ON YOUR OWN WORK DAY Finalize your article critique portfolio. Update your reflective audit trail. Work on your final: Proposal, Pilot, Reflection, and Presentation</p>	
Week 7 February 21 IRB Interviews and Focus Groups	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Focus groups; and Interviewing, types of <u>Textbook Reading:</u> Chapter 10 <u>Supplementary Reading:</u> Barbour & Schostak (2005)	Article Critique Portfolios due
Week 8 February 28 Analysis and Representation	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Analyzing qualitative data, Computer-assisted data analysis, Crisis of representation, Generalization, Inductive analysis, Inference, Interpretation, Representation, Triangulation, Trustworthiness criteria, Validity, Warranted assertion, and Writing strategies <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapters 8, 9, and 11	
Week 9 March 7	<p style="text-align: center;">IN CLASS WORK DAY/ CATCH UP DAY “Speed Dating” Finalize your proposal and pilot presentation. Finalize your reflective audit trail.</p>	
Week 10 March 21 Final Presentations	<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSAL AND PILOT PRESENTATIONS (Reflective Audit Trails due – Maybe...)</p>	
Week 11 March 28 Final Presentations	<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSAL AND PILOT PRESENTATIONS (Reflective Audit Trails due – Maybe...) (This just depends on how many there are... Stay tuned.)</p>	

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP)
making sense of evidence

10 questions to help you make sense of qualitative research

This assessment tool has been developed for those unfamiliar with qualitative research and its theoretical perspectives. This tool presents a number of questions that deal very broadly with some of the principles or assumptions that characterize qualitative research. It is *not a definitive guide* and extensive further reading is recommended.

How to use this appraisal tool

Three broad issues need to be considered when appraising the report of qualitative research:

- **Rigor:** Has a thorough and appropriate approach been applied to key research methods in the study?
- **Credibility:** Are the findings well presented and meaningful?
- **Relevance:** How useful are the findings to you and/or your organization?

The 10 questions on the following pages are designed to help you think about these issues systematically. You should answer each question and provide a rationale for your answer. The first two questions are screening questions and can be answered quickly; the rationale for the first two questions need only be one sentence. If the answer to both is “yes”, it is worth proceeding with the remaining questions. If the answer to either of these questions is “no,” you should choose another article to review for your article critique portfolio. A number of italicized prompts are given after each question. These are designed to remind you why the question is important, and to support your efforts to write a rationale for each of your responses. **For questions 3-10, your rationales should be at least a ‘meaty’ paragraph and they should reference particular content from the article (i.e., page numbers, section headings, direct quotes, etc.).** Please note, it is not enough to simply address each of these prompts. You must actually answer the questions as posed in the CASP tool. You may find it challenging to write a ‘meaty’ rationale for a ‘no’ response. If you are struggling, be clear about what the authors have failed to do or failed to do adequately/well. You can also offer suggestions about what they could or should have done; consider this practice for writing peer reviews for a journal.

Be sure to also follow APA format for appropriate citations, when needed.

The 10 questions have been developed by the national CASP collaboration for qualitative methodologies.

Screening Questions

1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?

Consider:

- what the goal of the research was
- why it is important
- its relevance

2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?

Consider:

- if the research seeks to interpret or illuminate the actions and/or subjective experiences of research participants

Detailed questions

Appropriate research design

3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?

Consider:

- if the researcher has justified the research design (e.g. have they discussed how they decided which methods to use?)

Sampling

4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?

Consider:

- if the researcher has explained how the participants were selected
- if they explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study
- if there are any discussions around recruitment (e.g. why some people chose not to take part)

Data collection

5. Were the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?

Consider:

- if the setting for data collection was justified
- if it is clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc)
- if the researcher has justified the methods chosen
- if the researcher has made the methods explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews were conducted, did they use a topic guide?)
- if methods were modified during the study. If so, has the researcher explained how and why?
- if the form of data is clear (e.g. tape recordings, video material, notes etc)
- if the researcher has discussed saturation of data

Reflexivity (research partnership relations/recognition of researcher bias)

6. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?

Consider whether it is clear:

- if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during:
- formulation of research questions

- data collection, including sample recruitment and choice of location
- how the researcher responded to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design

Ethical Issues

7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?

Consider:

- if there are sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained
- if the researcher has discussed issues raised by the study (e. g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study)
- if approval has been sought from the ethics committee

Data Analysis

8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?

Consider:

- if there is an in-depth description of the analysis process
- if thematic analysis is used. If so, is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data?
- whether the researcher explains how the data presented were selected from the original sample to demonstrate the analysis process
- if sufficient data are presented to support the findings
- to what extent contradictory data are taken into account
- whether the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation

Findings

9. Is there a clear statement of findings?

Consider:

- if the findings are explicit
- if there is adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researcher's arguments
- if the researcher has discussed the credibility of their findings (e.g. triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analyst.)
- if the findings are discussed in relation to the original research questions

Value of the research

10. How valuable is the research?

Consider:

- if the researcher discusses the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding (e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy, or relevant research-based literature?)
- if they identify new areas where research is necessary
- if the researchers have discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered other ways the research may be used

Appendix B: Facilitating Article Discussion Rubric³

A discussion that earns an A (9-10 points) will be characterized by the following:

1. The discussion includes at least 75% of the other students in the class or group.
2. At least 75% of the discussion is focused on the methodological issues in the article (rather than the conceptual foundations, findings, or implications).
3. The facilitator only shares (or asks questions only seeking) factual information when those facts serve to help explore open-ended questions (i.e., those without a single correct answer) and ideas (i.e., those that might lead to more than one conclusion).
4. The comments offered and/or questions used include at least one from each of the following categories:
 - a. **Explanation:** provide or guide others to express thorough and justifiable accounts of *what* is included in the article, with a focus on methods (participants, data collection, data analysis, and justification for findings and conclusions).
 - b. **Interpretation:** render methodological ideas from the article and other relevant texts accessible and understandable.
 - c. **Application:** effectively use or guide others to use information from other class materials, such as the texts, to shed light on the methodological content of the article.
 - d. **Empathy:** express or guide others to express ideas about what others (other readers, other researchers, the participants, etc.) might find uncomfortable, odd, justifiable, useful, or lacking in the methods employed in the article; and/or explore the degree to which the author(s) reveal(s) empathy. This is an opportunity to engage in a little critical theory.
 - e. **Self-knowledge:** express or guide others to express the personal styles, prejudices, projections, and habits of mind that both shape and impede our own understanding; and/or explore the degree to which the author(s) share(s) their self-knowledge. Think subjectivity!

A discussion that earns a B (8-8.9 points) will be characterized by the following:

1. The discussion includes at least 50% of the other students in the class or group.
2. At least 50% of the discussion is focused on the methodological issues in the article (rather than the conceptual foundations, findings, or implications).
3. The facilitator only shares (or ask questions only seeking) factual information when those facts serve to help explore open-ended questions (i.e., those without a single correct answer) and ideas (i.e., those that might lead to more than one conclusion).
4. The comments offered and/or questions used include at least one from at least four of the following categories:
 - a. **Explanation**
 - b. **Interpretation**
 - c. **Application**
 - d. **Empathy**
 - e. **Self-knowledge**

³ Based on the Rubric for Grading Student-Led Discussions in Smagorinsky, P. (2002). *Teaching English through principled practice*. Allyn and Bacon. And the Six Facets of Understanding in Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design, expanded 2nd ed.* Prentice Hall.
I also wish to thank Dr. Alyson Whyte for her guidance developing this rubric.

A discussion that earns a C (7-7.9 points) will be characterized by the following:

1. The discussion includes fewer than half of the other students in the class or group.
2. Less than half of the discussion is focused on the methodological issues in the article (rather than the conceptual foundations, findings, or implications).
3. The facilitator occasionally shares (or asks questions only seeking) factual information that does not serve to help explore open-ended questions and ideas.
4. The comments offered and/or questions used include at least one from at least three of the following categories:
 - a. **Explanation**
 - b. **Interpretation**
 - c. **Application**
 - d. **Empathy**
 - e. **Self-knowledge**

A discussion that earns a D (6-6.9 points) will be characterized by the following:

1. The discussion includes fewer than half of the other students in the class or group.
2. Less than half of the discussion is focused on the methodological issues in the article (rather than the conceptual foundations, findings, or implications).
3. The facilitator frequently shares (or asks questions only seeking) factual information that does not serve to help explore open-ended questions and ideas.
4. The comments offered and/or questions used include no more than two of the following categories:
 - a. **Explanation**
 - b. **Interpretation**
 - c. **Application**
 - d. **Empathy**
 - e. **Self-knowledge**

A discussion that earns an F (0-5.9 points) will be characterized by the following:

1. The facilitator gives little evidence of having read the article.
2. The facilitator gives little evidence of having prepared comments or questions of any kind.

Appendix C: Rubric for Final Presentation

Criteria	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5
Introduction and Description of Methods for the PROPOSED Study						
Clear research question(s) that indicate the use of qualitative research methods—assumptions and rationale						
Clear and detailed explanation of data collection methods						
Clear and detailed explanation of data analysis methods						
Appropriateness of proposed participants						
Results of the PILOT Study						
Explanation of connection to larger, proposed study						
Description of the data collected						
Warranted preliminary findings						
Sharing Methodological Learning ⁴						
Evidence of reflexivity (i.e., It's clear the students has thought about their role as a researcher.)						
Inclusion of lessons learned or lingering questions based on the pilot study						
Preparation						
Coherent presentation; attractive materials that are properly edited; evidence of rehearsal (i.e., within the allotted 10 minutes)						
General Comments:						
Total:						/25

⁴ This portion may be repeated for groups of two or three.

