

ERMA 7210.001: Theory and Methodology of Qualitative Research¹

Auburn University - College of Education

Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, & Technology

Summer 10 week semester, 2016

1. **Class Time:** Tuesdays, 10:00-1:50 pm
Location: Haley Center, Room 1454
Instructor: Carey Andrzejewski
Contact information: 334.844.3012 cea0011@auburn.edu
Office Hours: Tuesdays 2:00-4:00, and by appointment; Virtual office hours,
Wednesdays 3:15-4:45
Credit Hours: 3 semester hours
2. **Date Syllabus Prepared:** May 2016
3. **Special 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. 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).
4. **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 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; 4.) provide an opportunity to begin honing your qualitative research design skills; and 5.) push you to ‘get your feet wet’ in conducting qualitative research—fieldwork and deskwork.
5. **Required Texts:**
Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwandt, T. A. (2015). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
6. **Required Materials:**

Time management skills. (This course is time-intensive. I encourage you to consider your schedule before deciding to commit to this class.).

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

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. Speaking of technology:

The Web Ate My Homework and Other Excuses:

By registering for this course, please realize:

- This course relies heavily on online technology and often requires students to download and employ third-party software programs and troubleshoot their own technology problems. Since I can't make house calls or analyze multiple different student computer systems, troubleshooting may involve working with the campus help desk, LRC, peers, etc. That being said, if you have tech issues, I will happily try to help you during regular office hours.
- All assignments for this course are submitted electronically to Canvas. Courses with electronically submitted assignments require students to take responsibility for saving/backing up work and for re-doing assignments if they fail to back up their work. (It's a good idea to create assignments in Word, Pages, or other word processing software in case Canvas times you out or you lose your connection.)

7. **Course Objectives:** Upon completion of this course, you will be able to:

- Discuss the theoretical traditions of qualitative research;
- Discuss the limits and possibilities of various approaches to qualitative inquiry;
- Discuss the limits and possibilities of various techniques and procedures for collecting qualitative data;
- Assess the quality of qualitative research;
- Design qualitative research studies; and
- Conduct qualitative research.

8. **Course Format:** Scholars have long theorized that educational pedagogy and practice is rooted in a “banking” approach to teaching and learning (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1997). In this banking model, students were (and in many cases still are) viewed as empty vessels to be filled by the teacher, who “deposits” knowledge and expertise. In this way, students are positioned as passive and powerless, and teaching is a purely teacher-directed act. Due to this positioning, students are often unfamiliar with being responsible for active participation in their own learning. Since all education is political (Freire, 1970) and teachers generally develop courses around their convictions, I try to be very transparent about my teaching philosophy: I approach teaching from a critical stance, which counters passive transference of knowledge. Instead of assuming the role of ‘director’ of learning and ‘keeper’ of authority in a classroom of adults, I participate in teaching as a guide, wherein students emerge as co-directors of the curriculum. This model of teaching expects that students will contribute their own experiences, knowledge, and expertise, and empowers students to be actively involved in their own development. This empowerment is particularly critical in working with adult students who each add a valuable and unique perspective that is essential to quality graduate level learning. Furthermore, an important aspect of this course will be ongoing collaborative interactions with your classmates. You will be working in a collaborative group for many of the class activities and projects. I hope you will learn a great deal from each other. I view myself as both a learner and a teacher in the class, and I expect each of you to also participate in both of these roles. Our course will include small group discussions and activities, whole-class discussions and activities, reflection, conferencing, fieldwork,

and student-led discussions and presentations. It is important 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.

9. Course Requirements and Evaluation (see weekly schedule for due dates):

- A. Reader's Questions/Ideas/Comments (8 points):** The reading for this class is not casual. To understand it, you will need to devote adequate time. 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 earlier, the better. 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, specific to the readings, and integrative. That is, you should draw on specific concepts from our reading to frame your questions/ideas/comments. As these questions/ideas/comments are intended form the skeleton for much of our class discussion, you will be responsible for sharing them in class each week. You will not earn credit, if you are not in class. As the course builds from week to week, you may begin to compare and contrast/synthesize across multiple readings as you formulate your questions/ideas/comments. Questions/ideas/comments for the readings each week are a course requirement and they will be marked in one of three ways: incomplete or absent from class (0 points), complete (0.5 point), or complete and substantive (1 point).
- B. Article Critiques (10 points each, x 2 = 20 points total):** 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 (e.g., determine what to include in a comprehensive review of the extant literature), 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 (in our course, with the help of a library workshop on how to search for literature in your field during class time), 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 publications. To help you develop a critical eye for evaluating qualitative research you will be asked to appraise the quality of two qualitative research articles from a field of your choosing that represent two 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 (1 point per question; 10 points per critique; 20 points total). 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, providing a clear statement of your assessment and critique of the article, *and* provide support for your evaluation. Support for your evaluation should

take the form of specific integration of course readings (ie. Creswell, Schwandt, journal articles, etc.). Remember that the purpose of this assignment is **to critique**, not simply to summarize.

- C. Facilitating Discussion (10 points total):** For one of the *assigned* empirical readings for class, you will be asked to facilitate the class discussion about its methodological merits and flaws (signup in Canvas). It will be helpful to again use the CASP tool (See Appendix A) and the Creswell text as starting places. The discussion should include the following three components to be ‘chunked’ : 1) how the methods in the article map on to (or don’t) Creswell’s expectations/template for the approach; 2) the ethical issues treated in the article; 3) the trustworthiness and credibility of the researcher(s). 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 for the rubric). This assignment is intended to be formal in the sense that you will need to be prepared, but informal in the sense that you are not required to present, write a formal paper, or the like. Your task is to *lead our discussion* about the article, meaning that your job is to ask your classmates questions to get them talking about qualitative research methods. However, if your natural inner teacher pushes you to create some slides or handout to guide us, it is of course within your right to do so!
- D. Qualitative Research Project and Presentation (62 points):** Working in a small group of two-three people, you will design and execute a qualitative study with two sources of data (interview data and archival data). The design and the conduct of your pilot study, should 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. Although this is a “group” project, each person in the group must complete their own CITI training and write their own reflective audit trail.
1. CITI Training (completion). Online ethics in research training required by the university before you begin conducting research with human subjects. Every *individual* enrolled in this class must complete their CITI training. Although you do not have adequate time to apply for IRB approval for your pilot study, I am requiring that you are at least eligible for IRB approval (i.e., have completed your CITI training). In addition to the required modules, I encourage you to also complete any modules that are relevant to your field of study.
 2. In-Class Literature Search (1 point): Details will be given in class.
 3. Letter of Intent, in two submissions (20 points): Each group will submit an initial letter outlining what it is you want to know and how you plan to answer your questions, and a revised letter after your group has identified the ‘type’ of study you will conduct (ie. which one of Creswell’s five approaches have you chosen?). Your first letter should: identify your group’s problem and research questions, and **draw on the literature you found during your search** to frame your topic (1-3 sentences; 2 points); provide a brief explanation regarding why this is important to you and/or your field (not more than 1 paragraph; 2 points), describe a pilot study that you plan to conduct (4 points) during the summer, and include a fieldwork calendar for

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

completing your pilot by the time of your presentation (2 points). Be sure your calendar aligns with our class calendar and leaves you adequate time to collect and analyze your data and prepare your presentation. *Only one letter should be submitted per group* (including names of all group members), and each of the group members will receive the same grade for the letter of intent. Your second letter should be an updated version of the first, with specific articulation of how you will clearly align your design within the parameters of a specific qualitative approach (as outlined in the Creswell text), the specific data you will generate (focus group/individual interviews, and what ‘types’ of documents you will seek and obtain), and a strict timeline for collection and analysis.

4. Interview Protocol (1 point): Details will be given in class.

5. Your two types of data:

Interview (Guide/Transcript): Each group member is required to conduct at least one interview as part of the research project. As a group, you will develop an interview guide (make sure the questions are not leading or compound). Individual members will each conduct an interview, transcribe the recording, and code the data. You must transcribe your own interview recording so as to become intimately involved in your participant’s stories. *You will submit both your interview guide and transcript(s) of interviews individually*, but group analysis will be conducted across all your data sources.

AND

Document/Archival Collection: Through this part of the assignment, you will develop your ability to examine documents/archival/artifact data analysis skills. Each group member will collect at least one document or artifact related to your research topic. For example, if you are working in a school setting, there are many forms of artifacts that you could collect and interpret including: mission statements, schedules, teachers’ planning books, bulletin board content, Internet Web pages, student papers, etc. If you are engaged in historical research, your archival data could include court records, letters, diaries, maps, photographs, and similar types of documents. *You will individually submit*: 1) a description of where and when you collected the data and 2) copies of the archives/artifacts you used. Again, group analysis will be conducted across all your data sources.

6. Pilot Presentation (25 points). A conference-style, not-more-than-15-minute presentation of the **results of your pilot study**, and your **methodological learning**. Your presentation should include: a definition of your topic/research question, a brief rationale, and the key assumptions you are making about this topic; what methods used to gather information (i.e., number, length, and focus of interviews/focus groups); and specifically how you analyzed these data. The description of the pilot study should detail your preliminary findings, which should be warranted with data. Your description of your methodological learning should focus on the following: what you learned from conducting the pilot that will shape your conduct of the full study (i.e., emergent design, emergent questions, or lessoned learned), *and* what have you learned about yourself as a researcher and about the conduct of qualitative research.

You will not be allowed more than 15 minutes, 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 15 minutes in the following way: 1.) approximately three minutes to introduce and describe the study and a (very) brief overview of relevant literature; 2.) approximately seven minutes to share your pilot data and discuss preliminary findings and implications for future practice and research, and 3.) approximately one to 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 timing;), and f) reflective analysis (see Appendix C for rubric). 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. 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; that may require that you conduct more than just one interview or document for 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.

7. Reflective Audit Trail Journal (15 points). This semester, you will be asked to keep an *individual* 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 and 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? How is your understanding of self as instrument evolving? How are you both a help and hindrance to your work? 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. If you'd like a little more structure to your audit trail, I would suggest three categories: theoretical memos (TM), methodological memos (MM), and personal memos (PM). Learn to use your journal as a **habitual** way of jotting down your thoughts, questions, and notes for later application to your dissertation research process. You are encouraged to use your writing as a means of inquiry. Later you may find that your journal entries will become important data for research you are conducting, as well as a valuable means of sense-making and a source that documents personal transformation. Be sure to document dates and times of your entries.

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 should incorporate specific concepts from course readings and discussions (including citations).

This is an individual assignment. Every member of every group must write and submit an individual reflective audit trail journal, and include all data (transcripts, documents, etc) as part of their data trail document. This assignment will be assessed based on the degree to which it is systematic, comprehensive, and reflective (See Appendix D for the rubric).

NOTE: Each student will collect data as part of this class; however, the data collected is for educational purposes only and NOT for thesis, dissertation, or any additional projects or publications.

Task	Points Possible
CITI Training	Completion
Literature Search	1
Letter of Intent (in two submissions)	20
Interview Protocol	1
Reflective Audit Trail Journal	15
Pilot Study Presentation	25
TOTAL	62

10. Final Grade:

Assignment	Points Possible
Facilitating Class Discussion	10
Article Critiques	20
Pilot Study and presentation	62
Attendance, Class Participation (including reading questions)	8
TOTAL	100

Points	Letter Grade
90 to 100 points	A
80 to 89.99 points	B
70 to 79.99 points	C
60 to 69.99 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 nearly always there. If you anticipate missing a class, please let me know in advance, particularly when your assignments are due.
- B. Professionals complete assignments on time. Assignments are due in Canvas as indicated in the syllabus and the course calendar. 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. Please respect our class time together by planning to discuss grades or other points of contention during office hours.

- 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. While I do check my e-mail regularly, **I do not check e-mail after 9 pm (to protect my sanity). Please allow me 48 hours to respond to email, even though I'll probably get back to you sooner.**
- E. Professionals give credit where credit is due. Even though I will encourage you to work in groups and learn from each other, each individual is held responsible for his/her own behavior and learning. I expect students to submit their own work for all assignments. 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. If and when resources are found (even those online!), proper citation must be used. Details regarding APA formatting and citations will be available on Canvas. Specifically, 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. To cycle back to my previously articulated teaching philosophy, understand that I am learning along with you, and that my teaching practice is also a work in progress. 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/modifications to any assignment because of special needs (disabilities, religious observances, and so on).

Weekly Calendar		
Date	Readings	Assignments
Week 1	<u>Textbook Reading:</u> Chapter 1	
May 24	<u>link in Canvas:</u> : Big Data Needs Thick Data	
Introduction: What is qualitative research anyway?	<u>Reflective Journaling:</u> Ortlipp (2008)	
Week 2	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Auditing, Methodology, Objectivity, Paradigm, Positivism, Postmodernism, Postpositivism, Subjectivity, Ethics of qualitative inquiry, Informed consent, and Institutional review board	CITI training
May 31	<u>Ethics Readings:</u> Tillman (2002); Orb, Eisenhower, & Wynaden (2000)	
Ethics and Research; What is a paradigm anyway?	<u>Textbook Reading:</u> Chapter 2	
Week 3	<u>Textbook Reading:</u> Chapters 3 and 6	Literature search assignment due by the end of class
June 7	<u>Lit search reading:</u> Boote & Beile (2005)	
Literature search and identifying a topic of interest – Class will meet in RBD	<u>Developing Research Questions:</u> Creswell (2017), pp. 97-101	
Week 4	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Field journal, Narrative, Phenomenology, and Reflexivity	Letter of intent due Sunday, June 12
June 14	<u>Subjectivity:</u> Peshkin (1988)	Article Discussions in class
Reflexivity	<u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapter 4, pp. 70-83; Chapter 10, pp. 258-260	
Narrative and Phenomenological Research	<u>Narrative Examples:</u> Berman et al. (2009); van Wormer & Falkner (2012)	
	<u>Phenomenology Examples:</u> Edwards (2013); Bartholomew et al. (2015)	

Week 5 June 21 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> Brown (2006); Helmer (2015) <u>Ethnography Examples:</u> Collier, Sorensen, & Iedema (2015); Jones (2012)	Article Discussions in class; Article Critique 1 due Sunday, June 26
Week 6 June 28 Case Studies; Interviews and documents	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Case study research, and Interviewing, types of <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapter 4, pp. 97-107; Chapter 10, pp. 264-265 <u>Case Study Examples:</u> Chur-Hansen et al. (2015); Anyon (1981) <u>Interviewing:</u> revisit Creswell, Chapter 3; Josselson (2013)	Article Discussions in class; Revised letter of intent and interview protocol due by the end of class
Week 7 July 5 Data collection	No class – Use this time and this week to focus on conducting and transcribing interviews.	Article Critique 2 due Sunday, July 3
Week 8 July 12 Inductive Analysis and Representation	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Analyzing qualitative data, Inductive analysis, Inference, Interpretation, Triangulation, Trustworthiness criteria, and Validity <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapter 8	
Week 9 July 19 Deductive Analysis and Representation	<u>Dictionary Terms:</u> Representation, Crisis of representation, Generalization, Warranted assertion, and Writing strategies <u>Textbook Readings:</u> Chapters 9 and 11 <u>Analysis example:</u> DeCuir & Dixson (2004)	
Week 10 July 26	Final presentations of pilot studies	
Week 10.5 July 31 st	<u>REFLECTIVE AUDIT TRAIL JOURNALS DUE</u>	

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 (i.e., state your views regarding the quality of the article). 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. For question 10, be sure to consider your answers to questions 3-9. Your evaluation of the quality of the article in these respects should inform your overall assessment of the value of the article.

Your task is not to merely summarize the articles. Your task is to critique them by crafting supported evaluations following the format and guidelines offered in the following pages.

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.

© Public Health Resource Unit, England (2006). All rights reserved.

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 used 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*

© Public Health Resource Unit, England (2006). All rights reserved.

Appendix B: Facilitating Article Discussion Rubric³

High quality discussions will be characterized by the following:

1. The discussion includes at least 75% of the other students in the class or group. Your task is to ask questions that will get your classmates talking, not to present a summary of the article. Everyone in the room should have read it.
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!

Criteria	Ratings						Points
Involving Classmates	75% or more – 2.5 pts		50-74% - 2 pts		Less than 50% - 1.5 pts		2.5 pts
Focus on Methodology	75% or more – 2.5 pts		50-74% - 2 pts		Less than 50% - 1.5 pts		2.5 pts
Focus on Open-Ended Questions	100% - 2.5 pts		Occasional Closed – 2 pts		Frequent Closed – 1.5 pt		2.5 pts
Content (Explanation, Interpretation, Application, Empathy, and Self-Knowledge)	All 5 – 2.5 pts	4/5 – 2 pts	3/5 – 1.5 pts	2/5 – 1 pt	1/5 – 0.5 pt	0/5 – 0 pt	2.5 pts
Total Points: 10							

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.

Appendix C: Rubric for Final Presentation

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4
Introduction and Description of Methods for the Pilot Study					
Clear research question(s) that indicate the use of qualitative research methods—assumptions and rationale					
Clear and detailed explanation of data generation methods					
Clear and detailed explanation of data analysis methods					
Results of the Pilot Study					
Assertions warranted with substantive data (exemplary quotes, excerpts from field notes, etc.)					
Sharing Methodological Learning					
Evidence of reflexivity (i.e., It's clear the student has thought about their role as a researcher.)					
Inclusion of lessons learned or lingering questions based on the pilot study					
Preparation					
	0				1
Coherent presentation; attractive materials that are properly edited; evidence of rehearsal (i.e., within the allotted time)					
General Comments:					
Total:					
/25					

Appendix D: Reflective Audit Trail Journal rubric (15 points)

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	5
Systematic documentation – evidence of regular entries						
Audit trail – inclusion of specific details regarding who, what, when, etc. in pilot study						
Reflective journaling – substantive sense-making, with accurate application of concepts that are integrated from course readings (with in-text citations)						
General Comments:						
Total:						/15