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# Course Overview

## Course Description:

This course explores how social research may be engaged when issues of inequity and marginalization are embedded in the research content and processes. We will examine scholarship that looks at the (existing and possible) power relations involved in the production of knowledge as well as the tensions and possibilities for the conduct of research as a mechanism of social change.

## Course Objectives:

The aim of this course is for us, as a group, to:

1. explore the potential for research to contribute to projects of social justice/social transformation from the ontological and epistemological starting points to specific research methods
2. engage in dialogue about the merits of certain methodologies & approaches over others for justice-related knowledge production and social change
3. draw insights from readings and discussion of your own research areas and interests
4. explore how our research decisions are influenced by our own intellectual genealogies

The course primarily considers indigenous and decolonizing methodologies, participatory research methodologies (including arts-informed research), institutional ethnography, mixed methods, and critical approaches. In our consideration of a selection of research approaches that (claim to) offer resources for social change, we will include:

* ontological and epistemological underpinnings of the approach, including conceptualizations of power, its sources and mechanisms
* debates and tensions within and between paradigms, including the roots of current critiques
* specific examples of the approaches
* common issues and critiques, as well as dialogue with other methodologies
* reflection and guidance regarding the processes & politics of research, including relationships with participants; representation of participants / marginalized people; identity and location of the researcher [accountability, positioning, partiality]

The basic assumptions of this course concur with the broader curriculum context set by the **School of Social Work's Statement of Philosophy**:

*As social workers, we operate in a society characterized by power imbalances that affect us all. These power imbalances are based on age, class, ethnicity, gender identity, geographic location, health, ability, race, sexual identity and income. We see personal troubles as inextricably linked to oppressive structures. We believe that social workers must be actively involved in the understanding and transformation of injustices in social institutions and in the struggles of people to maximize control over their own lives.*

## Course Format

For the most part we will engage in dialogue, individual presentations, andfacilitated discussion. Students will also be posting and responding to discussion questions.

## Required Texts:

There are no required texts for this course. Weekly readings and other course materials will be posted on A2L and may fluctuate over the course of the term in response to student interests.

## Additional Suggested Readings

The instructor, as well as students, may post additional suggested readings to A2L over the duration of the course.

# Course Requirements/Assignments

## Requirements Overview and Deadlines

1. Facilitated discussion: 30% (15% - facilitated discussion; 15% - 7-8-page paper to be submitted 1 week later). Due dates to be determined in class. See description below.
2. Discussion Questions: 20% (Over the course, students will develop and post 5 discussion questions and respond to the posted questions of 5 peers: 10 X 2% each.) Due dates to be determined in class. See description below.
3. Final paper: 50%, 20-25-page paper due December 11th, 2020. See description below.

*Suggestion: it can be helpful to keep a journal of your intellectual journey through the course.*

## Requirement/Assignment Details

1. Seminar Facilitation and Notes
	* Each student will be responsible for facilitating discussion of one week’s readings during the course. Students, with approval of the course instructor, can replace one of the assigned readings with a reading of their choice (‘readings’ can be academic articles, a non-academic source, a video, etc: we will discuss this in the first class of the course).
	* Keep in mind that it is the student’s task to facilitate the discussion. As all students in the class are expected to have completed the week’s readings prior to class, the facilitator need not present a summary of the article, however, they must prepare a list of guiding questions for the discussion and this list is to be posted on Avenue to Learn in advance of the class. Students may also choose to create a powerpoint presentation that includes the discussion questions, some of their own reflections on the readings, and any other material they feel will be useful to the discussion (e.g., video clips, images, etc.).
	* Some questions to consider when preparing for facilitation:
		1. What are the main ontological, epistemological and theoretical features of this approach?
		2. What are the primary critiques being put forward in the readings?
		3. What assumptions lie behind these critiques?
		4. What possibilities for reform/change/transformation/revision are being suggested?
		5. What is the author(s) saying about how this particular methodology can be used, applied, works?
		6. What is the author(s) saying about the problems, limitations, risks of the approach, and/ or its synergies with other approaches?
	* In terms of integrating the learning from the readings:
		1. compare and contrast perspectives and approaches between the week’s assigned readings and readings from other weeks where appropriate
		2. indicate what you learned from the readings about the relationship between research and social change
		3. indicate what the readings offer your own emerging conceptual framework
		4. articulate any questions, concerns, or troubling aspects that the approach raises for you
	* For the week that you facilitate, submit a 7-8 double-spaced page discussion of the readings along ***a small selection*** of the dimensions above (those that are most relevant to your own work and emerging ideas for research). ***In particular***, attend to the issues, questions, concerns, dilemmas and possibilities raised in the class discussion. Again, this paper should ***not*** be a summary of the articles. Papers should be submitted via Avenue to Learn.
2. Development of Discussion Questions
	* Each student will be responsible for developing 1 discussion question for 5 different classes over the course of the term and responding to 5 discussion questions posted by peers (again, for 5 different classes). The details will be posted on Avenue to Learn. Discussion questions are to be made available in advance of the class. **During our first class, we will discuss whether to post discussion questions and responses on Avenue to Learn, or to use FlipGrid.**
3. Final Paper - Research for Social Change: your model, metaphor, framework, vision applied to your emerging research plans
	* The major assignment for this course involves you, in dialogue with authors in this course and your 771 colleagues, articulating a conceptual framework for research for social change in relation to your emerging research plans. In your 20-25 paged paper (double spaced) discuss:
		1. Your early assumptions and ideas about research for social change – what it means, how it happens, who/what it involves, what it requires, how it works in the world etc. Consider including some form of visual representation, or use a metaphor or image, to both deepen and make apparent your understanding/ vision. [Miner? Honeybee? Detective? Earth worm? Etc.].
		2. Your current conceptual framework / vision for research for social change, *applied to your own emerging thesis plans*. Again, consider using a visual representation, diagram or image, metaphor, photograph, etc. to deepen and make apparent your understanding / vision.
		3. Consider the following questions:
			1. how did you get from where you started to your current conceptual framework?
			2. How have your early assumptions changed throughout the course?
			3. What tensions were introduced and/or assumptions challenged?
			4. What was it about the readings, our class discussions of the readings, your own personal or professional experiences, conversations, dreams, insights etc. that led you to rethink, re-vision the framework?
			5. What was named, refined, confirmed, or challenged?
		4. Consider as well, the boundaries and ‘messy’ edges of your framework:
			1. what does it make possible?
			2. What / who does it limit or exclude?
			3. What are its challenges, worries, risks?
			4. What still needs working out? (And possible avenues for doing so…)
	* Papers should be submitted via Avenue to Learn.

# Assignment Submission and Grading

## Form and Style

* Written assignments must be typed and double-spaced and submitted to Avenue 2 Learn with a front page containing the title, student’s name, student number, and the date. Number all pages (except title page).
* Paper format must be in accordance with the current edition of American Psychological Association (APA) publication manual with particular attention paid to font size (Times-Roman 12), spacing (double spaced) and margins (minimum of 1 inch at the top, bottom, left and right of each page) as papers not meeting these requirements will not be accepted for grading.
* Students are expected to make use of relevant professional, social science and other literature as well as other bodies of knowledge (including non-academic sources and forms such as media, community-based, arts-based/artistic, etc.) in their assignments. When submitting, please keep a spare copy of your assignments.
* Alternative forms/formats for assignments (e.g., audio versions, arts-based, non-traditional ways of writing, etc.) *are welcome* but must be discussed with the instructor ahead of time.

## Avenue to Learn

In this course, we will be using Avenue to Learn, Zoom, and possibly FlipGrid. Students should be aware that, when they access the electronic components of this course, private information such as first and last names, user names for the McMaster e-mail accounts, and program affiliation may become apparent to all other students in the same course. The available information is dependent on the technology used. Continuation in this course will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure please discuss with the course instructor.

## Submitting Assignments & Grading

Please refer to the section on assignments for details.

## Privacy Protection

In accordance with regulations set out by the Freedom of Information and Privacy Protection Act, the University will not allow return of graded materials by placing them in boxes in departmental offices or classrooms so that students may retrieve their papers themselves; tests and assignments must be returned directly to the student. Similarly, grades for assignments for courses may only be posted using the last five digits of the student number as the identifying data. The following possibilities exist for return of graded materials:

1. Direct return of materials to students in class;
2. Return of materials to students during office hours;
3. Students attach a stamped, self-addressed envelope with assignments for return by mail;
4. Submit/grade/return papers electronically.

Arrangements for the return of assignments from the options above will be finalized during the first class.

## Extreme Circumstances

The University reserves the right to change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances (e.g., severe weather, labour disruptions, etc.). Changes will be communicated through regular McMaster communication channels, such as McMaster Daily News, A2L and/or McMaster email.

# Student Responsibilities

* Students are expected to contribute to the creation of a respectful and constructive learning environment. Students should read material in preparation for class, attend class on time and remain for the full duration of the class. A formal break will be provided in the middle of each class, students are to return from the break on time.

## Attendance

In this seminar class students learn not only from the course materials, but also from engagement with their peers and the course instructor. Should you be unable to attend a particular class, please advise the course instructor ahead of the class.

## Academic Integrity

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behaviour in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity. Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. This behaviour can result in serious consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: “Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty”), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university. It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty, please refer to the [Academic Integrity Policy](https://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/AcademicIntegrity.pdf)

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

* Plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one’s own or for which other credit has been obtained.
* Improper collaboration in group work.
* Copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations

## Conduct Expectations

As a McMaster student, you have the right to experience, and the responsibility to demonstrate, respectful and dignified interactions within all of our living, learning and working communities. These expectations are described in the *Code of Student Rights & Responsibilities* (the “Code”). All students share the responsibility of maintaining a positive environment for the academic and personal growth of all McMaster community members, **whether in person or online**.

It is essential that students be mindful of their interactions online, as the Code remains in effect in virtual learning environments. The Code applies to any interactions that adversely affect, disrupt, or interfere with reasonable participation in University activities. Student disruptions or behaviours that interfere with university functions on online platforms (e.g. use of Avenue 2 Learn, WebEx or Zoom for delivery), will be taken very seriously and will be investigated. Outcomes may include restriction or removal of the involved students’ access to these platforms.

## Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities who require academic accommodation must contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS) at 905-525-9140 ext. 28652 or sas@mcmaster.ca to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. For further information, consult McMaster University’s *Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities* policy.

## Accessibility Statement

The School of Social Work recognizes that people learn and express their knowledge in different ways. We are committed to reducing barriers to accessibility in the classroom, and working towards classrooms that welcome diverse learners. If you have accessibility concerns or want to talk about your learning needs, please be in touch with the course instructor.

## Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observances (RISO)

Students requiring academic accommodation based on religious, indigenous or spiritual observances should follow the procedures set out in the RISO policy. Students should submit their request to their Faculty Office ***normally within 10 working days*** of the beginning of term in which they anticipate a need for accommodation or to the Registrar's Office prior to their examinations. Students should also contact their instructors as soon as possible to make alternative arrangements for classes, assignments, and tests.

## E-mail Communication Policy

Effective September 1, 2010, it is the policy of the Faculty of Social Sciences that all e-mail communication sent from students to instructors (including TAs), and from students to staff, must originate from the student’s own McMaster University e-mail account. This policy protects confidentiality and confirms the identity of the student. It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that communication is sent to the university from a McMaster account. If an instructor becomes aware that a communication has come from an alternate address, they may not reply.

## Copyright and Recording

Students are advised that lectures, demonstrations, performances, and any other course material provided by an instructor include copyright protected works. The Copyright Act and copyright law protect every original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic work, including lectures by University instructors.

The recording of lectures, tutorials, or other methods of instruction may occur during a course. Recording may be done by either the instructor for the purpose of authorized distribution, or by a student for the purpose of personal study. Students should be aware that their voice and/or image may be recorded by others during the class. Please speak with the instructor if this is a concern for you.

The School of Social Work requests and expects that:

* Instructors inform students about what they will record, when they will record, and what they will do with the recording
* Students who wish to record contact the instructor first. This is so the instructor can inform the class when permission has been given to a student to record (the identity of the student will be kept confidential by the instructor).
* Recordings by students are used for personal study only, and not shared with anyone else, and are deleted when no longer needed for personal study
* There will likely be times when students or guest speakers share personal or sensitive information. In this circumstance we expect everyone to stop recording. The instructor (or student or guest sharing) may also ask for recording to stop, and we expect everyone to respect such a request.

# Course Weekly Topics and Readings

## Week 1: September 10th, 2020

### Topics:

* Introductions, current plans and aspirations for research for social change.
* Review of the course outline

### Readings:

* Wolgemuth, J. R. (2015). Driving the paradigm: (Failing to teach) methodological ambiguity, fluidity, and resistance in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 1-8.

## Week 2: September 17th, 2020

### Topics:

* Setting the Stage: Personal Intellectual Genealogies exercise

### Readings:

* Pillow, W. S. (2015). Reflexivity as interpretation and genealogy in research. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, *15*(6), 419-434.
* Smith, L. T. (1992). Some notes on being constructed: The view from my grandmother’s verandah in. *Te Pua*, *1*(1), 59-64.

Supplementary Readings:

* Simon, R. I. (2003). Innocence without naivete, uprightness without stupidity: The pedagogical *Kavannah* of Emmanuel Levinas. *Studies in Philosophy and*

*Education, 22*:45-59.

## Week 3: September 24th, 2020

### Topics:

* Emancipatory (?) Epistemologies

### Readings:

* Ladson-Billings, G. & J. Donnor. (2008). Waiting for the call: The moral activist role of critical race theory relationship. In N. K. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith Eds.), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, pp. 624 Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.
* Fine, M. (1992). Passions, politics, and power: Feminist research possibilities. In M. Fine (Ed), *Disruptive voices: The possibilities of feminist research*, pp. 205-231 Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
* Daniele, A. & Woodhams, C. (2005). Emancipatory Research Methodology and Disability: A Critique. *Int. J. Social Research Methodology* 8(4), pp. 281–296.
* Nkoane, M. M. (2012). Critical emancipatory research for social justice and democratic citizenship. *Perspectives in Education*, *30*(4), 98-104.
* Linda T. Smith youtube video on optimism: [**https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpisrVd0LRs**](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpisrVd0LRs)

Supplementary Readings:

* Becker, H. (2004). "Whose side are we on?" In W. K. Carroll, (Ed.) in *Critical strategies for social research*, (pp. 23-28). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
* Denzin, N.K., (2018). Answering the Call. Qualitative Inquiry, 1-2.

DOI:10.1177/1077800418806604

* Whitmore, E. (2001). “People Listened to What We Had to Say”: Reflections on an Emancipatory Qualitative Evaluation. In I. Shaw and N. Gould (Eds.), *Qualitative* *Research in Social Work*, (pp. 83-99). London: Sage Publications.

## Week 4: October 1st, 2020

### Topics:

* Participatory, Inclusive and Community Action/-based research
* Knowledge Co-production

### Readings:

* Reitsma-Street, M. and Brown, L. (2004). Community Action Research. In W.K.Carroll, (Ed.) in *Critical strategies for social research*, (pp. 303-319). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
* Levine-Rasky, C. (2015). Research For/About/With the Community A Montage. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1532708615572359.
* Bain, A.L. & Payne, W.J. (2016). Queer de-participation: re-framing the co-production of scholarly knowledge. *Qualitative Research, 16*(3) 330-340.
* Costa, L., Voronka, J., Landry, D., Reid, J., Mcfarlane, B., Reville, D., & Church, K. (2012). " Recovering our Stories": A Small Act of Resistance. *Studies in Social Justice*, *6*(1), 85.
* Dean, A. (2015). Colonialism, Neoliberalism and University-Community Engagement, What Sorts of Encounters with Difference are our Institutions Prioritizing. In C. Janzen, D. Jeffrey & K. Smith (Eds.), *Unravelling Encounters: Ethics, Knowledge and Resistance under Neoliberalism*, (pp.175-194), Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Supplementary Readings:

* Spagnuolo, N., El-Lahib, Y., & Kusari, K. (2019). Participatory training in disability and migration: mobilizing community capacities for advocacy. *Qualitative Research,* DOI: 1468794119830076.
* Kesby, M. (2005). Retheorizing Empowerment-through-Participation as a Performance in Space: Beyond Tyranny to Transformation. Signs: *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30*(4), 2037-2065.
* Kara, H. (2017). Identity and power in co-produced activist research. *Qualitative Research*, *17*(3), 289-301.

## Week 5: October 8th, 2020

### Topics:

* Aboriginal, Indigenous and North/South approaches and tensions:

### Readings:

* Jones, A. & Jenkins, K. (2008). Rethinking collaboration: Working the indigene-coloniser hyphen. In *Handbook of Critical* *and Indigenous methodologies*, edited by N. K. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.
* Blix, B. H. (2015). “Something Decent to Wear” Performances of Being an Insider and an Outsider in Indigenous Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(2), 175-183.
* Meekosha, H. (2011). Decolonizing disability: Thinking and acting globally. *Disability & Society, 26*(6), 667-682.
* Cannella, G.S. and Maneulito, K.D. (2008). Feminisms from Unthought Locations; Indigeneous Worldviews, Marginalized Feminisms, Revisioning an Anticolonial Social Science. In N.K.Denzin, Y. Lincoln and L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, (pp 45-59). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Supplementary Reading:

* Simonds, V. W., & Christopher, S. (2013). Adapting Western research methods to indigenous ways of knowing. *American Journal of Public Health*, *103*(12), 2185-2192.
* Grande, S. (2008). Red pedagogy: The un-methodology. In *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, edited by N. K. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc.
* Peltier, C. (2018). An application of two-eyed seeing: Indigenous research methods with participatory action research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *17*(1), 1609406918812346.
* Hart, M. (2010). Indigenous Worldviews Knowledge, and Research: The Development of an Indigenous Research Paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work* *, 1* (1), 1-16.
* Meadows, L., Lagendyk, L., Thurston, W., & Eisener, A. (2003). Balancing Culture, Ethics, and Methods in Qualitative Health Research with Aboriginal Peoples. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 2* (4), 1-14.
* Meyer, M. A. (2008). Indigenous and authentic: Hawaiian epistemology and the triangulation of meaning. In *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous methodologies*, edited by N. K. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, and L. T. Smith. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc, p. 624.
* Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People*. London: Zed Books. Chapter 5.
* Caretta, M. A., & Riaño, Y. (2016). Feminist participatory methodologies in geography: creating spaces of inclusion. *Qualitative Research*, *16*(3), 258-266.

## Week 6: October 15th Midterm Recess

* **no class**

## Week 7: October 22nd, 2020

### Topics:

* Using the Arts in/for Research

### Readings:

* Boydell, K. M., Hodgins, M., Gladstone, B. M., Stasiulis, E., Belliveau, G., Cheu, H., ... & Parsons, J. (2016). Arts-based health research and academic legitimacy: Transcending hegemonic conventions. *Qualitative Research*, *16*(6), 681-700.
* Sinding, C., Paton, C., & Warren, R. (2012). Social work and the arts: Images at the intersection. *Qualitative Social Work*, 13(2), 187-202
* Enria, L. (2015). Co-producing knowledge through participatory theatre: reflections on ethnography, empathy and power. *Qualitative Research,* 1468794115615387
* Springgay, S., & Zaliwska, Z. (2015). Diagrams and cuts: A materialist approach to research-creation. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, *15*(2), 136-144.

Supplementary Readings:

* Joffre-Eichhorn, H. J. (2019). The Memory Box-Initiative: Nonextractivist Research Methodologies and the Struggle for an Architecture of Remembrance in Kabul, Afghanistan. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1532708619863008.
* Fudge Schormans, A. (2015). Corroding the comforts of social work knowing: Persons with intellectual disabilities claim the right of inspection over public photographic images. In, C. Sinding and H. Barnes (Eds.). *Social Work Beyond Borders/Social Work Artfully,* Wilfrid Laurier University Press, pp. 173-188.
* Ignagni, E. & Fudge Schormans, A. (2016). Reimagining Parenting Possibilities: Towards Intimate Justice. *Studies in Social Justice, 10* (2), 238-260.
* Sinding, C., Gray, R., & Nisker, J. (2008). Ethical issues and issues of ethics. In G. Knowles & A. Coles (Eds.), *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research* (pp. 459 – 467). Thousand Oaks, California; Sage Publications Inc.
* Engel, A. (2018). Queer Reading as Power Play: Methodological Considerations for Discourse Analysis of Visual Material. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1077800418789454.
* Thiel, J. J., & Hofsess, B. A. (2019). Digressive Methodologies: Inviting the Aesthetic and Material Into the Phenomenological. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1077800419836698.

## Week 8: October 29th, 2020

### Topics:

* Critical and Postmodern Tensions

### Readings:

* Herising, F. (2005). Interrupting positions: Critical thresholds and queer pro/positioning. In *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-oppressive Approaches*, edited by L. Brown and S. Strega, pp. 127-151. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
* Delhi, K. (2008). Coming to terms: Methodological and other dilemmas in research. In, *The Methodological Dilemma: Creative, Critical and Collaborative Approaches to Qualitative Research*, edited by K. Gallagher. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 46-66.
* Cannella, G. S. (2015). Qualitative research as living within/transforming complex power relations. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(7), 594-598.
* Lather, P. (2008). Getting lost: Critiquing across difference as methodological practice. In, K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The Methodological Dilemma: Creative, critical and collaborative approaches to qualitative research,* (pp. 219-231). London & NY: Routledge.

Supplementary Readings:

* Taguchi, H.L. (2013). Images of thinking in feminist materialisms: ontological divergences and the production of researcher subjectivities. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26* (6), 706-716.
* Strega, S. (2005). The view from the poststructural margins: Epistemology and methodology reconsidered. In *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-oppressive Approaches*, edited by L. Brown and S. Strega. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
* Mykhalovskiy, E., Armstrong, P. Armstrong, H. Bourgeault, I., Choiniere, J., Lexchin, J., Peters, S., & White, J. (2008). Qualitative research and the politics of knowledge in an age of evidence: Developing a research-based practice of immanent critique. *Social* *Science & Medicine* 67:195-203.
* *Lather talking about her work:* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wd4hbECjEmA>

## Week 9: November 5th, 2020

### Topics:

* Critical Discourse Analysis

### Readings:

* Wodak, R., & Meyer, M.  (2009).  Critical Discourse Analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology.  In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-34).  Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
* Martinez, D. F.  (2007).  From theory to method:  A methodological approach within Critical Discourse Analysis.  *Critical Discourse Studies, 4*(2), 125-140.
* van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society 4*(2):249-283. *\*Note: this is a seminal article on CDA.*
* Fraser, N. & Gordon, L. (1994). A Geneology of *Dependency*: Tracing A Key Word of the U.S. Welfare State. *Signs 19*(2), 309-336.

Supplementary Readings:

* Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of educational research*, *75*(3), 365-416.
* Herzog, B. (2018). Suffering as an anchor of critique. The place of critique in critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *15*(2), 111-122.
* Taylor, S.  (2004).  Researching educational policy and change in “new times”:  Using critical discourse analysis.  *Journal of Education Policy, 19*(4), 433-451.
* Lassen, I. (2018). Resisting dehumanization: citizen voices and acts of solidarity. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1-17.
* Lynn, T. J., & Williams, L. S. (2018). ‘Have a Quiet, Orderly, Polite Revolution’: Framing Political Protest and Protecting the Status Quo. *Critical Sociology*, *44*(4-5), 733-751.
* Hammersley, M. (2014). On the ethics of interviewing for discourse analysis. *Qualitative Research*, *14*(5), 529-541.

## Week 10: November 12th, 2020

### Topics:

* Institutional Ethnography

### Readings:

* [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1RI2KEy9NDw](https://univmail.cis.mcmaster.ca/Redirect/www.youtube.com/watch?v=1RI2KEy9NDw)
* Smith, D. (2005). Knowing the social: An alternative design. In *Institutional*

*Ethnography: A sociology for people*. Oxford: AltaMira Press, pp.27-45.

* Smith, D. E. (2005). Designing an ontology for institutional ethnography. In D.E. Smith. (Ed). *Institutional Ethnography: A sociology for people* (p.49-73)*.* Altamira Press: A division of Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
* Smith, G.W. (1990). Political Activist as Ethnographer. *Social Problems* 37:629-648.
* Watt, L. (2015). (Un)safe at School: Parents’ Work of Securing Nursing Care and Coordinating School Health Services Delivery for Children with Diabetes in Ontario Schools. Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, June 2015, Volume XLII, Number 2

Supplementary Readings

(these include more writings by D.E. Smith and example of IE):

* Smith, D. E. (1987). Finding and writing a sociology for women. In *The everyday world* *as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, pp.45-105.
* Smith, D. E. (2005). Language as coordinating subjectivities. In D.E. Smith. (Ed). *Institutional Ethnography: A sociology for people* (p.75-98)*.* Altamira Press: A division of Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
* Smith, D. E. (1993). The Standard North American Family: SNAF as an Ideological Code. *Journal of Family Issues, 14*(1), 50-65.
* Watt, L. (2017). “Her Life Rests on Your Shoulders”: Doing Worry as Emotion Work in the Care of Children with Diabetes. *Global qualitative nursing research*, *4*, 2333393617743638.
* Rankin, J. M. (2009). The nurse project: An analysis for nurses to take back our work. *Nursing Inquiry*, *16*(4), 275-286.
* Luken, P. C., & Vaughan, S. (2006). Standardizing childrearing through housing. *Social problems*, *53*(3), 299-331.
* Nichols, N. (2018). The Social Organization of Access to Justice for Youth in ‘Unsafe’ Urban Neighbourhoods. *Social & Legal Studies*, *27*(1), 79-96.
* Melon, K. A., White, D., & Rankin, J. (2013). Beat the clock! Wait times and the production of ‘quality ’in emergency departments. *Nursing Philosophy*, *14*(3), 223-237.

## Week 11: November 19th, 2020

### Topics:

* Auto/ethnography, Ethnomethodology and Narrative Approaches

### Readings:

* Adams, T. E. (2008). A review of narrative ethics. *Qualitative inquiry*, *14*(2), 175-194.
* Onuora, A. N. (2013). HERstory Is OURstory: An Afro-Indigenous Response to the Call for “Truth” in Narrative Representation. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, *13*(5), 400-407.
* Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: an overview. *Historical social research/Historische sozialforschung*, 273-290.
* Winkler, I. (2018). Doing autoethnography: Facing challenges, taking choices, accepting responsibilities. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *24*(4), 236-247.
* de Montigny, G. (2018). Engaging ethnomethodology for social work. *Journal of Social Work*, 1468017318795925.

Supplementary Readings:

* Bochner, A. P. (1997). It's about time: Narrative and the divided self. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *3*(4), 418-438.
* Esposito, J. (2014). Pain Is a Social Construction until It Hurts: Living Theory on My Body. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *20*(10), 1179-1190.
* Peers, D. (2012) Interrogating disability: the (de)composition of a recovering Paralympian, Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 4:2, 175-188, DOI: 10.1080/2159676X.2012.685101
* Forber-Pratt, A. J. (2015). “You’re going to do what?” Challenges of autoethnography in the academy. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(9), 821-835.
* Adams, T. E., & Holman Jones, S. (2011). Telling stories: Reflexivity, queer theory, and autoethnography. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, *11*(2), 108-116.
* Field-Springer, K. (2019). Reflexive embodied ethnography with applied sensibilities: methodological reflections on involved qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1468794119841835.
* Hammersley, M. (2019). Ethnomethodological criticism of ethnography. *Qualitative Research*, *19*(5), 578-593.

## Week 12: November 26th, 2020

### Topics:

* Mixed/Multiple Methods

### Readings:

* Goertz, G., & Mahoney, J. (2012). Concepts and measurement: Ontology and epistemology. *Social Science Information*, *51*(2), 205-216.
* Springgay, S., & Truman, S. E. (2018). On the need for methods beyond proceduralism: Speculative middles, (in) tensions, and response-ability in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *24*(3), 203-214.
* Mason, J. (2006). Mixing methods in a qualitatively driven way. *Qualitative research*, *6*(1), 9-25.
* Greene, J. C., Benjamin, L., & Goodyear, L. (2001). The merits of mixing methods in evaluation. *Evaluation*, *7*(1), 25-44.
* Schadler, C. (2019). Enactments of a new materialist ethnography: methodological framework and research processes. *Qualitative Research*, *19*(2), 215-230.

Supplementary Readings:

\**Note: the first reading below is a critical response to the Greene, Benjamin and Goodyear article above. The second article by Greene, is a response to Kushner. Combined with the original Greene article, together they offer up an interesting conversation that addresses many of the issues/tensions in mixed methods.*

* Kushner, S. (2002). I'll take mine neat: Multiple methods but a single methodology. *Evaluation*, *8*(2), 249-258.
* Greene, J. C. (2002). With a splash of soda, please: Towards active engagement with difference. *Evaluation*, *8*(2), 259-266.

## Week 13: December 3rd, 2020

### Topics:

* Academia and Social Activism/Activist Research

### Readings:

* Fraser, N. and Naples, N. (2004). To Interpret the World and to Change It: An interview with Nancy Fraser. *Signs* 29(4), 1103-1124.
* Fobear, K (2015). “I Thought We Had No Rights” – Challenges in Listening, Storytelling, and Representation of LGBT Refugees. *Studies in Social Justice,* (1):102-117.
* Reinertsen, A. B. (2015). A minor research and educational language: Beyond critique and the imperceptible beingness of engagement; creating spaces for collective subjectivity intensities, for change, and for social justice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *21*(7), 623-627.
* Khasnabish, A., & Haiven, M. (2015). Outside but along-side: Stumbling with social movements as academic activists. *Studies in Social Justice*, *9*(1), 18-33.
* Cox, L. (2015). Scholarship and activism: A social movements perspective. *Studies in Social Justice*, *9*(1), 34-53.

Supplementary Readings:

* Dawson, M. C., & Sinwell, L. (2012). Ethical and political challenges of participatory action research in the academy: Reflections on social movements and knowledge production in South Africa. *Social Movement Studies*, *11*(2), 177-191.
* Chaudhry, V. (2018). Knowing through tripping: A performative praxis for co-constructing knowledge as a disabled halfie. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *24*(1), 70-82.
* Manning, K., Holmes, C., Sansfacon, A. P., Newhook, J. T., & Travers, A. (2015). Fighting for trans\* kids: Academic parent activism in the 21st century. *Studies in Social Justice*, *9*(1), 118-135.
* Kara, H. (2017). Identity and power in co-produced activist research. *Qualitative Research*, *17*(3), 289-301.