

## Analyses, ethics and reflexivity in Qualitative Research

<b>Course Code</b>	
<b>Course Title, Nynorsk</b>	Analyse, etikk og refleksivitet i kvalitativ forskning
<b>Course Title, Bokmål</b>	Analyse, etikk og refleksivitet i kvalitativ forskning
<b>Course Title, English</b>	<b>Analyses, ethics and reflexivity in Qualitative Research</b>
<b>ECTS Credits</b>	Participation two days (16 hours), reading of coursework ( pages) and submitted paper 5000-6000 words focusing on methodological questions with relevance for the course: 3 credits. Participation two days, (16 hours) and reading of coursework: 1 credit
<b>Level of Study</b>	Ph.d.
<b>Language of Instruction</b>	English, or Norwegian if all participants are Scandinavian speaking
<b>Semester</b>	Spring 2018
<b>Place of Instruction</b>	University of Bergen, Bergen

<b>Objectives and Content</b>	<p><i>Course content and objectives:</i></p> <p>As research literature on the collection of qualitative research material for educational research is extensive, the literature on various forms of qualitative analysis is far more scarce and scattered. The seminar will therefore focus on the process of qualitative analysis as well as how to explicitly describe and discuss this process in the PhD-thesis. The course will take the participants own projects as a point of departure and pay specific attention to the development of categories, ethical challenges and issues concerning reflexivity in the analytical process. The aim for the course is to deepen the candidates' knowledge of and reflection about qualitative analysis and their own position in and description of the analytical process.</p> <p><i>Type of course:</i> methods</p> <p><i>Learning outcomes:</i></p> <p>On completion of this course, the PhD-candidates should have the following learning outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the knowledge of significant elements and challenges of qualitative analysis.</li> <li>• Be able to explicitly discuss their own position in the analytical process and the possible consequences for interpretation of the material.</li> <li>• Be able to describe their own analytical procedures and reflect on these in the methods section in the thesis and in articles</li> <li>• Critically evaluate ethical challenges and issues concerning reflexivity in the analytical process.</li> </ul> <p>The participant will have the ability to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate and discuss different qualitative approaches and their respective advantages and uses</li> </ul>
<b>Required Previous Knowledge</b>	<p>Master Degree in disciplines relevant to educational sciences, psychology and public health.</p>
<b>Recommended previous Knowledge</b>	<p>It is recommended that participants have completed an introductory course in qualitative methods</p>
<b>Is the course open or reserved for students enrolled in particular programs?</b>	<p>Lectures and seminars before lunch are open, sessions after lunch will be closed and for course participants only. Closed sessions are primarily for PhD-candidates at the Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen. PhD-candidates from other institutions upon request.</p>
<b>Teaching Methods and Extent of Organized Teaching</b>	<p>Open lectures, workshops and seminars in total 16 hours over 2 days</p>

<p><b>Compulsory Assignments and Attendance</b></p>	<p>80% attendance and participation in lectures, seminars and workshops.</p> <p>The participants are expected to submit the following:</p> <p>a) a short project description (max.1 page). Deadline of submission will be announced.</p> <p>b) a text to be discussed during the workshop, e.g. a draft describing data analysis, data presentation etc. Maximum length: 2-4 pages. Deadline of submission will be announced.</p>
<p><b>Forms of Assessment</b></p>	<p>1 credit: 80% attendance (pass/fail)</p> <p>3 credits: 80% attendance (pass/fail) and paper 5000-6000 words (pass/fail)</p>
<p><b>Reading List</b></p>	<p>Becker, H. (1967) Whose side are we on? <i>Social Problems</i>, vol.14 (3):239-247 [8]</p> <p>Blikstad-Balas, M (2014) Vague Concepts in the Educational Sciences: Implications for Researchers. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research</i>, Vol 58, No. 5, pp 528 – 539 [11]</p> <p>Brinkmann, S. (2012). Qualitative research between craftsmanship and McDonaldization. A keynote address from the 17th Qualitative Health Research Conference. <i>Qualitative Studies</i>, vol 3(1):56-68 [12]</p> <p>Constas, M.A. (1992) Qualitative analysis as a public event: The documentation of category development procedures. In <i>American Educational Research Journal</i>, vol 29, No2, pp. 253 – 266 [13]</p> <p>Creswell, J.W. and Miller, D.L. (2000) Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. In <i>Theory into Practice</i>, Vol 39, No 3, pp. 124 – 130 [6]</p> <p>Dennis, B. (2018) Validity as Research Praxis: A Study of Self-Reflection and Engagement in Qualitative Inquiry. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i>, Vol. 24(2) 109 –118 [9]</p> <p>Garratt, D (2015) Challenging convention: Methodological explorations in contemporary qualitative inquiry. <i>Power &amp; Education</i> Vol. 7(1) 7–18 [11]</p> <p>Hammersley, M. (2007) The issue of quality in qualitative research. In <i>International Journal of Research &amp; Method in Education</i>. Vol. 30, No. 3, November, pp. 287–305 [18]</p> <p>Iversen, A. (2014) Collecting narratives?, <i>Nordic Psychology</i>, 66:2, 135-149 [14] DOI: 10.1080/19012276.2014.928484</p> <p>Klinkmann, S.E. (2012) Forskning som förstärker stereotypisering. <i>ELORE</i>, vol 19 (2): 93-117 [24]</p>

	<p>Oancea, A. (2007) From Procrustes to Proteus: trends and practices in the assessment of education research. In <i>International Journal of Research &amp; Method in Education</i>. Vol. 30, No. 3, November, pp. 243–269 [26]</p> <p>Richie, S. and Rigano, D. (2001) Researcher – participant positioning in classroom research. In <i>Qualitative studies in Education</i>. Vol 14, no 6, pp 741-756 [15]</p> <p>Rossman, G. B., Rallis, S. F. and Kuntz, A. M. (2010) Qualitative research – standards of proof. Validity: Mapping Diverse Perspectives. In Peterson, p., Baker, E. and McGaw, B. (eds.) <i>International Encyclopedia of Education</i> (Third Edition) Elsevier, pp 505 – 513 [8]  <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01542-6">https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01542-6</a></p> <p>Stenvoll, D. and Svensson, P. (2011) Contestable contexts: the transparent anchoring of contextualization in text-as-data. <i>Qualitative Research</i>, vol 11(5):570–586 [16]</p> <p>Sykes, C. M., Willing, C. and Marks, D. F. (2004) Discourses in the European Commission’s 1996–2000 Health Promotion Programme. <i>Journal of Health Psychology</i>, vol 9 (1):131–141[10]</p> <p>Taylor, S. (2004) Researching educational policy and change in 'new times': using critical discourse analysis, <i>Journal of Education Policy</i>, vol 19 (4): 433 — 451 [18]</p> <p>Thomas, G. and Gorard, S. (2007) Quality in education research. In <i>International Journal of Research &amp; Method in Education</i>. Vol. 30, No. 3, November, pp. 239–242 [3]</p> <p>Watson, C. (2009) The `impossible vanity': uses and abuses of empathy in qualitative inquiry. <i>Qualitative Research</i>, vol. 9 (1):105–117 [12]</p>
<b>Course Evaluation</b>	Written, digital evaluation
<b>Programme Committee</b>	Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen
<b>Course Coordinator</b>	Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen
<b>Course Administrator</b>	Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen
<b>Contact Information</b>	Department of Education

