

Course Number	SOWK 741 S01	Classroom	Online
Course Name	Research Foundations: Epistemology and Professional Knowledge Building		
Day(s) & Time	Zoom sessions Thursday 1-3:45. Details provided in attachment		
Instructor	Christine Walsh		
U of C E-mail	cwalsh@ucalgary.ca	Phone	403 220-2274

SYLLABUS STATEMENT

An exploration of major philosophical issues that have shaped social work's diverse approaches to knowledge building and research methods. The relevance of this exploration to the student's area of interest is emphasized. Note: Restricted to Social Work PhD students only or consent of the Faculty.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This seminar course will offer students the opportunity to place the types of research social work scholars undertake within their larger philosophical and methodological traditions, including conceptions of knowing (epistemology), nature of reality (ontology) and doing (praxis). Students are expected to be familiar with basic research methods concepts and processes.

This course has no pre-requisites or co-requisites.

COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Students will be able to describe the distinguishing features of several sets of research approaches (post-positivist, pragmatic, interpretive, social constructionist, post-modernist, poststructural, transformative and indigenous) used in social work knowledge building.
2. Students will be able to critically assess strengths and weaknesses of each approach for their own research interest areas.
3. Students will develop and deepen an appreciation for diverse points of view and research approaches.
4. Students will be able to articulate their own positions about the generation of social work knowledge.
5. Students will develop or deepen presentation and discussion facilitation skills.
6. Students will develop or deepen academic writing (journal manuscript) writing skills.

LEARNING RESOURCES

REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS AND/OR READINGS

A series of readings compiled by the instructor (see Recommended Reading section below) and class members will be used in this course.

Required readings are indicated with an asterisk.

Reading Set 1: Systematic Reviews

- *Bronson, D. E., & Davis, T. S. (2011). *Finding and evaluating evidence: Systematic reviews and evidence based practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- *Crisp, B. R. (2015). Systematic reviews: A social work perspective. *Australian Social Work*, 68(3), 284-295.
- *Hodge, D. R. (2007). A systematic review of the empirical literature on intercessory prayer. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 17, 174-187. Retrieved from <http://www.sagepub.com/vaughnstudy/articles/intervention/Hodge.pdf>
- *Social Care Institute for Excellence. (2003). *Using systematic reviews to improve social care*. SCIE Reports:No4. Retrieved from: <http://www.scie.org.uk/publications/reports/report04.pdf>
- *Victor, L. (2008). *Systematic reviewing*. Social Research Update, 4. Retrieved from <http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU54.pdf>

Reading Set 2: The Context of Social (Work) Research Paradigms

- *Júlíusdóttir, S. (2006). The emerging paradigm shift in social work - in the context of the current reforms of European social work education. *Social Work and Society International Online Journal*, 4(1) Retrieved from <http://www.socwork.net/sws/article/view/175/566>
- *Payne, M. (2005). Chapter 1. In *Modern social work theory* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: Lyceum.
- *Zeira, A., & Rosen, A. (2000). Unraveling "tacit knowledge": What social workers do and why they do it. *Social Service Review*, 74(1), 105-123.
- Boettcher, R. E. (1997). Content analysis of social work dissertation papers: Epistemological implications. In D. J. Tucker, C. D. Garvin, & R. C. Sarri (Eds.), *Integrating knowledge and practice: The case of social work and social science* (pp. 62-74). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Fook, J. (2002). Theorizing from practice. *Qualitative Social Work*, 1(1), 79-95.
- Gibbs, A. (2001). The changing nature and context of social work research. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31(5), 687-704.
- Goldstein, H. (1986). Toward the integration of theory and practice: A humanistic approach. *Social Work*, 31(5), 352-357.
- Hammersley, M. (1995). Theory and evidence in qualitative research. *Quality and Quantity*, 29(1), 55-66.

- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The route to normal science. In *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Reamer, F. G. (1993). Chapter 4: Epistemology. In *The philosophical foundations of social work*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Rosen, A., Proctor, E. K., & Staudt, M. M. (1999). Social work research and the quest for effective practice. *Social Work Research*, 23(1), 4-14.
- Souflée, F. (1993). A metatheoretical framework for social work practice. *Social Work*, 38(3), 317-331.
- Thyer, B. (2002). Developing discipline specific knowledge for social work: Is it possible? *Journal of Social Work Education*, 38(1), 101-113.

Reading Set 3: Indigenous Approaches

- *Angell, G. B. (2000). Cultural resilience in North American Indian First Nations: The story of Little Turtle. *Critical Social Work*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/culturalresilience-in-north-american-indian-first-nations-the-story-of-little-turtle>
- *Peters, W. (2013). *Use of indigenous/indigenist research methodologies*. Retrieved from http://crcaih.org/assets/documents/Use_of_Indigenous-Indigenist_Research_Methodologies.pdf
- *Hill, L. (2020). 'You know what you know': An Indigenist methodology with Haudenosaunee grandmothers. *Journal of Indigenous Social Development*, 9(1), 1-18.
- *Kovach, M. (2010). Conversational method in indigenous research. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, 5(1), 40-48.
- Dumbrill, G. C., & Green, J. (2008). Indigenous knowledge in the academy. *Social Work Education*, 27(5), 489-503.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York, NY: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Gray, M., Coates, J., & Yellow, B. M. (2008). *Indigenous social work around the world: Towards culturally relevant education and practice*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate.
- Kovach, M. E. (2000). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- MacDonald, M. (2016, April 6). Indigenizing the academy: What some universities are doing to weave Indigenous peoples, cultures, and knowledge into the fabric of their campuses. *University Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/features/featurearticle/indigenizing-the-academy/>
- Pete, S. (2016). 100 ways: Indigenizing and decolonizing academic programs. *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 6(1), 81-89. <https://doi.org/10.5663/aps.v6i1.27455>

- Sium, A., Chandi, D., & Ritskes, E. (2012). Towards the 'tangible unknown': Decolonization and the Indigenous future. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*.
- Retrieved from http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Honouring_the_Truth_Reconciling_for_the_Future_July_23_2015.pdf
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- Walsh, C. A., & Aarrestad, S. A. (2015). Incarceration and Aboriginal women in Canada: Acts of resilience and resistance. (pp. 67-82). In E. Coburn (Ed.) *More will Sing their Way to Freedom: Indigenous Resistance and Resurgence*. Calgary: Fernwood Press.
- Reading Set 4: Transformative Approaches**
- *Bergold, J., & Thomas, S. (2012). Participatory research methods: A methodological approach in motion *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 13(1). Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1201302>.
- *Rogers, J. (2012). Anti-oppressive social work research: Reflections on power in the creation of knowledge. *Social Work Education-The International Journal*, 31(7), 866-879.
- Adams, R., Dominelli, L., & Payne, M. (1998). *Social work: Themes, issues and critical debates*. New York, NY: MacMillan Press.
- Anderson, W. T. (2000). (Ed.). *The truth about the truth: De-confusing and re-constructing the postmodern world*. New York, NY: Putnam's Books.
- Becerra, R. M (1997). Can valid research on ethnic minority populations only be conducted by researchers from the same ethnic group? In D. De Anda (Ed.), *Controversial issues in multiculturalism* (pp. 110-118). Boston, MA: Allan & Bacon.
- Brown, B. (1999). Searching for a theory: The journey from explanation to revolution. *Families in Society*, 80(4), 359-366.
- Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press/Women's Press.
- Connell, R. (2007). Chapters 9 and 10. In *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Dean, R., & Fenby, B. (1989). Exploring epistemologies: Social work action as a reflection of philosophical assumptions. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 25(1), 46-54.
- Fook, J. (1993). Editorial: Towards an Australian radical social work for today. *Australian Social Work*, 46(1), 2.

- Gorey, K., Leslie, D., & Franke, T. (1997). Do methods of evaluating practice need to be adapted for multicultural populations? In D. De Anda (Ed.), *Controversial issues in multiculturalism* (pp. 119-131). Boston, MA: Allan & Bacon.
- Hartman, A. (1993). Out of the closet: Revolution and backlash. *Social Work, 38*(3), 245-360.
- Healy, K. (2001). Reinventing critical social work: Challenges from practice, context and postmodernism. *Critical Social Work, 2*(1). Retrieved <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/reinventing-criticalsocial-work-challenges-from-practice-context-and-postmodernism>
- Hurtado, A. (1996). Strategic suspensions: Feminists of colour theorize the production of knowledge. In M.R. Goldberger, J. M. Tarule, B. M. Clinchy & M. F. Belenky(Eds.), *Knowledge, difference and power: Essays inspired by women`s ways of knowing* (pp. 372-388). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Israel, B., Schultz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 19*(1), 173-202.
- Leonard, P. (2001). The future of critical social work in uncertain conditions. *Critical Social Work, 2*(1). Retrieved from <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/the-future-of-critical-social-work-inuncertain-conditions>
- Longres, J. F. (1996). Radical social work: Is there a future? In P. R. Raffoul & C. A. McNeece (Eds.), *Future issues for social work practice* (pp. 222-239). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mullaly, R. (1997). Chapter 7. In *Structural social work: Ideology, theory, and practice* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: McClelland.
- Park, P. (1993). What is participatory research? A theoretical and methodological perspective. In P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall, & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of change: Participatory research in the United States and Canada* (pp. 1-20). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Payne, M. (2005). Chapters 11-14. In *Modern social work theory* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: Lyceum.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2006). Introduction: Inquiry and participation in search of a world worthy of human aspiration. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.) *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 13-16). London, UK: Sage.
- Schmitz, C., Stakeman, C., & Sisneros, J. (2001). Educating professionals for practice in a multicultural society: Understanding oppression and valuing diversity. *Families in Society, 82*(6), 612-622.
- Sefa, G. J. (1996). Chapter 3. In *Anti-racism education theory and practice*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). Chapter 1. In *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2001). Chapters 1 and 10. In *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Sohng, S. (1996). Participatory research and community organizing. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 23*(4), 77-97.

- Sollors, W. (1995). The idea of ethnicity. In W. T. Anderson (Ed.), *The truth about the truth: De-confusing and re-constructing the postmodern world* (pp. 58-65). New York, NY: Putnam's Books.
- Stanfield, J. H. (1994). Ethnic modeling in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 175-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wagner, D. (1989). Radical movements in the social services: A theoretical framework. *Social Service Review*, 63(2), 264-284.
- Wagner, D. (1991). Reviving the action research model: Combining case and cause with dislocated workers. *Social Work*, 36(6), 477-482.
- Weaver, J. (1998). Indigenous people in a multicultural society: Unique issues for human services. *Social Work*, 43(3), 203-211.
- Webster, Y. O. (2002). A human centric alternative to diversity and multicultural education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 38(1), 17-36.
- Williams, C. C. (2006). The epistemology of cultural competence. *Families in Society*, 87(2), 209-220.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Reading Set 5: Ethics and Trustworthiness

- *Cullen, O., & Walsh, C. A. A narrative review of ethical issues in participatory research with young people. *Youth* <https://doi.org/10.1177/1103308819886470>

Choose 1 reading related to research ethics in your field of study

Reading Set 6: Arts-based Approaches

- *Camargo-Borges, C. (2017). Creativity and Imagination: Research as World-Making! In Patricia Leavy (Ed.), *Handbook of Arts-Based Research* (pp. 88-100). Guildford Press.
- *Lorde, A. (2007). Poetry is not a luxury. In Audre Lorde (Ed.), *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches* (pp. 36-39). Crossing Press.
- *Oliver, M. (2016). Of power and time. In Mary Oliver (Ed.), *Upstream: Selected Essays* (pp. 23 - 30). Penguin Books.
- *Walsh, C. A., St-Denis, N., & Eaglebear, A. (in press). Decolonizing reflexive practice through photography: Storying Place. *Special Issue of Critical Pedagogical Inquiry Creating a Canvas: Blending Visual Arts and Storytelling into the Curriculum Pallet*, 10(1), 103-118

Reading Set 7: Afro-centric and Critical Race Theory

- *Bernard, W. T. & Smith, H. (2018). Injustice, justice and Africentric practice in Canada. *Canadian Social Work Review / Revue canadienne de service social*, 35(1), 149–157.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1051108ar>
- *Cabrera, N.L. (2018). Where is the Racial Theory in Critical Race Theory?: A constructive criticism of the Critics. *The Review of Higher Education* 42(1), 209-233. [doi:10.1353/rhe.2018.0038](https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2018.0038).
- *Reviere, R. (2001). Toward an Afrocentric research methodology. *Journal of Black Studies*, 31(6), 709–728 <https://doi.org/10.1177/002193470103100601>
- *Schiele, J. H. (2017). The Afrocentric paradigm in social work: A historical perspective and future outlook. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 27, 1-2,15-26, DOI: 10.1080/10911359.2016.1252601

Reading Set 8: Post-Positivist and Pragmatic Approaches

- *Chaumba, J. (2013). The use and value of mixed methods research in social work. *Advances in Social Work*, 14(2), 307-333. Retrieved from <https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/advancesinsocialwork/article/view/1858>
- *Ilaydjiev, I. (2013). A pragmatic approach to social sciences. *E-International Relations Student*. Retrieved from <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/03/01/a-pragmatic-approach-to-social-science/>
- *Ryan, A. B. (2006). Post-positivist approaches to research. In *Researching and Writing your thesis: A guide for postgraduate students* (pp. 12-26). MACE: Maynooth Adult and Community Education.
- *Sale, J. E. M., Lohfeld, L. H., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality & Quantity*, 36, 43-53. Retrieved from <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/css506/506%20Readings/sale%20mixed-methods.pdf>
- Barber, J. (1996). Science and social work: Are they compatible? *Research on Social Work Practice*, 6(3), 379-388.
- Brannen, J. (2005.). Mixing methods: The entry of qualitative and quantitative approaches into the research process. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(3), 173-184.
- Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 97-113.
- Corcoran, K. (2007). From the scientific revolution to evidence-based practice: Teaching the short history with a long past. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 17(5), 548-552.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). Chapter 2. In *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denscombe, M. (2008). Communities of practice: A research paradigm for the mixed methods approach. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 2(3), 270-283.

- Epstein, W. (1986). Science and social work. *Social Service Review*, 60(1), 145-160.
- Fortune, A. E. (1999). Editorial: Studies on social work issues. *Social Work Research*, 23(2), 67-68.
- Greene,
J. C. (2008). Is mixed methods social inquiry a distinctive methodology? *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 2(1), 7-22.
- Johnson, R., & Onweuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Martinez-Brawley, E. (2001). Searching again and again: Inclusion, heterogeneity and social work research. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31, 271-285.
- Mendlinger, S., & Cwikel, J. (2008). Spiraling between qualitative and quantitative data on women' health behaviors: A double helix model for mixed methods. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(2), 280-293.
- Morgan, D. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76.
- Phillips, D. C. (2000). Chapter 4. In *The expanded social scientist's bestiary: A guide to fabled threats to, and defenses of, naturalistic social science*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Sells, S., Smith, T., & Sprenkle, D. H. (1995). Integrating qualitative and quantitative research methods: A research model. *Family Process*, 34(2), 199-218.
- Shadish, W. R. (1995). Philosophy of science and the quantitative-qualitative debates: Thirteen common errors. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 18(1), 63-75.
- Sheldon, B. (2001). The validity of evidence-based practice in social work: A reply to Stephen Webb. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31(5), 801-809.
- Solulski, M., & Lawrence, C. (2008). Mixing methods for full-strength results: Two welfare studies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 2(2), 121-148.
- Teddlie, C., & Burke Johnson, R. (2009). Methodological thought since the 20 Century. In C. Teddlie & A. Tashakkori (Eds.), *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 62-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Webb, S. (2001). Some considerations on the validity of evidence-based practice in social work. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31(1), 57-79.
- Witkin, S. (2001). Editorial: Whose evidence and for what purpose? *Social Work*, 46(4), 293-296.
- Zimmerman, J. H. (1989). Determinism, science, and social work. *Social Service Review*, 63(1), 52-62.

Reading Set 9: Interpretive and Social Constructionist Approaches

- *Butt, T., & Parton, N. (2005). Constructivist social work and personal construct theory: The case of psychological trauma. *British Journal of Social Work*, 35(6), 793-806. ISSN 1468-263X

- *Carter, S., & Little, M. (2007). Justifying knowledge, justifying method, taking action: Epistemologies, methodologies and methods in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1316-1328.
- *Denzin, K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 97-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Lietz, C. A., & Zayas, L. E. (2010). Evaluating qualitative research for social work practitioners. *Advances in Social Work*, 11(2), 188-202. Retrieved from <https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/advancesinsocialwork/article/viewFile/589/1790>
- *Revise Sociology. (2015). *Positivism and interpretivism in social research*. Retrieved from <https://revisesociology.com/2015/05/18/positivism-interpretivism-sociology/>
- Anells, M. (1996). Grounded theory method: Philosophical perspectives, paradigm of inquiry, and postmodernism. *Qualitative Health Research*, 6(3), 379-393.
- Bein, A., & Allen, K. (1999). Hand in glove? It fits better than you think. *Social Work*, 44(3), 274-277.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Bryman, A. (1984). The debate about quantitative and qualitative research: A question of method or epistemology? *British Journal of Sociology*, 35(1), 75-92.
- Cook, J. A., & Fono, M. M. (1986). Knowledge and women's interests: Issues of epistemology and methodology in feminist sociological research. *Sociological Inquiry*, 56, 2-29.
- Drisko, J.W. (1997). Strengthening qualitative studies and reports: Standards to promote academic integrity. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 33(1), 185-197.
- Epstein, I. (1996). In quest of a research-based model for clinical practice: Or, why can't a social worker be more like a researcher? *Social Work Research*, 20(2), 97-100.
- Gilgun, J. F., & Abrams, L. S. (2002). The nature and usefulness of qualitative social work research: Some thoughts and an invitation to dialogue. *Qualitative Social Work*, 1(1), 39-55.
- Goldstein, H. (1991). Qualitative research and social work practice: Partners in discovery. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 18(4), 101-119.
- Halmi, A. (1996). The qualitative approach to social work: An epistemological basis. *International Social Work*, 39, 363-375.
- Handkinson Nelson, L. (1996). Who knows? What can they know? And when? In A. Garry & M. Pearsall (Eds.), *Women, knowledge, reality: Explorations in feminist philosophy* (pp. 286-297). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harding, S. (1997). Women's standpoint on nature: What makes them possible? *Osiris*, 12, 186-200.
- Harding, S. (2001). Comment on Walby's "Against epistemological chasms: The science question in feminism revisited": Can democratic values and interests ever play a rationally justifiable role

- in the evaluation of scientific work? *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 26(2), 511-525.
- Harding, S. S. (1991). Chapter 5. In *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Haworth, G. O. (1991). My paradigm can beat your paradigm: Some reflections on knowledge conflicts. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 18(4), 35-50.
- Heineman, M. B. (1981). The obsolete scientific imperative in social work research. *Social Service Review*, 55(3), 371-397.
- Heineman Pieper, M. (1987). Comments on "Scientific imperatives in social work research: Pluralism is not skepticism". *Social Service Review*, 61(2), 368-370.
- Heineman Pieper, M., & Tyson, K. (1999). Response to Padgett's "Does the glove really fit?" *Social Work*, 44(3), 278-279.
- Heineman-Pieper, J., Tyson, K., & Heineman Pieper, M. (2002). Doing good science without sacrificing good values: Why the heuristic paradigm is the best choice for social work. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 83(1), 15-26.
- Holland, T. P. (1983). Comments on scientific imperative in social work research and practice. *Social Service Review*, 57(2), 337-339.
- Houston, S. (2001). Beyond social constructionism: Critical realism and social work. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31(6), 845-861.
- Hudson, W. H. (1982). Scientific imperatives in social work research and practice. *Social Service Review*, 56(2), 246-258.
- Karger, H. J. (1983). Science, research, and social work: Who controls the profession? *Social Work*, 28(3), 200-205.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1995). Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3, 275-289.
- Longino, H. (1996). Can there be a feminist science? In A. Garry & M. Pearsall (Eds.), *Women, knowledge, reality: Explorations in feminist philosophy* (2nd ed., pp. 251-263). New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCoyd, J., & Shdaimah, C. (2007). Revisiting the benefits debate: Does qualitative social work research produce salubrious effects? *Social Work*, 52(4), 340-349.
- Nes, J., & Iadicola, P. (1989). Toward a definition of feminist social work: A comparison of liberal, radical and socialist models. *Social Sciences Social Work*, 34(1), 12-21.
- Padgett, D. K. (1998). Does the glove really fit? Qualitative research and clinical social work practice. *Social Work*, 43(4), 374-381.
- Payne, M. (2005). Chapters 8 and 9. In *Modern social work theory* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: Lyceum.

- Phillips, D. C. (2000). Chapters 2 and 10. In *The expanded social scientist's bestiary*. New York, NY: PergamonPress.
- Radcliff Richards, J. (1995). Why feminist epistemology isn't. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, 775, 385-412.
- Reamer, F. (1992). From the editor: The place of empiricism in social work. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 28(3), 257-259.
- Rodwell, M. K. (1987). Naturalistic inquiry: An alternative model for social work assessment. *Social Service Review*, 61(2), 231-246.
- Ruckdeschel, R., & Shaw, I. (2002). Teaching as practice: Issues, questions and reflections. *Qualitative Social Work*, 1(2), 229-244.
- Schmidt, V. (2001). Oversocialised epistemology: A critical appraisal of constructivism. *Sociology*, 35(1), 135-157.
- Sherman, E. (1987). Hermeneutics, human science, and social work. *Social Thought*, 13, 34-41.
- Shiva, V. (1996). Science, nature and gender. In A. Garry & M. Pearsall (Eds.), *Women, knowledge, reality: Explorations in feminist philosophy* (2nd ed., pp. 264-285). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Spolander, G., Engelbrecht, L., Martin, L., Strydom, M., Pervova, I., Marjanen, P., Tani, P., Sicora, A., & Adaikalam, F. (2014). The implications of neoliberalism for social work: Reflections from a six-country international research collaboration. *International Social Work*, 57(4), 301-312.
- Swigonski, M. (1994). The logic of feminist standpoint theory for social work research. *Social Work*, 39(4), 387-393.
- Wakefield, J., & Kirk, S. (1996). Unscientific thinking about scientific practice: Evaluating the scientist/practitioner model. *Social Work Research*, 20(2), 83-96.
- Walby, S. (2001). Against epistemological chasms: The science question in feminism revisited. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 26(2), 485-509.

Reading Set 10: Post-Modernist and Post-Structural Approaches

- *Bryman, A. (2016). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research: QR*, 6(1), 97-113.
- *Craig, D., & Bigby, C. (2015). Critical realism in social work research: Examining participation of people with intellectual disability. *Australian Social Work*, 68(3), 309-323.
- *Dominelli, L. (2007). The postmodern 'turn' in social work: The challenges of identity and equality. *Social Work and Society International Online Journal*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://www.socwork.net/sws/article/view/144/513>
- *Harding, S., & Norberg, K. (2005). New feminist approaches to social science methodologies: An introduction. *Signs*, 30(4), 2009-2015. doi:10.1353/ren.2007.0337

- *Kaushik, V., & Walsh, C. A. (2019). Pragmatism as a research paradigm and its implications for social work research. *Social Sciences*, 8(9), 255. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8090255>
- Anderson, W. T. (Ed.). (1995). Chapters 1, 2 and 6. In *The truth about the truth: De-confusing and reconstructing the postmodern world*. New York, NY: Putnam's Books.
- Campbell, C., & Ungar, M. (2003). Deconstructing knowledge claims: Epistemological challenges in social work education. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 14(1), 41-59.
- Chambon, A., Irving, A., & Epstein, L. (1999). *Reading Foucault for social work*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Damianakis, T. (2001). Postmodernism, spirituality, and the creative writing process: Implications for social work practice. *Families in Society*, 82(1), 23-34.
- Irving, A., & Young, T. (2002). Paradigm for pluralism: Mikhail Bakhtin and social work practice. *Social Work*, 47(1), 19-29.
- Layder, D. (1994). Chapter 6. In *Understanding social theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Noble, C. (2004). Postmodern thinking. *Journal of Social Work*, 4(3), 289-304.
- Pease, B. (2002). Rethinking empowerment: A postmodern reappraisal for emancipatory practice. *British Journal of Social Work*, 32(2), 135-147.
- Houston, S. (2001). Beyond social constructionism: Critical realism and social work. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31(6), 845-861.
- Ritzer, G. (1993). Chapter 8. In *the McDonaldization of society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Sands, R., & Nuccio, K. (1992). Postmodern feminist theory and social work. *Social Work*, 37(6), 489- 494.
- Walker, S. (2001). Tracing the contours of postmodern social work. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31(1), 2939.
- Williams, M. (1996). Chapter 7: Poststructuralism, postmodernism and social research. In *Introduction to philosophy of social research*. London, UK: Routledge.

Other References

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. – first and second editions contain different material that may also be useful.
- Hesse-Biber, S., & Leavy, P. (2008). *Handbook of emergent methods*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Williams, M. (2006). *Philosophical foundations of social research methods* – 4 volumes published as part of the Sage Benchmarks in Social Research Methods series. London, UK: Sage.

LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES AND REQUIREMENTS

A D2L site is set up for this course which contains required readings and other relevant class resources and materials. A laptop, desktop or mobile device with Internet access, microphone and speaker is required for D2L and Zoom access.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER COURSES

SOWK741 is a core research methods course for PhD students. Collectively, SOWK741, SOWK 745 (*Quantitative Research Methods*), and SOWK 747 (*Qualitative Research Methods*) will assist PhD students to develop competency in research design and implementation. This course is integrated with SOWK 747 as noted in the class schedule attached.

CLASS SCHEDULE

Course content will be presented through instructor, student-led class discussion, guest lectures and experiential activities. The instructor will provide a framework for discussion and a preliminary bibliography of core and supplemental readings. Students will be expected to attend class and participate fully, including leading or co-leading discussion on selected topics. It will be possible, with *prior arrangement only*, to participate in classes via Zoom, Desire2Learn (D2L) or other technology. As this is a doctoral level course, students are expected to spend approximately 8-10 hours per week on average on coursework outside of class time. Several weeks have been set aside for independent work or student-directed activities. D2L may be employed at the students' discretion for continuing dialogue and sharing of materials collected.

ADDITIONAL CLASSROOM CONDUCT AND RELATED INFORMATION

USE OF INTERNET AND ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION DEVICES IN CLASS

The use of laptop and mobile devices is acceptable when used in a manner appropriate to the course and classroom activities. Students are to refrain from accessing websites that may be distracting for other learners (e.g., personal emails, Facebook, YouTube) during class time.

GUIDELINES FOR ZOOM SESSIONS IN ONLINE CLASSES

Students are expected to participate actively in all Zoom sessions. If you are unable to attend a Zoom session, please contact your instructor to arrange an alternative activity for the missed session (e.g., to review a recorded session). Please be prepared, as best as you are able, to join class in a quiet space that will allow you to be fully present and engaged in Zoom sessions. Students will be advised by their instructor when they are expected, if they are able, to turn on their webcam (for group work, presentations, etc.). All students are expected to behave in a professional manner during the session.

MEDIA RECORDING FOR ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

The instructor may use media recordings as part of the assessment of students. This may include but is not limited to classroom discussions, presentations, clinical practice, or skills testing that occur during the course. These recordings will be used for student assessment purposes only and will not be shared or used for any other purpose.

ZOOM RECORDINGS OF ONLINE CLASSES

The instructor may record online Zoom class sessions for the purposes of supporting student learning in this class – such as making the recording available for review of the session or for students who miss a session. Students will be advised before the instructor initiates a recording of a Zoom session. These recordings will be used to support student learning only and will not be shared or used for any other purpose.

ASSESSMENT COMPONENTS

There are three assignments for this course.

Assignment 1 --- Your Approach to Knowledge Building (value: 15%)

At the beginning (September 10) and end (December 3) of the course, students will be required to reflect on their own approach to knowledge building within the context of their area(s) of research and practice interest. Using the criteria presented in the SOWK 747 course outline, summarize your position in a **1-2 paragraph description and/or table/graphic representation**. Repeat the assessment of your position at the end of the term and reflect on if and how your position has changed. Please also bring copies of your position statement for all class members or post on D2L. Hand in both parts on December 4.

Due Dates: part 1: for presentation in class September 11, 2018 part 2/revision: for presentation in class December 3, 2020

Assignment 2 --- Class Content Development (value: 35%)

Assignment 2 will allow class members to tailor course content and discussion to student needs. Working individually or as a team(s), the students, with the support of the instructor, will determine appropriate topics and activities on research foundations and methodologies for week 11. (Note that activities during these weeks may take place out of class time with consensus of the group.) Sessions may explore approaches covered in weeks 1 to 9 in more detail or may explore other forms of research. Some possible activities include: seminars or a seminar series on topics of particular interest to the class; faculty panel discussion(s); invited speaker(s); or a journal club. Class time (Week 10, November 19, 2020) has been set aside to discuss your ideas. Students are expected to submit a one-page proposal and work plan to the class. The choice of activities will be determined by consensus, and for teamwork, all students in the same team will be assigned the same grade.

Due Date: November 26, 2020

Assignment 3 --- Paper (value: 50%)

Write a paper with a focus on aspects of the epistemology of research and social work scholarship that could be submitted for publication to the journal of your choice. The topic of the paper can be whatever is useful to build your theoretical and/or research methods expertise. Some suggested formats include:

A synthesis or critique of current theories or approaches in your area of interest (e.g., Kwan, C., & Walsh, C. A. (2015). Climate change adaptation in low resource countries: Insights gained from a feminist gerontological social work lens. *International Journal of Social Work*, 58(3), 385-400.); an in-depth research methods critique (e.g., Lorenzetti, L., & Walsh, C. A. (2014). Is there an 'F' in Your PAR: Understanding, teaching and doing action research. *Canadian Journal of Participatory Action Research*, 15(1), 50-63.); a self-reflection or autoethnography (e.g., St. Denis, N., & Walsh, C. A. (2016). Reclaiming my indigenous identity and the emerging warrior: An autoethnography. *Journal of Indigenous Social Development*, 5(1), 1-17.) or a systematic or scoping review in a particular research area (e.g. Kaushik, V., Walsh, C. A., & Haefele, D. (2016). Social integration of immigrants within the linguistically diverse workplace: A systematic review. *Review of Social Sciences*, 1(1))

It is expected that you will write the manuscript according to the selected journal's "instructions to authors" in terms of formatting, word count, referencing style, etc.

Individual consultation time (November 19) has been set aside to discuss paper ideas, outlines and issues. You are also invited to submit an outline or edited draft to the instructor for feedback any time up to one week before the end of term. When you hand in the final paper in electronic version, please submit the "instructions to authors" for the journal you have selected in document form or link to the journal. The assessment of the paper will include adherence to the journal requirements (formatting, reference style, etc.). You are strongly encouraged to continue to develop a paper for submission to a journal after the course is completed.

Due Date: December 10, 2020

ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION INFORMATION

LATE ASSIGNMENTS

Any extensions will be granted only if negotiated with the instructor **in advance of the due date**. Late assignments will be accepted without penalty **only** if there are extenuating circumstances, for example, illness. No extensions are available for workload reasons.

EXPECTATIONS FOR WRITING

All assignments will be assessed partly on writing skills. Writing skills include not only surface correctness (grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, etc.) but also general clarity and organization. Sources used in research papers must be properly documented and referenced in APA

format. If you need writing support, please connect with the Student Success Centre, at:
<https://www.ucalgary.ca/student-services/student-success/writing-support>

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

It is expected that all work submitted in assignments is the student’s own work, written expressly by the student for this particular course. Students are reminded that academic misconduct, including plagiarism, has serious consequences, as set out in the University Calendar:
<http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k.html>

GRADING

A student’s final grade for the course is the sum of the separate assignments. It is not necessary to pass each assignment separately in order to pass the course.

The University of Calgary **Graduate Grading System** and Faculty of Social Work Percentage Conversion will be used.

Grade	Grade Point	Description	Percentage
A+	4.0	Outstanding	95-100
A	4.0	Excellent – superior performance, showing comprehensive understanding of subject matter	95-100
A-	3.7	Very Good Performance	90-94
B+	3.3	Good Performance	85-89
B	3.0	Satisfactory performance. Note: The grade point value (3.0) associated with this grade is the minimum acceptable average that a graduate student must maintain throughout the programme as computed at the end of each year of their program.	80-84
B-	2.7	Minimum pass for students in Graduate Studies. Note: Students who accumulate two grades of “B-” or lower can be required by the Faculty to withdraw from the programme regardless of the grade point average.	75-79
C+	2.3	All grades below “B-” are indicative of failure at the graduate level and cannot be counted towards Faculty of Graduate Studies course requirements.	70-74
C	2.00		65-69
C-	1.70		60-64
D+	1.30		55-59
D	1.00		50-54
F	0.00		Below 50

COURSE EVALUATION

Student feedback will be sought at the end of the course through the standard University and Faculty of Social Work course evaluation forms. Students are welcome to discuss the process and content of the course at any time with the instructor.

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY POLICIES AND SUPPORTS

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

As members of the University community, students and staff are expected to demonstrate conduct that is consistent with the University of Calgary Calendar <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k.html>

Students and staff are also expected to demonstrate professional behaviour in class that promotes and maintains a positive and productive learning environment. Consistent with the aims of the Social Work Program and the University of Calgary, all students and staff are expected to respect, appreciate, and encourage expression of diverse world views and perspectives; to offer their fellow community members unconditional respect and constructive feedback; and to contribute to building learning communities that promote individual and collective professional and personal growth. While critical thought and debate is valued in response to concepts and opinions shared in class, feedback must always be focused on the ideas or opinions shared and not on the person who has stated them.

Students and staff are expected to model behaviour in class that is consistent with our professional values and ethics, as outlined in the Canadian Association for Social Workers, Code of Ethics (2005) and the Alberta College of Social Work Standards of Practice (2019). Both can be found online at: <https://acsw.ab.ca/site/practice-resources?nav=sidebar>

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATION

It is the student's responsibility to request academic accommodations according to the University policies and procedures. Students seeking an accommodation based on disability or medical concerns should contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS). SAS will process the request and issue letters of accommodation to instructors. For additional information on support services and accommodations for students with disabilities, visit www.ucalgary.ca/access/. Students who require an accommodation in relation to their coursework based on a protected ground other than disability should communicate this need in writing to their Instructor. The full policy on Student Accommodations is available at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/student-accommodation-policy.pdf>

RESEARCH ETHICS

"If a student is interested in undertaking an assignment that will involve collecting information from members of the public, they should speak with the course instructor and consult the CFREB Ethics Website (<http://www.ucalgary.ca/research/researchers/ethics-compliance/cfreb>) before beginning the assignment.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

For information on academic misconduct and its consequences, please see the University of Calgary Calendar at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k.html>

INSTRUCTOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Course materials created by professor(s) (including presentations and posted notes, labs, case studies, assignments and exams) remain the intellectual property of the professor(s). These materials may NOT be reproduced, redistributed or copied without the explicit consent of the professor. The posting of course materials to third party websites such as note-sharing sites without permission is

prohibited. Sharing of extracts of these course materials with other students enrolled in the course at the same time may be allowed under fair dealing.

COPYRIGHT LEGISLATION

All students are required to read the University of Calgary policy on Acceptable Use of Material Protected by Copyright (<https://www.ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/acceptable-use-of-material-protected-by-copyright-policy.pdf>) and requirements of the copyright act (<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-42/index.html>) to ensure they are aware of the consequences of unauthorised sharing of course materials (including instructor notes, electronic versions of textbooks etc.). Students who use material protected by copyright in violation of this policy may be disciplined under the Non-Academic Misconduct Policy.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Student information will be collected in accordance with typical (or usual) classroom practice. Students' assignments will be accessible only by the authorized course faculty. Private information related to the individual student is treated with the utmost regard by the faculty at the University of Calgary.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE POLICY

The University recognizes that all members of the University Community should be able to learn, work, teach and live in an environment where they are free from harassment, discrimination, and violence. The University of Calgary's sexual violence policy guides us in how we respond to incidents of sexual violence, including supports available to those who have experienced or witnessed sexual violence, or those who are alleged to have committed sexual violence. It provides clear response procedures and timelines, defines complex concepts, and addresses incidents that occur off-campus in certain circumstances. Please see the policy available at <https://www.ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/sexual-violence-policy.pdf>

OTHER IMPORTANT INFORMATION

Please visit the Registrar's website at: <https://www.ucalgary.ca/registrar/registration/course-outlines> for additional important information on the following:

- **Wellness and Mental Health Resources**
- **Student Success**
- **Student Ombuds Office**
- **Student Union (SU) Information**
- **Graduate Students' Association (GSA) Information**
- **Emergency Evacuation/Assembly Points**
- **Safewalk**