COURSE DESCRIPTION[1]

This graduate seminar is a course on qualitative methods, specifically on sociological fieldwork. The overarching goal of qualitative methods is to understand people's experiences and meaning making in their interactions and relationships. Sociologists use a wide variety of qualitative methods to study social dynamics in various settings, from small groups such as families to formal organizations to the natural world. Through qualitative research, we can explain how "the everyday" creates, sustains, and contests ideas, institutions, social structures, inequalities, and power relations of marginalization and domination. Done well, qualitative research generates in-depth knowledge by constructing meaningful, accurate representations of social life.

Fieldwork is qualitative research in which researchers interact with, or come into proximity to, the people we study. Typically, it is done through observation, which is a powerful means of capturing people's *actions* and *interactions,* and interviewing, which is especially good at uncovering people's *perceptions*.

Your primary focus in this course will be developing your skills of sociological fieldwork by collecting, analyzing, and presenting qualitative evidence. The course goals are for you to (1) develop a deep understanding of various methodological approaches to sociological fieldwork and (2) gain some experience in qualitative design, data collection, and analysis. Students will work independently (or else in groups of two) to design and implement a small original, empirical research project on the theme of *social dynamics in organizational settings*. You will select a topic connected to the course theme and develop and implement a research plan. You will conduct observations and interviews and collect supplemental organizational documentation. You will analyze the evidence you gather and write up what you are learning. Much of our class time will be spent workshopping your research.

By completing the course requirements, you should be well versed in the theories, techniques, problems, logistics, ethics, advantages, and disadvantages of qualitative research methods. You should have first-hand experience doing observation and interviews and presenting qualitative data in a sociological manner. I expect and hope that you will refine and reflect upon your own abilities to do qualitative research and support other students as everyone learns, experiments, and develops skills.

---

[1] I developed my approach to teaching qualitative methods through my own sociological training at Northwestern University, including a foundational course on fieldwork taught by Prof. Carol Heimer, as well as my experiences teaching fieldwork at University at Buffalo, SUNY, University of Denver, and University of Toronto (St. George and Mississauga campuses). This syllabus is inspired by those of Prof. Jessica Fields and Prof. Judith Taylor (both University of Toronto). I am grateful to Jessica Fields for giving me her consent to borrow heavily from her syllabus, with attribution; any text in quotes or in blue font is copied directly from her Winter 2023 SOC6712HS syllabus.

ON LEARNING TO DO FIELDWORK

Doing sociological fieldwork well requires sensitivity to process and context as well as self-conscious reflection. It calls for an understanding of method, theory, ethics, and reflexivity. Writing is another essential component: it is a means of recording information, making sense of what you are learning, analyzing evidence, and communicating insights. There are foundational principles for qualitative research – such as using reliable and rigorous techniques, ensuring our engagements are ethical, and remaining open and responsive to an inherently iterative, reciprocal research process. That said, there is no one right way to do qualitative research, as Ashley Rubin (2021) writes. This course is a time to explore what approaches best suit your individual strengths, personalities, capacities, and preferences as well as the specifics of your project.

A major challenge of learning to do field research is that you need to learn everything *all at once*, as I learned from Carol Heimer, who taught my grad school fieldwork seminar. There are no clear-cut linear steps to learning and honing techniques. For the most part, people learn by *doing*, not by being taught to do. I have designed this course to give you hands-on exposure to fieldwork. Your reflections on your own experiences and those of other students, together with what you learn from the authors whose work we read, will help you as develop a repertoire of skills for this style of research.

Our class time together will primarily center on workshopping: sharing work in progress, discussing our experiences of data collection, and deciphering what we are learning as well as discussing readings and connecting them to students' projects. We will focus our energies on the nitty gritty process of collecting and making sense of qualitative evidence—on mucking through it, together, and supporting each other's explorations and growth along the way. Under ideal circumstances, your field research would be driven by a research question with grounding in sociological or social scientific literature. We would have spent more time reading qualitative studies and more time on technical issues of research design. However, in 12 weeks, our time is best spent on the on-the-ground aspects of fieldwork that are the most difficult to learn outside a class setting.

The structure of most of the course assignments mirror the syllabus created by UofT Professor Jessica Fields for this course, as do the readings and (often verbatim) the introductory summaries of the readings each week (SOC6712HS, Winter 2023). The course readings include samples from a wide range of approaches, from canonical scholarship to community-engaged work to critical race research. Many are on the Department of Sociology's Qualitative Methods comprehensive exam list. The assignments and readings set us up to explore the strengths and limitations of field methods for characterizing social conditions and our own roles as field researchers in challenging (and reproducing) power relations.

Many of the readings will push us to question and reflect on how sociology and the social sciences generally are "deeply extractive in their focus on disenfranchised people," as Prof. Judith Taylor explains in her syllabus for this course (SOC6712HS, Fall 2024). The goals of such research are, too often, "not to ease their pain, but to collect information about them and problem solve, attuned to logics of capitalism and governance. Sociologists have produced thousands if not millions of studies of suffering. Sociology however also has branches that seek to change relations of power, inequality, and exploitation, that are justice seeking in their ethos and striving. And, there are also sociologists who are just keen to explain how things work, reliant on neither people's pain nor social movements to do their research." These are essential dynamics for us to consider as you come to understand how you want to do research yourself.

READINGS

Required

Three textbooks are assigned. Rubin is available online through the UofT library. The other two must be purchased, although I have requested that the library put the hard copies on course reserve.

Ghodsee, Kristen. 2016. *From Notes to Narrative: Writing Ethnographies that Everyone Can Read.*
Chicago: University of Chicago Press. *Ebook for purchase through* the press website. $18 USD

Rubin, Ashley. 2021. *Rocking Qualitative Methods. An Irreverent Guide to Rigorous Research.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. *Ebook available through the* UofT library.

Tracy, Sarah J. 2024. *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact,* 3rd edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. *Ebook and paper/print for purchase through* the press website. $74 CAD.

Other readings are online in the UofT library or else in Quercus Files.

How to Read for This Course

Doing the readings and engaging seriously with their content is important for developing your ability to do sociological fieldwork. The readings include how-to guides and empirical studies published in academic books, chapters, articles, and reports. They provide much insight into *how* to do sociological fieldwork effectively, carefully, and intentionally. Read closely and take notes, focusing on *how* the researchers did what they did, rather than their substantive topic. During our class discussions, you will be expected (and may be called upon) to share your reactions to the readings and to discuss how they relate to your project. Bring books to class or have the electronic versions ready for reference.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Assignment Type	Description	Date Due	Weight
1) Research Proposal Memo	appx. 750-1000 words	draft: Tues., Jan. 14, 9am final: Thurs. Jan. 16, 11:59pm	5%
2) Research Proposal	appx. 1250+ words	Thurs. Jan. 30, 11:59pm	15%
3) Fieldnotes + Memo		Thurs., Feb. 27, 11:59pm	10%
4) Interview transcript + Memo		Thurs., Mar. 13, 11:59pm	10%
5) Portfolio		Tues., Apr. 15, 11:59pm	30%
6) Reading Responses + Mini-Assignments	6 Reading Responses 1+ Mini-Assignments	Reading Responses due: Week 1: Thurs., Jan. 9, 11:59pm Weeks 2-12: Sundays, 11:59pm	10%
7) In-Class Engagement	Facilitation	to be scheduled	5%
	Works in Progress	to be scheduled	5%
	In-Class Participation	ongoing	10%

STUDENT PROJECTS & COURSE THEME:
STUDYING ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS

Each student will work (or collaborate with another student) on a research project that explores experiences and perceptions of *social dynamics in formal organizational settings*. This theme provides us with a common reference point and analytic approach across disparate groups and settings.

The possible projects are many. People experience and perceive social dynamics in the context of many different formal organizations, including universities and colleges, government-managed public spaces such as trains and parks, legal institutions such as courts, and shopping malls. We often do not recognize organizational settings as such, but almost all the spaces where we spend time are owned, managed, or to some extent controlled by formal organizations. Organizational conditions can matter – or not – in expected and unexpected ways for people's behaviors, interactions, and understandings of social life.

When designing your project, there are two priorities above all else: **be realistic** and **do no harm**. You should construct a study that is easy to implement, focused on people aged 18 or older, and involving an organizational context that is publicly accessible. You will need to gain access by late Jan./early Feb. Throughout the course, we will discuss the ethics and other dimensions of harm, which typically focus on risks to individuals and their communities but can extend more broadly. Because this is a course for beginner qualitative researchers, you should avoid doing a project on precarious and vulnerable people, that raises especially sensitive issues in identity research (e.g., violence, abuse, and trauma), or that requires organizational leaders' consent to access to a formal organization. This will help us avoid thornier ethical and methodological concerns to focus instead on learning this style of research.[2]

Instructions on selecting your research site(s) for participant observation
Limit your site(s) to either (1) those in which there is no expectation of privacy or 2) easily accessible sites in which they may be some expectation of privacy. In the latter case, you should announce your presence as researchers to participants and share an Informed Consent document with setting participants. A template for this document is available on our Quercus site. All participant observation data, no matter the research site, should not allow for the identification of the participants; should not be staged by the researchers; and should be non-intrusive. Do not audio record, video record, or photograph participants' identifying features without their consent.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS
All written assignments should be in 12-pt font, one-inch margins, single or double spaced (unless otherwise noted). Include the word count at the top. Please edit for organization, spelling, and grammar. Do not use AI to generate written text or data analysis for this course. See guidelines at end of syllabus.

The multiple course assignments culminate in a final paper and portfolio. Before collecting data, you will submit two assignments: 1) Research Proposal Memo and then 2) a Research Proposal. These lay out your plan for your project this term. Your data collection should aim to include 6 (or more) interviews and/or field observations in total. There will be some flexibility depending on your project, but all students should do at least 2 participant observations and at least 2 interviews. Don't treat the final report and portfolio as a separate activity to be completed "later," at the semester's end. As you write your proposal, field notes, notes-on-notes, and memos and as you process what is happening in your site, keep your final report in mind. You should use those assignments to develop pieces of the report.

---

[2] Researchers always have a legal duty to report any suspicion of danger to a child. Since there is a remote possibility that such suspicion will arise during interviews you conduct for this course, we will address this possibility directly in our discussion of ethical concerns in class.

1) RESEARCH PROPOSAL MEMO: 5%: Draft due Tues. Jan. 14, 9am. Final due Thurs., Jan. 16, 11:59pm
Write appx. 750-1000+ words on your research ideas and plan. Your memo should cover these topics:
- Possible research interest(s) and questions, i.e. what you are studying. Your research question will evolve, but you need to start with at least a research objective (Rubin 2021).
- Proposed research site(s) and/or group(s) you will focus on and reasons for your choice.
- Methods you expect to use.
- Practical and ethical issues of this choice.

You have the option to cover more content in the Research Proposal (see below). Prepare a draft Research Plan Memo to discuss in class on Tues., Jan. 14, then a final version that you will hand in.

2) RESEARCH PROPOSAL: 15%
Due by Thurs., Jan. 30, 11:59pm (or sooner if you prefer)
You should write up a Research Proposal of at least 1250 words (appx. 5+ pages, double spaced). Draw on feedback you have received, seminar discussions, and secondary sources to address each of the following topics, using headers. It must cite and **incorporate multiple relevant course readings**.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL CONTENT

A. Your Study: Topic and Questions
- **The group or setting** *e.g., who belongs, where is it, what distinguishes the group or setting from other people or places?*
- **The organization(s) responsible for this setting**: *Provide some background information. Discuss (and cite) at least one an organizational document, if available.*
- **Your sociological questions.** *As you look to understand people's experiences and perceptions, consider the group, the organizational setting, and salient. What topics interest you?*
- **Your access:** *What challenges do you expect? If your access is iffy, what is your backup plan?*

B. Data Collection Plan and Methods
Your plan should ensure you will complete the required data collection assignments (see below) and strive toward depth (Lareau and Rao 2016). Your methods should follow from your research question and should enable you to *begin* to answer that question. Using and citing course readings, explain:
- **Your methods and rationales for each**
- **(Participant) observations:** *Where, when, how (participation vs observing), how often, your initial topical focus, consent process (if relevant)*
- **Interviews:** *With whom, how many, your topical focus, consent process*
- **Organizational documentation:** *What documentation do you expect to collect to describe the organizational context of your study? Describe and/or include in the appendix at least one document.* Examples include the TTC's security policy, visitor guidelines of Ontario courts, or a map of a shopping mall and descriptive information on the company that owns it. The document(s) may be specific to your field site or, if necessary, general to that type of field site.
- **The account you will share with participants**—*your explanation of what you are doing (there).*
- **Tools:** e.g. a digital recorder.

C. Ethical Considerations & Reflections on Positionality
Using and citing course readings, discuss ethical considerations of the setting or group that you are studying. Your plans should ensure voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and protection from harm. You should reflect on key relevant dimensions of your positionalities that may shape your engagement, approach, and ethics. *Consider factors such as the multiple, perhaps conflicting group/status memberships and ethical systems relevant to the project and how you intend to navigate*

---

those; practices you plan to use to center the interests and needs of those you will study; and your understanding of the legal duty to report any suspicion of danger to a child.

D. Bibliography (*do not include in word count*)
- For ASA guidelines for formatting your citations bibliography, see Quercus Files.
- Throughout your assignment, **cite your sources** within the text of your paper whenever you use a key idea from a source. You also need to provide additional information for each citation (although this does not follow the American Sociological Association Style Guide):
  - *If the source has page numbers:* include those in your citations such as: (Ray 2022, p. 51).
  - *If the source does not have page numbers,* cite the author's last name and year and insert a footnote with the chapter number or header for that section of an article and a quote that captures the relevant idea. Here is an example of the formatting: (Ray 2022).[3]
- List each source that you cite (and no others) in **a bibliography** at the end of your assignment.

E. Appendix (*do not include in word count*)
1) your (draft) script/email for obtaining consent to observe and/or interview.
2) your draft interview guide
3) organizational documentation you may use as data
4) OPTIONAL: bibliography (list or annotated) of at least 5 relevant sources you expect to read

3) FIELDNOTES WITH NOTES-ON-NOTES + MEMO: 10%, due Thurs., Feb. 27, 11:59pm
You should conduct at least one sustained observation and submit your field notes for it along with your note-on-notes and a memo.
- On the first page, include a short Context section: the place observed, why you selected it, when and where you did the observation and for how long, any problems, and other key details to orient your reader (and yourself, later in the semester!). Include your research question.
- In the memo, describe "something going on" in your field site (appx. 250-500 words) and reflect on your experience as an observer/participant in the field (min. 250 words, no max).
- If you did not include organizational document(s) in your Research Proposal or your organizational setting has changed, include those documents, too.

4) INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT WITH NOTES-ON-NOTES, MEMO, INTERVIEW PROTOCOL, + SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTION: 10%, due Thurs., Mar. 13, 11:59pm
You should conduct and transcribe at least one interview and submit the transcript for it along you're your interview protocol (including your introductory script and informed consent process), notes-on-notes, a memo, and your (draft) Summary of Data Collection.
- On the first page of the transcripts, provide a Context section with the interviewee's name or pseudonym, their title if relevant, why you interviewed this person, when and where the interview was conducted and for how long, any problems that arose and other key details to orient your reader (and yourself, later in the semester!). Include your current research question.
- In the memo, describe "something going on" in your interview data (appx. 250-500 words) and reflect on your experience as an observer/participant in the field (min. 250 words, no max).
- Your (draft) Summary of Data Collection should be a table or a sheet with a row for each observational visit and interview with key details on each (e.g., location, date, interviewee name, time in field, any follow-up steps). Consider including org documents, too.

---

[3] Ray 2022, Chap. 4: "Bell recognized that no single law or policy will permanently eliminate racism."

5) FINAL PORTFOLIO: 30%, due Tues., April 15, 11:59pm
- Revised Research Proposal that incorporates feedback and insights learned.
- Summary of Data Collection
- Documentation of 6+ instances of fieldwork: fieldnotes (minimum 2) and transcripts (minimum 2) with notes-on-notes
- Organizational documentation that you are using as data (appendix and/or links)
- Preliminary research report: a 15-page (double-spaced) paper. Instructions will be provided.

6) READING RESPONSES & MINI-ASSIGNMENTS, 10% total, ongoing

Reading Responses: For six weeks of the semester, students should post a Reading Response on the Discussion Board. You decide which weeks. Your Reading Response should be appx. 1 to 2 pages, single spaced, written in complete sentences, and organized into paragraphs. Explain key ideas of (all or almost all) the readings, their contributions and/or limitations, and ways that they help you think about your own project. You have the option to also identify questions and topics you would like to discuss in class. Feel free to respond to any posts by other students, too.

All students in the course are required to do one of their six responses on the Week 1 or Week 2 readings. The Reading Responses are typically due Sunday, 11:59pm, before class meets, to prepare for a meaningful in-class discussion. However, the Week 1 Reading Response is due Thurs., Jan. 9, 11:59pm. No make-up assignments accepted. If you struggle with completing this assignment, please contact me asap and we will work on an accommodation.

Mini-Assignments: Occasionally, a small assignment will be due Sunday, 11:59pm, before class.

7) IN-CLASS ENGAGEMENT
Each class session, we will discuss the assigned readings. For many class sessions, you will workshop your project-related work with the entire class and in small groups. You are expected to talk in class to share your experiences of fieldwork and your perceptions of your field site and interviewing. You also will share field notes, transcripts, or memos.

a) **Facilitation, 5%:** Each student is responsible for leading a discussion on the readings for appx. 45 minutes. You can do this on your own or with one other student. Sign up here for a date to facilitate. To prepare, you should closely read the assigned readings, review students' Discussion Board posts for that week, and select a few compelling questions and topics to discuss.

b) **Works in progress, 5%:** Sign up here for a date when you will describe an issue, topic, observation, concern, or quandary based on your fieldwork experiences to the class for discussion and constructive feedback. On the week you share your work in progress, you should circulate (i.e. post on Quercus) material beforehand– fieldnotes, interview transcript, org documents, or a short memo. These will be due Saturday, 11:59pm prior to your date (or another date/time the class agrees to).

c) **In-Class Participation aka "Scholarly Attitude": 10%, ongoing:** Students are expected to attend all the class meetings in their entirety and remain engaged throughout the discussion. More generally, I encourage you to adopt – in the words of Prof. Neda Maghbouleh - a "scholarly attitude." This means taking the role of graduate student and the work of field research seriously: engaging actively with the readings and other course content, sharing your fieldwork experiences, providing support and constructive feedback for other students, and generally going beyond the course requirements.

COURSE SCHEDULE & READINGS
Every attempt will be made to follow this schedule,
but it is subject to change at the discretion of the instructor

WEEK 1: January 7
introductions + formulating projects
The first chapter of the Tracy textbook (re)introduces us to foundations of empirical qualitative research, including its distinctive features compared to quantitative research. This reading also helps us appreciate research questions as an issue of feasibility, value, and interest—our own and others'. Kleinman, et al. help us think about the experience of being a beginner and not knowing. Along with Behar's chapter, it helps us begin clarifying the epistemological particularities— understandings of how we know what we know—of qualitative research. Behar will elaborate a theme that carries across this week's readings: the importance of reading, writing, and imagination for creative and incisive qualitative research. Read Becker's classic article as a study of beginners motivated by a "how" research question that, through nuanced evidence and analysis, helps us understand "why." Ybema et al introduce organizational ethnography as fieldwork on the everyday complexities of organizational life; they provide important guidance as you brainstorm topics for your research project. Mushtaq's *Contexts* "field note" is the first of many we will read for quick glimpses into field work in organizational settings, in lieu of reading longer publications based on fieldwork. These field notes, which were a regular section of *Contexts* in its early years, illuminate salient ethnographic experiences that are significant for the researcher and revealing for their findings. (Note that these are pieces are not technically "field notes;" they are thoughtfully crafted, polished pieces of scholarship).

reading - *appx. 65 pages*
- Tracy, Sarah. 2024. *Qualitative Research Methods.* Chap. 1: "The Power and Impact of Qualitative Methods," pp. 1-12 (stop at 'Transforming ideas...'). Also recommended: Preface.
- Behar, Ruth. 2020. "Read More, Write Less." Pp. 47-53 in *Writing Anthropology: Essays on Craft & Commitment*, ed. Carole McGranahan. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kleinman, Sherryl, Martha Copp, and Karla Henderson. 1997. "Qualitatively Different: Teaching Fieldwork to Graduate Students." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 25(4):469-99.
- Ybema, Sierk, Dvora Yanow, Harry Wels, and Frans Kamsteeg. 2009. "Studying Everyday Organizational Life." Pp. 1-9 in *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life.* London: SAGE Publications.
- Becker, Howard. 1953. "Becoming a Marihuana User." *American J of Sociology* 59(3): 235-242.
- Mushtaq, Faiza. 2007. "A Day with Al-Huda." *Contexts.* 6(2):60-61.

reminder: the Week 1 Reading Response deadline is Thurs., Jan. 9, 11:59pm.

WEEK 2: January 14
asking questions in qualitative research
We now begin to identify research topics and ideas and to frame the research questions that will occupy us for the remainder of the term. Tracy's (half) chapter lays out one way to think about this process, with an eye toward feasibility, ethical practice, and reflexivity. Rubin explains the process of formulating research questions in terms of a flexible "dirtbagging" approach that refuses the common sentiment that there is one "Right Way" to do research. Note that Rubin uses rock climbing as a parable for understanding qualitative methods. You can read those parts or skip them (these page numbers skip them), although you should understand what she means by dirtbagging. Ghodsee reminds us to follow our passion and curiosity when selecting a research topic. The excerpt by Geertz is a foundational statement on how to conceptualize culture as the subject of ethnographic study, exemplified by the

complexities of differentiating twitching from winking. Read Geertz alongside Tracy's discussion (p. 34) of thick description. Anderson's article (based on his book of the same title) exemplifies one approach to ethnography of a public organizational setting; he does not center organizational analysis but rather treats the organization as the scene of the study.

reading - *appx. 70 pages + skimming 15 pages and reviewing*
- Tracy. *Qualitative Research Methods*
    - Chap. 1 (con't), start at 'Transforming ideas…' on p. 12 – 26.
    - Chap. 2 (partial), "Entering the Conversation of Qualitative Research," pp. 27-34 (stop after bricolage)
- Rubin, Ashley T. 2021. *Rocking Qualitative Social Science.*
    - Chap. 1, "Introduction to Dirtbagging," just pp. 3- 7
    - Chap. 2, "What Exactly Are Qualitative Methods?" pp. 14-17
    - Chap. 3, "Picking Your Proj: Identifying Your Research Question," pp. 36-58
- Ghodsee, Kristen. 2016. "Choose a Subject You Love." Pp. 9-22 in *From Notes to Narrative.*
- Geertz, Clifford. 2000 [1973]. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," Chap. 1 in *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books, just pp. *3 – middle of 7 on his concept of thick description of culture and his analysis of twitching and winking.*
- Skim Anderson, Elijah. 2004. "The Cosmopolitan Canopy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.* 595(1): 14-31. *Also check out his two maps on the first few pages (pp. x-xi) of his book on* google books*.*
- Review Ybema et al from last week.

assignment due by Tues., Jan. 14, 9am: draft Research Proposal Memo (bring to class)
assignment due by Thurs., Jan. 16, 11:59pm: Research Proposal Memo (submit on Quercus)

WEEK 3: January 21
research design, evaluative standards, and epistemologies
With a sense of our research question, we will examine how good research design enables us to gather the data or evidence we need to answer our question. What ideas are central to our study? What and who can be the objects of our study? How will we render the complexities of social life intelligible through data? More generally, we will consider what qualitative methods are good for and appropriate standards of evaluating qualitative work. Tracy reminds us of to match our methods with our research questions and to think purposefully about sampling. Auerbach and Silverstein introduce standards of evaluation tailored to qualitative research; this short chapter is one of my favourite writings on the strengths of qualitative methods. Lareau & Rao (and Small, optional) similarly consider sampling, operationalization, and generalization in qualitative research that speaks across methods, fields, and disciplines and captures "depth." Rubin adds complexity to all these readings by complicating core axioms in qualitative research, such as sampling, n, and generalizability. The two fieldnotes by Castellano and McCorkel illustrate what depth can look like as well as the insights into organizational and institutional processes that depth can generate.

This week, we also extend our attention to a few of the many different epistemological approaches to qualitative research. Understanding the relevance of epistemology for research gives us insight into the traditions we've inherited, those we prefer, and ourselves as researchers. Carroll critiques technical approaches to qualitative methods (exemplified by the Tracy textbook?) and outlines a strategy for doing critical social research. Smith and Griffith elaborate a feminist framework that centers people as subjects, not objects, of study. Grounded in critical Indigenous studies, Tuck rejects "damage-centred"

research and damaging research, underscoring the intertwining of epistemology, such as ones theory of change, with ethics.

reading *appx. 90 pages*

- Tracy, Chap 4 (partial) on planning data collection and sampling, pp. 83-95 (*random, representative, and maximum convenience sampling are more appropriate to quantitative research*)
- Rubin, Chap. 2 (cont'd), "What Exactly Are Qual Methods?" pp. 17 -34 (start at "Consequently…").
- Auerbach, Carl and Louise Silverstein. 2003. *Qualitative Data: An Intro to Coding and Analysis.* Chap. 8 "Convincing Other People," pp. 77-87
- Lareau, Annette, and Aliya Hamid Rao. 2016. "It's About the Depth of Your Data." *Contexts*.
- Castellano, Úrsula. 2007. "Tell Your Story." *Contexts.* 6(3): 56-57 (on case worker visits)
- McCorkel, Jill. 2004. "Rentin' Out Your Head." *Contexts.* 4(2): 58-59 (on rehab program)
- Review Ybema et al from Week 1.

Epistemological approaches (read Tracy and at least two of the other three readings):
- Tracy, Qualitative Research Methods, Chap. 3 (partial) on research paradigms, pp. 54-66.
- Carroll, William K. 2004. "Introduction: Unpacking and Contextualizing Critical Research Strategies." Pp. 1-14 in *Critical Strategies for Social Research.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars.
- Smith, Dorothy E. and Alison Griffith. 2022. *Simply Institutional Ethnography: Creating a Sociology for People.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Chaps 1-2, pp. 3-23.
- Tuck, Eve. 2009. "Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities." *Harvard Educational Review*. 79(3):409-427.

WEEK 4: January 28
entering the field, gaining and maintaining access, + initial conversation on ethics

Learning begins in qualitative research well before we're in the field. As we formulate questions, consider ethical concerns, and elaborate our plans to answer our questions, we gain insight into the topics and communities that interest us. Then, learning continues as we enter the field, when our preconceptions, dispositions, and locations come up against those of the people and places we hope to understand. One of the profound lessons of early-stage qualitative research is that gaining and maintaining access to those we study is ongoing and relational. Tracy covers pragmatic aspects of these processes, which will be relevant given the stage of student projects. The Tri-Policy Council statement is the Government of Canada's official guidelines on ethics (there's much to praise and much to criticize); the Quercus documents are specific to this class and UofT. Grant specifies varied phases of access, and levels of analysis, in an organizational ethnography. Consider the   reading, which identifies "serious ethical questions" that arise in early fieldwork and how the practicalities of fieldwork often are not compatible with legally effective informed consent protocols. Then read González-López's article to understand how she navigated these dynamics. Berrey and Moon each reflect on the in-the-moment complexities, limitations, and emotions that fieldworkers navigate in organizational settings**. TA Workshop: Getting Access, Formulating Your Questions.**

reading - *appx. 90 pages*

- Tracy, Qualitative Research Methods, Chap. 5, "Negotiating Access Scene," pp. 114-139.
- Government of Canada, 2022. *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans.*
    - Chap. 1, "Ethics Framework," pp. 4-12
    - Chap. 2 (partial) on risk, pp. 23-29 only
    - Also review the 3 documents in the Quercus REB folder

- Thorne, Barrie. 1980. "'You Still Takin' Notes?' Fieldwork and Problems of Informed Consent." *Social Problems* 27(3):284-97.
- González-López, Gloria. 2011. "Mindful Ethics: Comments on Informant-Centered Practices in Sociological Research." *Qualitative Sociology* 34(3):447-461.
- Grant, Amy. 2017. "I Don't Want You Sitting Next to Me": The Macro, Meso, and Micro of Gaining and Maintaining Access to Government Organizations During Ethnographic Fieldwork." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 16(1):1-11.
- Berrey, Ellen. 2004. "The Drive for Diversity." *Contexts* 3(1):60-61
- Moon, Dawne. 2003. "Gay Pain in Church." *Contexts* 2(1):58-59.

assignment due Sun., Jan. 26, 11:59pm (**before class meets**): post your Week 4 mini-assignment on the Discussion Board (your research question + a draft script for introducing your project)

WEEK 5: February 4
participant observation

Participant observation is perhaps the emblematic form of qualitative research, invoking as it does the romantic and romanticized image of the ethnographer in the field, immersed in a community, coming to a deep interpretive understanding of everyday social life. This week's readings explore the practicalities and the thorny challenges of being in the field, recording notes, and documenting other people's behavior and lives. Tracy provides an overview of the method and approaches to it as well as practical guidance on taking field notes. Emerson, et al. elaborate the craft of ethnography grounded in symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology, with an instructive discussion of field note excerpts from different students' observations of the same scene. Ghodsee encourages us to write details into our data—a helpful reminder as the class prepares to submit the first required fieldnotes (it also speaks to earlier readings - Tracy's discussion of thick description on p. 34 and Geertz's classic piece). Ghodsee also explores how best to render places and events in our fieldnotes and eventual analysis. Reich's field note catapults us into intense organizational and interpersonal family dynamics. Ryvicker shows us how fieldwork can reveal organizational cultures and their consequences for caregiving. Wynn's piece illustrates how an ethnographer can polish their field notes and present them in a way that illustrates important social dynamics in their site. These readings will help you prepare for our **TA-led in-class workshop and excursion: Participant Observing at Service Ontario.** We will meet first in our classroom for discussion, then walk to College & Bay, then return to the department to debrief. Please let me know in advance if you have any mobility needs or concerns.

reading- *appx. 70 pages*
- Tracy, Chap. 6, "Field Roles, Fieldnotes, and Field Focus," pp. 141-167
- Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw. 1995. Chap. 1, "Fieldnotes in Ethnographic Research," pp. 1-20 in *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (*Note: their use of "native" and "Indigenous" to describe research participants is indicative of the white settler colonial foundations of anthropology and is critiqued in the Tracy chapter*)
- Ghodsee, Kristen. 2016. *From Notes to Narrative:*
  - Chap. 3, "Incorporate Ethnographic Detail." pp. 31-40
  - Chap. 4, "Describe Places and Events." Pp. 41-50
- Reich, Jennifer. 2002. "Bogeyman with a Clipboard." *Contexts* 1(1): 59-60.
- Ryvicker, Miriam. 2006. "The Trade-Off in Caring." *Contexts* 5(3): 44-45.
- Wynn, Jonathan. 2007. "Guiding Ideas." *Contexts* 6(1): 56-57.

assignment due by Thurs., Feb. 6, 5pm: Research Proposal

WEEK 6: February 11
interviewing

Interviewing is the most frequently used method for qualitative fieldwork. It's often a more practical route than ethnography and participant observation for busy researchers, and many are drawn to the idea of talking to people about their experiences of the social order and inequalities that interest us. Start with the Weiss *Contexts* article for an engaging overview of interviewing, accompanied by photographs. Then, read the chapters from his foundational book. Consider how his interview questions and engagement create a structured conversation that encourages the interviewee to open up and talk in detail about their life. With your draft interview protocol in hand, consult the Tracy chapters and explore UofT Prof. Ping-Chun Hsiung's website on Lives & Legacies instrumentally, to update any parts of your protocol that need revision. Optional readings: DeVault helps us consider the ways gender threads through what women say and how they say it, while May interrogates the ways race and racism thread through even our conversations about race and racism. Pugh offers further strategies for not taking interviewees at face value and instead thinking carefully about what we can learn through the complicated talk generated in interviews**. In-class TA workshop: Interviewing**

reading - *appx. 140 pages plus skimming and instrumental reading – but Weiss is an easy read!*
- Weiss, Robert S. 2004. "In Their Own Words." *Contexts* 3(4): 44-51
- Weiss, Robert S. 1995. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview.* - see Quercus if you can't access the library copy.
  - o Introduction, pp. 1-11
  - o Chap. 4, Interviewing, pp. 61-119. *Looks long, but it's mostly transcript excerpts + analysis*
  - o Skim Chap. 5: Issues in interviewing, pp. 121-150.
- Tracy, *Qualitative Research Methods:*
  - o Chap. 7, "Interview Planning and Design," pp. 169-191 –*read the opening section on self-reflexivity. After that, focus on what's helpful.*
  - o Chap. 8, "Interview Practice," read p. 196-200, *also read about mediated interviews if you expect to do interviews on Zoom or over the phone.*
- Lives & Legacies website, sections under "Interviewing" – *focus on what's helpful*:
  - o Characteristics of Good Interviews + the 4 linked pages at the bottom
  - o Phrasing Questions and Other Interview Techniques: The Don'ts and The Do's
- Revisit and, if needed, update your draft interview guide based on these readings

optional but recommended
- De Vault, Marjorie L. 1990. "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis." *Social Problems* 37(1):96-116.
- May, Reuben A. Buford. 2014. "When the Methodological Shoe is on the Other Foot: African American Interviewer and White Interviewees." *Qualitative Sociology* 37(1):117-36.
- Pugh, Allison. 2013. "What Good are Interviews for Thinking about Culture?" *American Journal of Cultural Sociology* 1(1):42-68.

February 18: Reading Week

WEEK 7: February 25

ethics + engaging existing research + catch-up

As this week's readings make clear, ethical considerations in qualitative research are far-ranging Researchers have ethical obligations to the people we study, the communities we belong to, our institutional homes, and ourselves. We cannot anticipate every ethical issue we will encounter in research, but we can anticipate some and we can develop an ethical code that reflects our professional, political, moral, and interpersonal responsibilities to ourselves and others. Fine & Schulman revisit a classic piece by Fine on ethnographers' lies, to consider ethical dynamics in studying organizations. Readings by Taylor & Patterson and Tuck examine the institutional strategies, mindful practices, and analytic priorities that qualitative researchers may adopt to chart alternative paths through the fraught ethical terrain of qualitative research. Blee's fieldnote provides a reference point for considering ethics when studying people with odious beliefs.

Engaging existing research – what is commonly called the literature review- tends to be done in various stages in qualitative research. Earlier on, reading existing research helps us to clarify the methodological traditions and theoretical understandings that underpin our approaches. It is important to understand what has been published on our topics previously. Yet, this gets complicated. While doing fieldwork, topics often are emergent and iterative, revealing themselves as we gather and analyze evidence, reflect, and get clarity on what we're *able* to learn from our empirical research. The short sections from the Tracy chapter provide important orientation to this process, including the distinction between a study's conceptual framework and existing knowledge on the phenomenon studied. Ghodsee helps us establish an initial relationship to the literature in our reading, research, and writing. **In class: Works-in-Progress. TA workshop: Engaging Existing Research**

reading - *appx. 65 pages + any catch-up/reviewing*

ethics
- Fine, Gary Alan and David Shulman. 2009. "Lies from the Field: Ethical Issues in Organizational Ethnography. Pp. 177-195 in *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life.* London: SAGE Publications.
- Taylor, Judith, and Matthew Patterson. 2010. "Autonomy and Compliance: How Qualitative Sociologists Respond to Institutional Ethical Oversight." *Qualitative Sociology* 33(2):161-83.
- Review Tuck on Suspending Damage
- Blee, Kathleen M. 2002. "The Banality of Violence." *Contexts* 1(4): 60-61.

engaging existing research
- Tracy, Chap. 4: Within the section on Creating a Research Proposal, read pp. 103-107 (the sub-sections on Conceptual cocktail party, Rationale, and Lit review and conceptual frameworks)
- Ghodsee, Kristen. 2016. "Integrate Your Theory." Pp. 51-61 in *From Notes to Narrative.*
- Read students' Works in Progress

assignment due by Thurs. Feb. 27, 11:59pm: fieldnotes, with notes-on-notes and memo

WEEK 8: March 4

emotion and self in the field

A common saying in field research is that "the researcher is the instrument." We are the tool through which data is collected; and we are the research tool that participants interact with. Much as the quality of the online survey, interview questions, or archival system helps to shape the data available for study, the researcher's biography, body, behavior, social location, and social identities (projected and claimed) will help determine the data available in a qualitative study. The authors we read for today's class join other qualitative researchers approach these questions of "positionality" as a source of methodological

strength and sociological insight. Kovach, et al. explore the additional issue of our relationships to ideas and histories. Hordge-Freeman and Moussawi examine the value of our emotional lives and corporeal selves in the field. Ghodsee supports our efforts to write these experiences as researcher and as instrument into our data and our analysis. Kudler chronicles a Muslim family's grieving over the death of a loved one in a U.S. hospital – an account that is rich in detail but lacking in emotion itself. Pager describes the emotional experiences of her research assistants as they personally encountered the very discrimination her research documents. **In class: Works-in-Progress.**

reading - *appx. 60 pages*
- Kovach, Margaret, Jeannine Carriere, M. J. Barrett, Harpell Montgomery, and Carmen Gillies. 2013. "Stories of Diverse Identity Locations in Indigenous Research." *International Review of Qualitative Research* 6(4):487-509.
- Ghodsee, Kristen. 2016. "Put Yourself into the Data." Pp. 23-30 in *From Notes to Narrative:*
- Hordge-Freeman, Elizabeth. 2018. "Bringing Your Whole Self to Research: The Power of the Researcher's Body, Emotions, and Identities in Ethnography." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 17(1):1-9.
- Moussawi, Ghassan. 2021. "Bad Feelings: On Trauma, Nonlinear Time, and Accidental Encounters in 'the Field.'" *Departures in Critical Qualitative Research* 10(1):78-96.
- Kudler, Taryn. 2007. "Providing Spiritual Care." *Contexts* 6(4): 60-61.
- Pager, Devah. 2003. "Blacks and Ex-Cons Need Not Apply." *Contexts* 2(4): 58-59.
- Read students' Works in Progress

WEEK 9: March 11
coding + analysis
Data collection and analysis are usually simultaneous and dialectic in qualitative research. An inductive approach to analysis and theory-building involves systematic and consistent reflection on the evidence we've collected. New questions emerge, sampling takes a new direction, and concepts gain new clarity as researchers spend more time in the field learning more about the setting and people and gaining a new appreciation of what they still need to learn. The readings for today emphasize the importance of simultaneous data collection and analysis, but they also turn our attention to that moment in a study in which data collection ends and analysis becomes the focus. Tracy's overview of coding covers a variety of approaches as well as foundational analytic tasks when coding qualitative data. Davies and Hughes distill the basics of analyzing data collected through different qualitative methods, with useful reminders of what qualitative data are good for. Auerbach and Silverstein provide some practical guidance for making sense of interview data (the optional Emerson et al reading does the same for field notes); be sure you understand the chart on p. 35. Berrey et al offer an example of an interview-based study that captures people's perceptions, experiences, and identities in the institutional context of the U.S. legal system, involving multiple organizational entities and profoundly unequal power dynamics; in class, we may read and analyze the transcript for the Chris Burns interview. **In class: Works-in-Progress. Workshop: Coding Interviews, Part 1**

reading - *appx. 100 pages*
- Tracy, Chap. 9, "Pronetic Iterative Qualitative Data Analysis," pp. 224-254 – *read what's useful.*
- Davies, Martin and Nathan Hughes, 2014. *Doing a Successful Research Project: Using Qualitative or Quantitative Methods.* 2nd edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Chap. 12 "Analysing Qualitative Data." Pp. 187-206.
- Auerbach, Carl and Louise Silverstein. *Qualitative Data: An Introduction to Coding and Analysis:*
  - Chap. 4: Coding I, The Basic Ideas, pp. 31-41

- o Chap. 5: Coding II, The Mechanics, Phase I, Making the Text Manageable, pp. 42-53
    - o Chap. 6, Coding II, The Mechanics, Phase II, Hearing What Was Said, pp. 54-66
- Berrey, Ellen, Steve Hoffman, and Laura Beth Nielsen. 2012. "Situated Justice: A Contextual Analysis of Fairness and Inequality in Employment Discrimination Litigation," *Law & Society Review* 46(1): 1-36. Abstract + pp. 8 (Why Employment Civil Rights?) – 30. *Focus on the experiences of the plaintiffs (the party that files the lawsuits), especially Chris Burns.*
- Optional: Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes.* Chap. 6, "Processing Field Notes: Memoing and Coding," pp. 142-168
- Read students' Works in Progress

assignment due by Thurs., Mar. 13, 11:59pm: interview transcript, with memo

WEEK 10: March 18
analysis, continued

We continue to focus on analysis this week, with an emphasis on theoretical dimensions of coding. Tracy, again, orients us to a range of approaches to advanced coding; focus on the approaches that are most applicable to your project. The other readings explain grounded theory along with more recent innovations that build on and critique that tradition. Charmaz & Belgrave offer an overview of grounded theory, which is the most cited method of data collection and analysis in qualitative research (often, problematically so!). Deterding & Waters offer a flexible model that engages with recent and established technological advances in data analysis. Timmermans & Tavory develop abductive analysis as a more accurate and theoretically generative alternative to grounded theory. Optional: Vila-Henniger et al proposes an approach for concretely implementing abduction in analysis and coding. **In class: Works-in-Progress. Workshop: Coding Interviews, Part 2**

reading - *appx. 85 pages + review/optional*
- Review last week's readings if helpful but especially Berrey et al's *Law & Society Review* article
- Tracy, Chap. 10, "Advanced Data Analysis," pp. 256-283 – *read what's useful.*
- Charmaz, Kathy, and Linda Liska Belgrave. 2015. "Grounded Theory." Pp. 1-6 in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by George Ritzer. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Deterding, Nicole M., and Mary C. Waters. 2018. "Flexible Coding of In-Depth Interviews: A Twenty-First-Century Approach." *Sociological Research & Methods* 50(2) 708-739.
- Timmermans, Stefan and Iddo Tavory. 2012. "Theory Construction in Qualitative Research: From Grounded Theory to Abductive Analysis." *Sociological Theory* 30(3):167-186.
- Optional: *on implementing abduction in coding:* Vila-Henninger, Luis, Claire Dupuy, Viginie Van Ingelgom, Mauro Caprioli, Ferdinand Teuber, Damien Pennetreau, Margherita Bussi, and Cal Le Gall. 2022. "Abductive Coding: Theory Building and Qualitative (Re)Analysis." Sociological Methods & Research 0(0) - *focus on pp. 11-23.*
- Read students' Works in Progress

WEEK 11: March 25

Ragin's discussion of cases – a foundational topic in research design – can help you conceptualize what your study is a case of. This week, we also will revisit earlier readings on what qualitative methods are good for and appropriate evaluative standards for qualitative research. This is a useful moment to remind ourselves what we can say with the evidence collected thus far. We have time this week for additional topics that have emerged over the semester., as well **In class: Works-in-Progress.**

reading – *appx. 45 pages + re-read appx. 14 pages*

- Ragin, Charles C. 1992. Pp. 1-17 in *What Is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry,* eds. C. Ragin and H. Becker. Cambridge University Press.
- Tracy, Chap. 11, "A Big Tent Model of Qualitative Quality," pp. 285-311.
- Re-read: Auerbach and Silverstein. Chap. 8 "Convincing Other People: The Topics Formerly Known as Reliability, Validity, and Generalizability," pp. 77-87
- Re-read: Lareau and Rao. 2016. "It's About the Depth of Your Data." *Contexts*.
- Klinenberg, Eric. 2002. "Inside the Box." *Contexts* 1(3):56-57.
- Read students' Works in Progress

WEEK 12: April 1

developing a "good enough" argument based on evidence

In this last seminar meeting, we will reflect on what we've learned and accomplished as qualitative researchers this term. Tracy situates writing within the research process, with guidance for composing and crafting your final report. Ghodsee encourages us to find our own practices and ambitions as qualitative researchers and writers. Luttrell argues that, in the end, it might be enough to be "good enough." In class, we will discuss writing a "spew draft" (Becker 2020). **In class: Works-in-Progress.**

reading – *70 pages + some optional/review*

- Tracy, *Qualitative Research Methods*
  - Chap. 13, "Drafting, Polishing, and Publishing," pp. 343-368 – *focus on what's useful*
  - Chap. 14 "Qualitative Methodology Matters," pp. 369 – 375 (or beyond, if you're curious about public scholarship).
- Luttrell, Wendy. 2000. "'Good Enough' Methods for Ethnographic Research." *Harvard Educational Review* 70(4):499-523.
- Ghodsee, Kristen. 2016. "Find Your Process." Pp. 117-26 in *From Notes to Narrative*.
- Read students' Works in Progress

assignment due by Tues., April 15, 11:59pm: final portfolio

COURSE POLICIES

Late Assignments
Late assignments will not be penalized if the assignment is late for legitimate (preferably documented) reasons beyond the student's control. For all other late assignments, a late penalty of 5% will be assigned per day; assignments will be accepted up to 7 days late. Late Reading Responses are not accepted for any reason.

Course Extensions – Extenuating Circumstances
Students are expected to submit course work on time. Occasionally, students may not be able to make agreed upon deadlines due to extenuating circumstances. Students are required to make arrangements with their instructors about how to submit late course work. The graduate office highly recommends that course work extensions remain within the term dates in which the course was taught.

Note: submitting work beyond the term end date (not the last day of instruction but the actual end of term, e.g., the last day of a winter term class may be April 3, but the term ends April 30) requires a discussion with the instructor and the graduate office, as well as completion of an SGS request for an extension of course work form. These forms will be considered by the graduate office and are not automatically approved.

Academic Integrity
Copying, plagiarizing, falsifying medical certificates, or other forms of academic misconduct will not be tolerated. Any student caught engaging in such activities will be referred to the Dean's office for adjudication. Any student abetting or otherwise assisting in such misconduct will also be subject to academic penalties.Students are expected to cite sources in all written work and presentations. See this link for tips for how to use sources well.

According to Section B.I.1.(e) of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters it is an offence "to submit, without the knowledge and approval of the instructor to whom it is submitted, any academic work for which credit has previously been obtained or is being sought in another course or program of study in the University or elsewhere."

By enrolling in this course, you agree to abide by the university's rules regarding academic conduct, as outlined in the Calendar. You are expected to be familiar with the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters and the Code of Student Conduct, which spell out your rights, your duties and provide all the details on grading regulations and academic offences at the University of Toronto.

Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to the University's plagiarism detection tool for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the tool's reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of this tool are described on the Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation web site.

Use of Generative AI
Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) – and specifically foundational models that can create writing, computer code, and /or images using minimal human prompting – are proliferating and becoming ubiquitous. This includes not only GPT-4 (and its siblings ChatGPT and Bing), but many writing assistants that are built on this or similar AI technologies. There are now hundreds of these systems that are readily available.

The results of generative AI systems can be impressive and quite human-like.* Yet these tools have many limitations. Importantly, AI systems like ChatGPT generate answers by relying on probability (what is likely to be the correct answer, based on available internet content), not by relying on accuracy (what is a true and factual answer, supported by reliable sources). These tools can make some of our work more efficient and stronger, but people also misuse and abuse them in ways that are manipulative and counterproductive to learning and assessment. I believe we need to learn how to effectively work with these systems in ways that still align with 1) standards of academic integrity and 2) the essential pedagogical principle that students should be assessed based on the quality of their original work, which they produce on their own and which reflects their academic abilities.

NOT PERMITTED IN THIS COURSE – and a potential academic offence:
- ∅ Students **may not** knowingly use AI tools to generate drafts or final versions of assignments.
- ∅ Students **may not** represent AI-generated content as their own words and/or their own ideas.
- ∅ Students **may not** copy and paste (or minimally modify) text generated by AI tools

Such unauthorized use of Chat GPT and other generative AI tools on a marked assignment is a violation of academic integrity. Useful information and resources on generative AI is provided by the UofT Office of the Vice-Provost and, specific to graduate students, by the School of Graduate Studies.

PERMITTED IN THIS COURSE: Students <u>may</u> use generative AI tools to:
- ☐ refine language or grammar (e.g., checking use of English language, Grammarly),
- ☐ conduct background research and identify additional literature,
- ☐ ask questions about course themes and assimilate information for general understanding.
- ☐ transcribe interview recordings
- ☐ explore potential codes and themes in a subset of your anonymized data– *to be discussed first*

If you wish to use a generative AI program such as ChapGPT, I strongly recommend that instead you use Microsoft Copilot, which is free to the UofT community under license. The content entered into UofT's Copilot is not saved by the system or used to train AI.

For any of these permitted uses for a course assignment, students must do the following. The goal is to ensure transparency and to encourage you to use these tools critically, consciously, and productively:
1. Submit, as an appendix, an explanation of and reflection on how you used generative AI.
    - In your explanation, state how you used generative AI (e.g. which tool, the prompts you used, and how you incorporated the results from the AI into your submitted work, such as what content you used or did not use.
    - Include before/after text or screen shots of your work and the generative AI output. Also provide a link to the output if that is an option.
    - In your process reflection, consider how this tool was helpful or not and what you learned from using it as well as any ethical concerns it may have raised for you.
2. Appropriately cite any content you produced using an AI tool. Many organizations that publish standard citation formats are now providing information on citing generative AI (e.g., MLA: https://style.mla.org/citing-generative-ai/).

Note that these terms of use may change without advance notice during the term.

---

* Some ideas and text in this section are copied or adapted from Prof. Steve Hoffman's syllabus content on AI.

Student Services and Resources

The university offers a variety of **student support services and resources**, which can be found at http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/current-students. This includes supports for your academics, health, and wellness, and other student services.

Accessibility Services

It is the University of Toronto's goal to create a community that is inclusive of all persons and treats all members of the community in an equitable manner. In creating such a community, the University aims to foster a climate of understanding and mutual respect for the dignity and worth of all persons. Please see the University of Toronto Governing Council "Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities."

In working toward this goal, the University will strive to provide support for, and facilitate the accommodation of, individuals with disabilities so that all may share the same level of access to opportunities, participate in the full range of activities that the University offers, and achieve their full potential as members of the University community. We take seriously our obligation to make this course as welcoming and accessible as feasible for students with diverse needs. We also understand that disabilities can change over time and will do our best to accommodate you.

Students seeking support must have an intake interview with a disability advisor to discuss their individual needs. In many instances it is easier to arrange certain accommodations with more advance notice, so we strongly encourage you to act as quickly as possible. To schedule a registration appointment with a disability advisor, please visit Accessibility Services, call at 416-978-8060, or email accessibility.services@utoronto.ca. The office is located at 455 Spadina Avenue, 4th Floor, Suite 400.

Additional student resources for distressed or emergency situations can be located at Student Life's web site for distressed students; Health & Wellness Centre, 416-978-8030;or Student Crisis Response, 416-946-7111.

Equity and Diversity

All members of the learning environment in this course should strive to create an atmosphere of mutual respect. It is our collective responsibility to create a space that is inclusive and welcomes discussion. Discrimination, harassment and hate speech will not be tolerated; please alert me to any behaviour that undermines the dignity or self-esteem of any person in this course or otherwise creates an intimidating or hostile environment. You'll find additional information and reports on Equity and Diversity at the University of Toronto online.