

**GS/NURS 5750 3.0, Section M**

**Interpretation and Data Analysis**



**Course Professor: Fay M Dastjerdi RN; PhD**

**Calendar (Short) Course Description**

This course focuses on the processes by which the major schools of thought frame interpretation in research and inquiry. Students explore, analyze, and critique the ways in which these different traditions influence the what, why and how of nursing research practices and their links to diverse forms of data analysis.

**Expanded Course Description**

Students examine the history of interpretation and situate the role of interpretation in understanding, language/discourse, and knowledge creation. The processes/methods of interpretation will be considered as they are enacted across various schools of thought and knowledge traditions that inform practice and research. Students will engage in data analysis processes across different theoretical paradigms of nursing science and consider the politics of interpretation and data analysis.

**Learning Outcomes**

1. Students demonstrate a deep and self-reflective understanding of their own worldviews within an interpretive frame.
2. Students demonstrate the ability to articulate and critique the different ways of representing reality through interpretation.
3. Students demonstrate the ability to systematically assess, synthesize, and enact different interpretive approaches for understanding nursing phenomena.
4. Students engage with data analysis techniques across major paradigms of thought.

To help organize the ideas to be explored in the course discussions, we have grouped the course content into four broad thematic areas called *perspectives*:

- Humans as interpreting beings
- Paradigms/ontologies & interpretations of reality
- Knowledge, context & values
- Interpretation & research

### Essential Understandings:

1. All approaches in nursing research and practice involve an interpretation of meaning and value within a personal horizon or worldview.
2. Interpretation is influenced by biases and prejudices (pre-judgements) that can both open up and close one down to understanding different perspectives
3. Data analysis involves integrating data within a horizon of understanding—personal, philosophical, and theoretical.
4. Research findings represent the researcher’s story of how descriptions from participants (data) make sense in light of a nursing perspective/theory.

### Required Text:

Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Email: [order@sagepub.com](mailto:order@sagepub.com)

### Resources

Some core readings and resources will be provided as a place to start engaging, questioning, and reflecting. You are also encouraged to contribute resources that are meaningful to you and that you believe may be helpful for others to read, see, or consider. Obtaining required articles online through York Library:

Go to <http://www.library.yorku.ca/ccm/jsp/homepage.jsp>

- Under “Library Resources,” type in the name of the journal (e.g., *Nursing Science Quarterly*), click “Find,” and then scroll down and **click to access this resource**
- You will then need to sign in (Passport York or library number)
- Click on the desired year, e.g., 2014
- Click on the required volume and issue, e.g., 27(1)
- Scroll down to find authors’ names and click on PDF version; you can then download and save or print the article

### Web-Based Resources

- 1) Use the Internet to search for relevant articles, videos, images, texts, etc. Students are required to reference all material in keeping with copyright law: see <http://copyright.info.yorku.ca/>
- 2) An excellent resource website about nursing theory, including links to websites about

multiple theorists, is based at the Hahn School of Nursing and Health Science.  
 Available at: <http://www.sandiego.edu/academics/nursing/theory/>

**Overview of Teaching-Learning Approach**

Course teaching-learning activities are informed by complexity pedagogy. Complexity pedagogy proposes that all persons in a community of inquiry learn together. Teachers and students come together to engage, share, and question in order to develop personal understandings. Diverse views and different perspectives enable deep learning, and so, in many ways we are all responsible for contributing—not only to our own understanding and growth, but to that of our colleagues and classmates. There are no right and wrong answers in complexity learning. We all have different views and understandings, because our understanding is contextual, historical, and experiential. We are all coming together from a different place to spend time together in a shared quest for insights and emergent learning.

**Evaluation of Learning: Due Dates & Weighting**

Evaluation Activity	Due Date (11pm)	Weighting
<b>1. Ongoing Participation and Contribution to Shared Learning 12 weeks from Jan 3<sup>rd</sup> to Mar 29<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>Self-evaluation of participation (April 1<sup>st</sup>) (see rubric below)</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>2. Self-reflective Paper</b>	<b>Reflexivity Paper (Feb 11<sup>th</sup>)</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>3. Data Analysis Activity and Short Assignment</b>	<b>Data analysis activity discussion on Moodle and Short Assignment (March 21<sup>st</sup>)</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>4. Final Scholarly Paper</b>	<b>Final paper: April 6<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>40%</b>

- 1. Ongoing Participation and Contribution to Shared Learning - 25% (Due: April 1<sup>st</sup>)**  
 Discussion about topics/ideas and questions will take place within the Moodle platform. You are expected to be contributing to the discussions at least three times each week. (For more ideas about what this entails, please review the complexity pedagogy concepts (above) and the evaluation rubric below.

You may find one of the controversies in the course particularly interesting to discuss on Moodle. The controversies can be linked to discussions to provoke different ideas and views on issues important to nursing practice. **Please remember to upload links (URLs) for published resources rather than the actual resource, in conformance with copyright law.**

Links to Creative Commons, Open Access and Public Domain materials can be found here: <http://copyright.info.yorku.ca/online-resources-for-content/>

To reiterate: Participation in the online discussion is critical to your learning and the learning

of your colleagues. Therefore, students are asked to be responsive and generous with ideas, feelings, and different views. Since there are no right or wrong answers or preferred pathways for learning, we all contribute to the layers of understanding and the breadth of possible ways of thinking. To enhance learning, focus on asking questions, posing other ways of thinking, challenging your own assumptions, and questioning issues of power, structures, and politics. We all have different perspectives and we will have points of agreement, uncertainty, and disagreement on many issues and ideas during the course. Attending to these foci and questions is the work we will do together. We will also consider various consequences of thinking in light of our professional responsibilities, relational ethics, and social justice mandate as nurses.

The online discussion will be in the form of a dialogue or conversation that is informal and spontaneous. Of course, you should include references for ideas and images when you bring in content that can further the thinking and understanding that is emerging in the discussion. Use resources only to build on, or disagree with, what others are thinking. For instance, you might say the following in a posting:

Smith (2015) proposes that nursing must prioritize technical skills in acute practice settings, but I disagree. I believe technical skills are important but the relational aspects of nursing practice have equal importance and serious consequence if ignored.

Ref:

Smith, G. (2015). Technical and relational responsibilities in nursing, *Journal of Relational Care*, 4, 4-5. (Fictional Reference!)

**2. Self-reflective Short Scholarly Paper—20% (Due: February 11<sup>th</sup>)**  
**Criteria: 5-6 double-spaced pages (excluding cover and references); APA 6<sup>th</sup> Edition; First Person preferred.**

This paper has four parts: Please use headings for each part or section:

**Part 1 – Personal Values, Attitudes, and Beliefs**

In our text, *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*, on pages 64-65, Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018) define *Value*, *Attitude*, and *Belief*. Using their definitions as a guide, please describe your values, attitudes, and beliefs about nursing research. What kind of researcher do you want to become? What is your attitude toward different kinds of research (quantitative, qualitative, critical)? What has shaped your attitudes about research over your career?

**Part 2 – Identify a human experience that you would like to explore as a researcher** (e.g. grieving, feeling stigmatized, loneliness, experience of living in poverty, feeling hopeful, resilience, other—check with course director). What are your values, attitudes, and beliefs about this phenomenon? How are your values, attitudes and beliefs about your chosen phenomenon reflected in a creative expression (e.g. *in your own* poem, painting, photograph(s), or video). Reflect on how you have come to feel and think this way about the phenomenon as you reflect on your creative expression.

**Part 3 – Find two scholarly papers** on your phenomenon of interest. One paper should be aligned with your values/attitude/beliefs and the other should oppose or be different than your own values/attitudes /beliefs. Write about the difference in the papers, especially the findings.

Describe your comfort and discomfort with these two papers regarding the representation of your phenomenon of interest.

**Part 4 - Glossary of terms** – after the references and appendices provide a glossary of terms you have collected over the course to date – ensure you cite your sources for these definitions.

### 3. Data Analysis Activity - 15% (Due: March 21<sup>st</sup>)

During the week 10, you will be provided with stories of loss from transcripts with women whose mothers were living with Alzheimer's disease (Jonas-Simpson & Mitchell, 2004). Throughout that week we will each read the stories composed from the interview transcripts and discuss categories and themes that you identify emerging in the stories. When you read the stories analyze this data from your chosen theoretical lens and/or ontological tradition (paradigm/worldview). Identify the categories and themes that seem important in the stories from this lens. In Chapter 9 of our course text, (Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M., 2018), you will find guidelines for completing synthesis of data and for identifying codes and themes. Include excerpts from the stories to support your findings.

**On March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2019 you are required to submit a two-page description of the categories/ideas and themes you think are most important across the stories of loss. In a diagram show how the categories emerged into themes. Also show how the themes are consistent with and link with your chosen theoretical framework and world view/paradigm or ontological tradition?**

### 4. Final Paper-40% (Due: April 6<sup>th</sup>) Length 8 to 10 double-spaced pages (excluding cover page, references and appendices); APA 6th Edition

The final scholarly paper focuses on how knowledge is created within different theoretical lens and ontological traditions in nursing.

The hermeneutics of interpretation shows how research data are interpreted within a horizon of understanding (Gadamer, 1989) that researchers are required to make explicit in their introduction and theoretical framework. The horizon of understanding will be connected with the basic values, attitudes and beliefs affiliated with different ontologies/paradigms. For instance, a researcher within a post-positivist paradigm will value measurement, causality, control and the researcher's review of literature and their conceptual framework should reflect these values. Data analysis and interpretation of data should reflect these same values—completing the hermeneutic circle of interpretation and the fusion of horizons (Gadamer, 1989).

Note. Gadamer, H. G. (1989). *Truth and method* (trans: J. Weinsheimer and DG Marshall). London: Sheed and Ward.

### Paper Requirements:

For this scholarly paper, you will be writing up a short research study. Ensure there is congruence with your theoretical framework and philosophical tradition or paradigm in all sections of the paper. The focus of this course is on analysis so the first few sections of this paper are to show how your chosen lens leads you to create knowledge in a unique way. Use the categories and themes from the stories of living with loss that you identified during the data

analysis exercise earlier in the term. You may have synthesized your themes even further and this often happens as researchers come to write up the findings. (see Chapters 6 and 9 to help guide you with these sections of your paper):

1. Introduction: Provide a brief introduction to your research about the phenomenon/experience of loss for daughters whose mothers are diagnosed with Alzheimer Disease. Include a purpose for your research study. (1 – 2 para)
2. Theoretical Framework – describe your theoretical framework and situate it within a larger ontological tradition/worldview/paradigm (1 to 2 para)
3. Research question (s) – What is/are your research questions? These questions will reflect your theoretical lens and worldview and how you view the phenomenon of loss.
4. Data collection methods and Participants (1 to 2 para)
5. Data Analysis and methods (1 para)
6. Findings – this is the focus of the paper where you are fleshing out your findings – what are the themes that you identified emerging in the stories of loss – provide examples of excerpts from the stories to give support to your themes (4 to 5 pages). Show how the themes link with and expand your chosen theoretical framework – you may use your diagram from the earlier assignment.
7. Conclusions (1 to 2 paras)

### Bibliography

- Baskerville, R. L., & Wood-Harper, A. T. (2016). A critical perspective on action research as a method for information systems research. In *Enacting Research Methods in Information Systems: Volume 2* (pp. 169-190). Springer International Publishing.
- Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 15*(2), 219-234.
- Berring, L. L., Pedersen, L., & Buus, N. (2015). Discourses of aggression in forensic mental health: A critical discourse analysis of mental health nursing staff records. *Nursing inquiry, 22*(4), 296-305.
- Casey, B., Proudfoot, D., & Corbally, M. (2016). Narrative in nursing research: An overview of three approaches. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*.
- Chowdhury, M. F. (2015). Coding, sorting and sifting of qualitative data analysis: Debates and discussion. *Quality & Quantity, 49*(3), 1135-1143.
- D'Arrigo-Patrick, J., Hoff, C., Knudson-Martin, C., & Tuttle, A. (2016). Navigating critical theory and postmodernism: social justice and therapist power in family therapy. *Family Process*.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1989). *Truth and method* (trans: J. Weinsheimer and DG Marshall). London: Sheed and Ward.
- Houghton, C., Murphy, K., Shaw, D., & Casey, D. (2015). Qualitative case study data analysis: an example from practice. *Nurse researcher, 22*(5), 8-12

- Jonas-Simpson, C., Mitchell, G. (2004). Experiences of loss for daughters of mothers diagnosed with Alzheimer Disease. Presentation at the Ninth Martha Rogers conference, New York City, NY.
- Katz, J. (2015). A theory of qualitative methodology: The social system of analytic fieldwork. *Méthod (e) s: African Review of Social Sciences Methodology*, 1(1-2), 131-146.
- Lewis, S. (2015). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. *Health promotion practice*, 1524839915580941.
- Ricoeur, P. (2016). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences: essays on language, action and interpretation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Schiller, C. J. (2016). Critical realism in nursing: an emerging approach. *Nursing Philosophy*, 17(2), 88-102.
- Spence, D. G. (2016). Supervising for Robust Hermeneutic Phenomenology Reflexive Engagement Within Horizons of Understanding. *Qualitative health research*, 1049732316637824.
- Thorne, S. (2016). *Interpretive description*. Routledge.
- Westley, F., Zimmerman, B., & Patton, M. Q. (2007). Chapter 1, The first light of evening. Getting to maybe. How the world is changed. Toronto: Vintage Canada, 3-28.
- Williams, L., Rycroft-Malone, J., & Burton, C. R. (2016). Bringing critical realism to nursing practice: Roy Bhaskar's contribution. *Nursing Philosophy*.
- Wodak, R. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*.
- Zanotti, R., & Chiffi, D. (2016). A normative analysis of nursing knowledge. *Nursing Inquiry*, 23(1), 4-11.

***These course materials are designed for use as part of the (enter course code) course at York University and are the property of the instructor unless otherwise stated. Third party copyrighted materials (such as book chapters, journal articles, music, videos, etc.) have either been licensed for use in this course or fall under an exception or limitation in Canadian Copyright law. Copying this material for distribution (e.g. uploading material to a commercial third-party website) may lead to a violation of Copyright law.***

## Grading for Graduate Courses

Grading of papers will be conducted in accordance with the Faculty of Graduate Studies regulations and standards, as below:

A+	(Exceptional)
A	(Excellent)
A-	(High)
B+	(Highly)
B	(Satisfactory)
C	(Conditional)
F	(Failure)
I	(Incomplete)

For further information please see the website <http://gradstudies.yorku.ca/current-students/regulations/>

### EXPECTATIONS AND GRADING LEVELS IN MScN PROGRAM

NOTE. SOME STUDENTS THINK ABOUT ASSIGNMENTS AND PAPERS AS STARTING AT 100% AND THEN THEY LOSE MARKS FOR VARIOUS REASONS. BUT WE ASK YOU THINK DIFFERENTLY. IN THIS COURSE, YOUR PAPER COMES IN WITH NO SET VALUE AND YOU ACHIEVE GRADES ACCORDING TO THE QUALITY OF YOUR WORK

The following description of general expectations related to grading levels will be used in grading in this course. In addition, please consult the evaluation rubric provided for participation.

**A+ (Exceptional):** Thorough knowledge of concepts and/or techniques and exceptional skill and/or originality in the use of those concepts/techniques in satisfying the requirements of an assignment. ‘Wow factor’ present in several ways.

Outstanding work, of exceptional quality. Content is complete, accurate, and at a high level. Consistently strong in structure, expression, mechanics (grammar, punctuation, and spelling), and presentation. Well organized, linkages evident, and logical conclusions/proposals. Excellent comprehension of the subject; sound critical and analytical thinking; innovative ideas on the subject. Contains original and credible argument or presentation of the assigned topic with attention to many details and perspectives. Excellent use of the literature, and draws on a wide range of current and/or relevant sources that serve as the foundation of arguments/proposals. Evidence of much effort and personal involvement with the topic. Writing style is clear and succinct with correct use of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and referencing



format. Errors of expression are infrequent and do not detract from the assignment's effectiveness.

**A- to A (High to Excellent):** Thorough knowledge of concepts and/or techniques together with a high degree of skill and/or some elements of originality in satisfying the requirements of an assignment. 'Wow factor' present in at least one way.

The principle difference between an 'A+' and an 'A' or 'A-' assignment is that there are no identified areas for improvement in an 'A+' assignment. And, the creativity/innovation in A+ paper is evident in more than one way.

**B to B+ (Satisfactory to Highly Satisfactory):** Good to thorough knowledge of concepts and/or techniques together with a fairly high degree of skill in the use of those concepts/techniques in satisfying the requirements of an assignment. Good to very good quality work with no major weaknesses. Well focused on the topic; clear; explicit. Discussion shows more than adequate comprehension of the subject. Some degree of critical and analytical thinking; some use of the literature; most details and perspectives are discussed, but considerations of additional ones would have improved the assignment. Some evidence of personal involvement with the topic. In most cases, writing style is clear and succinct with correct paragraph and sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and correct use of referencing format. Errors of expression are occasional rather than repeated and do not obscure meaning.

The principle difference between an "A-" assignment and a "B+" assignment is in the quality of the discussion. A "B" grade is an assignment of good quality with no major weaknesses; it is similar to a "B+" assignment, but with less evidence of critical and analytical thinking.

**C (Conditional):** Less than satisfactory level of knowledge of concepts and/or techniques together with some skill in using them to satisfy the requirements of an assignment. Overall, a less than adequate assignment. Fair comprehension of the subject, but some weaknesses in content and/or structure. Discussion is vague even though on topic; important details or perspectives are left out. Minimal use of the literature; minimal evidence of critical and analytical thinking; transitions may be inconsistent; evidence may be occasionally unconvincing or incomplete. At times lacks clarity and succinctness. Minimal evidence of personal involvement with the topic. Occasional/many errors in paragraph and sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and referencing format, but not so serious or repetitive that they make the assignment difficult or impossible to understand.

The principle difference between a "B" assignment and a "C" assignment is in the quality of the discussion, with the "C" assignment being more unclear than the "B" assignment. Also, a "C" assignment may have more errors in structure etc., than are acceptable.