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# **Cross-listed 3973 introduction to narrative and narrative research Intersession April/May 2013**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clive Baldwin**  MA Education (Cambs), MA Social Work (University of Leicester), Certificate of Qualification in Social Work (University of Leicester, PhD (University of Sheffield) | | | |
| **Office** | BMH313 | **Office Hours** | Wed 11.30 – 1pm  (other times by appointment) |
| **Phone** | 452-9596 | **E-mail** | baldwin@stu.ca |
| **Day & Time of class** | Mon – Thurs 9.00 – 11.30 Commencing April 29th 2013 | | |

**Calendar Description**

Framed around three key approaches to narrative this course will provide students with the basis on which to develop their understanding of narrative and their skills in narrative analysis. The three approaches are: the narrative study of lives; the narrative analysis of texts; and, the analysis of narrative dynamics. Through these approaches students will be introduced to the work of key narrative thinkers. The course, in content and delivery, reflects the inter-disciplinary nature of narrative.

## **Course Description**

This course seeks to introduce students to the nature and role of narrative across disciplines and to provide some basic knowledge of various forms of narrative research. It is divided, roughly, into four sections. The first week will be spent introducing narrative as it is understood and how it functions in a range of disciplines. Various guest speakers will provide insight into how narrative relates to English, medicine, health care, gerontology and psychology. Other disciplines, such as theology, sociology, philosophy and the natural sciences will be covered by Dr Baldwin.

Week Two is given over to developing an understanding of narrative and its relationship to lived experience. Following some theoretical input, participants will engage in a short data collection exercise and will be given the opportunity to analyse these data using narrative concepts.

Week Three will explore how texts other than interview transcripts can be understood and analyzed in narrative terms. Using professional reports, newspaper reports and other materials participants will learn how to analyze these using the concepts to which they have been introduced. Participants will also explore issues of ethics and quality control in narrative research.

Week Four moves outward to looking at how narratives interact with other narratives and participants will be introduced to key concepts in narrative rhetoric and ideology as well as to Plummer’s sociology of stories. In the final session(s) we will start to think about how to write narratively in research.

## **Course Objectives** Upon completion of this course, students will be able to:

## a) Demonstrate an understanding of the nature and role of narrative in a chosen discipline;

## b) Demonstrate an understanding of key narrative concepts and their application across disciplines;

## c) Conduct a narrative interview;

## d) Apply a range of analytical techniques to interview and textual data;

## e) Demonstrate an understanding of quality issues in narrative analysis;

## f) Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical issues involved in narrative analysis.

## **Learning and Teaching Methods**

The class will meet three hours per day, Mon to Thursday for three weeks commencing April 29th. The Monday of the final week is Victoria Day and is thus a holiday. Further, I would like to hold a session on Friday 17th May (9.00 – 11.30) in lieu of that scheduled for Thursday 24th May.

Learning outcomes will be achieved through a variety of learning opportunities such as lecture presentations on theory and practice of narrative therapy, audio-visual material, class discussions, role plays and other experiential exercises. Guest speakers will present particular sessions and there will be opportunity to discuss narrative research with a number of researchers.

The course is intended to be highly interactive and so requires that participants undertake reading in advance. All necessary readings will be provided.

## **Required Readings** There is no one set text for the course. All required readings will be provided in advance of the respective class and ***it is essential that you read these.***

While the required readings will help you understand the subject, further reading is advisable. A number of other readings are available on request – see bibliography.

## Three very good books are:

Frank, A.W. (2012) *Letting stories breathe: A socio-narratology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J.F. eds. (2012) *Varieties of narrative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sparkes, A.C. (2002) *Telling tales in sport and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

**C:\Users\user\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Low\Content.IE5\TB5EFLC5\MC900047794[1].WMFExpectations**  
All students are expected to participate in classroom discussion and activities in a meaningful and respectful manner.

You are **required** to read the course materials and you should come to class prepared to discuss these thoughtfully and critically. For each reading you should prepare one or two questions for discussion with your peers.

Full attendance is expected as class participation in this course is crucial to the learning process.

Classes will start on time. If you are not on time, you may have to wait to be admitted to class, so as not to disturb others. Similarly, you are expected to be on time when returning from breaks.

You are required to notify the instructor prior to commencement of class if they must be absent due to illness or emergency. You are responsible to make arrangements to catch up on material missed in your absence.

No laptops/notebooks/tablets or other electronic devices to be used in class. Mobile phones should be turned off during class.

**ASSIGNMENTS**

There are three assignments for this course:

## ***Assignment One:*** A 2000 word essay on the strengths and limitations of a narrative approach in a chosen discipline (40%)

***Assignment Two:*** A narrative analysis of an interview transcript. (30%)

***Assignment Three:*** A narrative analysis of a text (30%)

Assignments have been designed to allow for some choice on the part of the student but also to assess the understanding of narrative theory and analysis. Transcripts and texts will be supplied by the instructor.

**C:\Users\user\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Low\Content.IE5\TB5EFLC5\MC900047794[1].WMF*Assignment One*** is to be submitted, in hard copy, by **4pm on 28th May 2013** at Rm 311, Brian Mulroney Hall. It should be accompanied by a completed cover sheet and a self-assessment sheet (see end of this course outline). Assignments without these two sheets will be considered incomplete.

The assignment should be formatted as follows:

12 point sans-serif font – for example, Arial, Verdana, Lucida Sans

1.5 line spacing

2cm margin all round

Page numbers, bottom right

Header to contain Course Number and Student ID number (so that it appears on each page)

Citations and references are to be formatted according to the APA 6th edition (see: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/06/>) A useful tool that will format your references for you can be found at: <http://citationmachine.net/index2.php?reqstyleid=2&newstyle=2&stylebox=2>

Assignments should be no longer than 2000 words. A penalty of 1 mark per 1% over the limit will be applied. Thus, if you write 2200 words this is 200 words (or 10%) over the limit and you will be penalised 10 marks.

***Assignments Two and Three*** will be completed during class.

***N.B.*** Assignments should be identified ONLY by your student number.

## **Marking Schema**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A+ | 95-100 |  | C+ | 65-69 |
| A | 90-94 |  | C | 60-64 |
| A- | 85-94 |  | C- | 55-59 |
| B+ | 80-84 |  | D | 50-54 |
| B | 75-79 |  | F | 0-49 |
| B- | 70-74 |  |  |  |

**Grade Assignment**

(see University Calendar for description of letter grades)

|  |
| --- |
| A+ 4.3 Exceptionally excellent |
| A 4.0 Excellent |
| A- 3.7 Nearly excellent |

Demonstrating an exceptional knowledge of the subject matter, the literature and concepts and/or techniques. Outstanding powers of analysis, criticism, articulation and demonstrated originality. A performance qualitatively better than that expected of a student who does the assignment or course well.

|  |
| --- |
| B+ 3.3 Very good |
| B 3.0 Good |
| B- 2.7 Fairly good |

Demonstrating considerable knowledge of subject matter, concepts, techniques as well as considerable ability to analyze, criticize, articulate; performance in an assignment or course which can be called ‘well done’.

|  |
| --- |
| C+ 2.3 Better than adequate |
| C 2.0 Adequate, satisfactory |
| C- 1.7 Barely adequate |

Demonstrating a reasonable understanding of the subject matter, concepts and techniques; performance in an assignment or course which, whole not particularly good, is adequate to satisfy general University requirements and to indicate that the student has learned something useful.

|  |
| --- |
| D 1.0 Minimally acceptable |

Marginal performance, demonstrating a low level of understanding and ability in an assignment or course; less than adequate to satisfy general University requirements, but sufficient to earn a credit.

|  |
| --- |
| F 0 Unacceptable |

Wholly below University requirements.

**Assignments and evaluation**

Students are directed to the University’s policy under ‘*Method of evaluation*’ in the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar, which states, “In the evaluation of any piece of writing, submitted in any course in the University, form as well as content … will be considered”. If you require assistance with language and writing skills, please contact the Student Affairs Office as soon as possible for information regarding writing skills sessions and free tutoring services.

Written assignments handed in after their due date and time will be deducted at the rate of 5% for the first day late and thereafter 2% per day unless there are serious, unforeseen circumstances that are communicated to the instructor before or by the due date and alternate arrangements have been negotiated.

University activities are governed by many regulations. One of the most serious infractions in an academic setting is plagiarism. Quoting or paraphrasing from a source (book, article, website etc.) without acknowledgement constitutes plagiarism. Also submitting work completed by someone else or taking someone else’s ideas, argument or line of thought without acknowledgement is plagiarism. For further explanation, please see the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar on Regulations – Academic Misconduct).

## **Course Outline**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Session** | **Date** | **Title and Content** | **Activity** |
| **1** | 29/4/13 | Introduction to course: Format, assignments, exercises, readings  An introduction to narrative: Philosophical foundations; Nature and function of narrative; Narrative concepts  *Required reading:*  Baldwin, C. and Estey-Burtt, B. (2013) Introduction to narrative theory. *Narrative social work: Theory and application.* Bristol: The Policy Press, pp.13-27. | Lecture, group discussion, Q&A. |
| **2** | 30/4/13 | Narrative across the disciplines (1): Arts and humanities: Literature, philosophy, history and theology  *Required reading:*  Navone, J. (1977) Storytelling. *Towards a theology of story*. Slough, U.K.: St. Paul Publications, pp. 11-51. | Guest speaker: Prof McKim, group discussion, Q&A. |
| **3** | 1/5/13 | Narrative across the disciplines (2): Social sciences: Sociology, psychology and gerontology  *Required readings*:  Dingfelder, S.F. (2011) Our stories, ourselves. *Monitor*, January. Available from: http://www.apa.org/monitor/2011/01/stories.aspx  Kenyon, G. and Randall, W. (1997) The stories of our lives. *Restorying our lives: Personal growth through autobiographical reflection.* Westport, CT: Praeger, pp.33-59.  Randall, W. (n.d.) *Honoring older adults’ stories*. Unpublished. | Guest speakers: Profs. Randall and Lafrance, group discussion, Q&A. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | 2/5/13 | Narrative across the disciplines (3): Sciences  An introduction to narrative across the natural sciences, medicine and healthcare.  *Required readings:*  Engel, J.D. et al. (2008) Transdisciplinary narrative turns and narrative health care. *Narrative in health care*. Oxford: Radcliffe Publishing Ltd, pp. 40-71.  Eva, G. (2009) Narrative, story, and service evaluation - Patients’ stories and their consequences. In: Gunaratnam, Y and Oliviere, D. eds. *Narrative and stories in health care: Illness, dying and bereavement*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 95-110. | Guest speakers: Profs McKim and Furlong, group discussion, Q&A. |
| **5** | 6/5/13 | Narrative analysis (1a): the analysis of lived experience – theory   1. Narrative and the Self 2. Narrative and meaning making   *Required readings:*  Baldwin, C. Narrative Self and social work. *Narrative social work: Theory and application.* Bristol: Policy Press, pp.47-57.  McAdams, D,P. (2012) Exploring psychological themes through life-narrative accounts. In: Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J.F. eds. *Varieties of narrative analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 15-32. | Lecture, group discussion, individual exercise, Q&A. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | 7/5/13 | Narrative interviewing  An introduction to the practice of narrative interviewing, how it differs from other forms of interviewing.  Students will be given the opportunity to interview each other, and receive feedback on their performance.  *Required reading:*  Gudmundsdottir, S. (1996) The teller, the tale, and the one being told: The narrative nature of the research interview, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 26 (3): 293-306.  Jovchelovitch, S.; Bauer, M.W. (2000) *Narrative interviewing* [online]. London: LSE Research Online. Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/2633/1/Narrativeinterviewing.pdf> | Lecture, group discussion and role plays  Group exercise and reflection |
| **7** | 8/5/13 | Narrative analysis (1b): the analysis of lived experience –  A practical session on the narrative analysis of transcript data | Individual and group exercises |
| **8** | 9/5/13 | Assignment Two – the narrative analysis of a transcript | Individual and group exercise |
| **9** | 13/5/13 | Narrative analysis (2a): the narrative analysis of texts – theory  *Required readings:*  Baldwin, C. (2011) Narrative rhetoric in expert reports: A case study. *Narrative Works*, 1 (2): 3-20. | Lecture, group discussion, Q&A |
| **10** | 14/5/13 | Narrative analysis (2b): the narrative analysis of texts – practice | Group exercise and discussion |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | 15/5/13 | Narrative analysis (3a): the analysis of narrative dynamics – theory   1. Plummer’s sociology of stories 2. Narrative and ideology   *Required readings:*  Mumby, D.K. (1987) The political function of narrative in organizations. *Communication Monographs*, 54 (2): 113-127.  Plummer, K. (1995) An invitation to a sociology of stories. *Telling sexual stories: Power, change and social worlds*. London. Routledge, pp. 18-31. | Lecture, group discussion, Q&A |
| **12** | 16/5/13 | Narrative analysis (3b): the analysis of narrative dynamics – practice | Lecture, group discussion, case studies |
| **13** | 17/5/13 | Assignment Three: Analysing texts | Individual and group exercise |
| **14** | 21/5/13 | Ensuring quality and the ethics of narrative research  *Required readings:*  Reynolds, J. et al, (2011) Quality assurance of qualitative research: A review of the discourse. *Health Research Policy and Systems, 9:43*.  Josselson, R. (2007) The ethical attitude in narrative research: Principles and practicalities. In: Clandinin, J.D. ed *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp.537-566. | Lecture, group discussion, case studies |
| **15** | 22/5/13 | Narrative research in practice: Case examples | Guest speakers: TBA |
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**ASSIGNMENT ONE COVER SHEET**

**STUDENT NUMBER:**

**Date:**

**Word Count:**

In submitting this assignment I am mindful of the nature of plagiarism and the University’s position on this (as stated in the Academic Calendar). I am also declaring that the attached assignment is my own work.

**STUDENT SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM**

* You are required to complete this form & submit it with your assignment.
* This form provides an opportunity for you to reflect upon the work you are submitting for assessment.
* This is an important key skill that will contribute to your development as a reflective & evaluative student.
* Completion of the form will assist lecturers in providing feedback, which is appropriate to your individual needs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STUDENT ID NUMBER:** | | |  | |  |
| **COURSE Code:** | **Course Title:** | | | | |
| Structure and Academic Style | | **20** | | Comments: (i.e. What did you do well, not so well etc.) | |
| * Presentation * Spelling/Grammar * Professional/Appropriate language * Structure/Organization * Coherence/Expression * Referencing * Reading/Investigation of sources | |  | |
| **Quality of Content & Application** | | **40** | | Comments:  . | |
| * Relevance * Concision * Accuracy * Application of knowledge * Key issues * Reflection | |  | |
| **Level of Reasoning, Intuition or Perception** | | **40** | | Comments: | |
| Evidence of:   * Critical analysis * Synthesis * Perspective and argument | |  | |
| **Taking into account your comments above & the criteria for assessment, what do you think would represent a fair mark for your work? (Please use the marking criteria to guide you)** | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASSIGNMENT FEEDBACK RECORD**  **MARKING CRITERIA** | | | | | |  | | | | | | |  | | | | |
| **STUDENT NUMBER:** | | | **STUDENT NAME:** | | | | | | **Intake:** | | | | |  | | | |
| **COURSE Code:**  **3973** | | **COURSE Title:**  **Introduction to narrative** | | | | | | | |  | | | | **MARK:** | | | **GRADE:** |
| **StructurE and Academic Style** |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Presentation** |  | Very poor | | | Adequate presentation | | | Clear presentation | | | | Clear and appropriate | | | | Professional presentation | |
| **Spelling/Grammar** | Major deficiencies | | | Many deficiencies | | | Some errors | | | | Minimal/minor errors | | | | No errors | |
| **Professional/Appropriate language** | Inappropriate | | | Inconsistent use of | | | Occasional lapses | | | | Effective use of | | | | Creative use of | |
| **Structure/Organisation** | Inappropriate structure and style, illogical organisation | | | Inadequate attention to structure & organisation | | | Links parts together, but falls short of creating a logical whole | | | | Well structured. Logical organisation | | | | Integrates detail, guides reader to a reasoned conclusion | |
| **Coherence/Expression** | Incoherent | | | Vague, over-simplistic expression | | | Generally coherent, Some lapses in expression | | | | Coherent, Clearly expressed | | | | Expression concise, accurate & well articulated | |
| **Referencing** | None or inaccurate | | | Significant errors | | | Some deficiencies | | | | Minimal deficiencies | | | | No/minor errors. Consistent & accurate | |
| **Reading/investigation of sources** | None/Limited | | | Adequate | | | Good range | | | | Wide range | | | | Creative and wide range detailed and relevant | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **quality of content & Application** |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant learning outcomes and guidelines met** |  | Fails to identify or address | | | Some outcomes addressed | | | Met all, limited depth/breadth | | | | All accurately/well addressed | | | | Addressed in a systematic/comprehensive/ creative way | |
| **Application of knowledge** | None evident | | | Some application and limited discussion | | | Good application, informs discussion | | | | Clear & comprehensive, supports discussion | | | | Creative use of contemporary evidence to inform and support discussion | |
| **Key issues** | Significant omissions | | | Some identified, no/few suggestions for development of practice | | | Main issues identified, includes suggestions for development of practice | | | | Broad range identified, proposing creative solutions for development of practice | | | | Extensive range identified includes new insight and/or hypothesis for development of practice | |
| \*Reflection | Very little evident | | | Evident – lacks depth | | | Appropriate personal and professional | | | | Extensive personal and professional | | | | Thoroughly integrated personal & professional | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Level of Reasoning, intutition or perception** |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Critical analysis** |  | Not evident | | Analysis evident – lacks critical insight | | | Good evidence of critical analysis, consistently applied | | | | Very good critical analysis with depth & originality | | | | Excellent critical analysis, used to inform synthesis | | |
| **Synthesis** | Not evident | | A mixture of Component parts in evidence | | | A fusion of complex issues beginning to emerge | | | | Creative approach in proposing solutions to complex issues | | | | Innovation and creativity utilised to confidently construct solutions for complex issues | | |
| **Perspective and argument** | Perspective not identified/no argument | | Some attempt to identify perspective/ limited argument | | | Clear identification of perspective, clear line of argument | | | | Clear line of sustained argument, introducing alternative perspectives | | | | Clear line of innovative & sustained argument using alternative perspectives | | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |