

THE UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN

School of Medicine- Family and Community Medicine Department

Scientific Medical Research (3rd Medical Year)

Second Semester 2020/2021

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

During this course, students are expected to work within independent research teams.

- Each group will be assigned to an advisor who is faculty member at the university of Jordan.
- Each advisor will schedule a weekly virtual meeting with her/his students according to their availability.
- During each virtual meeting general issues related to research process will be discussed and clarified.
- Students will follow the instruction of their advisor within their groups and might meet independently and/or with their advisor according to their specific needs.
- Due date of submission: 20th May 2021
- Please submit the assignments electronically through email to your advisor on the day that they are due. When submitting the assignments, please name the assignments according to your group number.

ASSESSMENT DETAILS

Focus of projects: The student evaluations for the practical part of this course are built around an applied research projects. Projects will require students to conduct interviews (or focus groups if possible) with other students, friends or colleagues. Each group is responsible for conducting two in-depth interviews.

Research Topics

Exploring Medical Students' Perspectives towards E- Learning during the COVID-19 pandemic in Jordan.

Studying During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Qualitative Exploratory Analysis of the University of Jordan Medical Students' Perceptions and Experiences

Students will work in their group for this assignment. As a group, students will develop 3-4 primary research questions to explore through their qualitative data collection. Within each primary research question, they should identify the specific interview questions to be included on the guide they will use for the interviews. The interview guide will be designed for a 45-minute interview. Students will be required to conduct, record and fully transcribe two interviews for analysis. Students will be required to submit a full transcript of their interviews. The collected data should be analysed using thematic analysis process.

The Group assignment report should provide a complete document of the entire research process. The report should not exceed maximum 15 pages, with line space 1.5 and Times New Roman 12 points, excluding Appendices and the References. APA style is the referencing system required in this course. Students should use APA style in their assignments to format details of the information sources they have cited in their work.

Usually, the paper consists of the five chapters or sections of the report, includes references and appendices, and has the following elements:

Introduction.

A good introduction provides a brief overview of the manuscript, including the research question and a statement justifying the research question and the reasons for using qualitative research methods. This section also should provide background information, including relevant literature from public health, medicine, and other health professions, as well as literature from the field of education that addresses similar issues. Any specific educational or research terminology used in the manuscript should be defined in the introduction.

- Title: Specific reflect the dissertation topic
- Introduction, background and what was written about the topic international, regional, and national: Background and what was written about the topic international, regional, and national
- Rationale for your research problem: what problem does it address/solve, what research agenda does it advance, who would be interested in the knowledge generated by your study? etc.
- Study purpose: Clear and Reflect the study problem
- Problem Statement: Why should this study be done? Identify the gap that this study is addressing.
- Significance to medicine: Why should this study be done? Significance to medicine and Original
- Research questions: The research question(s) should be clearly related to an explicit statement about the aims and purposes of the proposed study; Questions include a clear formulation of the logical status of the variables involved, i.e., in the framework of the proposed study, Precise and Concise

Literature Review

- Description of past research efforts: past research projects and publications that led to the current application;
- Preparatory work in measurement or sampling; past access to relevant target populations, etc.
- Complete
- Recent
- Criticize

Methods.

The methods section should clearly state and justify why the particular method, for example, face to face semi-structured interviews, was chosen. The method should be outlined and illustrated with examples such as the interview questions, focusing exercises, observation criteria, etc. The criteria for selecting the study participants should then be explained and justified. The way in which the participants were recruited and by whom also must be stated. A brief explanation/description should be included of those who were invited to participate but chose not to. It is important to consider “fair dealing,” ie, whether the research design explicitly incorporates a wide range of different perspectives so that the viewpoint of 1 group is never presented as if it represents the sole truth about any situation. The process by which ethical and or research/institutional governance approval was obtained should be described and cited.

Sampling.

The study sample and the research setting should be described. Sampling differs between qualitative and quantitative studies. In quantitative survey studies, it is important to select probability samples so that statistics can be used to provide generalizations to the population from which the sample was drawn. Qualitative research necessitates having a small sample because of the detailed and intensive work required for the study. So sample sizes are not calculated using mathematical rules and probability statistics are not applied. Instead qualitative researchers should describe their sample in terms of characteristics and relevance to the wider population. Purposive sampling is common in qualitative research. Particular individuals are chosen with characteristics relevant to the study who are thought will be most informative. Purposive sampling also may be used to produce maximum variation within a sample. Participants being chosen based for example, on year of study, gender, place of work, etc. Representative samples also may be used, for example, 20 students from each of 6 schools of pharmacy. Convenience samples involve the researcher choosing those who are either most accessible or most willing to take part. This may be fine for exploratory studies;

however, this form of sampling may be biased and unrepresentative of the population in question. Theoretical sampling uses insights gained from previous research to inform sample selection for a new study. The method for gaining informed consent from the participants should be described, as well as how anonymity and confidentiality of subjects were guaranteed. The method of recording, eg, audio or video recording, should be noted, along with procedures used for transcribing the data.

Data Analysis.

A description of how the data were analyzed also should be included. Was computer-aided qualitative data analysis software such as NVivo (QSR International, Cambridge, MA) used? Arrival at “data saturation” or the end of data collection should then be described and justified. A good rule when considering how much information to include is that readers should have been given enough information to be able to carry out similar research themselves.

One of the strengths of qualitative research is the recognition that data must always be understood in relation to the context of their production.¹ The analytical approach taken should be described in detail and theoretically justified in light of the research question. If the analysis was repeated by more than 1 researcher to ensure reliability or trustworthiness, this should be stated and methods of resolving any disagreements clearly described. Some researchers ask participants to check the data. If this was done, it should be fully discussed in the paper.

An adequate account of how the findings were produced should be included. A description of how the themes and concepts were derived from the data also should be included. Was an inductive or deductive process used? The analysis should not be limited to just those issues that the researcher thinks are important, anticipated themes, but also consider issues that participants raised, ie, emergent themes. Qualitative researchers must be open regarding the data analysis and provide evidence of their thinking, for example, were alternative explanations for the data considered and dismissed, and if so, why were they dismissed? It also is important to present outlying or negative/deviant cases that did not fit with the central interpretation.

The interpretation should usually be grounded in interviewees or respondents' contributions and may be semi-quantified, if this is possible or appropriate, for example, “Half of the respondents said ...” “The majority said ...” “Three said...” Readers should be presented

with data that enable them to “see what the researcher is talking about.”¹ Sufficient data should be presented to allow the reader to clearly see the relationship between the data and the interpretation of the data. Qualitative data conventionally are presented by using illustrative quotes. Quotes are “raw data” and should be compiled and analyzed, not just listed. There should be an explanation of how the quotes were chosen and how they are labeled. For example, have pseudonyms been given to each respondent or are the respondents identified using codes, and if so, how? It is important for the reader to be able to see that a range of participants have contributed to the data and that not all the quotes are drawn from 1 or 2 individuals. There is a tendency for authors to overuse quotes and for papers to be dominated by a series of long quotes with little analysis or discussion. This should be avoided.

Participants do not always state the truth and may say what they think the interviewer wishes to hear. A good qualitative researcher should not only examine what people say but also consider how they structured their responses and how they talked about the subject being discussed, for example, the person's emotions, tone, nonverbal communication, etc. If the research was triangulated with other qualitative or quantitative data, this should be discussed.

Discussion.

The findings should be presented in the context of any similar previous research and or theories. A discussion of the existing literature and how this present research contributes to the area should be included. A consideration must also be made about how transferrable the research would be to other settings. Any particular strengths and limitations of the research also should be discussed. It is common practice to include some discussion within the results section of qualitative research and follow with a concluding discussion.

The author also should reflect on their own influence on the data, including a consideration of how the researcher(s) may have introduced bias to the results. The researcher should critically examine their own influence on the design and development of the research, as well as on data collection and interpretation of the data, eg, were they an experienced teacher who researched teaching methods? If so, they should discuss how this might have influenced their interpretation of the results.

Conclusion.

The conclusion should summarize the main findings from the study and emphasize what the study adds to knowledge in the area being studied. Mays and Pope suggest the researcher ask the following 3 questions to determine whether the conclusions of a qualitative study are valid¹²: How well does this analysis explain why people behave in the way they do? How comprehensible would this explanation be to a thoughtful participant in the setting? How well does the explanation cohere with what we already know?

References: List references cited in the text in APA format.

Appendices: Copies of questionnaires, interview guides, scoring instructions, letters of request to agencies for participation, consent form, instructions to be provided to subjects are included.

- ❖ Note: The paper must follow the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association format. Any restrictions that apply in reproducing established instruments; obtain permission if indicated. In all instances, the proposal must be reviewed and approved by the student's instructor.

Teamwork: You are preparing the assignments with all team members, who share responsibility for their end result and organization of group work. It is of course expected that all team members provide an equal share of work. For any team malfunction, you should contact your advisor in due time.

Assignments' Assessment: The assignment counts for 10% of the final course grade. Assignments will be assessed on the quality of the written material. The grade for this assignment is a group grade, which means that each member of the group gets the group grade.

Appendix 1. Checklist for authors and reviewers of qualitative research.

Introduction

- ☐ Research question is clearly stated.
- ☐ Research question is justified and related to the existing knowledge base (empirical research, theory, policy).
- ☐ Any specific research or educational terminology used later in manuscript is defined.
- ☐ The process by which ethical and or research/institutional governance approval was obtained is described and cited.

Method

- ☐ Reason for choosing particular research method is stated.

- ☐ Criteria for selecting study participants are explained and justified.
- ☐ Recruitment methods are explicitly stated.
- ☐ Details of who chose not to participate and why are given.
- ☐ Study sample and research setting used are described.
- ☐ Method for gaining informed consent from the participants is described.
- ☐ Maintenance/Preservation of subject anonymity and confidentiality is described.
- ☐ Method of recording data (eg, audio or video recording) and procedures for transcribing data are described.
- ☐ Methods are outlined and examples given (eg, interview guide).
- ☐ Decision to stop data collection is described and justified.
- ☐ Data analysis and verification are described, including by whom they were performed.
- ☐ Methods for identifying/extrapolating themes and concepts from the data are discussed.

Results

- ☐ Sufficient data are presented to allow a reader to assess whether or not the interpretation is supported by the data.
- ☐ Outlying or negative/deviant cases that do not fit with the central interpretation are presented.
- ☐ Transferability of research findings to other settings is discussed.
- ☐ Findings are presented in the context of any similar previous research and social theories.

Discussion

- ☐ Discussion often is incorporated into the results in qualitative papers.
- ☐ A discussion of the existing literature and how this present research contributes to the area is included.
- ☐ Any particular strengths and limitations of the research are discussed.
- ☐ Reflection of the influence of the researcher(s) on the data, including a consideration of how the researcher(s) may have introduced bias to the results is included.

Conclusions

- The conclusion states the main findings of the study and emphasizes what the study adds to knowledge in the subject area.

Go to:

REFERENCES

1. Murphy E, Dingwall R, Greatbatch D, Parker S, Watson P. Qualitative research methods in health technology assessment: a review of the literature. *Health Technology Assessment* 1998; Vol. 2: No. 16. <http://www.nchta.org/fullmono/mon216.pdf> Accessed August 31, 2010.
2. Pope C, Mays N. *Qualitative Research in Healthcare*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell; 2006. [[Google Scholar](#)]
3. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2006. [[Google Scholar](#)]
4. Burke R, Johnson R. Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educ Res*. 2004;33(7):14–26. [[Google Scholar](#)]
5. Farris KB, Demb A, Janke KK, Kelley K, Scott SA. Assessment to transform competency-based curricula. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2009;73(8) Article 158. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
6. Kurtz S, Silverman J. The Calgary-Cambridge referenced observation guides: an aid to defining the curriculum and organizing the teaching in communication training programmes. *Med Educ*. 1996;30:83–89. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
7. Greenhill N. *An Exploration of Pharmacist-Patient Communication in Clinic-Style Consultations* [doctoral thesis]. University of Nottingham, England; October 2010.
8. Austin Z, Marini A, Glover NM, Croteau D. Continuous professional development: a qualitative study of pharmacists' attitudes, behaviors, and preferences in Ontario, Canada. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2005;69(1):4. [[Google Scholar](#)]
9. Qualitative research. *British Medical Journal* Web site. <http://resources.bmj.com/bmj/authors/checklists-forms/qualitative-research>. Accessed August 31, 2010.

10. Qualitative research review guidelines – RATS. BioMed Central. <http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/rats> Accessed August 31, 2010.
11. Britten N. Making sense of qualitative research: a new series. *Med Educ.* 2005;39:5–6. [[PubMed](#)] [[Google Scholar](#)]
12. Mays N, Pope C. *Qualitative Research in Health Care*. London: BMJ Publishing Group; 1996. [[Google Scholar](#)]