

- Feedback about papers
- Review for test
- Assessing trustworthiness of qualitative studies
- Affinity Group work

Feedback about papers & general purpose of Writing Assignment #3

Notes about Citations—where should they go?

Not so good: The research of Joe T. Plumber found that blah blah blah (Plumber, 2005).

Better: The research of Joe T. Plumber (2005)...

Not so good: In Joe Sixpack's and Joe Plumber's research, they found that...blah blah blah (Sixpack & Plumber, 2005)

Better: Sixpack and Plumber (2005) found that...

Not so good: In one study it showed that...

Better: One study showed that...

Assessing the quality of qualitative research —generalizability, validity and reliability

- A. Generalization—how much could the study findings be generalized to the larger study population, other populations, or other settings?
 1. Not as much a concern in qualitative studies
 2. Especially for those studies developing theory, or dimensions of an instrument, do the themes represent those in a larger population?
 3. Some studies might require *theoretical sampling*—another way to describe *purposive* sampling—looking for cases that will provide the most information about the anticipated themes
- B. Reliability
 1. In quantitative research: consistency of data and findings
 2. In qualitative research: accurate data collection (taping, transcribing) and interrater reliability for coding themes
- C. Validity—How to verify *trustworthiness* of qualitative findings:
 1. Prolonged engagement in field and consistent observation
 2. Triangulation—the use of multiple sources of data to confirm results

- In a case study of a school’s compliance with No Child Left Behind, the researcher collects & analyzes test scores, children’s views of testing, teacher’s methods and opinions, and the principal’s opinions

3. Peer review or debriefing

- In a narrative study about a welfare recipient’s adaptation to Welfare-to-Work, the researcher consults with other researchers not involved with the study to review and comment on the research procedures—interviews with the participant, location, interview guidelines, documentation procedures, etc.

4. Negative case analysis—Refining the working hypotheses or thematic interpretations in light of negative or disconfirming evidence

- In a phenomenological study about the experiences of patients undergoing chemotherapy, one participant does not seem to be experiencing similar stages of anger and depression as the other participants

5. Clarifying researcher bias at the outset of the study

- In a phenomenological study of people’s experience with substance abuse, the researcher documents her personal belief that substance abuse is a matter of choice (rather than a biophysical response) despite her knowledge of scientific evidence to the contrary

6. Member checking

- In a grounded theory study of the adaptation of an evidence-based practice to Latino and African-American families, the researcher meets again with focus group participants (clinicians) to confirm the thematic analysis (e.g. “Our analysis showed that clinicians had to make a lot of changes to the clinical assessment instrument to accommodate diverse families. Is that accurate?”)

7. “Thick description” – Describing the process and structural aspects of the research site and its participants in a way that allows the reader to generalize to other settings

- In an ethnographic study of gangs, the researcher describes the neighborhood’s characteristics, its residents, gang boundaries, SES issues, experiences walking down the street at night, etc. so that the experience rings “true” and the findings about gang life can be generalized to other geographic areas

Affinity Group Work—Moving Forward with your Methods

Focus on: Describing your research design

- I. Is your study descriptive, explanatory (non-evaluative), or evaluative?
 - A. If descriptive—cross-sectional or longitudinal?
 - B. If explanatory:
 1. Cross-sectional or longitudinal?
 2. Prospective (looking forward) or retrospective (looking backward)?
 - a) Prospective example—surveys of adolescents looking for factors predicting school success, and then reviewing school grade records later
 - b) Retrospective example—sampling adolescents representing those along the continuum of grade performance, then surveying them to understand past factors. (Another term for this: *case control study*)
 - C. If evaluative: type of group design
 1. Experimental, quasi-experimental or pre-experimental?
 2. Specific type of design (e.g. pretest, posttest nonequivalent comparison group). *Note—no need to use X O notation.*
- II. Is your study qualitative, or does it have a qualitative component? Pick one approach:
 - A. Narrative
 - B. Phenomenological
 - C. Grounded theory
 - D. Ethnographic
 - E. Case study—single or collective?

Study Questions for Next Week

Epstein, M. H., Nordness, P. D., Kutash, K., Duchnowski, A., Schrepf, S., Benner, G. J., & Nelson, R. J. (2003). Assessing the wraparound process during family planning meetings. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 30*, 352-362.

1. What do the authors mean by “fidelity of the wraparound process”? Why is it important?
2. There is no specific theory stated, but there is a theoretical basis of how wraparound should work. What are some of the components of wraparound?

3. **This study is an early testing of an instrument. What would be a good research design if the instrument were to be used in a study of the effectiveness of wraparound?**
4. **Did the care coordinators implement wraparound “as intended”?**