

**The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
School of Social Work**



Course: SOWO 910, Research Methods for Social Intervention (3 credits)  
FALL 2020, Tuesday 2:00–4:50 PM, TTK Room 137

Instructor: Rainier D. Masa, Ph.D., M.S.W.  
Assistant Professor, School of Social Work  
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
CB#3550, 325 Pittsboro St., Suite 402L  
Phone: 919-962-6531  
email: [rmasa@email.unc.edu](mailto:rmasa@email.unc.edu)

Office Hours: Tuesday before class and by appointment

**COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES:** This course introduces the basic principles and procedures used in planning and evaluating social interventions. Topics include the philosophy of research, problem formulation, design, measurement, analysis, and the application of findings to theory and practice. This course provides an opportunity for seminar participants to gain knowledge about the following issues in social intervention research:

- ◇ the quantitative-comparative experimental paradigm that prevails in social intervention research;
- ◇ special legal and ethical issues that impinge on social intervention researchers;
- ◇ broadly inclusive processes to plan, implement, and evaluate social interventions;
- ◇ the need for culturally aware social intervention research that is responsive to the diversity of community values and preferences; and
- ◇ implementation constraints that often compel the use of designs other than fully randomized experiments.

**STUDENTS TAKING THE COURSE WILL BE ABLE TO:**

1. develop “well-built” research questions for estimating the causal impact of social interventions on desired outcomes for target populations;
2. develop conceptual models to support proposed social interventions and explicate underlying theories of change;
3. assess validity and reliability of alternative qualitative and quantitative measures of constructs in conceptual models that guide social intervention research;
4. understand basic aspects of sampling, design, data analysis, and statistical power analysis;

5. critically evaluate various experimental, quasi-experimental, and nonexperimental research designs by identifying threats to the validity of each design; and
6. prepare an application for IRB approval of human research subjects.

**REQUIRED TEXT:**

Gray, D. E. (2018). *Doing research in the real world* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TEXT:**

Dixon, J. C., Singleton Jr., R. A., & Straits, B. C. (2019). *The process of social research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kazdin, A. E. (Ed.). (2016). *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Online access available via [UNC Library](#) and available in our Sakai site's course reserves.

Related readings outside of the textbook are listed in the course outline and **are assigned at the instructor's discretion.**

**POLICY ON INCOMPLETE OR LATE ASSIGNMENTS:** If students plan to submit any part of any assignment late, they must notify the instructor at least 24 hours before an assignment is due. The instructor will give extensions at his discretion. For unexcused late assignments, participants will lose five points for each 24-hour period beyond the due date and time (including weekends). The instructor will not accept assignments that are more than 5 days late. Students can receive a grade of "Incomplete" only in extenuating circumstances and in accordance with School of Social Work and University policies.

**POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:** Academic dishonesty is contrary to the ethics of the social work profession, unfair to other seminar participants, and the seminar facilitator does not tolerate it in any form. Please refer to the *APA Style Guide*, *The SSW Manual*, and the *SSW Writing Guide* for information on attribution of quotes, plagiarism, and appropriate use of assistance in preparing assignments. In keeping with the UNC Honor Code, if reason exists to believe that academic dishonesty has occurred, the seminar facilitator will make a referral to the Office of the Student Attorney General for investigation and further action as required.

**ACCESSIBILITY AND RESOURCES SERVICES:** The School of Social Work aims to create an educational environment that supports the learning needs of all seminar participants. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill facilitates implementation of reasonable accommodations, including resources and services for participants with disabilities, chronic medical conditions, temporary disability, or pregnancy complications that result in difficulties with accessing learning opportunities. The Accessibility Resource and Services Office (ARS) at UNC coordinates all accommodations. If you need accommodations at any point, please contact ARS prior to the beginning of the semester if possible, or as soon as you can, so that they can assist you—this process takes time. You can visit their website, <http://accessibility.unc.edu>, and contact ARS by email: [accessibility@unc.edu](mailto:accessibility@unc.edu) or phone at 919-962-8300. The accommodations process starts with ARS and helps instruct Faculty at the School of Social Work on how best to

proceed. As a School, we are committed to working with ARS and participants to implement needed accommodations for all. In addition to seeking ARS supports, please also reach out to your instructor to communicate how best your needs can be met once you have begun the ARS process.

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:** Acts of discrimination, harassment, interpersonal (relationship) violence, sexual violence, sexual exploitation, stalking, and related retaliation are prohibited at UNC-Chapel Hill. If you have experienced these types of conduct, you are encouraged to report the incident and seek resources on campus or in the community. Please contact the Director of Title IX Compliance / Title IX Coordinator (Adrienne Allison, [adrienne.allison@unc.edu](mailto:adrienne.allison@unc.edu)), Report and Response Coordinators (Ew Quimbaya-Winship, [eqw@unc.edu](mailto:eqw@unc.edu); Rebecca Gibson, [rmgibson@unc.edu](mailto:rmgibson@unc.edu); Kathryn Winn, [kmwinn@unc.edu](mailto:kmwinn@unc.edu)), Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPs) (confidential) in Campus Health Services at (919) 966-3658, or the Gender Violence Services Coordinators (confidential) (Cassidy Johnson, [cassidyjohnson@unc.edu](mailto:cassidyjohnson@unc.edu); Holly Lovern, [holly.lovern@unc.edu](mailto:holly.lovern@unc.edu)) to discuss your specific needs. Additional resources are available at [safe.unc.edu](http://safe.unc.edu).

**FORMAT FOR WRITTEN WORK:** Note that students should complete all written assignments in APA format. Please refer to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (7<sup>th</sup> ed.)* for information on APA format. You can find self-paced APA tutorial at <http://www.lib.unc.edu/instruct/citations/apa/index.html>.

**USE OF LAPTOPS AND OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICES:** I will permit the use of ***laptops and tablets only*** and all uses are restricted to the academic enterprise in our classroom. Please do not visit social media pages or other nonacademic pages during class. Please turn off all cell phones and other devices that would disrupt the learning environment of the classroom. Please close laptops and tablets during class discussions and other activities that do not require them.

**COURSE EXPECTATIONS:** Students are expected to attend all classes, to complete the readings before class begins, and to participate in discussions. Please contact your instructor, in advance, if you will miss a class. If you are not able to let the instructor know in advance, please follow up with communication after the fact. Also, it is important to be on time so as not to disrupt class. It is your responsibility to obtain handouts, information about class content, and information about announcements, etc., from your classmates if you are unable to attend a class. Students with three absences will receive an “L” unless they have made prior arrangements with the instructor. Any student with significant difficulty with these requirements should speak with me at the beginning of the semester so that alternative forms of contribution can be identified.

The learning environment is collaborative, but students should take responsibility for their own learning, and seeking out the seminar facilitator and other resources to enhance the reading and knowledge beyond the course materials. Note that the instructor can make changes in course schedule or assignments at any time. Participants will be informed of such changes well in advance of the time they are instituted.

**Community Standards in Our Course and Mask Use.** This fall semester, while we are in the midst of a global pandemic, all enrolled students are required to wear a mask covering your mouth and nose at all times in our classroom. This requirement is to protect our educational community -- your classmates and me – as we learn together. If you choose not to wear a mask, or wear it improperly, I will ask you to leave immediately, and I will submit a report to the [Office of Student Conduct](#). At that point you will be disenrolled from this course for the protection of our educational community. Students who have an authorized accommodation from Accessibility Resources and Service have an exception. For additional information, see <https://carolinatogether.unc.edu/university-guidelines-for-facemasks/>.

---

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

### A. Seminar Participation

- **Obtain certification in protection of human subjects:** Seminar participants must complete the on-line course developed by the [Collaborative IRB Training Initiative \(CITI\)](#) to certify that they are familiar with the ethical principles and guidelines governing research involving human participants. Completing the course requires several hours; each seminar participant is required to submit a completion certificate (via Sakai) **BY THE 3<sup>rd</sup> SEMINAR—August 25.**
- **Identify funding resources:** Become familiar with sources of information about [obtaining financial support](#) for your research. **Create a SPIN** profile using your UNC email address and set your funding alerts. **BY THE 5<sup>TH</sup> SEMINAR—SEPTEMBER 8**
- **Participate in seminar:** The instructor expects that participants will read assignments and come to each class session prepared to ask and respond to questions about assigned readings and other course material.

### B. Writing Assignment

During the semester, you will write five papers (varying in length from 1 to 6 pages) on different components of the research process. The final assignment will require revision and expansion of each of these components into a full IRB application. All assignments should reflect the original work. **Please note that written assignments are due by 11:59 PM on the day noted and should be submitted electronically using our course Sakai site.** The assignments are as follows:

1. **Research (PICO) Question:** After meeting with the instructor to discuss preliminary ideas, each student will identify a topic for a proposal to evaluate the effects of a social intervention. The research question should consist of the following components: 1) the target population about which you wish to draw inferences; 2) the outcome you intend to achieve or problem you hope to address; 3) the intervention you are interested in evaluating; 4) and the alternative course of action with which you will draw a comparison (e.g., no intervention, regular services, or different interventions). This paper (1-2 pages), including a

brief statement about the significance of the problem or outcome you are studying, will be due **September 1**.

2. **Research Review:** Conduct a computerized search of electronic databases using keywords from your research question. Select the strongest four to six (4-6) studies that bear on your topic. Write up a research review using narrative descriptions that also assess the strength of the evidence for supporting the use of your intervention and identify the limitations of these studies and their applicability to your population. This paper (4-6 pages) will be due **September 15**.
3. **Logic Model:** Expand your research question into a logic model that lays out the expected causal mechanisms and mediating pathways from the intervention to the desired outcome. Your description of the target population should also list any population conditions that you believe may moderate the intervention's impact on the outcome. The model should also enumerate any background factors and external conditions that contribute to the significance of problem you are addressing. It should list the key assumptions of the theory of change you are positing will effectuate the desired change. Finally, the model should identify general end-values for reconciling diverse outcomes and evaluating the ultimate worth of the resulting change. A modified Logic Model Template for filling in this one (1) page figure is available under Resources on Sakai. It will be due **September 29**.
4. **Measurement Review:** Identify and assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of alternative measures or approaches to measuring a construct (population, intervention, or outcome) referenced in your research question. The purpose of the exercise is to select the measure (or set of measures) that will yield the most valid and reliable data concerning this construct. This paper (4-6 pages) will be due **October 13**.
5. **Evaluation Design/Approach:** Based on your research question, you will outline the basic features of experimental or quasi-experimental design for evaluating the impact of the identified social intervention on your outcome construct. The description should identify the unit(s) of analysis, sampling design, recruitment procedure, comparison group(s), and how threats to the validity of your research will be addressed. The discussion should provide a rationale for the method you are proposing and how concessions to design constraints may make the research vulnerable to criticism. This 5-7-page paper will be due **November 10**.
6. **IRB Application:** This final assignment will follow the instructions issued by the UNC Office of Human Research Ethics for application for IRB approval. We will be reviewing various resources throughout the course that will be helpful in preparing it. It will incorporate material from each of the other written assignments as well as a description of risks to human subjects and measures to minimize those risks and a discussion of the benefits to subjects and/or society. The online application form can be accessed from <http://irbis.unc.edu> after you enter your Onyen and password. Instructions and training videos can be accessed at <http://research.unc.edu/offices/human-research-ethics/index.htm> by clicking on online submission on the left. This application will be due on **November 20**.

**C. Research Presentation (November 17)**

Seminar participants will each create and deliver a fifteen to a twenty-minute presentation of the research proposal during the final class session. The seminar facilitator will grade each presentation according to the professionalism of materials (PowerPoint, handouts), articulation of the problem, and strength of the research design.

**GRADING:** Final grades will be determined on the basis of the points earned on each assignment and on participation in seminars. Letter grades will correspond to the following point totals:

94–100:	H	70–79:	L
80–93:	P	< 70:	F

Assignments will be scored as follows:

1. Seminar participation:	10%
2. Research question:	5%
3. Research review:	10%
4. Logic model:	10%
5. Measurement review:	10%
6. Research approach:	20%
7. IRB application:	25%
8. <u>Research presentation:</u>	<u>10%</u>
Total	100%

---

**COURSE OUTLINE**


---

**SEMINAR 1—AUGUST 11: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF SOCIAL INTERVENTION**

**RESEARCH.** Overview of the course and discussion of the unique features and context of social intervention research. The financial realities of contemporary social intervention research dictates that you become familiar with funding opportunities for your research.

**Required:**

- Gray (2018). Chapter 1
- El-Bassel, N. (2013). Practice Interventions and Research. *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199975839.013.299>

**Further reading:**

- Fraser, M. W., & Galinsky, M. J. (2010). Steps in intervention research: Designing and developing social Programs. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 20(5), 459–466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731509358424>

---

**SEMINAR—2 AUGUST 18: ETHICS IN INTERVENTION RESEARCH**


---

**Required:**

- Gray (2018). Chapter 4
- Friesen, P., Kearns, L., Redman, B., & Caplan, A. L. (2017). Rethinking the Belmont Report? *American Journal of Bioethics*, 17(7), 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2017.1329482>
- Newcomb, M. E., Clifford, A., Greene, G. J., & Mustanski, B. (2016). Parent perspectives about sexual minority adolescent participation in research and requirements of parental permission. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 59(4), 443–449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.05.014>

**Further reading:**

- Iltis, A. S. (2013). Parents, adolescents, and consent for research participation. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, 38(3), 332–346. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmp/jht012>
- Long, C. R., Stewart, M. K., & McElfish, P. A. (2017). Health research participants are not receiving research results: A collaborative solution is needed. *Trials*, 18(1), 449. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-017-2200-4>
- McInroy, L. B. (2017). Innovative ethics: Using animated videos when soliciting informed consent of young people for online surveys. *Social Work Research*, 41(2), 121–128. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svx004>

**Additional resources:**

- UNC Office of Human Research Ethics. (2013). Responsible conduct of research: Pocket guide for researchers. Available at [https://cfe.unc.edu/files/2014/08/research\\_conduct\\_pocket\\_guide.pdf](https://cfe.unc.edu/files/2014/08/research_conduct_pocket_guide.pdf)

---

**SEMINAR 3—AUGUST 25: CONCEPTUALIZING SOCIAL INTERVENTION RESEARCH PART I: PICO QUESTION & LITERATURE REVIEWS**


---

**Required:**

- Gray (2018). Chapters 3 and 5
- Lipowski E. E. (2008). Developing great research questions. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, 65(17), 1667–1670. <https://doi.org/10.2146/ajhp070276>
- Considine, J., Shaban, R. Z., Fry, M., & Curtis, K. (2017). Evidence based emergency nursing: Designing a research question and searching the literature. *International Emergency Nursing*, 32, 78–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ienj.2017.02.001>

**Further reading:**

- Bragge, P. (2010). Asking good clinical research questions and choosing the right study design. *Injury*, 41, S3–S6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2010.04.016>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- McGrath, J. M., Brown, R. E., & Samra, H. A. (2012). Before you search the literature: How to prepare and get the most out of citation databases. *Newborn and Infant Nursing Reviews*, 12(3), 162–170. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.nainr.2012.06.003>
- Mayo, N. E., Asano, M., & Barbic, S. P., (2013). When is a research question not a research question? *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 45(6), 513–518. <https://doi.org/10.2340/16501977-1150>

**Additional resources:**

- Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (<https://www.cebm.net/category/ebm-resources/tools/>)
- UNC Health Sciences Library (<https://hsl.lib.unc.edu/>)
- [Boolean operators and search tips](#)

---

**SEMINAR 4—SEPTEMBER 1: CONCEPTUALIZING SOCIAL INTERVENTION RESEARCH  
PART II: CONCEPTUAL MODEL, THEORY of CHANGE, and VALIDITY of RESEARCH  
DESIGNS**

---

**Required:**Conceptual model

- Earp, J. A., & Ennett, S. T. (1991). Conceptual models for health education research and practice. *Health Education Research*, 6(2), 163–171. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/6.2.163>
- Moore, G. F., & Evans, R. E. (2017). What theory, for whom and in which context? Reflections on the application of theory in the development and evaluation of complex population health interventions. *SSM - Population Health*, 3, 132–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2016.12.005>

Logic model and theory of change

- Harvard Family Research Project (2002). *Learning from logic models in out-of-school time*. Available at: <https://archive.globalfrp.org/out-of-school-time/publications-resources/learning-from-logic-models-in-out-of-school-time>
- De Silva, M. J., Breuer, E., Lee, L., Asher, L., Chowdhary, N., Lund, C., & Patel, V. (2014). Theory of change: a theory-driven approach to enhance the Medical Research Council’s framework for complex interventions. *Trials*, 15, 267. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-15-267>

Research designs and threats to validity

- Gray (2018). Chapter 2
- Parker, R. M. (1993). Threats to validity of research. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 36(3), 130–138. Article is available [here](#). Skim this article.

**Further reading:**

- Paradies, Y., & Stevens, M. (2005). Conceptual diagrams in public health research. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 59(12), 1012–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.036913>
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2004). Logic model development guide. <https://www.bttop.org/sites/default/files/public/W.K.%20Kellogg%20LogicModel.pdf>



---

**SEMINAR 5—SEPTEMBER 8: RESEARCH DESIGN: QUANTITATIVE and INTERNAL VALIDITY**

---

**Required:**

- Gray (2018). Chapter 6
- Kazdin, A. E. (2016). Experimental and observational designs: An overview. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research, 4th ed.* (pp. 155–180). American Psychological Association. Online access available via [UNC Library](#).
- Leighton, J. (2010). Internal validity. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Research Design* (pp. 620–622). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n192>

**Further reading:**

- Anda, D. d. (2007). Intervention research and program evaluation in the school setting: Issues and alternative research designs. *Children & Schools, 29*(2), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/29.2.87>
- Deaton, A., & Cartwright, N. (2018). Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials. *Social Science & Medicine, 210*, 2–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.005>

**Additional resource:**

- Thyer, B. A. (2015). A bibliography of randomized controlled experiments in social work (1949–2013): solvitur ambulando. *Research on Social Work Practice, 25*(7), 753–793. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731515599174>

---

**SEMINAR 6—SEPTEMBER 15: MEASUREMENT and CONSTRUCT VALIDITY**

---

**Required:**

- Gray (2018). Chapters 6 [pp. 151–158]
- Kazdin (2016). Chapter 13: Selecting measures for research investigations. Online access available via [UNC Library](#) and available in our Sakai site's course reserves.
- Coster, W. J. (2013). Making the best match: selecting outcome measures for clinical trials and outcome studies. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 67*(2), 162–170. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2013.006015>

**Further reading:**

- Drost, E. A. (2011). Validity and reliability in social science research. *Education Research and Perspectives, 38*(1), 105–123.
- Thorkildsen, T. (2010). Validity of measurement. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Research Design* (pp. 1592–1596). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n487>
- Ramírez, M., Ford, M. E., Stewart, A. L., & Teresi, J. A. (2005). Measurement issues in health disparities research. *Health Services Research, 40*(5 Pt 2), 1640–1657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00450.x>

---

**SEMINAR 7—SEPTEMBER 22: SAMPLING STRATEGIES and EXTERNAL VALIDITY**

---

**Required:**Sampling & external validity

- Gray (2018). Chapters 6 [pp. 147–151] and 9
- Johnston, L. G., & Sabin, K. (2010). Sampling hard-to-reach populations with respondent driven sampling. *Methodological Innovations Online, 5*(2), 38–48. <https://doi.org/10.4256/mio.2010.0017>
- Leighton, J. (2010). External validity. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Research Design* (pp. 467–470). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n146>

**Recruitment methods & retention**

- Aguirre, T. M., Koehler, A. E., Joshi, A., & Wilhelm, S. L. (2018). Recruitment and retention challenges and successes. *Ethnicity & Health*, 23(1), 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557858.2016.1246427>
- Flores, G., Portillo, A., Lin, H., Walker, C., Fierro, M., Henry, M., & Massey, K. (2017). A successful approach to minimizing attrition in racial/ethnic minority, low-income populations. *Contemporary Clinical Trials Communications*, 5, 168–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conctc.2017.01.009>

**Further reading:**

- Arnett, J. J. (2016). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research*. (pp. 115–132). American Psychological Association. Online access available via [UNC Library](#)
- Rothwell, P. M. (2005). External validity of randomised controlled trials: “To whom do the results of this trial apply?” *Lancet*, 365(9453), 82–93. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(04\)17670-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17670-8)
- Treweek, S., Pitkethly, M., Cook, J., Fraser, C., Mitchell, E., Sullivan, F., Jackson, C., Taskila, T. K., & Gardner, H. (2018). Strategies to improve recruitment to randomised trials. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2, MR000013. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000013.pub6>
- McKenzie, M., Tulsy, J. P., Long, H. L., Chesney, M., & Moss, A. (1999). Tracking and follow-up of marginalized populations: a review. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 10(4), 409–429. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2010.0697>

---

**SEMINAR 8—SEPTEMBER 29: ANTIRACIST RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

---

**Guest Speaker:** Neil Bilotta, PhD, MSW, MPH, Clinical Assistant Professor, UNC SSW**Required:**

- Held, M. B. (2019). Decolonizing research paradigms in the context of settler colonialism: an unsettling, mutual, and collaborative effort. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918821574>.
- Hernández, E. (2016). Utilizing critical race theory to examine race/ethnicity, racism, and power in student development theory and research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57(2), 168–180.

**Further reading:**

- Braun, K. L., Browne, C. V., Ka’opua, L. S., Kim, B. J., & Mokuau, N. (2014). Research on indigenous elders: From positivistic to decolonizing methodologies. *The Gerontologist*, 54(1), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnt067>
- Simonds, V. W., & Christopher, S. (2013). Adapting Western research methods to indigenous ways of knowing. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(12), 2185–2192. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.301157>

---

**SEMINAR 9—OCTOBER 6: RESEARCH DESIGN: QUALITATIVE and MIXED METHODS**

---

**Required:**

- Gray (2019). Chapters 7 (Qualitative Methods) and 8 (Mixed Methods)
- Collingridge, D. S., & Gantt, E. E. (2008). The quality of qualitative research. *American Journal of Medical Quality*, 23(5), 389–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1062860608320646>

**Further reading:**

- Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). A typology of mixed methods research designs. *Quality & Quantity*, 43, 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9105-3>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). Validity and qualitative research: An oxymoron? *Quality & Quantity*, 41(2), 233–249. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9000-3>

- Wu, S., Wyant, D. C., & Fraser, M. W. (2016). Author guidelines for manuscripts reporting on qualitative research. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, 7(2), 405–425. <https://doi.org/10.1086/685816>

---

**SEMINAR 10—OCTOBER 13: EXPLORATORY STUDIES and SECONDARY DATA**

---

**Required:**

Exploratory studies:

- Finlayson, T. L., Asgari, P., Hoffman, L., Palomo-Zerfas, A., Gonzalez, M., Stamm, N., ... Nunez-Alvarez, A. (2017). Formative research: using a community-based participatory research approach to develop an oral health intervention for migrant Mexican families. *Health Promotion Practice*, 18, 454–465. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839916680803>
- Whitehead, A. L., Sully, B. G., & Campbell, M. J. (2014). Pilot and feasibility studies: Is there a difference from each other and from a randomised controlled trial? *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, 38, 130–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cct.2014.04.001>

Secondary data and research:

- Gray (2018). Chapter 22.

**Further reading:**

- Bowen, D. J., Kreuter, M., Spring, B., Cofta-Woerpel, L., Linnan, L., Weiner, D., ... Fernandez, M. (2009). How we design feasibility studies. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 36(5), 452–457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.02.002>
- Thabane, L., Ma, J., Chu, R., Cheng, J., Ismaila, A., Rios, L. P., ... Goldsmith, C. H. (2010). A tutorial on pilot studies: The what, why and how. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 10, 1-2288-10–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-10-1>
- Tight, M. (2019). Secondary data research. In Tight, M. *Documentary research in the social sciences* (pp. 95-108). 55 City Road, London: SAGE Publications Ltd Doi: 10.4135/9781529716559 (Online access available via UNC Library)

---

**SEMINAR 11—OCTOBER 20: PARTICIPATORY and VISUAL RESEARCH METHODS**

---

**Required:**

Participatory research:

- Gray (2018). Chapter 13
- Horowitz, C. R., Mimsie Robinson, R., & Seifer, S. (2009). Community-based participatory research from the margin to the mainstream: are researchers prepared? *Circulation*, 119, 2633–2642. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.729863>

Visual research methods:

- Gray (2018). Chapter 20
- Evans-Agnew, R. A., & Rosemberg, M. A. (2016). Questioning photovoice research: Whose Voice? *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(8), 1019–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315624223>

**Further reading:**

- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19, 173–202. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173>
- Teti, M., Koegler, E., Conserve, D. F., Handler, L., & Bedford, M. (2018). A scoping review of photovoice research among people with HIV. *The Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care: JANAC*, 29(4), 504–527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jana.2018.02.010>

---

**SEMINAR 12—OCTOBER 27: DATA COLLECTION METHODS**


---

**Required:**Questionnaires and surveys:

- Gray (2018). Chapters 10 and 14
- Yampolskaya, S. (2017). Research at work: Administrative data and behavioral sciences research. *Families in Society*, 98(2), 121–125. <https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.2017.98.17>

Interviewing and focus groups:

- Gray (2018). Chapters 15 (Interviewing) and 18 (Focus Groups)

**Further reading:**

- Gray (2018). Chapter 16 (Non-Participant Observation)
- Ebert, J. F., Huibers, L., Christensen, B., & Christensen, M. B. (2018). Paper- or web-based questionnaire invitations as a method for data collection: cross-sectional comparative study of differences in response rate, completeness of data, and financial cost. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 20(1), e24. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8353>
- Flanagan, S. M., Greenfield, S., Coad, J., & Neilson, S. (2015). An exploration of the data collection methods utilised with children, teenagers and young people (CTYPs). *BMC Research Notes*, 8, 61. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-015-1018-y>

---

**SEMINAR 13—NOVEMBER 3: DATA ANALYSIS**


---

**Required:**

- Gray (2018). Chapters 24 (Analyzing and Presenting Quantitative Data) and 26 (Analyzing and Presenting Qualitative Data)
- Petrocelli, N. (2010). Validity of research conclusions. In N. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Research Design* (pp. 1597–1599). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n488>

**Further reading:**

- Castro, F. G., Kellison, J. G., Boyd, S. J., & Kopak, A. (2010). A methodology for conducting integrative mixed methods research and data analyses. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4(4), 342–360. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689810382916>
- Cohen, J. (2016). Things I have learned (so far). In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research*, 4th ed. (pp. 265–276). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Guetterman, T. C., Feters, M. D., & Creswell, J. W. (2015). Integrating quantitative and qualitative results in health science mixed methods research through joint displays. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 13(6), 554–561. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1865>

---

**SEMINAR 14—NOVEMBER 14: DIGITAL RESEARCH METHODS and DISSEMINATION**


---

**Required:**

- Gray (2018). Chapters 21 (Digital Research Methods) and 27 (Writing Up the Research)
- Miner, M. H., Bockting, W. O., Romine, R. S., & Raman, S. (2012). Conducting internet research with the transgender population: Reaching broad samples and collecting valid data. *Social Science Computer Review*, 30(2), 202–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439311404795>

**Further reading:**

- Gray (2018). Chapter 19 (Unobtrusive measures)

- Kazdin, A. E. (2016). Publication and communication of research findings. In A. E. Kazdin (ed.), *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research, 4th ed.* (pp. 647-662). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Murray, E., Hekler, E. B., Andersson, G., Collins, L. M., Doherty, A., Hollis, C., ... Wyatt, J. C. (2016). Evaluating digital health interventions: Key questions and approaches. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 51*(5), 843–851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.008>
- Thornton, L., Batterham, P. J., Fassnacht, D. B., Kay-Lambkin, F., Caley, A. L., & Hunt, S. (2016). Recruiting for health, medical or psychosocial research using Facebook: Systematic review. *Internet Interventions, 4*, 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2016.02.001>

---

**SEMINAR 15—NOVEMBER 17: STUDENT PRESENTATIONS**

---

**Recommended:**

- Kazdin, A. E. (2016). Perspectives and general lessons to guide research. In A. E. Kazdin (ed.), *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research, 4th ed.* (pp. 675–685). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.