Mixed Methods in Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Research

To view the original video, please go to https://prevention.nih.gov/programs-events/medicine-mind-the-gap/seminars/methods-health-promotion-research.

>> I WANTED TO WELCOME YOU TO THE NIH OFFICE OF DISEASE PREVENTION. THIS WEBINAR SERIES EXPLORES RESEARCH DESIGN, MEASUREMENT, INTERVENTION, DATA ANALYSIS AND OTHER METHODS OF INTEREST. OTHER GOAL IS TO ENGAGE THE PREVENTION RESEARCH COMMUNITY AND THOUGHT PROVOKING DISCUSSIONS TO PROMOTE THE USE OF THE BEST ABLE METHODS AND SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF BETTER METHODS. BEFORE I BEGIN, I HAVE SOME HOUSEKEEPING ITEMS. TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS DURING THE WEBINAR, THERE ARE 2 OPTIONS. FIRST, YOU MAY SUBMIT QUESTIONS VIA WOMEN EX, CLICKING ON THE -- WEB EX IN THE TOOL BAR AND DIRECT QUESTIONS TO ALL PANELISTS. SECOND, YOU MAY PARTICIPATE BY TWITTER AND SUBMIT QUESTIONS USING THE HASH TAG NIH MTG. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE TALK, WE WILL OPEN THE FLOOR FOR QUESTIONS. WE COULD APPRECIATE YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT THE WEBINAR. UPON CLOSING THE MEETING YOU’LL BE DIRECTED TO A WEBSITE TO COMPLETE A SEMINAR EVALUATION. ALSO, SENT AN E-MAIL WITH A LINK TO THE EVALUATION. THIS WILL HELP US TO IMPROVE THE WEBINAR SERIES. I WOULD LIKE TO TURN THINGS OVER TO DR. DAVID MURRAY, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF DISEASE PREVENTION.


>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THIS INVITATION TO PRESENT MIXED METHODS AND DISEASE PREVENTION HEALTH PROMOTION RESEARCH. THIS LECTURE DRAWS ON MATERIAL THAT WAS IN A BOOK THAT DAVE AND I EDITED, 2016. CALLED THE HANDBOOK OF METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH. QUALITATIVE, QUANTITYITATIVE AND MIXED METHODS. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAS THE PUBLISHER. IN THIS HANDBOOK, DAVE AND I WANTED TO CONTRIBUTE SOMETHING ABOUT THE COMMUNITY ORIENTED APPROACH WHICH UTILIZES A WIDE VARIETY OF CONTEMPT RATHER QUALITATIVE, QUANTITATIVE MIXED MESSAGE APPROACHES THAT WERE THEORETICALLY SOUND, VALID AND CREATIVE. WE WANTED TO ADDRESS AN INNOVATIVE MANNER QUESTIONS WITH IMPORT FOR COMMUNITIES IN WHICH THEY WORK. FIRST LET'S TALK ABOUT DEFINITIONS. MIXED METHOD APPROACHES COMBINE QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE METHODS WITHIN THE SAME STUDY OR PROJECT. QUANTITATIVE
RESEARCH OFTEN IS BASED ON POSITIVISM, OR THE BELIEF IN A SINGLE REALITY ACCESSIBLE THROUGH SCIENTIFIC PROCEDURES. IN CONTRAST, QUALITATIVE STUDIES ARE GROUNDED IN A CONSTRUCTIVE PARADIGM, RATHER THAN A SINGLE UNIVERSE SIMPLY SHARED REALITY, EACH PARTICIPANT HAS HIS OR HER OWN REALITY. LET'S FIRST TALK ABOUT QUALITATIVE APPROACHES. THERE IS AN EMPHASIS ON THE MEANING OF THE PHENOMENON ON CONSIDERATION TO THOSE EXPERIENCING IT. DATA WHICH TYPICALLY CONSISTS OF WORDS, PROVIDES DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPANT'S EXPERIENCES. THERE IS AN ACTIVE COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE RESEARCHERS AND THE PARTICIPANTS THROUGHOUT THE RESEARCH INTERVENTION PROCESS. AND SOME EXAMPLES OF THESE TYPES OF QUALITATIVE MESSAGES ARE PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION, QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS, FOCUS GROUP AND CASE STUDIES. NOW, QUANTITATIVE APPROACHES HAVE AN EMPHASIS ON TRYING TO ESTABLISH CAUSE AND EFFECT RELATIONSHIPS. DATA TYPICALLY CONSISTS OF NUMBERS AND THEY'RE OBTAINED BY USE OF STANDARDIZED MEASURES. IN THIS APPROACH, THEY TRY TO PRODUCE GENERALIZABLE FINDINGS AS OPPOSED TO QUALITATIVE APPROACHES. AS EXAMPLES OF QUANTITATIVE METHODS, WE HAVE QUANTITATIVE DESCRIPTION, RANDOMIZED FIELD EXPERIMENTS, NON EQUIVALENT COMPARISON GROUP DESIGNS, AND INTERRUPTED TIME SERIES DESIGNS. [TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES] MIXED MESSAGE STUDIES USED QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODS [TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES] IN A SENSE MIXED MESSAGE PROVIDE A MORE NUANCED UNDERSTANDING OF RESEARCH QUESTION THAN A SINGLE MESSAGE CAN ACCOMPLISH. NOW, THERE ARE DIFFERENT TAPES OF MIXED METHODS APPROACHES. OFTEN, ONE IS HIERARCHICAL. SO ONE METHOD IS USUALLY DOMINANT OR MORE CENTRAL. THE OTHER IS MORE SECONDARY OR SUPPORTIVE. THAT DOESN'T ALWAYS OCCUR. SOMETIMES YOU HAVE BOTH APPROACHES EQUIVALENT. ALSO, MIXED METHODS MAY BE SEQUENTIAL, FIRST USING AN EXPLORATORY METHOD FOR DISCOVERY AND LATER USING A CONFIRMATORY METHOD FOR JUSTIFICATION. BUT THEY CAN ALSO BE SIMULTANEOUS, OCCURRING AT THE SAME TIME AS OPPOSED TO ONE OCCURRING AND THEN THE SECOND ONE OCCURRING. NOW, THERE ARE MANY TYPES OF MIXED METHOD DESIGNS AND MANY DIFFERENT WAYS OF THINKING ABOUT THEM. MORE ON THE FIRST TOPOLOGISTS. AND I'M GOING TO TALK ABOUT AT A ONE. THE DOMINANT METHOD IS USING REPRESENTED BY A CAPITAL LETTERS, LIKE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE. AND THE COMPLEMENTALLY METHOD WERE THE -- WHAT'S CALLED SECONDARY METHOD, REPRESENTED USING ALL LOWER CASE LETTERS. QUAN. AND QUAL. USUALLY THERE IS A SEQUENTIAL DESIGN AND PLUS DESIGN IS A CONCURRENT DESIGN. HERE YOU SEE 9 DIFFERENT COMBINATIONS, EQUIVALENT SIMULTANEOUS DESIGNS, WHICH QUANTITATIVE FOLLOWED BY QUALITATIVE. AND YOU CAN ALSO SEE DOMINANT SUPPLEMENTIOUS DESIGNS, WHERE THE PRIMARY METHOD IS QUANTITATIVE SECONDARY QUALITATIVE, OR THE PRIMARY QUALITATIVE SECONDARY QUANTITATIVE. YOU ALSO HAVE DOMINANT SEQUENTIAL DESIGNS. YOU CAN SEE SOME EXAMPLES OF THAT ON THE BOTTOM. THESE ARE JUST A FEW OF THE EXAMPLES AND THERE CAN BE ROUTES, SO ONE CAN HAVE MORE THAN TWO APPROACHES IN A PARTICULAR STUDY OR AREA. WE CAN OUTLINE DIFFERENT WAYS OF TYPES OFF MIXING, IT COULD BE TRIANGULATING, WHICH ALLOWS FOR CONVERGING FINDINGS TO USE MULTIPLE METHODS TO INCREASE THE STUDY'S VALIDITY. IT CAN BE DEMARCATION, REFERRING TO HOW METHODS ARE RELATED. QUANTITATIVE, DOMINANT AND QUALITATIVE AS A SECONDARY, FOR EXAMPLE. AND RECLASSIFICATION. REFERRING TO HOW BOTH QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE METHODS CAN BE USED IN EXPLORATORY AND CONFIRMATORY WAYS. CHAMP BELL IN A BOOK IN
2012 talked about plural statistic studies also nope as mixed methods. It can occur within the confines of the single study or can exist at levels. In one study it can incorporate quantitative methods and qualitative. A pluralistic program can reflect pluralism conducted pie the same team on one topic. Fields of science or scholarship in which a balance of study design analyst technique is used in publications, for example, community psychology. Pluralism also can accrue -- occur across programs of studies conducted by a team. I'm going to give 2 examples of 2 different types of research and how these types of mixed methods were used. First I'm going to talk about the DePaul University team that has been studying recovery homes called Oxford Houses for over 25 years. Real briefly, Oxford Houses have no professional staff, completely self-run. They're the largest self-help recovery residential program in the U.S., over 2,000 homes. A person can live in these homes as long as they want, but they need to pay their share of rent and follow house rules. We developed a collaboration with the organization with a phone call to the founder, and for over a year we had conversations building trust between the community organization, Oxford House, and the DePaul research group. Oxford House representative eventually sent to Illinois to set up a group of recovery homes in the early 1990s. For the first year we collected no formal data but built up a relationship of trust. In our early stats, our partners attended our research meetings and tape recorded them so that their members could learn what we were thinking about doing. So that every one could have input into this process, if they wished. We did not just start collecting data. We focused on building a trusting relationship with our community partners. We determined together what questions should be addressed, what kind of data could we collect, who should collect the data. So our first study was really a mixed study. It used an equivalent estimatious design, which used both qualitative and quantitative methods. The qualitative were trying to understand why did people want to live in these Oxford Houses. Why did they join them? We found it was a place that was safe and people can have fellowship with others. But we also had some quantitative questions. We wanted to find out the socio demographics of these houses which turned out to be very comparable to other treatment type settings. Also we found the longer people live in these houses, it seems like the better outcomes in terms of abstinence. Those were more quantitative methods that we approached in our first study of this particular organization. During the 1990s, our research group submitted a number of grant proposals to collect data from the Oxford House members. But NIH reviewers asked us to conduct a randomized study to determine whether or not these homes could lead to reductions. And substance abuse. We informed the grant reviewers and randomized design was not feasible, each house voted on whether to allow new members to live in their house. We finally approached the founder of Oxford House with this predicament. He said he would work with us toward a randomized study. So the willingness of Oxford House leadership was likely a direct result of years of mutual trust building using quantitative and qualitative methods, this mixed method approach really brought us closer to this particular organization and
ALLOWED THEM TO WANT TO HELP US WITH THE RESEARCH. SO WE DID FINALLY GET FUNDING FROM NIH, IN A QUANTITATIVE STUDY. IT WAS A 2 YEAR LONGITUDINAL STUDY FOUNDED -- FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALCOHOLISM AND ALCOHOL ABUSE. INCLUDED 150 PARTICIPANTS RECRUITED FROM A VARIETY OF INPATIENT CENTERS THROUGHOUT THE CHICAGO. THEY WERE ASSIGNED TO AN OXFORD HOUSE OR USUAL AFTER CARE AFTER FINISHING TREATMENT. THOSE IN THE OXFORD HOUSE CONDITION OVER A TWO YEAR PERIOD HAS SIGNIFICANTLY LESS SUBSTANCE USE, HIGHER EMPLOYMENT, LOWER CRIMINAL JUSTICE RELATED OUTCOMES. THESE ARE EXAMPLES OF TWO YEARS LATER, THE OXFORD HOUSE HAD ABOUT 69% ABSTINENCE, VERSES 35% FOR THE MUTUAL CARE CONTROL. INCARCERATION RATES WERE SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER IN THE OXFORD HOUSE. MONTHLY INCOME WERE SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER IN THE OXFORD HOUSE TWO YEARS LATER. SO OVER THE NEXT NUMBER OF YEARS, WE INSTITUTED A MULTITUDE OF QUANTITATIVE QUALITATIVE MIXED METHOD DESIGNS AND WE HAVE ACTUALLY PUBLISHED IN THE JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY A SUMMARY OF THIS RESEARCH. AND HERE IS AGAIN SOME EXAMPLES OF SOME OF THE WORK THAT WE DID. AND THERE IS A RESEARCH ON THE ROLE OF NATURAL MENTORING, RELATIONS AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE RECOVERY. SO OUR FIRST QUANTITATIVE STUDY WAS REALLY -- GAVE US A GLIMPSE THAT SOMETHING ELSE WAS GOING ON. WE FOUND IF YOU HAD A BEST FRIEND IN THE OXFORD HOUSE, THAT WAS THE BEST PREDICTOR OF LONG TERM OUTCOMES. IF YOU COULD JUST FIND ONE PERSON WHO YOU COULD FIND -- BE A FRIEND, YOU STAYED IN THE OXFORD HOUSE LONGER AND YOU HAD BETTER OUTCOMES A COUPLE YEARS LATER, THIS LED TO A SERIES OF STUDIES WHICH I'D LIKE TO REPORT ON BRIEFLY. THERE WERE FOCUSED GROUPS PAIRED WITH A SERIES OF QUANTITATIVE MEASURES THAT UNDERSTAND NATURAL MENTORING RELATIONS. IN THE QUALITATIVE SECTION OF THE STUDY WE HAD FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS CREATED WITH THE INPUT OF OXFORD HOUSE RESIDENTS, AND THE NATURE OF THESE MENTORING RELATIONS WAS DESCRIBED DURING FOCUS GROUPS. THE RICHNESS OF THIS PROCESS, ONE MALE PARTICIPANT EXPLAINED I USUALLY GO TO ANY OF THE GUYS, THAT'S WHY I PUT FIVE OF THEM ON THE SURVEY REGARDING THE NUMBER OF MENTORS IN THE HOUSE. I DIDN'T JUST PUT ONE. WE ALL HAD DIFFERENT PERSONALITIES. THERE IS A CERTAIN THING YOU CAN SPEAK TO. CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS THAT WILL HELP YOU OUT, LEAD YOU THE RIGHT WAY. QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS RESULTED AT THE MENTORING CHARACTERISTICS AND ACTIVITIES PREDICTED SOCIAL SUPPORT IN HELPING BEHAVIORS. SO THE USE OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODS PROVIDED A RICH EMPIRICAL SUPPORT FOR THE CHARACTERISTICS OF NATURAL MENTORING RELATIONSHIPS AND THEIR IMPORTANCE FOR OXFORD HOUSE RESIDENTS. JOHN, A SOCIOLOGIST OF OREGON RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BEGAN WORKING WITH US AS WELL ON TRYING TO UNDERSTAND SOME OF THE DYNAMICS USING MORE QUANTITATIVE METHODS OF LOOKING AT, FOR EXAMPLE, TRUST. IN OXFORD HOUSES OVER TIME. WE FOUND TRUST RELATIONSHIPS TENDED TO BE MORE SYMMETRICAL, WHICH THIS GRAPH SHOWS. CONFIDENT RELATIONSHIPS, THE ELEMENT OF SPECIALIZATION WHERE SOMEONE IS A LISTENER, NOT GENERALLY CONFIDE IN THE OTHER PERSON, WE DIDN'T SEE THAT TYPE OF RECIPROCAL NATURE AS WE DID WITH TRUST MOVE SO IN A SENSE, THE METHODS AND RESULTS OF ONE OXFORD HOUSE STUDY OFTEN SHED LIGHT ON THE RESULTS OF ANOTHER STUDY OR INSPIRED THE DESIGN OF A NEW STUDY. THE DOMINANT SEQUENTIAL FROM QUANTITATIVE TO QUALITATIVE TO QUANTITATIVE HAS OCCURRED IN A NUMBER OF OUR STUDIES. WHILE CONDUCTING A NATIONWIDE STUDY OF AN OXFORD HOUSE, THROUGH QUALITATIVE FINDINGS AND
DISCUSSIONS WITH MEMBERS OF THE OXFORD HOUSE ORGANIZATION, WE FOUND LATINOS WERE UNDER-REPRESENTED, IN OXFORD HOUSE RESIDENTS. THIS AWARENESS SPURRED CURIOSITY ABOUT LATINOS PERCEPTIONS OF OXFORD HOUSES AND POTENTIAL BARRIERS THAT LATINOS ENCOUNTERED WHEN ENTERING AN OXFORD HOUSE. TO ADDRESS THE QUESTIONS, RESEARCHERS HELPED WITH THE OXFORD HOUSE ORGANIZATION AND CONDUCTED A SERIES OF QUALITATIVE STUDIES THAT REVEALED THAT LATINOS HAD A POSITIVE RECOVERY EXPERIENCE IN OXFORD HOUSE AND MORE LATINOS COULD BENEFIT FROM PARTICIPATING. SO THE QUANTITATIVE STUDY WAS AN NIH GRANT WHERE WE ACTUALLY DID THE FINDINGS OF THE QUALITATIVE STUDIES, HELPS US BASICALLY DO A QUANTITATIVE, AN EXPERIMENT IN WHICH LATINO RESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL RECOVERY HOMES WERE COMPARED TO LATINO RESIDENTS, FUNDING BY NIH. I MIGHT SWITCH TO ANOTHER AREA, CHRONIC FATIGUE SYNDROME. [INDISCERNIBLE]. SOME OF YOU MIGHT KNOW, DEBILIATING AS TYPE II DIABETES, MS OR END STAGE RENAL DISEASE. AND BRIEFLY, STIGMA OVER THE PAST 3 DECADES, THERE IS A SERIES OF KEY DECISIONS THAT WERE MADE CONCERNING METHODS FOR GATHERING PREVALENCE DATA, THE NAME AND TREATMENT APPROACHES FOR THESE ILLNESSES. MOST OF THESE DECISIONS WERE FORMULATED WITHIN A SOCIETAL OF CRITICAL CONTEXT WHICH THIS ILLNESS WAS ASSUMED TO BE PSYCHOLOGICALLY GENERATED PROBLEM. PHYSICIANS HAVE REGARDED FATIGUE AS ONE OF THE LEAST IMPORTANT PRESENTING SYMPTOMS. MIXED METHOD WERE SUITABLE FOR RESEARCH IN PURSUIT OF SO YOU BELIEVE JUSTICE FOR MARGINALIZED POPULATIONS, BECAUSE IT'S MORE SENSITIVE TO CONTEXT. MORE LIKELY TO UNCOVER POWER CHALLENGED AND TO GIVERS TO PARTICIPANTS. IN SUCH CONTROVERSIAL CONTEXT, THE EMPLOYMENT OF A PURPOSEFUL MULTI PHASE MIXED METHODS PROGRAM COUPLED WITH THE VALUES OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY CAN BE A TOOL ESPECIALLY SUITED TO PROVIDE PATIENTS, HEALTHCARE WORKERS, SCIENTISTS, AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS LESS STIGMATIZING WAYS OF UNDERSTANDING THIS ILLNESS. SO, LET ME GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE OF WORK WE DID IN THIS AREA. CDC IN THE 80s CONDUCTED STUDIES PRIMARILY WITHIN SCF, FOUND IT WAS A RELATIVELY RARE DISORDER, AFFECTING CAUCASIAN WOMEN. WE LISTENED TO PATIENT GROUPS WHO CHALLENGED THESE FINDINGS. IN OUR GROUP WE LAUNCHED A MORE COMMUNITY BASED STUDY, RATHER THAN PHYSICIAN BASED STUDY. RAMLY SELECTED -- RANDOMLY SELECTED INDIVIDUALS AND BROUGHT THEM IN FOR WORKUPS. OUR ESTIMATES SUGGESTED 20,000 PEOPLE WERE EFFECTED, AND THAT PUT THE CDC HAD SUGGESTED. RATHER THAN THE 20,000, OUR FINDINGS IN 1999 SUGGESTED THAT IT WAS CLOSER TO A MILLION. SO WE USED SEQUENTIAL SAMPLING PROCEDURE. FOR THAT PARTICULAR STUDY DONE FROM 1995 TO 1997, TEN YEARS LATER, WE BASICALLY DID EQUIVALENT SIMULTANEOUS DESIGN, USED BOTH QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODS. WE WANTED TO FIND OUT TEN YEARS LATER AFTER FINDING THE PREVALENCE RATES OF .42, WHICH SUGGESTS THAT THERE WERE A MILLION PEOPLE WITH THIS ILLNESS, WE WANTED TO LOOK TEN YEARS LATER, THOSE THAT DEVELOPED THE ILLNESS OVER THIS PERIOD OF TIME AND THOSE WHO'S DIAGNOSIS REMITTED OVER THE PAST DECADE. SO OUR QUANTITATIVE OUTCOMES INVOLVE RECONTACTING THE PARTICIPANTS, GIVING THEM A COMPLETE MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION. QUANTITATIVE DATA SUGGESTS THE RATES WERE COMPARABLE OVER THE DECADE. THIS HELPED TO ANSWER IMPORTANT QUESTIONS. WERE ILLNESS RATES INCREASING DECREASING OR STAYING THE SAME? OUR QUALITATIVE METHODS WERE USED TO PROVIDE US WITH A DEEPER UNDERSTANDING OF THE INTERACTION OF THE MULTIPLE
SYSTEMS INVOLVED IN THIS CHRONIC LISTENS, AS WELL AS HEAR THE VOICE OF THE PATIENTS. A CODING SYSTEM WAS DEVELOPED TO A GROUNDED THEORY FRAMEWORK IN ORDER TO FOCUS ON THE CONTEXT DEPENDENCE AND STRUCTURAL PROCESSES WITHIN THE DATA. SO QUANTITATIVE THEMES, THE COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO THE ILLNESS INCLUDED THESE TYPES OF THINGS FROM THE MEDICAL COMMUNITY AS WELL AS RELIGHTED NETWORKS, SUCH AS SUPPORT GROUPS, AN EXAMPLE MANY PATIENTS MENTIONED THAT THEY EXPERIENCED NEGATIVE ATTITUDES, SUCH AS PHYSICIAN MINIMIZATION OF ILLNESS. FURTHERMORE, MANY RESPONDENTS TOLD THAT THEIR OBSTACLES TO SECURING DISABILITY IN A CLIMATE WHERE THERE IS DISBELIEF. THERE WAS THEME OF IDENTIFYING THE COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO THE LISTENS WAS ESSENTIAL COMPONENT TO UNDERSTANDING SYSTEMS INVOLVED WITH SERIOUSNESS OF THE SUFFERERS. WHAT ARE SOME BENEFITS IN THIS ARENA OF USING MIXED METHOD APPROACHES. THE QUALITATIVE METHODS ALLOW US TO UNDERSTAND THE BETTER EXPERIENCE OF THE PATIENTS WHO HAD BEEN IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS STUDY. IT PROVIDED AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT THE CONNECT OF ILLNESS TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWER AND PRIVILEGE WITHIN THE MEDICAL COMMUNITY AS WELL AS THE SOCIAL RESPONSE TO CHRONIC ILLNESS AND HEALTHCARE. THUS WE FOUND, AS [INDISCERNIBLE] SUGGESTS, THAT MIXED METHOD APPROACHES PROVIDES MULTIPLE WINDOWS INTO THE LIVES OF LESS EMPOWERED AND HISTORICALLY LICENSED WITHIN OUR -- SILENCED WITHIN OUR SOCIETY. WHAT ARE SOME OF THE BENEFITS? WELL, QUALITATIVE METHODS WERE USED TO HELP DEVELOP BETTER QUANTITATIVE METHODS, USING COMMUNITY BASED SAMPLES. IT WAS USED TO PROBE QUALITATIVE FEATURES OF THE ILLNESS EXPERIENCED BY PATIENTS. QUAINTE RESEARCH PROVIDED DATA ON THE MAGNITUDE OF THE ILLNESS. QUALITATIVE METHODS ALLOWED US TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE UNIQUE CHALLENGES AND STIGMA THAT THE PATIENT EXPERIENCED IN THEIR FAMILIES, FRIENDS AND TREATMENT PROFESSIONALS. THESE THINGS, THESE DATA PROVIDED US DATA THAT ALLOWED US TO PROVIDE BETTER APPRECIATIONS OF THE MAGNITUDE OF THE EFFECTS OF THIS ILLNESS ON PATIENTS. WE USED THESE DATA TO ESTIMATE THE ECONOMIC [INDISCERNIBLE] OF THIS ILLNESS TO OUR NATION. SO LET'S TALK ABOUT MIXED METHOD APPROACHES IN AGAIN. THIS APPROACH MORE ACCURATELY REPRESENTS THE ILLNESS THAT FAMILY FRIENDS AND HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS AND THEREBY HAS THE POSSIBILITY OF IMPROVING SERVICES TO THOSE EFFECTED. THESE TYPES OF INTEGRATED VALUE BASED APPROACHES ARE USEFUL FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADVOCACY RESEARCH THAT WORKS TOWARD THE UNDERSTANDING AND EMPOWERMENT OF OTHER SIMILAR GROUPS WHO MAY EXPERIENCE NEGATIVE SOCIAL PERCEPTIONS, AND DISMISSIVE TREATMENT. BUT THERE ARE CERTAIN CHALLENGES TO DOING THESE TYPES OF MIXED METHOD APPROACHES. WE'D LIKE TO MENTION SOME OF THEM. FIRST THING, THERE IS NO DEFINITIVE GUIDELINES FOR HOW TO CONDUCT A MIXED METHOD STUDY. ALSO, INTEGRATING MULTIPLE DATASETS IS A COMPLEX TASK. ESPECIALLY WHEN THEY COME FROM DIFFERENT METHODOLOGICAL TRADITIONS. IT'S ALSO A LACK OF INDEPTH TRAINING BY SCHOLARS AND BOTH METHODOLOGIES. PEOPLE ARE TRAINED IN QUALITATIVE METHODS, OTHERS ARE TRAINED IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS. VERY FREQUENTLY, PEOPLE DON'T GET TRAINING IN BOTH OF THESE METHODS. FINALLY, IT'S CHALLENGING IN PUBLISHING. WORD LIMITS IN JOURNALS. OFTEN WHEN YOU PRESENT THE APPROACH, IT COULD BE A LITTLE BIT LONGER IN PAGE LENGTH. MANY JOURNALS PREFER HAVING YOU SEND PAPERS THAT ARE 25 TO 30 PAGES LONG, SOMETIMES THAT BECOMES A PROBLEM WITH MIXED METHOD APPROACHES. BUT ULTIMATELY THERE ARE
MANY BENEFITS OF THIS TYPE OF WORK. MIXING METHODS CAN ENHANCE THE VALIDITY OR TRUTH WORTHINESS OF INFERENCEs AND ASSERTIONS BY PROVIDING MUTUAL CONFIRMATION OF FINDS. THIS OCCURRED IN OUR OXFORD HOUSE STUDIES AS WELL AS ME AND SCF STUDIES. MIXED METHOD DESIGNS CAN PROVIDE DEEPER EXPLORATION OF MECHANISMS, INTERPRETATION OF VARIABLES, AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS THAT MAY REMEDIATE OR MODERATE THE TOPIC OF STUDY. AND GWEN WE SAW THIS -- AGAIN WE SAW THIS AS A QUANTITATIVE STUDY FOUND THAT FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS WERE IMPORTANT, AND THAT LED TO QUALITATIVE WORK WITH FOCUS GROUPS TO TRY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS IT ABOUT FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS THAT MADE A DIFFERENCE? THOSE STUDIES ULTIMATELY IN A SEQUENTIAL WAY, LED US TO WORKING COLLABORATIVELY WITH PEOPLE FROM DIFFERENT DISCIPLINES ON SOCIAL NETWORKS RESEARCH. AGAIN YOU CAN SEE A PROGRAM OF RESEARCH FAR AWAY FROM QUANTITATIVE TO QUALITATIVE IN OUR OXFORD HOUSE STUDIES. MIXED METHODS RESEARCH CAN FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF [INDISCERNIBLE] INSTRUMENTS AND POST ARDEEP UNDERSTANDING OF THE -- FOSTER A DEEPER UNDERSTANDING OF THE PHENOMENON OF INTEREST. CLEARLY EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY HELPS US UNDERSTAND THE MAGNITUDE AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE ILLNESS ON A COMMUNITY SAMPLE THAT WAS UNBIASED BY HEALTH SEEKING BEHAVIOR. TO REALLY UNDERSTAND SOME OF THE THEMES AND THE ISSUES OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAD THIS ILLNESS. THE QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS GAVE US THEMES THAT RESONATED WITH US SO THAT WE COULD UNDERSTAND THE EXPERIENCE OF THE ILLNESS, NOT JUST THE MAGNITUDE OF THE DISABILITY THAT THOSE INDIVIDUALS WERE EXPERIENCING. IN QUANTITATIVE HAD THE MOST POWER TO APPEAL TO COLLABORATORS IN FUNDING A POLICY, SO QUANTITATIVE PROCEDURES SEEMED TO CERTAINLY BE ONES THAT DIFFERENT FUNDING AGENCIES SEEMED TO BE A LITTLE MORE INTERESTED IN AND OFTEN POLICY INDIVIDUALS LIKE TO HAVE THE HARD NUMBERS OF SAYING YES, THIS IS THE ECONOMIC COST OF THIS PARTICULAR ILLNESS, OR YES, OXFORD HOUSE, THESE ARE THE BENEFITS OVER USUAL AFTERCARE THAT YOU CAN HAVE A RANDOMIZED STUDY AND YOU CAN BASICALLY FIND, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT THESE RECOVERY HOMES ACTUALLY DO MAKE A DIFFERENCE OVER THOSE WHO GET RELEASED FROM TREATMENT FROM SUBSTANCE ABUSE DISORDERS. QUALITATIVE ARE MORE LIKELY TO EMPOWER COMMUNITY MEMBERS AND GAIN INSIGHTS INTO HOW TO IDENTIFY AND WORK WITH PARTICIPANTS. SO IN A SENSE, THE QUALITATIVE STUDIES REALLY ARE ATTEMPTS TO GET TO APPRECIATE THE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE FEELINGS OF THE PEOPLE THAT ARE INVOLVED IN THESE PROJECT. AND I CAN JUST SAY THAT BY GOING TO OXFORD HOUSE MEETINGS, AND GOING TO OXFORD HOUSE CONVENTIONS, AND BY SITTING DOWN AND TALKING WITH INDIVIDUALS AND GETTING THE INDIVIDUALS FROM THE OXFORD HOUSE MOVEMENT TO TELL US WHAT THEY THINK ARE IMPORTANT TO STUDY, AND TO INVOLVE THEM IN THINKING ABOUT HOW TO STUDY THE TOPICS, WE ACTUALLY END UP WITH RICHER TYPES OF RESEARCH THAT ULTIMATELY COULD LEAD TO DIFFERENT TYPES OF FUNDING SOURCES AS WAS INDICATED IN THE OXFORD HOUSE STUDIES. AS NOTED BY MYSELF AND DAVE, IN A 2012 PUBLICATION, ANOTHER BOOK ON RESEARCH METHODS, FORMATIVE MIXED METHOD STUDIES CAN BE INSTRUMENTAL IN LEARNING HOW TO ACCESS AND DEVELOP TRUSTING RELATIONSHIPS WITH DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE COMMUNITY. COMBINING THESE METHODS CAN BE MOST EFFECTIVE WHEN UNDERTAKING COMMUNITY BASED ISSUES. AND AGAIN, A LOT OF THE STUDY THAT I HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT DURING THIS PRESENTATION INVOLVED VERY CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS WITH COMMUNITY MEMBERS. THIS IS PARTICIPANT
COMMUNITY RESEARCH. THIS IS VERY MUCH WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY, IMA CLINICAL COMMUNITY -- I AM A CLINICAL COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGIST, SO THAT'S THE TYPE OF WORK THAT I DO. THESE ARE SOME OF THE REFERENCES THAT I REFERRED TO IN THE PRESENTATION. AND, OF COURSE, CERTAINLY THEY'RE AVAILABLE FOR FOLLOW-UP DURING A BRIEF 35 MINUTE PRESENTATION. I'M NOT ABLE TO GO INTO A LOT OF DETAILS OF THESE METHODS, BUT FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE INTEREST, I CERTAINLY WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU TO LOOK AT SOME OF THE JOURNALS THAT ARE MENTIONED HERE AS WELL AS A COUPLE OF THE BOOKS THAT HAVE COME OUT THAT GIVE MUCH MORE DETAILS. I MIGHT ADD THAT THE HANDBOOK OF METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY BASED RESEARCH HAS OVER 35 CHAPTERS IN IT. AND THE CHAPTERS ARE BOTH ON QUANTITATIVE, QUALITATIVE METHODS, AS WELL AS MIXED METHODS. AND THEY ARE -- THEY ALL GIVE EXAMPLES HOW THEY WERE USED BY RESEARCHERS, NOT ONLY IN THE UNITED STATES BUT OTHER COUNTRIES. AT THIS POINT, YOU CAN SUBMIT YOUR QUESTIONS BY WEB EX OR TWITTER. AND I WILL BE AVAILABLE TO ANSWER YOUR QUESTIONS. ONCE AGAIN, I WANT TO THANK DAVID FOR THE INVITATION. AND I WANT TO THANK YOU ALL FOR LISTENING TO ME OVER THE LAST FEW MINUTES.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ENJOYED YOUR PRESENTATION. WE HAVE SOME QUESTIONS. AND OTHERS WILL COME IN AS WE PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION, SO LET'S JUST START BY ASKING SOME OF THE QUESTIONS THAT WE'VE RECEIVED SO FAR. YOU SPOKE A NUMBER OF TIMES DURING YOUR PRESENTATION ABOUT CHALLENGES IN GETTING PROJECTS APPROVED OR GRANTS FUNDED IN NIH. WE ARE SITTING HERE AT NIH TODAY HOSTING THIS WEBINAR, SO WE'RE ALWAYS SENSITIVE TO THOSE ISSUES. DO YOU HAVE ADVICE FOR OTHERS IN THE AUDIENCE WHO ARE THINKING ABOUT PUTTING THE GRAND PROPOSAL TOGETHER THAT WOULD USE BOTH QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITY METHODS? ARE THERE LESSONS THAT YOU HAVE LEARNED IN YOUR YEARS OF APPROACHES TO AVOID OR TO USE THAT YOU THINK MAY INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF SCHEDULE IN THE FUNDING PROCESS? THAT'S THE GENERAL QUESTION. FOR EXAMPLE, HAVE YOU FOUND THAT REVIEWERS EXPECT THAT A GOOD BIT OF THE QUALITATIVE WORK SHOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN DONE AND DESCRIBED IN PRELIMINARY STUDIES, AND THEN THE GRANT PROPOSAL MAY BUILD ON THAT, BUT THE KEY FEATURE OF THE GRANT PROPOSAL ITSELF IS A QUANTITATIVE INVESTIGATION. OR HAVE YOU HAD SUCCESS IN GETTING SUPPORT TO DO WHAT IS LARGELY QUALITATIVE WORK IN AN NIH GRANT PROPOSAL, THAT MIGHT ULTIMATELY LEAD TO QUANTITATIVE WORK, BUT QUANTITATIVE ISN'T INCLUDED IN THAT APPLICATION. LET ME PAUSE AND SEE WHAT COMMENTS YOU HAVE.

>> THANK YOU. THAT'S AN EXCELLENT QUESTION. I DO AGREE WITH YOU THAT I DO THINK HAVING SOME PRELIMINARY DATA POTENTIAL QUANTITATIVE OR QUALITATIVE HELPS WITH ALL GRANT PROPOSALS. TO SHOW ONE HAS SOME FAMILIARITY AND COMFORT GOING FROM QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE CAN BE THE STRENGTH OF A RESEARCH PROPOSAL. ONE THING THAT YOU MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER AS YOU'RE THINKING ABOUT USING A MIXED METHOD APPROACH, AND I DO THINK THAT MIXED METHOD APPROACHES CAN BE FUNDED, IS THAT THERE MIGHT BE IMPORTANT ISSUE OF TALKING TO THE PROGRAM OFFICIAL AT NIH AND BASICALLY FINDING OUT THEIR COMFORT LEVEL WITH MIXED METHODS. IF YOUR PROJECT OFFICER AT NIH FEELS THAT IT'S VERY -- SOMETHING THAT THEY'RE INTEREST IN, THEN YOU MIGHT WANT TO LOOK AT THE REVIEW COMMITTEE. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE, YOU ACTUALLY HAVE SOME INFLUENCE IN SORT OF GETTING YOUR PROPOSAL SENT TO. BECAUSE YOU CAN LIST WHICH REVIEW COMMITTEES YOU
THINK WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR YOUR GRANT PROPOSAL TO GO TO. SO YOU MIGHT GO AND ACTUALLY LOOK AT THE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS, WHICH IS LISTED ON THE WEB, AND YOU CAN SEE THE PEOPLE REVIEWING THE GRANTS DO MIXED METHODS WORK. SO FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU HAVE A GRANT SENT TO A PARTICULAR REVIEW COMMITTEE, ALL THE PEOPLE ON THE REVIEW COMMITTEE DO JUST QUANTITATIVE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, THAT WILL PROBABLY TELL YOU SOMETHING ABOUT THE PARTICULAR REVIEW COMMITTEE. YOU MIGHT WANT TO HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH THE SRO ABOUT WHETHER IT'S POSSIBLE FOR HAVING SOMEONE THAT'S MAYBE MORE OF A MIXED METHOD RESEARCHER INVOLVED. CERTAINLY I WOULD START WITH GOING TO THE PROJECT OFFICER BECAUSE ULTIMATELY, THEY'RE THE ONE WHOSE WOULD BE FUNDING YOU AND ASKING THEM ABOUT WHAT THE POSSIBILITY OF HAVING A MIXED METHOD APPROACH IS. NOW, SOMETIMES THERE IS AN RFA THAT MIGHT BE FOCUSING ON SAYING YEAH, WE'D LIKE TO HAVE BOTH APPROACHES. I TEND TO THINK THAT IF YOU HAVE EQUIVALENT DESIGN, IN OTHER WORDS, THEY'RE BOTH EQUALLY IMPORTANT. YOU MIGHT HAVE MORE DIFFICULTY IN THE SPACE TO ACTUALLY PRESENT ALL THE INFORMATION YOU NEED TO JUSTIFY THEM BOTH. SO THAT IF YOU BASICALLY PUT A PROPOSAL THAT IS DOMINANT WITH ONE APPROACH, WHETHER IT'S QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE AND YOU HAVE MORE TIME TO RUSH INTO THE DETAILS, THEN HAVING A PIECE OF IT THAT MAY BE, FOR EXAMPLE, QUALITATIVE, THEN I THINK THEY CAN GET THE FLAVOR OF ONE APPROACH IN A LITTLE BIT MORE DETAIL. REMEMBER, YOU ONLY HAVE 12 PAGES TO REALLY MAKE YOUR ARGUMENT. THAT'S NOT A LOT OF SPACE. SO I DO THINK THROUGH PROBABLY FOCUSING ON ONE APPROACH REALLY GOING INTO DETAIL, GOING THROUGH ALL THE METHODS, AND THEN MAYBE HAVING A PIECE ON AT THE END THAT SECONDARY, THAT DIFFERENT APPROACH IS ACTUALLY SOMETHING THAT I HAVE DONE IN SEVERAL GRANT PROPOSALS SUCCESSFULLY, AND I THINK THE REVIEWERS HAVE ACTUALLY APPRECIATED THE FACT THAT I HAD SOME FLEXIBILITY. AND I COULD, FOR EXAMPLE, SAY ONE STUDY WAS A QUANTITATIVE STUDY WHERE WE REALLY WERE TRYING TO, IN A SENSE, UNDERSTAND THE EPIDEMIOLOGY, THE DISTRIBUTION OF CASES OF URBAN AREA CHICAGO. BUT WE WERE ALSO INTERESTED IN FINDING OUT PEOPLE'S EXPERIENCES THAT HAD THIS ILLNESS, THAT COULD GENERATE OTHER POTENTIAL HYPOTHESIS IN THE FUTURE. SO THAT WE COULD DO SOME QUALITATIVE WORK WITH SOME OF THE INDIVIDUALS THAT WE IDENTIFIED AS HAVING THIS ILLNESS. I THINK THAT THAT WAS SOMETHING THAT WAS BENEFICIAL TO THE REVIEWER WHOSE THOUGHT THAT WAS INNOVATIVE. SO WHEN YOU'RE WRITING A PROPOSAL FOR NIH, YOU HAVE TO THINK ABOUT WHAT IS INNOVATIVE, WHAT DIFFERENTIATES YOU FROM OTHER PEOPLE, BECAUSE THAT'S AN IMPORTANT PIECE, THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROJECTS IS IMPORTANT BUT THE INNOVATIVE SECTION OF IT IS VERY IMPORTANT AND IF YOU CAN SHOW THAT YOU'RE USING MIXED METHODS IN VERY CREATIVE WAYS, THAT COULD GET PEOPLE EXCITED AND GIVE YOU A FUNDABLE SCORE.

>> THANK YOU. FOLLOW-UP QUESTION. VERY MUCH RELATED. SO IN MANY AREAS IT'S DIFFICULT FOR THE PI, THE PRINCIPLE INVESTIGATOR, TO BE AN EXPERT IN ALL THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE GRANT APPLICATION. AS AN EPIDEMIOLOGIST, I'M USED TO WORKING WITH TEAMS WHERE WE HAVE PEOPLE THAT HAVE SKILLS IN DIFFERENT AREAS THAT ARE HELPING PUT THE PROPOSAL TOGETHER. THAT SEEMS EVEN MORE LIKELY TO BE IMPORTANT IN A PROJECT THAT'S USING MIXED METHODS WHERE ONE PERSON MAY BE AN EXPERT ON QUANTITATIVE METHODS, NOT QUALITATIVE OR VICE VERSA. HAVE YOU FOUND THAT YOU NEED TO HAVE A TEAM APPROACH WHERE YOU CAN HAVE INDIVIDUALS
WITH EXPERTISE IN THESE VARIOUS AREAS? YOU HAVE BEEN DOING THIS YOURSELF A LONG TIME. THINKING ABOUT ALL THE OTHER PEOPLE OUT THERE THAT ARE THINKING ABOUT DOING IT, MAY STRENGTH IN ONE AREA. IS IT BETTER FOR THEM TO BE AN EXPERT IN EVERYTHING OR BETTER TO PARTNER WITH PEOPLE ALREADY EXPERT IN THE AREAS THAT THEY DON'T RECOVER?

>> AGAIN, THANK YOU. ANOTHER EXCELLENT QUESTION. YES. I DO THINK THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO PARTNER WITH DIFFERENT PEOPLE WITH DIFFERENT EXPERTISE. SO IF YOU HAVE SPENT QUANTITATIVE METHODS YOU MIGHT HAVE SOME FAMILIARITY WITH QUALITATIVE METHODS. THAT MIGHT NOT BE YOUR STRENGTH. SO TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU CAN BRING ON TO YOUR TEAM SOMEONE WHO HAS FAMILIARITY WITH THAT AREA, THAT REALLY IMPROVES YOUR TEAM. AND I MIGHT ADD THAT WHEN WE DO RESEARCH AT THE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH AT DEPAUL UNIVERSITY, WE'RE CONSTANTLY LOOKING FOR THE BEST OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE TOPIC AREAS. SO FOR EXAMPLE, WE REACH OUT TO AN ECONOMIST, TO HELP US WORK ON ECONOMIC ISSUED. WE WORK OUT WITH A SOCIOLOGIST WHO BASICALLY UNDERSTANDS NETWORKS. WE WORK WITH A SIMULATOR WHO HELPS US UNDERSTAND SIMULATIONS AS WE DEVELOP MODELS. AND WE ALSO, THEN, REACH OUT FOR PEOPLE WHO HAVE SOME OF THE MORE QUALITATIVE EXPERIENCES OF UNDERSTANDING AND THE INDIVIDUAL'S EXPERIENCES. SO FOR EXAMPLE -- SO YES, IN OUR OXFORD HOUSE RESEARCH RIGHT NOW, WE DO HAVE MULTIPLE DISCIPLINES. AND ACTUAL LE, REACHING OUT TO PEOPLE IS EASIER THAN YOU THINK. BECAUSE IF YOU HAVE A TOPIC THAT'S GRABBING AND THEY SAY THIS IS SOMETHING THAT HASN'T BEEN DONE, THAT IS REALLY INTERESTING, COME TOGETHER AND LET'S JOIN OURSELVES WITH THE TEAM, THEY ACTUALLY DON'T OFTEN -- YOU DON'T HAVE TO HAVE MONEY TO EVEN FUND THIS, TO GET A TEAM GOING. IF YOU HAVE MONEY, THAT'S GREAT. IF YOU HAVE SOMETHING THAT YOU CAN ENTICE THEM TO WORK WITH YOU, THAT THEY MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN THE TOPIC, OR IN THE COLLABORATION OF A MULTI DISCIPLINARY GROUP THAT WILL GET THEM EXCITED. THERE ARE SOME RISKS INVOLVED IN DOING THIS TYPE WORK, TOO. SO FOR EXAMPLE, I'VE SEEN COLLABORATIONS WHERE BASICALLY THEY HAVE BROUGHT ON 2 OR 3 DIFFERENT PEOPLE IN AN AREA. SO LET'S SAY QUALITATIVE. AND THERE ARE MANY DIFFERENT QUALITATIVE METHODS. I'VE SEEN, FOR EXAMPLE, WHERE YOU HAD 3 PEOPLE WHO BASICALLY BELIEVED IN 3 DIFFERENT TYPES OF QUALITATIVE METHODS. ULTIMATELY, THERE WAS SOME DIFFICULTIES IN TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO ANALYZE THE DATA. BECAUSE EACH OF THEM HAD THEIR PREFERENCE ON A PARTICULAR WAY. SO I THINK EARLY ON, TRYING TO SET THE BOUNDARIES, TRYING TO FIND OUT A COMFORT LEVEL WITH THE COLLABORATORS, TRYING TO BASICALLY SEE HOW YOU'RE THINKING ABOUT APPROACHING THIS FROM WHICH PARTICULAR METHODS, JUST LIKE WITH THE PUBLICATION. WHEN YOU'RE GOING TO WRITE SOMETHING UP, YOU SHOULD REALLY HAVE DISCUSSIONS ABOUT AUTHORSHIP VERY EARLY ON. AND I THINK THE SAME APPLIES HERE. THAT WHEN YOU BRING A MULTI DISCIPLINARY GROUP TOGETHER, THERE SHOULD BE EARLY DISCUSSIONS ABOUT WHAT THE ROLES ARE AND HOW DIFFERENT STRATEGIES AND TACTICS AND TECHNIQUES AND METHODS WILL BE USED. AND THEN WHEN THE DATA ACTUALLY COMES IN, WHERE THE GRANT IS WRITTEN AND THE FUNDING OCCURS, YOU REALLY CAN TRY TO MINIMIZE SOME OF THE POTENTIAL NEGATIVE SIDES OF MISCOMMUNICATIONS, AND CONFLICT THAT CAN OCCUR IF YOU HAVEN'T HAD THOSE DISCUSSIONS EARLY ON.
THANK YOU. YOU MADE A VERY GOOD SUGGESTION EARLIER ABOUT CONTACTING THE PROJECT OFFICER AT NIH EARLY ON AS YOU'RE CONSIDERING A GRANT APPLICATION IDEA. WE'VE ALWAYS ENDORSED THAT KIND OF ADVISE MOVE VERY IMPORTANT TO SPEAK TO SOMEONE AT THE AGENCY THAT MIGHT FUND THE PROJECT EARLY ON, DESCRIBE THE PROJECT, DESCRIBE RATIONALE, DESCRIBE THE METHODS, GET FEEDBACK. THEY CAN OFFER ADVICE ON WHAT WOULD BE A GOOD STUDY SECTION TO REVIEW THE APPLICATION. AND YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU TRY TO LOOK AT THE MEMBERSHIP OF POTENTIAL STUDY SECTIONS AND MAKE YOUR OWN JUDGMENT ABOUT WHETHER IT WOULD BE A GOOD GROUP TO REVIEW YOUR PROJECT. I WANT TO ASK A QUESTION RELATED TO THAT ASPECT. SOMETIMES THE PROJECT OFFICER IS GOING TO STEER YOU IN ONE DIRECTION. YOU LOOK AT THE PANEL, THEY'RE ALL IN THIS DIRECTION OR IN THAT DIRECTION. THEY'RE MISSING CERTAIN KINDS OF EXPERTISE THAT WOULD BE IMPORTANT FOR MY PROJECT. AND YOU'VE INDICATED THAT SOMETIMES YOU CONTACT AN SRO TO SUGGEST THAT. DEPENDING ON THE TIMING IT COULD BE TOO LATE FOR THOSE SUGGESTIONS TO BE USEFUL, IF YOU'VE ALREADY SUBMITTED YOUR APPLICATION, FOR EXAMPLE. THE SROs MAY HAVE PRETTY WELL BOOKED THE PANEL, AND IT'S TOO LATE TO ACT ON ANYTHING. HAVE YOU TRIED SUGGESTING REVIEWERS THAT MIGHT COMPLEMENT THE EXISTING MEMBERSHIP WHEN YOU SUBMIT YOUR APPLICATION? IS THAT A STRATEGY THAT YOU'VE TAKEN?

OKAY. THIS IS A VERY COMPLICATED QUESTION, BECAUSE BASICALLY A SCIENTIST REVIEW OFFICER WHO OVERSEES THE REVIEW PROCESS, YOU CANNOT BASICALLY ASK THEM TO PUT A PARTICULAR MEMBER ON THAT REVIEW COMMITTEE. IF YOU MENTION A PERSON'S NAME, WHETHER IT'S A QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE RESEARCHER, THEY WILL NOT, THEN, USE THAT PERSON. SO YOU CAN'T BASICALLY INDICATE A NAME. NOW, YOU CAN SAY TO A SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OFFICER WHO OVERSEES THE REVIEW PROCESS, YOU HAVE A GREAT REVIEW TEAM. YOU HAVE THE POPIC COVERED, SUBSTANCE ABUSE OR CHRONIC ILLNESS. I'M DOING STUFF THAT'S MIXED METHODS. IS IT POSSIBLE TO FIND SOMEONE, MAYBE AS AN AD HOC REVIEWER, TO SORT OF COMPLEMENT YOUR ALREADY RICH GROUP OF REVIEWERS? THAT'S SOMETHING THAT'S APPROPRIATE TO DO. YOU CAN ALSO TALK TO YOUR PROJECT OFFICER, EVEN BEFORE THEN, AND BASICALLY SAY WELL, LISTEN, I HAVE A PROPOSAL THAT I HAVE THAT BASICALLY WILL BE USING BOTH APPROACHES. WHAT DO YOU THINK OF IT? WHAT TYPES OF REVIEW GROUPS MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN IT? REMEMBER, THOSE PROJECT OFFICERS OFTEN SIT IN ON REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETINGS. SO AS THEY SIT IN THOSE MEETINGS, THEY BASICALLY GET A CHANCE OF SORT OF WHAT TYPES OF REVIEWERS ARE THERE. SO THEY CAN GIVE YOU GREAT INFORMATION. SO YES. THERE ARE WAYS OF INFLUENCING THE PROCESS, IF IT'S A SPECIAL EMPHASIZE PANEL, USUALLY YOU'RE NOT GOING TO KNOW WHO IS ON IT UNTIL VERY -- RIGHT BEFORE THE PANEL, MAYBE 30 DAYS BEFORE. BUT IF IT'S A REGULAR REVIEW COMMITTEE, ALL THE MEMBERS ARE LISTED. THEY ALL HAVE FOUR YEAR TERMS SO YOU CAN SEE WHO IS ON THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND YOU CAN RESEARCH THAT, AND YOU CAN ACTUALLY DO -- WE DO THAT. WE DO LITERATURE SEARCHES OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS. WE FIND OUT WHAT TYPES OF WORK, NOT JUST THE TOPIC, BUT ALSO THEIR STYLE, AND HOW THEY FEEL ABOUT PARTICULAR RESEARCH METHODS. AND IF YOU DON'T FEEL THAT THERE IS ANY CONFIDENCE IN THAT REVIEW COMMITTEE TO BASICALLY UNDERSTAND YOUR PROPOSAL, THEN YOU PROBABLY DON'T WANT TO KIND OF TARGET THAT REVIEW COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT IT TO.
THANK YOU. WE HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS WE WANT TO GET TO, SO ONE PERSON ASKED DID YOU PUBLISH YOUR STUDIES AS A SINGLE MIXED METHOD STUDY OR SEPARATE QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH STUDY?

SO -- SO THAT'S A REALLY GOOD QUESTION, AND AGAIN, THIS COMES UP TO ONE OF THE BARRIERS THAT OCCURS WITH PAGE LIMITATIONS. WE HAVE ONE STUDY THAT WE'RE -- ONE OF MY COLLEAGUES IS DOING IN NORWAY. AND IT'S A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF PEOPLE WHO GOT GIARDIA AND WHAT HAPPENED TO THEM A FEW YEARS LATER. IN THAT STUDY, AGAIN, BECAUSE IT WAS QUALITATIVE, WE COULDN'T EVEN PUT IT IN ONE STUDY. THERE WAS ACTUALLY THREE STUDIES THAT ARE COMING OUT, TAKING THREE DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF IT. WE HAVE ANOTHER STUDY GOING ON NOW ABOUT RECOVERY. AND WE HAVE INTERVIEWED PHYSICIANS ABOUT HOW THEY DEFINE RECOVERY. WE'VE INTERVIEWED PATIENTS. AND QUALITATIVE STUDIES, TO REALLY CAPTURE WHAT'S GOING ON, WE ACTUALLY HAVE HAD TO DIVIDE THEM UP INTO SEVERAL PAPERS. SO IN OUR EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY THAT I MENTIONED, WE -- SOME OF YOUR RESULTS IN QUANTITATIVE RESEARCHES, SOME OF YOUR RESULTS IN QUALITATIVE JOURNALS. THE REASON WE DID THIS WAS BECAUSE TO GET THROUGH -- TO GET THAT 25 TO 30 PAGES, WAS JUST VERY DIFFICULT TO BASICALLY DO ONE, DO THEM BOTH TOGETHER. SO I WOULD SAY WE OFTEN SPLIT THEM APART BUT NOT ALWAYS. SOMETIMES WE HAVE BASICALLY HAD A JOURNAL THAT WOULD GIVE US THE SPACE, AND WE WERE JUST VERY CAREFUL ABOUT HOW MUCH TIME WE PUT DESCRIBING THE METHODOLOGY OF THE QUANTITATIVE AND THE QUALITATIVE SO THAT WE COULD GET THE RICHNESS OF BOTH THE DATA QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE. SO I WOULD SAY THAT OFTEN, WE DO SPLIT THEM APART. BECAUSE THE SPACE ISSUES WITH JOURNALS, IF YOU HAVE A MONOGRAPH OR A BOOK, CERTAINLY YOU'VE GOT -- IF YOU HAVE A MONOGRAPH OR A BOOK YOU HAVE MORE ABILITY TO PUT THEM TOGETHER. THERE ARE SOME JOURNALS THAT ARE VERY INTERESTED IN MULTI METHOD RESEARCH, AND YOU CAN SUBMIT YOUR ARTICLES TO THOSE JOURNALS. AND YOU JUST HAVE TO BE A LITTLE BIT CAREFUL WITH HOW MUCH SPACE I HAVE TO DESCRIBE THE DIFFERENT METHODS, AS WELL AS THE RESULTS.

OKAY. THE NEXT PERSON WRITES I TEACH OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY, MASTER'S LEVEL STUDENTS AND MENTOR RESEARCH. HOW DO YOU RECOMMEND BETTER PREPARING THEM TO EMBRACE MIXED METHOD APPROACH?

I DO THINK IF IT'S POSSIBLE, IF YOU HAVE A COURSE IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS WHICH IS USUALLY OCCURS IN MOST OF THESE SCHOOLS, BUT MAYBE HAVING A COURSE IN QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE METHODS. SO IF YOU COULD HAVE COURSES IN BOTH AREAS, OR AT LEAST ONE COURSE IN BOTH AREAS, THAT'S REALLY IMPORTANT. AND THEN EVEN BETTER, IF YOU COULD ACTUALLY HAVE A COURSE IN MIXED METHODS, MAYBE AN ADVANCED SEMINAR. WHERE YOU HAVE A CHANCE TO ACTUALLY REVIEW STUDIES THAT HAVE USED BOTH. I RECOGNIZE THAT LOTS OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS DON'T HAVE THE TIME AND SPACE TO HAVE ALL THESE TYPES OF METHODOLOGY COURSES. BUT I WOULD AT MINIMUM RECOGNIZE FOR COMPETENCE AND QUANTITATIVE COMPETENCE IN QUALITATIVE, SO AT LEAST ONE GETS SOME EXPERIENCE IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN BOTH AREAS, AND THEN IF YOU HAVE THE LUXURY OF BEING ABLE TO HAVE A COURSE IN MIXED METHODS, THAT'S WONDERFUL. AND YOU CAN ALSO TELL YOUR STUDENTS THAT THEY CAN POTENTIALLY, FOR EXAMPLE, ATTEND WORKSHOPS, THIS TYPE OF WEBINAR, OR EVEN KIND OF READINGS. AND AGAIN, THERE IS
A number of books out there besides my own and Dave's that cover these areas. So individuals who have particular interest -- I must admit, lots of students are really interested in getting competence in both areas. So I find that the students at DePaul in our clinical community, in our community program, once they do quantitative methods, they want to then experience qualitative methods. Sometimes they want to actually do both. Which is really exciting. So I find having some exposure to both areas is really very important, even though one might be dominantly in one area, one can certainly have a secondary area that one has with. Enough experience that one wants to do collaborative research, one can bring in an expert that a person maybe is not that strong at.

>> Can you quickly provide the reference for Tasha Corey et al. 2003?

>> I can. Maybe I can do that by E-mail to you.

>> Okay. I'll make sure it's posted on our website.

>> I'll get that to you.

>> The next question is I wonder if Dr. Jason might comment on multi methods and the use or multi method verses mixed method approach, using different methodologies from the same research paradigm.

>> Yeah, I think that's really interesting. That -- within a particular method, often using several different strategies can be extremely helpful to understanding the phenomenon. And whether it's qualitative or quantitative methods, there is so many different rich ways of understanding stuff. In a sense, these are all just like tool kits. These are tools that we use to understand the reality of nature. And nature is complicated. Nature is not often linear. It's often kind of has feedback loops, often like systems that have to be understood. And really to understand those systems, and the dynamics in those systems, we need to have the richest ways of understanding that and I basically think that having the mixed method approach gives you the richness of that dynamic system that we're hopefully trying to understand, gets us beyond simple A to B linear projects, which unfortunately still represents the type work that occurs in our field.

>> Okay. Another person writes one of the reasons I can think about why the qualitative research is relatively particular to get funded is because the results might be difficult to replicated and verified. How do you deal with this concern?

>> Yeah, I mean certainly that is -- people who don't have training in some of the qualitative methods are kind of concerned about generalizable information. But certainly, if you understand that different context might draw for different types of phenomenon and behaviors and attitudes, beliefs, that we can basically have a richness of a contextual way of understanding people and relationship to their environments. And how that basically, that transaction really occurs. And I think these types of methods that help us
UNDERSTAND THESE PHENOMENA ARE REALLY INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT. AND AS SOME PEOPLE DISMISS ONE METHOD OR ANOTHER METHOD, I THINK THAT'S JUST A LIMITATION OF THEIR OWN TRAINING, BECAUSE THE REALITY, EACH HAS, TO GIVE US. MINOR AND I THINK THAT WHILE SOME QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH MIGHT BE MORE GENERALIZABLE, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH HAS ITS STRENGTHS TOO, OF UNDERSTANDING THE DEPTH OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT'S GOING ON WITHIN THAT PARTICULAR SETTING. SO TOGETHER, THEY REALLY PROVIDE A STORY THAT OFTEN ISN'T TOLD BY ONE OR THE OTHER.

>> DO YOU EVER MIX FUNDING STREAMS SO THAT YOU GET THE QUANTITATIVE ASPECTS FUNDED BY ONE SOURCE, AND THE QUALITATIVE ASPECTS FUNDED BY A DIFFERENT SOURCE?

>> THAT'S AN INTERESTING QUESTION. I THINK THAT WE PRIMARILY HAVE FOCUSED ON ONE SOURCE OF FUNDING TO DO OUR RESEARCH. AND IT WOULD BE LIKE A PARTICULAR GRANT. WE OFTEN DON'T HAVE MULTIPLE GRANTS SUPPORTING A PARTICULAR AREA OF RESEARCH. BUT I THINK THAT IS POSSIBLE. THERE ARE SOME, FOR EXAMPLE, FOUNDATIONS THAT WOULD BE PARTICULARLY MORE INTERESTED IN ONE PARTICULAR METHOD THAN THE OTHER. OUR GROUP AT DEPAUL GENERALLY DOESN'T GO AFTER FOUNDATION RESEARCH. WE JUST HAPPEN TO GO AFTER MORE FEDERAL SOURCES OF SUPPORT. BUT I THINK THOSE UNITS THAT ARE WORKING WITH, FOR EXAMPLE, COUNTIES, WORKING WITH STATES, WORKING WITH NOT FOR PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS, WORKING WITH FOUNDATIONS, THERE IS PROBABLY LOCAL WAYS, LOCAL SOURCES OF FUNDING THAT MIGHT BE MORE INTERESTED IN QUALITATIVE METHODS AND OUTCOMES THAN EVEN QUANTITATIVE. SO YES. I THINK ONE CAN EASILY HAVE MULTI SOURCES OF FUNDING, DIFFERENT TYPES OF THE RESEARCH TO BE FUNDED. OUR GROUP GENERALLY HAS NOT GONE THAT DIRECTION. I THINK SOME GROUPS DO. WELL, THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR ALL OF YOUR USEFUL INFORMATION. AND THANK YOU EVERYONE WHO PARTICIPATED IN TODAY'S WEBINAR. THE MEDICINE MIND THE FAP WEBSITE, WHICH IS PREVENTION.NIH.GOV/MIND THE GAP YOU WILL FIND SEVERAL RESOURCES FOR THIS TALK, INCLUDING THE SLIDES, REFERENCES AND A LINK TO COMPLETE AN EVALUATION. YOUR FEEDBACK IS VERY IMPORTANT TO US AS WE PLAN FUTURE SESSIONS. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. PLEASE JOIN US NEXT MONTH FOR A SESSION WITH DR. MURRAY FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH ABOUT THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES ASSOCIATED WITH DISSEMINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION RESEARCH.
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