**Initial discussion question**

Week 3 - Peer Feedback

66 unread replies.1515 replies.

Your initial discussion thread is due on Day 3 (Thursday) and you have until Day 7 (Monday) to respond to your classmates. Your grade will reflect both the quality of your initial post and the depth of your responses. Refer to the Discussion Forum Grading Rubric under the Settings icon above for guidance on how your discussion will be evaluated.

This discussion will be assessed on a 10-point scale and is **worth 4% of your final grade**.

|  |
| --- |
| **Quantitative Research Studies: Part 1 (Peer Feedback) [WLO: 1] [CLO: 2]** |

Prior to beginning work on this discussion forum, review the articles by Barnham (2015), Quantitative and Qualitative Research: Perceptual Foundations, and Rutberg and Bouikidis (2018), Focusing on the Fundamentals: A Simplistic Differentiation Between Qualitative and Quantitative Research. Additionally, review the [*Qualitative vs. Quantitative* (Links to an external site.)](https://youtu.be/2X-QSU6-hPUQuantitative) video and the [How to Read a Scholarly Article (Links to an external site.)](https://content.bridgepointeducation.com/curriculum/file/048e028b-dffc-4c85-895b-207550b65a9e/1/How%20to%20Read%20a%20Scholarly%20Article.zip/story.html) Refer to the “College of Doctoral Studies APA Template,” found on the [Introduction to APA (Links to an external site.)](https://writingcenter.ashford.edu/introduction-apa) webpage, to help you correctly cite journal articles. It is also recommended that you review the video entitled [Identifying and Finding Quantitative and Qualitative Research (Links to an external site.)](https://iad.scorm.canvaslms.com/ScormEngineInterface/defaultui/deliver.jsp?preventRightClick=false&cc=en_US&configuration=47N24QQMQYKNINME5NNZVGLW43TFWQON3OI7FDRDTVO3CLZ7BLCK27V7SESKJM4XKC3MOJCDGCKQZ6AZ3QVCEMKU6VXMHF2IFLBLS6O7I3GKJU4C52TB6RM3CWYFH7QBNZKXR3WLSG3W3YJDSASH6PQB4K4Y4ZEDTRAVWI4BKBV4QPFKDTQHXSLFYI2VOEUK4DNUC67MTKKJQG3FP6KBJHOAABCPEHCDMUAG3NBIQJ2UWCE3DB52PE3BACDJLXV3Q5ZFPOUY7LG42W4GQLSNSWDIZYUJFTIA2FMG6HTRN7KIT3BIFZHBF5FYL32DPH252RG62JPCJVCOPFOQF7ZPCS4AKXJITT7NLNRRASXRX2O4IE65JJ2Y72IK2EKBAEAJW2RBMLOGWKTZQ&ieCompatibilityMode=none&registration=47N24QQMQYKNI6KOGEFO6D3NSGOLAZ5CGMFFQCUD2K5U4KFBZPNETFN6JFX7R7EGMGW2DZHT3CXK6L4VQMDCCZ5E3PB2MDQMFFN4YFEIIH544NCT7CEVLMTROBO3G772&registration=47N24QQMQYKNISI3GTVVZZSPWPJFNZHQRKGWBNEZJY4QDJFOVIPJ7FCOJX7B4GVK53X67QXAW3RWRBZNL5YUPLCZO4CVNI3I54LRSDQ&ts=20191022183348&redirectUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fscone-prod.us-east-1.insops.net%2Fpackages%2F257720%2Flaunch_complete%3Flocale%3Den).

This discussion forum is the first part of a two-part integration. The peer and instructor feedback you receive in this discussion forum will be integrated and submitted in this week’s written assignment. You must provide feedback on your peers’ initial posts by **Day 5** of this week.

Continue to gather information about the topic of interest and the research focus you identified in Week 1. Identify three journal articles that report on *quantitative research studies* that address the research topic or research focus of interest to you.

In your initial discussion post that incorporates and cites information from at least two required or recommended resources,

* Create a complete APA citation for three articles that report on *quantitative research studies* that address your research topic or research focus. Consider accessing the Writing Center’s [Formatting Your References List (Links to an external site.)](https://writingcenter.ashford.edu/format-your-reference-list) for more on completing a complete reference citation.
* Append your three article to your initial discussion form post by **Day 3**
	+ The simplest way to post more than one file to a Canvas discussion is to zip the multiple files together and then upload them as a single file in your discussion post. Follow the [How to Create and Open Zip Files on PC and Mac (Links to an external site.)](https://www.sweetwater.com/sweetcare/articles/how-to-zip-and-unzip-files/) for step-by-step instructions for zipping and unzipping files on either a PC or a Mac.
* Identify the characteristics of each article that tell you the study is a *quantitative* research study, and not a qualitative research study, citing at least two required or recommended resources.
* Discuss how these three studies are useful in helping you develop a better understanding of your topic of interest or your research focus, and what you learned from each study.

**Guided Response:**Answer any questions your instructor has about your initial post. Review several of your classmates’ posts, prioritizing those who have not received feedback, and respond to at least two of your classmates’ posts by **Day 5**.

Each of your responses to your classmates should be at least 100 words in length. Indicate whether you agree that the studies identified by your classmate are quantitative research studies. Provide specific information to reinforce your assessment. Reflect on your classmate’s appraisal of the usefulness of each study.

You are encouraged to post your required replies early in the week to provide opportunities for interaction and further discourse within this forum. Continue to monitor the discussion forum through Day 7, and respond with robust dialogue to anyone who replies to your initial post.

Compile your instructor’s and classmates’ feedback and navigate to this week’s [assignment](https://ashford.instructure.com/courses/59266/assignments/1184715) to complete Part 2.

**Post 1(100words)**

[**Brittany Johnson**](https://ashford.instructure.com/courses/59266/users/231022)

ThursdayFeb 6 at 10:25am

[Manage Discussion Entry](https://ashford.instructure.com/courses/59266/discussion_topics/1653117)

Sarteschi, C. (2011). Assessing the effectiveness of MHC: A Quantitative Review. Journal of Criminal Justice, Volume 39, Issue 1, pages 12-20.

This article was a quantitative study that analyzed the importance of MHC. The study included both peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed studies. The main objective of this study was to determine if MHC are an efficacious intervention method for criminology and the problems associated. The methods used included a meta-analytic technique and a systematic search of an electronic database, as well as literature in July 2009. In conjuction with email surveys of MHC program directors, 18 studies were generated. This particular study is useful in helping me understand if MHC is successful and how the overall implementation of the programs in place reduce recidivism.

Anestis, J. C., Carbonell, J. L. (2014). Stopping the revolving door: Effectiveness of MHCs in reducing recidivism by mentally ill defendants. Psychiatric Services, 65, 1105-1112

This article conducts a quantitative overview of MHC and addressing the growing problem of offenders with mental illnesses cycling through the judicial system. The article also employs the mixed method by using quantitative studies to evaluate the effectiveness of one single MHC on measures involving criminal recidivism, the history of events as well as negative regression. Qualitative studies included court observations and interviews. This study suggested that providing incentives for compliance with programs and proper connection with mental health treatment services and completion of such programs can aide in reducing recidivism. This article was essential in identifying how mixed method research can show how effective programs and treatments can be in reducing recidivism. It also identified how mixed method research can yield similar yet different results.

Pullman, M. (2006). Offenders with Mental Health Needs: Reducing Recidivism using Wraparound. Center for Evaluation and Program Improvement. Volume 52, Issue 3 pp. 375-397

This article conducts a quantitative analysis on the concept and success rate of wrap around planning as it relates to mental health and offenders. Wrap around planning involves MHC (Mental Health Courts), families, providers and any other form of identified services and supports. The analysis was between a program called Connections that housed 106 offenders and another that housed 98 offenders, who were using traditional treatment means for mental health. The study revealed that the offenders in the Connections program were less likely to re-offend at all and less likely to re-offend with a felony offense. This article is usually in helping to identify which programs, if any, had successful rates in helping offenders with treatment that would reduce their rate of recidivism.
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Quantitative and qualitative research studies exhibit variations that contribute to the difference regarding the nature of the studies. While quantitative research provides factual and hard data, qualitative research is known to offer deep insights into the research and deep comprehension of the topic of evaluation (Barnham, 2015). It is imperative to ascertain the type of research in which a given study is categorized. It is vital to determine the distinct attributes or characteristics of both the quantitative and qualitative study. For a quantitative research study, the researchers embrace the use of structured research instruments in the gathering of data. As well, quantitative studies entail the use of large samples, which acts as a representative of the whole population (Barnham, 2015). Moreover, in the quantitative studies, researchers of the study clearly articulate the research questions and the objectives of the study.

The article by Beer and Chipps (2014) can be presumed to be a quantitative research study since the researchers of the given study deployed the use of questionnaires in gathering data for the study. As mentioned earlier, one of the attributes of a quantitative research study is that the researchers of the study embrace the use of structured research instruments in gathering data for the study. Therefore the research by Beer and Chipps (2014) is a quantitative study since the instrument used in data gathering is structured. In the given study, the participants were required to respond to questions in a questionnaire regarding the challenges of enhancing cultural competency in the organization setting and their cultural competence.

An article by C, M, and V (2016) is a quantitative study since the methods used in the evaluation of the data are statistical, thus presenting factual information. According to the study by C, M, and V (2016), a quasi-experimental design was embraced with a sample of 328 community nurses. The study sought to explore the strategies that should be deployed in improving cultural competences among the health care providers and community nurses. One of the characteristics of a quantitative study depicted in the article is the use of a large sample size, which acts as a representation of the whole population. A sample size of 328 is large, and therefore the results of the particular study can be generalized to a whole population.

A critical evaluation of the study carried out by Gemarino (2014) is a quantitative study since, in the article, the researcher has stated the purpose of the study and the objectives of the study. Moreover, the author has articulately outlined the four research questions that guided the study. The primary objective of the researcher was to examine the aspect of cultural competence and sensitivity among oncology nurses. According to the author, the research employed the standardized survey instrument in gathering information from the respondents (Gemarino, 2014). As well, the researcher embraced the technique of inferential statistics in data analysis, thus justifying the research as a quantitative study.

The three evaluated studies are of significance to the topic of study since they have explored the concept of cultural competency and the strategies that can be used in improving cultural competency in the health care settings. The article by Beer and Chipps (2014) contributes to the understanding of the topic since it evaluates the level of cultural diversity in the health care setting and the measures for enhancing cultural competency. Beer and Chipps (2014) assert that health care providers should target the inception of culturally responsive health care services. A study by C, M, and V(2016) is also significant since it suggests the deployment of feasible programs in the enhancement of cultural competency among the community health care providers. As well, the research by Gemarino (2014) contributes to the understanding of the topic since it explores the need for improving cultural competence among the oncology health care providers.
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While qualitative research generally focuses on answering *how* questions, quantitative research seeks to answer *what*questions (Barnham, 2015). Quantitative research also centers on measurement and strives to be objective (Barnham, 2015; Rutberg&Bouikidis, 2018). The three studies I identified help illuminate how diverse quantitative research design can be although all three studies employ the same types of instrument: surveys.

In Cagle’s (2013) study, he literally quantifies (counts) the interpretive materials available at 563 nature centers. This was achieved through the distribution of questionnaires with closed-ended questions in contrast to qualitative methods which would necessitate a more constructive approach in which the researcher acts as a tool of research (Rutberg&Bouikidis, 2018).

It should be noted that over 1,800 surveys were distributed. In other words, there is clearly a self-report bias one must account for because we are only hearing from people who like participating in surveys.

ŠvajdaadČinčera (2017) used unobtrusive observation to determine the attention capture and holding power of signs on an outdoor trail in Slovakia. Because this type of observation furnishes nothing more than a measurement of whether or not people stop in front of a sign and for how long, it is a good example of quantitative research. The number arrived at is useful because it tells researchers whether or not signs are working and “may be used to determine relationships between variables and outcomes” (Rutberg&Bouikidis, 2018, p. 211). However, it does not inform as to the reason for the behavior. One would need to implement qualitative methods to do that.

Zgłobicki and Baran-Zgłobicka (2013) performed a quantitative case study in which surveys were once again the instruments used to gauge interest levels and awareness of local geology in tourists. Scores were devised that “allows us to count the phenomena we experience in the world and to identify the connections (or incidences) that exist between perceptions” (Barnham, 2015, p. 843). However one should be cautioned that in order for quantitative methods to work, sample sizes need to be sufficient (Rutberg&Bouikidis, 2018), in contrast with qualitative studies in which small populations are more commonplace.
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