

Assignment 2: The Research Question

Objectives: After completing this assignment, you will be able to

- Find a research report using the UF library system
- Identify and interpret the objectives and research question in research reports
- Identify and interpret the author's theoretical or research hypothesis
- Analyze how the variables in the specific study relate to the constructs and linkages in the theoretical framework
- Evaluate the degree to which the research contributes to theoretical understanding and to solving problems, issues or needs

Select any one of the articles listed below for this assignment. There is NO direct link at Canvas or the course website to the reports. You have to look them up using the UF library system. You do **NOT** have to pay to get the article if you get it through the UF library system. If you fail to use the library system, you will have to pay for the article.

Adorno, E., Chassler, D., D'Ippolito, M., Garte-Wolf, S. et al. (2013) Predisposing, enabling, and need factors associated with addiction treatment among Massachusetts Puerto Rican drug users. *Social Work Research* 37(3), 195-206. DOI: 10.1093/swr/svt021

Asakura, K. (2017) Paving pathways through the pain: A grounded theory of resilience among lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 27(3), 521-536. DOI: 10.1111/jora.12291.

Berge, J.M., Arikian, A., Doherty, W.J. & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2012) Healthful eating and physical activity in the home environment: Results from multifamily focus groups. *Journal of Nutrition Education & Behavior* 44(2), 123-131. doi:10.1016/j.jneb.2011.06.011

De Coster S, Thompson MS. (2017) Race and general strain theory: Microaggressions as mundane extreme environmental stresses. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*. 34(5):903-930. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2016.1236204.

Dentato, M.P., Halkitis, P.N. & Orwat, J. (2013) Minority stress theory: An examination of factors surrounding sexual risk behavior among gay and bisexual men who use club drugs. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 25(4), 509-525, DOI: 10.1080/10538720.2013.829395

Dey, S., Resurreccion, B.P. & Doneys, P. (2014) Gender and environmental struggles: Voices from Adivasi Garo community in Bangladesh. *Gender, Place & Culture* 21(8), 945-962. DOI: 10.1080/0966369X.2013.832662

Hajiran H. (2006) Toward a quality of life theory: Net domestic product of happiness. *Soc Indicators Res*. 75(1):31-43. doi: 10.1007/s11205-004-4646-5.

Hamm, J.A. (2017) Trust, trustworthiness, and motivation in the natural resource management context. *Society & Natural Resources* 30(8), 919-933. DOI: /10.1080/08941920.2016.1273419

Hodge, C.J., Kanters, M.A., Forneris, T., Bocarro, J.N. & Sayre-McCord, R. (2017) A family thing: Positive youth development outcomes of a sport-based life skills program. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration* 35(1), 34-50. Doi: 10.18666/JPra-2017-V35I1-V35-11-6840

Inoue Y, Wegner CE, Jordan JS, Funk DC. (2015) Relationships between self-determined motivation and developmental outcomes in sport-based positive youth development. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*. 27(4):371-383. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2015.1010662.

Jagers, R.J., Lozada, F.T., Rivas-Drake, D. & Guillaume, C. (2017) Classroom and school predictors of civic engagement among Black and Latino middle school youth. *Child Development* 88(4), 1125-1138. DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12871

Kogan, S.M., Cho, J., Simons, L.G., Allen, K.A. et al. (2015) Pubertal timing and sexual risk behaviors among rural African American male youth: Testing a model based on life history theory. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 44(3), 609-618. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-014-0410-3.

Kubiliene N, Yan MC, Kumsa MK, Burman K. (2015) The response of youth to racial discrimination: Implications for resilience theory. *Journal of Youth Studies*. 18(3):338-356. doi: 10.1080/13676261.2014.963535.

Lee Westmaas J, Berg CJ, Alcaraz KI, Stein K. (2015) Health behavior theory constructs and smoking and cessation-related behavior among survivors of ten cancers nine years after diagnosis: A report from the American Cancer Society's study of cancer survivors-I. *Psychooncology*. 24(10):1286-1294. doi: 10.1002/pon.3885

Macias, T. (2015) Risks, trust, and sacrifice: Social structural motivators for environmental change. *Social Science Quarterly* 96(5), 1264-1276. DOI: 10.1111/ssqu.12201.

Marchini, S. & Macdonald, D.W. (2012) Predicting ranchers' intention to kill jaguars: Case studies in Amazonia and Pantanal. *Biological Conservation* 147(1), 213-221. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2012.01.002

McCleery, R.A. (2009) Improving attitudinal frameworks to predict behaviors in human-wildlife conflicts. *Society & Natural Resources* 22(4), 353-368. DOI: Conflicts, Society & Natural Resources, 22:4, 353-368, DOI: 10.1080/08941920802064414

Montgomery, M.C., Chakraborty, J., Grineski, S.E. & Collins, T.W. (2015) An environmental justice assessment of public beach access in Miami, Florida. *Applied Geography* 62, 147-156. DOI: 10.1016/j.apgeog.2015.04.016.

Murphy C, Vernon S, Diamond P, Tiro J. (2014) Competitive testing of health behavior theories: How do benefits, barriers, subjective norm, and intention influence mammography behavior? *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 47(1):120-129. 10.1007/s12160-013-9528-0.

Nylund D. (2007) Reading Harry Potter: Popular culture, queer theory and the fashioning of youth identity. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*. 26(2):13-24.

Pailler, S., Naidoo, R., Burgess, N.D., Freeman, O.E. & Fisher, B. (2015) Impacts of community-based natural resource management on wealth, food security and child health in Tanzania. *PLoS ONE* 10(7):1-22. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0133252

Park H, Yoon J, Crosby SD. (2016) A pilot study of big brothers big sisters programs and youth development: An application of critical race theory. *Children & Youth Services Review*, 61: 83-89. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.12.010.

Potts, R., Vella, K., Dale, A. & Sipe, N. (2016) Evaluating governance arrangements and decision making for natural resource management planning: An empirical application of the governance systems analysis framework. *Society & Natural Resources* 29(11), 1325-1341.

Proyer RT, Gander F, Wellenzohn S, Ruch W. (2016) Addressing the role of personality, ability, and positive and negative affect in positive psychology interventions: Findings from a randomized intervention based on the authentic happiness theory and extensions. *Journal of Positive Psychology*. 11(6):609-621. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2015.1137622.

Rendina, H.J., Gamarel, K.E., Pachankis, J.E., Ventuneac, A., Grov, C. & Parsons, J.T. (2017) Extending the minority stress model to incorporate HIV-positive gay and bisexual men's experiences: A longitudinal examination of mental health and sexual risk behavior. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 51(2), 147-158. DOI: 10.1007/s12160-016-9822-8.

Rust, N.A. & Taylor, N. (2016) Carnivores, colonization, and conflict: A qualitative case study on the intersectional persecution of predators and people in Namibia. *Anthrozoos* 29(4), 653-667. DOI: 10.1080/08927936.2016.1228758

Semp D. (2011) Questioning heteronormativity: Using queer theory to inform research and practice within public mental health services. *Psychology & Sexuality*. 2(1):69-86. doi: 10.1080/19419899.2011.536317.

Shannon, C.S. (2013) Bullying in recreation and sport settings: Exploring risk factors, prevention efforts, and intervention strategies. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration* 31(1), 15-33.

Sotirov, M. & Winkel, G. (2016) Toward a cognitive theory of shifting coalitions and policy change: Linking the advocacy coalition framework and cultural theory. *Policy Science* 49(2), 125-154. DOI: 10.1007/s11077-015-9235-8.

Spencer MB, Fegley SG, Harpalani V. (2003) A theoretical and empirical examination of identity as coping: Linking coping resources to the self processes of African American youth. *Applied Developmental Science*. 7(3):181-188.

Urban JB, Lewin-Bizan S, Lerner RM. (2009) The role of neighborhood ecological assets and activity involvement in youth developmental outcomes: Differential impacts of asset poor and asset rich neighborhoods. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 30(5):601-614. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2009.07.003.

Williams NJ, Glisson C. (2014) Testing a theory of organizational culture, climate and youth outcomes in child welfare systems: A united states national study. *Child Abuse Negl*. 38(4):757-767. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.09.003

Submit the completed flow chart (see below) on Canvas under Assignment 1: The Research Question. **Use this title for the submission "Your Last Name_First Author Last Name_A1"**
Example: Swisher_Kogan_A1

Complete the template called "Flow Chart Template for ARTICLES YOU READ." There is a link to this document at the course home page. Do NOT try to use the one called "Flow Chart for YOUR DESIGNS." Provide some detail. I need to be able to assess how well you understand the information in this article. I cannot do that if you do not provide some detail. Answer all questions **in your own words**. You will receive **zero points for simply repeating what the**

authors say – copy and paste is NOT an option. The questions below have a **bold heading** – it indicates the column in the Flow Chart where your answer(s) go.

Do no try to write paragraphs. I want clear, precise statements written in your own words and terms. Quality – not quantity of words counts. The instructions below indicate which boxes you need to complete in this assignment and, in a few cases, provide some further clarification about what is needed. They do **not** replace the instructions in the Flow Chart for Articles You Read. You will not fill out all of the boxes in this assignment. **These instructions tell you which boxes to leave blank in this assignment.**

BOX 1: Research Questions & Objectives. Most researchers describe the contributions to the body of knowledge that they want to make with a specific study in the introduction, often using a phrase like “The objectives of this research are...” Do **not** copy and paste. Explain what the author hopes to contribute in **your own words**. Do not “invent” contributions that the author never mentions, but read carefully and try to understand what the author wants to achieve.

A. Research Question.

B. Topic. What contributions (new information, new setting, new population, new factors) to the empirical evidence about the topic does the author hope to make?

C. Explanation. What does the author want to add to how we understand and can address the PIN of interest?

D. Theory. What contributions to theory does s/he want to make? Be prudent in this response. Good research questions are theory-based, but **not all researchers want to build or develop theory**. Many researchers **use theory** without trying to **develop theory**. If the article you select **uses theory but does not develop theory, leave this blank**. Do not confuse the two. **A researcher who wants to develop theory will usually have explicit objectives about building theory**. Examples of building theory are to add to theory, to test theory under new conditions, to test a new theory to explain something that existing theories do not explain well, or to compare which of two or more theories provides the best explanation for something. Failure to develop theory is **not** an indication of a weak or poor contribution to the body of knowledge. Failure to **use theory** is often a weakness.

E. Research Design. Do NOT complete.

BOX 2: Theoretical Constructs & Linkages Explored in the Research. Scientific research focuses on addressing problems, issues or needs by adding to knowledge. Therefore, good scientific research questions ask what we need to **know or understand** to be able to address a problem, issue or need. Research based on such questions is **explanatory as well as descriptive**. These research questions are usually theory-based, even if the author does not want to build or test theory. State the research question(s) **in your own words**. Do NOT copy and paste. For example, the research question might be “How does self-efficacy affect graduate student performance in research?” This is a very simple example of a research question. You will probably see a more complex question that explores several relationships. State **all of the research questions**. I suggest you number them. It makes it easier to complete the assignment.

- A. Constructs.** Do not confuse the topic with the theoretical construct. For example, the **theory** of planned behavior states that subjective norms strongly influence normative beliefs, which in turn affect our decisions to engage in specific behaviors. A specific research article may examine how peer influences affect young people’s decision to smoke. This is the **topic** of the research. The **theoretical constructs** examined are subjective norms, normative beliefs, and behavior.
- B. Research Hypotheses.** Hypotheses are statements about relationships. General or working hypotheses are typically based on relationships among constructs as they are expressed with regard to a specific topic. Some people, particularly people who use qualitative analysis, refer to these as “propositions. General hypotheses deal with the anticipated relationships between constructs in a theory **applied to a specific topic**. Some authors explicitly state the research or working hypothesis: “We expected that peer influences [a construct] would strongly influence the decision to smoke [a topic].” Others state it vaguely: “The proposed relationships between peer influence and smoking behavior ...” Others do not state it at all. You have to figure it out for yourself. State the general, working or research hypotheses (these are the same thing) in **your own words**. This is not a statistical hypothesis and should not be confused with a statistical hypothesis. A statistical hypothesis states the anticipated effect between two or more **variables** in a study – not constructs.
- C. Interventions or Treatments.** Was there some direct intervention – some manipulation designed to foster or cause changes in the participants, to make them different than they were before participating in the study. These might be changes in knowledge, behavior, attitudes, health status, or identity, for example.

BOX 3: Variables & Level of Measurement

- A. Comparison Group**
- B. Outcome Variables**
- C. Independent or Predictor Variables**

BOX 4: Sampling -- NOT NEEDED IN ASSIGNMENT 2. LEAVE THIS BLANK.

BOX 5: Data Collection Procedures – NOT NEEDED IN ASSIGNMENT 2. LEAVE THIS BLANK.

BOX 6: Statistical Data Analysis. Complete only those sections indicated below and only if statistical data analyses were used.

- A. Hypotheses.** List any specific hypotheses that you can identify. Do not be overly concerned in this assignment if you cannot identify or state the hypotheses. We will get to that later. You do not need to name the test used or the specific results.
- B. Unplanned Tests -- NOT NEEDED IN ASSIGNMENT 2. LEAVE THIS BLANK.**
- C. Key Results**

BOX 7: Qualitative Data Analysis.

- A. **Analyses Performed.** Describe these very briefly in your own words.
- B. **Presentation of Results**
- C. **Procedures to Ensure Rigor -- NOT NEEDED IN ASSIGNMENT 2. LEAVE THIS BLANK.**
- D. **Key Results**

BOX 8: CONCLUSIONS

- A. **Topical.** What did the author add to what we know about the topic? What did s/he find that was new and different? What did they reconfirm that others had reported before? What did they leave unanswered with regard to their objectives (Box 1-A)?
- B. **Explain & Understand.** What did the author add to how we understand and can explain the problem s/he wanted to address? What did s/he find that was new and different? What did they reconfirm that others had reported before? What did they leave unanswered with regard to their objectives (Box 1-B)?
- C. **Develop Theory.** IF the authors intended to contribute to the development of theory, what did they add? Did they reject the theory? Did they compare two theories and find that one is a better explanation than the other? Did they propose new constructs or ideas to include in a theory? Did they propose a new theory?

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS: These are where you reach your conclusions about the quality of this work. This is not an “opinion” or whether you liked the article or whether you thought it was an important question or even the right question. This is reasoned evaluation of the quality of the contribution made by this study. Use, cite and reference the research design literature extensively in your responses to these two questions.

1. **Your assessment of the contributions made by the research.** There is no box for this on the form. Just add this after the table – it does not have to be in a box. Go back to the objectives (Box 1) and the conclusions (Box 8). For each objective you listed, indicate whether you think the authors were able to make a meaningful contribution or not. This is ***your assessment of the value of the research, not what the authors say (what they say goes in Box 8)***. Remember for a researcher, it is ***as or even more important to disprove than confirm what you expected to find***. Not “finding what you thought you would” **IS** a contribution to the body of knowledge. The question here is “Did they succeed in making meaningful contributions to the body of knowledge – whether or not it all turned out “like they thought it should”? Justify your assessment. If you think not – what were the weaknesses? If you think they made good contributions, what was it that impressed you?
2. **Your assessment of the research question.** Based on all of your answers above, was their research question “a good one” from the point of view of thick versus thin questions, contributions to the body of knowledge, and laying groundwork for future research and practice? Explain your logic and reasoning, drawing on the material we have covered about research questions.

Assessment Criteria	Possible Points	Your Points
Followed instructions	10	
Was able to answer questions in your own words	30	
Was able to explain the researcher's objectives and questions and did not misstate or misinterpret the researcher's intent and questions; did not substitute some other question or objective for that of the researcher Differentiated between the theoretical components in the research question and the topic of the study Differentiated between the theoretical basis for the research (constructs, theoretical framework, general or research hypotheses) and the topic of the study Demonstrated understanding of the relationship between the theoretical or research hypotheses and the statistical hypotheses if used Could explain the steps in qualitative data analysis if used Correctly distinguished between results and conclusions and was able to tie the conclusions to the researcher's intended contributions to the body of knowledge	60	
Applied the concepts discussed in class and covered in the required readings in answering the last questions in particular Demonstrated that you understand the material that we have covered by using examples and explaining how you reached conclusions especially in your responses to the last two questions Used, cited, and referenced the research design literature in responses to the two discussion questions	50	
Total	150	