

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

RESEARCH METHODS I

<b>Course Number:</b>	SW 388R1	<b>Instructor:</b>	Namkee Choi
<b>Unique Number:</b>	64800	<b>Office Number:</b>	SSW 3.122D
<b>Semester:</b>	Fall 2005	<b>Office Phone:</b> <b>e-mail:</b>	(512) 232-9590 nchoi@mail.utexas.edu; nchoi@austin.rr.com
<b>Meeting Time/Place:</b>	TU 8:30-11:20 SSW 2.130	<b>Office Hours:</b>	TU 11:30-1:30 and by appt.

**I. Course Description**

This is the first in a series of research courses required of social work doctoral students. This course introduces students to the basic elements of research design in the social sciences with particular attention to social work research.

**II. Course Objectives**

At the end of this course, students should:

1. Have knowledge of aspects of epistemology relevant to the social sciences, especially social work;
2. Have working knowledge of the language of research in order to use research terminology precisely and accurately;
3. Know the elements and phases of research;
4. Be able to evaluate the quality of research done by others;
5. Have increased facility in designing research, especially in aspects preceding data analysis;
6. Have increased knowledge of tools useful in planning, conducting, and reporting the results of research such as data collection instruments and publication formats;
7. Have increased knowledge of the type of writing needed to describe research designs and report findings;
8. Be familiar with standards for the ethical conduct of research, including human subjects protection, and their relationship to the social work value base;
9. Be familiar with gender and ethnic sensitivity in conducting research;
10. Understand the impact of political and other ideological forces on social work research and program evaluation.

**III. Methods of Instruction**

The methods of instruction will be informal lectures (questions and comments are encouraged), class discussions, class exercises, guest presentations, and student presentations.

**IV. Course Readings**

The required text for the course is:

1. Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for social work* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole-Thompson Learning.

2. A course reading packet that contains copies of all the required readings noted in the course schedule. You can purchase the packet at the McCombs Business School, Room 3.136 (471-8281). Those who do not want to purchase the reading packet should prepare their own copies by downloading or making hard copies from the original sources. The links for the articles that can be electronically downloaded are provided at the end of this syllabus.

## V. Grading and Course Requirements

The final grade for the course will be based on (1) weekly written assignment 1 (15 points total); (2) weekly written assignment 2 (10 points total); (3) two tests (30 points total; 15 points each); (4) First draft of a research proposal (20 points); and (5) a final paper—revised research proposal (25 points).

### Accumulated points and grading scale

100-94 = A	93-90 = A-	89-87 = B+	86-84 = B	83-80 = B-	
79-77 = C+	76-74 = C	73-70 = C-	69-67 = D+	66-64 = D-	59 and below = F

### Course requirements and grade assignment:

1. Weekly written assignment 1: Questions from assigned readings (due each week for which reading assignments are to be discussed in class): For each chapter or article that is assigned as required reading for the week, please read it and generate at least one question that you want to be discussed in class. The question and the reason why you have chosen the question must be typed in single space and handed out to the instructor and your classmates at the beginning of the class. Each question and the narrative should not exceed half a page. The questions(s) may be raised regarding the purpose(s) of the study, theoretical frameworks, any aspect of research design, method of data collection, findings, and implications of the findings.
2. Weekly written assignment 2 (Due each week noted in the course schedule): Each student should submit one-page written plan/description of his/her research proposal that needs to be discussed in class. Please distribute the one-page description to the instructor and your classmates at the beginning of the class. This is in preparation for the development of the final paper, and each step of the proposal development will be discussed in class.
3. Two--mid-term and wrap-up--tests (15 points each, 30 points total, closed book; 10/17/05 & 12/6/05): Two tests will cover all materials assigned and/or discussed in class this semester. The format will consist of multiple choice, true-false choice, and short and long essay questions.
4. Draft of a research proposal (Due 11/8/05): Write a draft of a research proposal for a small scale study for you to conduct a survey, experimental/quasi-experimental study intended to evaluate a social service or intervention program, mixed--method study for the same purpose, existing data analysis, or development and validation of a scale.

The overall purpose of the research proposal is for students to practice, hands-on, writing a feasible research plan for a study of their choice. Specific goals are to (1) familiarize the students with the research literature and theoretical frameworks on a topic chosen by the student; and (2) allow the students the opportunity to generate research questions and hypotheses, select a scientifically solid research design, and describe the data collection methods and analysis strategy that are best for researching the chosen topic. The proposal should be written in accordance with the NIH research proposal guidelines and must include the following sections:

Abstract (NIH Term: Description of the Study)

A. Specific Aims

B. Background and Significance (of Problem and Literature Review and Conceptual/Theoretical Framework)

C. Research Design and Methods

-Overview of research design

-Setting (Study site, if applicable)

-Subjects (inclusion/exclusion criteria; sample size; recruitment/consent procedures; sampling steps, if applicable)

-Data collection methods and procedures

-Measures

-Data analysis

D. Description of Project Timeline

E. Human Subjects

Appendix (Survey questionnaires, copies of any scales and instruments, letters of support/collaboration)

**Each student will bring 10 copies of his/her draft proposal and distribute them to the instructor and his/her classmates for their feedback.**

5. Final research proposal (Due 12/13/05): Based on the feedback that the student received on draft proposal, a revision is required for improving the proposal. This final proposal must also include IRB application materials (including informed consent form and all the questionnaires and instrument).

## VI. Class Policies

1. Students are expected to attend all classes, if at all possible. In case you have medical emergencies, doctor's appointment, personal or family crises, special events, and/or university sanctioned activities occurring during the regularly scheduled time of this class, you may miss up to 2 classes without penalty. Students who miss more than two classes during the semester will lose 5 points, and those who miss more than four classes during the semester will lose 10 points.
2. Students are required to hand in assignments in hard copies at the beginning of the class on the date they are due. Students will lose 3 points for each day that an assignment is late. Any adjustment in assignment due dates and/or examination times **MUST** be discussed with the instructor at least 48 hours prior to the regularly scheduled date. Incompletes will not be allowed in this course.
3. Students are expected to do assigned readings before the class time (and the weekly assignment 1) and actively participate in class discussions and presentations.
4. While scholastic dishonesty is not anticipated, students shall be subject to The University of Texas at Austin's policy on this subject, in case violations occur.
5. Students with Disabilities: The University of Texas at Austin provides, upon request, appropriate academic accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. For more information, contact the Office of the Dean of Students at 471-6259 (voice) or 471-4641 (TTY for users who are deaf or hard of hearing).

## VII. Course and Instructor Evaluation

At the end of the course I will use the standard Course Instructor Survey (CIS) provided by the University of Texas at Austin. The CIS offers students a systematic, campus-wide method of evaluating courses and instructors. It also allows instructors to compare their course ratings with averages for their school. The results are also used by the Dean and the School's Executive Committee as one aspect of faculty evaluation. I hope every student will complete the CIS. In addition to this formal means of evaluating the course, I strongly recommend you to give me any feedback regarding the course during the semester; please stop by during my office hours or make an appointment.

### VIII. Course Schedule

DATE	TOPICS AND ASSIGNMENTS	REQUIRED READINGS
Week 1 9/6/05	Introduction to Course How Scientific is Social Work Research?	Rubin & Babbie, Ch. 1-3.  Fraser, M. W. (2004). Intervention research in social work: Recent advances and continuing challenges. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i> , 14 (3), 210-222.  Gabbrill, E. (1999). Evidence-based practice: An alternative to authority-based practice. <i>Families in Society: Journal of Contemporary Human Services</i> , 80, 341-350.
Week 2 9/13/05	Epistemological Issues in the Development of Social Work Knowledge  Feminist Perspectives on Social Science Research  Weekly assignment 1.1 due	Heineman-Pieper, J., Tyson, K & Heineman-Pieper, M. (2002). Doing good science without sacrificing good values: why the heuristic paradigm is the best choice for social work. <i>Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services</i> , 83, 15-28.  Bolland, K. & Atherton, C. (2002). Heuristic versus logical positivism: solving the wrong problem. <i>Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services</i> , 83, 7-13.  Thyer, B. (2001). Point/Counterpoint: What is the role of theory in research on social work practice? <i>Journal of Social Work Education</i> , 37(1), 9-25.  Gomoroy, T. (2001). A fallibalistic response to Thyer's theory of theory-free empirical research in social work practice. <i>Journal of Social Work Education</i> , 37(1), 26-50.  (Those who are interested can found more debates among Thyer, Gomory, and Munro in the Fall 2002 issue of the <i>Journal of Social Work Education</i> , 38 (3).)  Riger, S. (1992). Epistemological debates, feminist voices: Science, social values, and the study of women. <i>American Psychologist</i> , 47(6), 730-740.

<p>Week 3 9/20/05</p>	<p>Research purposes; topic selection; reviewing the literature; problem formulation; the research process; units of analysis; hypotheses; variables; and operational definitions</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.2 due</p> <p>Weekly assignment 2.1 due: Preliminary ideas for research proposal topic, questions, hypotheses, and rationale of the study.</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 4-6</p> <p>Somlai, A. M., Kelly, J. A., Wagstaff, D. A., &amp; Whitson, D. P. (1998). Patterns, predictors, and situational contexts of HIV risk behaviors among homeless men and women. <i>Social Work</i>, 43(1), 7-20.</p> <p>Buttell, F. P. &amp; Carney, M. M. (2005). Do batterer intervention programs serve African American and Caucasian batterers equally well? An investigation of a 26-week program. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 15 (1), 19-28.</p>
<p>Week 4 9/27/05</p>	<p>Measurement; instrument construction; reliability, validity, and cultural sensitivity of measurement;</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.3 due (For the assigned articles, you may choose two articles to read them in depth and generate questions; for the other two, please read them but you do not need to generate questions from them.)</p> <p>Weekly assignment 2.2 due: Description of any instrument and scales that you'd like to use (or develop) in your study; please provide some details regarding the scales' reliability and validity</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 6</p> <p>Pike, C. K. (2002). Measuring video gambling: Instrument development and validation. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 12(3), 389-407.</p> <p>Kumar, K., &amp; Blyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings, <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 76(5), 619-627.</p> <p>Tyson, E. H. &amp; Glisson, C. (2005). A cross-ethnic validity study of the shortform assessment for children (SAC). <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 15 (2), 97-109.</p> <p>O'Hare, T. &amp; Sherrer, M. V. (2005). Assessment of youthful problem drinkers: Validating the drinking context scale (DCS-9) with freshman first offenders. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 15 (2), 110-117.</p>
<p>Week 5 10/4/05</p>	<p>Sampling methods for different research designs; recruitment and retention of minority and oppressed populations</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.4 due</p> <p>Weekly assignment 2.3 due: Your choice of the type of sampling method and a sampling strategy to be used in your proposed study and rationale for this selection. Also consider generalizability (external validity) of study results when applicable.</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 8 &amp; 16</p> <p>Marin, G., &amp; Marin, B. V. (1991). <i>Research with Hispanic populations</i>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Chaps. 1 &amp; 3.</p> <p>Arean, P. A., Alvidrez, J., Nery, R., Estes, C., &amp; Kinkins, K. (2003). Recruitment and retention of older minorities in mental health services research. <i>The Gerontologist</i>, 43 (1), 33-44.</p>

<p>Week 6 10/11/05</p>	<p>Overview of various research designs and choosing the most appropriate one:</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.5 due Weekly assignment 2.4 due: Description of your choice of design and rationale for it</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 9-12</p>
<p>Week 7 10/18/05</p>	<p><b>Test 1</b></p>	
<p>Week 8 10/25/05</p>	<p>Specifics of survey research methods and experimental and quasi-experimental designs; primary data collection; internal and external validity</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.6 due (For the assigned articles, you may choose two articles to read them in depth and generate questions; for the other two, please read them but you do not need to generate questions from them.)</p> <p>Weekly assignment 2.5A due: For those who will conduct survey or experimental design research: Specifics of your research design and data collection methods/procedures</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 9-12</p> <p>Delva, J., Allgood, J. Morrell, R., &amp; McNeece, C. A. (2002). A statewide follow-up study of alcohol and illegal drug use treatment. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 12(5), 642-652.</p> <p>Costello, E. J., Compton, S. N., Keeler, G., &amp; Angold, A. (2003). Relationships between poverty and psychopathology: A natural Experiment. <i>Journal of American Medical Association (JAMA)</i>, 290 (15), 2023-2029.</p> <p>Foster, L., Brown, R., Phillips, B. &amp; Carlson, B. L. (2005). Easing the burden of caregiving: The impact of consumer direction on primary informal caregivers in Arkansas. <i>The Gerontologist</i>, 45 (4), 474-485.</p> <p>Fraser, M. W., Day, S. H., Galinsky, M. J., Hodges, V. G., &amp; Smokowski, P. R. (2004). Conduct problems and peer rejection in childhood: A randomized trial of the making choices and strong families program. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 14 (5), 313-324.</p> <p>Lutwack-Bloom, P. Wijewickrama, R. &amp; Smith, B. (2005). Effects of pets versus people visits with nursing home residents. <i>Journal of Gerontological Social Work</i>, 44(3/4), 137-159.</p> <p>Martsch, M. D. (2005). A comparison of two group interventions for adolescent aggression: High process versus low process. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 15 (1), 8-18.</p> <p>Gutheil, I. A. &amp; Heyman, J. C. (2005). Communication between older people and their health care agents: results of an Intervention. <i>Health &amp; Social Work</i>, 30 (2), 107-116.</p>
<p>Week 9 11/1/05</p>	<p>Specifics of participatory research, mixed method research, meta-analysis, and secondary data analysis)</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.7 due (For the assigned articles, you may choose two</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 14</p> <p>Select a meta-analysis from the Cochrane Collaborative on a topic of interest to you (<a href="http://www.cochrane.org/indexs0.htm">http://www.cochrane.org/indexs0.htm</a>)</p> <p>Ozawa, M. N. &amp; Yoon, H-S. (2005). "Leavers" from</p>

	<p>articles to read them in depth and generate questions; for the other two, please read them but you do not need to generate questions from them.)</p> <p>Weekly assignment 2.5B due: For those who will conduct participatory research, mixed method research, meta-analysis, and secondary data analysis: Specifics of your research design and data collection methods/procedures</p>	<p>TANF and AFDC: How do they fare economically? <i>Social Work</i>, 50 (3) 239-249.</p> <p>Choi, N. G. (1999). Determinants of Frail Elders' Length of Stay in Meals on Wheels. <i>The Gerontologist</i>. 39 (4), 397-404.</p> <p>Choi, N. G. (2003). Coresidence between Unmarried Aging Parents and Their Adult Children: Who Moved in with Whom and Why? <i>Research on Aging</i> 25 (4), 384-404.</p> <p>McAllister, C. L., Green, B. L., Terry, M. A., Herman, V., &amp; Mulvey, L. (2003). Parents, practitioners, and researchers: Community-based participatory research with Early Head Start. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 93, 1672-1679.</p> <p>Edmond, T., Sloan, L., McCarty, D. (2004). Sexual abuse survivors' perceptions of the effectiveness of EMDR and eclectic therapy. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 14 (4), 259-272.</p>
<p>Week 10 11/8/05</p>	<p>Specifics of Single-system design Research Ethics and the IRB process</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.8 due. Draft of a research proposal due</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 12</p> <p>Bradshaw, W. &amp; Rosenborough, D. (2004). Evaluating the effectiveness of Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of residual symptoms and impairment in Schizophrenia. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 14 (2), 112-120.</p> <p>Read "Policies and procedures governing research within human participants" at <a href="http://www.utexas.edu/research/humanresearch/policies.htm">www.utexas.edu/research/humanresearch/policies.htm</a> and take the on-line course listed in item 2 of "Required Education on the Protection of Human Research Participants."</p>
<p>Weeks 11-12 11/15/05 &amp; 11/22/05</p>	<p>Class discussion and feedback to draft research proposal</p>	<p>Your classmates' draft proposals (read them thoroughly and be prepared to offer constructive feedback)</p>
<p>Week 13 11/29/05</p>	<p>Other types of program evaluation: Needs assessment, process evaluation, cost-benefit analysis, and logic model</p> <p>Weekly assignment 1.9 due</p>	<p>Rubin &amp; Babbie, Ch. 13</p> <p>Lynam, D., &amp; Milich, R. (1999). Project DARE: No effects at 10 year follow-up. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>, 67, 590-593.</p> <p>Mulroy, E. A. &amp; Lauber, H. (2004). A user-friendly approach to program evaluation and effective community interventions for families at risk of homelessness. <i>Social Work</i>, 49(4), 573-586.</p>
<p>Week 14 12/06/05</p>	<p><b>Test 2</b></p>	

Week 15 (Finals week) 12/13/05	Final research proposal due	Bring the final research proposal to the instructor's office by 2:00 pm
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

**IX. Electronic Links to Weekly Assigned Readings (in order of recommended sequence of reading: Please remember that not all of these required readings are chosen because of their high scholarly quality. Some of them are chosen because of their many deficits so that we can discuss them.). To access electronic links to articles you must be signed onto the UT system using your UT EID.**

Week 1:

Fraser, M. W. (2004). Intervention research in social work: Recent advances and continuing challenges. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 14 (3), 210-222. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/14/3/210>.

Gambrill, E. (1999). Evidence-based practice: An alternative to authority-based practice. *Families in Society: Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 80, 341-350. URL: <http://www.familiesinsociety.org/Show.asp?override=true&docid=1214>.

Week 2:

Heineman-Pieper, J., Tyson, K & Heineman-Pieper, M. (2002). Doing good science without sacrificing good values: why the heuristic paradigm is the best choice for social work. *The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 83, 15-28. URL: <http://www.familiesinsociety.org/Show.asp?override=true&docid=41>.

Bolland, K. & Atherton, C. (2002). Heuristic versus logical positivism: solving the wrong problem. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 83, 7-13. . URL: <http://www.familiesinsociety.org/Show.asp?override=true&docid=38>.

Thyer, B. (2001). Point/Counterpoint: What is the role of theory in research on social work practice? *Journal of Social Work Education*, 37(1), 9-25. URL: [http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get\\_item/1/S3bd975w4\\_2/SB293\\_02.pdf](http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get_item/1/S3bd975w4_2/SB293_02.pdf).

Gomoroy, T. (2001). A fallibalistic response to Thyer's theory of theory-free empirical research in social work practice. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 37(1), 26-50. URL: [http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get\\_item/1/S3bd975w4\\_3/SB293\\_03.pdf](http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get_item/1/S3bd975w4_3/SB293_03.pdf)

Riger, S. (1992). Epistemological debates, feminist voices: Science, social values, and the study of women. *American Psychologist*, 47(6), 730-740. URL: <http://imagesrvr.epnet.com/embimages/pdh2/amp/amp476730.pdf>

Week 3:

Somlai, A. M., Kelly, J. A., Wagstaff, D. A., & Whitson, D. P. (1998). Patterns, predictors, and situational contexts of HIV risk behaviors among homeless men and women. *Social Work*, 43(1), 7-20. URL: [http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get\\_item/1/S3bd975w4\\_4/SB293\\_04.pdf](http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get_item/1/S3bd975w4_4/SB293_04.pdf)

Buttall, F. P. & Carney, M. M. (2005). Do batterer intervention programs serve African American and Caucasian batterers equally well? An investigation of a 26-week program. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15 (1), 19-28. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/15/1/19>.

Week 4:

Pike, C. K. (2002). Measuring video gambling: Instrument development and validation. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 12(3), 389-407. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/12/3/389>.

Kumar, K., & Blyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiation

behaviors in organizational settings, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 619-627. Search for this article using UT libraries online: <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/>.

Tyson, E. H. & Glisson, C. (2005). A cross-ethnic validity study of the shortform assessment for children (SAC). *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15 (2), 97-109. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/15/2/97>.

O'Hare, T. & Sherrer, M. V. (2005). Assessment of youthful problem drinkers: Validating the drinking context scale (DCS-9) with freshman first offenders. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15 (2), 110-117. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/15/2/110>.

Week 5:

Marin, G., & Marin, B. V. (1991). *Research with Hispanic populations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Chaps. 1 & 3.

Arean, P. A., Alvidrez, J., Nery, R., Estes, C., & Kinkins, K. (2003). Recruitment and retention of older minorities in mental health services research. *The Gerontologist*, 43 (1), 33-44. URL: <http://gerontologist.gerontologyjournals.org/cgi/reprint/43/1/36>.

Weeks 6 & 7: No assigned article

Week 8:

Delva, J., Allgood, J. Morrell, R., & McNeece, C. A. (2002). A statewide follow-up study of alcohol and illegal drug use treatment. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 12(5), 642-652. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/12/5/642>.

Costello, E. J., Compton, S. N., Keeler, G., & Angold, A. (2003). Relationships between poverty and psychopathology: A natural Experiment. *Journal of American Medical Association (JAMA)*, 290 (15), 2023-2029. URL: <http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/reprint/290/15/2023>.

Foster, L., Brown, R., Phillips, B. & Carlson, B. L. (2005). Easing the burden of caregiving: The impact of consumer direction on primary informal caregivers in Arkansas. *The Gerontologist*, 45 (4), 474-485. URL: <http://gerontologist.gerontologyjournals.org/cgi/reprint/45/4/474>.

Fraser, M. W., Day, S. H., Galinsky, M. J., Hodges, V. G., & Smokowski, P. R. (2004). Conduct problems and peer rejection in childhood: A randomized trial of the making choices and strong families program. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 14 (5), 313-324. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/14/5/313>.

Lutwack-Bloom, P. Wijewickrama, R. & Smith, B. (2005). Effects of pets versus people visits with nursing home residents. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 44(3/4), 137-159. Search for this article using UT libraries online: <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/>.

Martsch, M. D. (2005). A comparison of two group interventions for adolescent aggression: High process versus low process. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15 (1), 8-18. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/15/1/8>.

Gutheil, I. A. & Heyman, J. C. (2005). Communication between older people and their health care agents: results of an Intervention. *Health & Social Work*, 30 (2), 107-116. URL: [http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get\\_item/1/S2b8c42w6\\_1/SB954\\_01.pdf](http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get_item/1/S2b8c42w6_1/SB954_01.pdf).

Week 9:

Ozawa, M. N. & Yoon, H-S. (2005). "Leavers" from TANF and AFDC: How do they fare economically? *Social Work*, 50 (3) 239-249. (At time of print, not yet available online).

Choi, N. G. (1999). Determinants of Frail Elders' Length of Stay in Meals on Wheels. *The Gerontologist*. 39 (4), 397-404. (Not available online).

Choi, N. G. (2003). Coresidence between Unmarried Aging Parents and Their Adult Children: Who Moved in with Whom and Why? *Research on Aging* 25 (4), 384-404. URL: <http://roa.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/25/4/384>.

McAllister, C. L., Green, B. L., Terry, M. A., Herman, V., & Mulvey, L. (2003). Parents, practitioners, and researchers: Community-based participatory research with Early Head Start. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(10), 1672-1679. URL: <http://www.ajph.org/cgi/reprint/93/10/1672>.

Edmond, T., Sloan, L., McCarty, D. (2004). Sexual abuse survivors' perceptions of the effectiveness of EMDR and eclectic therapy. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14* (4), 259-272. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/14/4/259>.

Week 10:

Bradshaw, W. & Rosenborough, D. (2004). Evaluating the effectiveness of Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of residual symptoms and impairment in Schizophrenia. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14* (2), 112-120. URL: <http://rsw.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/14/2/112>.

Read "Policies and procedures governing research within human participants" at [www.utexas.edu/research/humanresearch/policies.htm](http://www.utexas.edu/research/humanresearch/policies.htm)

Weeks 11-12:

Review your classmates' research proposals and be prepared to offer constructive criticism.

Week 13:

Lynam, D., & Milich, R. (1999). Project DARE: No effects at 10 year follow-up. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*, 590-593. URL: <http://imagesrvr.epnet.com/embimages/pdh2/ccp/ccp674590.pdf>

Mulroy, E. A. & Lauber, H. (2004). A user-friendly approach to program evaluation and effective community interventions for families at risk of homelessness. *Social Work, 49*(4), 573-586. URL: [http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get\\_item/1/S2b8c42w6\\_2/SB954\\_02.pdf](http://pdfserve.galegroup.com/pdfserve/get_item/1/S2b8c42w6_2/SB954_02.pdf).

### Bibliography

Austin, D. M. (1999). A report on progress in the development of research resources in social work. *Research on Social Work Practice, 9*(6), 673-707.

Babbie, E. (2003). *The practice of social research*. (10th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City: NY: Anchor Books.

Bloom, M., Fischer, J., & Orme. (1996). *Evaluating practice: Guidelines for the accountable professional*. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gibbs, L. E. (1991). *Scientific reasoning for social workers: Bridging the gap between research and practice*. New York: Merrill.

Grinnell, Jr., R. M., & Grinnell, R. M. (1997). *Social work research and evaluation* 5th ed.). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Guba, E. G. (Ed.). (1990). *The paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1997). *The new language of a qualitative method*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, W. W., & Nurius, P. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Controversial issues in social work research*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Humphries, B., & Truman, C. (Eds.). (1994). *Re-thinking social research research: Anti-discriminatory approaches in research methodology*. Brookfield, VT: Avebury.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation* (3rd ed.). San Diego: Edits.
- Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). Foundations of behavioral research, 4th ed. New York: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1990). *Design sensitivity: Statistical power for experimental research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Marlow, C. R. (2001). *Research methods for generalist social work* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Miller, D. C. & Salkind, N. J. (2002). *Handbook of research design and social measurement* (6th ed.). Newbury Park, NJ: Sage Publications.
- Neuman, W. L. (2002). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Padgett, D. K. (1998). *Qualitative methods in social work: Challenges and rewards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Potocky, M., & Rodgers-Farmer, A. Y. (Eds.) (1998). *Social work research with minority and oppressed populations*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Potocky-Tripodi, M., & Tripodi, T. (Eds.) (1999). *New directions for social work practice research*. Washington, DC : NASW Press.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reissman, C. K. (1994). *Qualitative studies in social work research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Royse, D. (2002). *Research methods in social work* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2001). *Research methods for social work* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sherman, E., & Reid, W. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Qualitative research in social work*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Singleton, R. A., Straits, B. C., & Straits, M. M. (1993). *Approaches to social research* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stanfield, J. H., II, & Dennis, R. M. (1993). *Race and ethnicity in research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Task Force on Social Work Research. (1991). *Building social work knowledge for effective services and policies*. Austin, TX: School of Social Work, University of Texas at Austin.
- Tutty, L. M., Rothery, M. A., & Grinnell, R. M., Jr. (1996). *Qualitative research for social workers: Phases, steps, and tasks*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Tyson, K. (1995). *New foundations for scientific social and behavioral research: The heuristic paradigm*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Videka-Sherman, L. & Reid, W. J. (Eds.). (1990). *Advances in clinical social work research*. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- William, M., Unrau, Y. A., & Grinnell, R. M. (1998). *Introduction to social work research*. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.
- Yegidis, B. L., & Weinbach, R. W. (1991). *Research methods for social workers*. New York: Longman.