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Abstract

While research has shown that cultural navigation, or "acculturation" depends on context, most of the literature remains acontextual. Consequently, we used community-based explanatory mixed methods to understand acculturation in context, examining how and why some Latinx Immigrants’ desire to acculturate differently than they actually acculturate. To study the phenomenon of acculturation, we administered bilingual surveys and conducted focus groups with unauthorized and authorized Latinx immigrants living in Arizona, New Mexico, Maryland, and Virginia. We analyzed the quantitative data using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and path analysis, and we analyzed the qualitative data using grounded theory, informed by the constructs under study. Our results suggested that Latinx immigrants desire to and do acculturate differently according to their contexts. In this way, both personal and contextual factors explained how Latinx immigrants acculturated better than their mere desire to acculturate. In sum, our research provides insight into reasons for the diverse array of Latinx immigrant acculturation in the United States in light of their disparate contexts, preferences, and experiences. This case study explores how our qualitative and quantitative data complemented one another to provide a richer and more comprehensive understanding of acculturation across these individuals and their contexts. Students will gain an understanding of the utility of using mixed methods with groups underrepresented in research, the practicalities of conducting community-based research, gaining entry into these communities, and producing actionable findings for key stakeholders.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this case, students should be able to

- Recognize how communities shape the process of acculturation;
- Examine how qualitative and quantitative data complement one another in a mixed-method approach to research;
- Compare how community-based research differs from controlled lab settings;
- Develop strategies for working with communities underrepresented in research.

Project Overview and Context

Acculturation

When people from different cultural groups interact, they consider and potentially change their practices, values, and identifications, a concept known as “acculturation” (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). There are many models of acculturation; nonetheless, all
contemporary models generally imply that people can hold elements of more than one culture (Berry, 1980). In this way, people may simultaneously make cultural changes to their new communities while still maintaining their original practices, values, and identifications.

Throughout my (S.B.) education, I have been fascinated by acculturation and its impact on mental health. As a clinical-community psychology PhD student, my training and experiences highlighted that both people and communities impact actions and outcomes. However, as I delved into the acculturation literature, I noticed that research inherently assumed that all people acculturate according to their individual desires with little regard to the communities around them. Yet, the complexity of the literature simultaneously made it clear that both individuals and their contexts impact acculturation—and outcomes associated with it (e.g., see Birman, Trickett, & Buchanan, 2005; Phinney, Horenezyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Indeed, acculturation depends on what aspects of cultures are studied. And, acculturation also depends on who is changing and/or maintaining their cultures. To complicate things further, acculturation depends on where, when, and how cultural change and maintenance are examined (Bornstein, 2017).

I (S.B.) wanted to better understand acculturation by studying it in context. In my search for contextual models of acculturation, I discovered a newer model from Spain, the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM, Navas et al., 2005). The RAEM differentiates two types of acculturation: ideal acculturation, how people desire to change/maintain cultures, and real acculturation, how people actually change/maintain cultures. However, the RAEM does not explain why real acculturation may differ from ideal acculturation. And so, I integrated social science literatures to develop socio-ecological models of acculturation. Based on these literatures, I hypothesized that macrosystem factors—such as immigration policies and cultural expectations—microsystem factors—such as experiences of prejudice and positive contact—and individual factors—such as perceived threat—impact acculturation through sense of community and intergroup anxiety.

Context

To better understand the role of context in acculturation, I (S.B.) then selected four locations in two United States regions: the Southwest (Arizona and New Mexico) and the Mid-Atlantic (Virginia and Maryland). Each state within the pair is similar to the other in terms of geographic location and demographics (e.g., population, immigration trends, race/ethnicity, language). For example, most immigrants in the Southwest were born in Latin America, whereas Latin American immigrants constitute less than half of all immigrants in the Mid-Atlantic. Although similar in geography and demographics, the states within each pair differ greatly in their
immigration-related policies. New Mexico and Maryland have measures in place to support immigrants (e.g., in-state tuition for “DREAMers”), whereas Arizona and Virginia have many policies that restrict immigrants from particular activities and sectors of society (e.g., immigration status inquiry and enforcement laws). Conducting the study in these states allowed us to explore the roles of the demographic makeup of communities and policies on acculturation.

Research Design

We used a sequential *explanatory* mixed-method approach to understand how and why real acculturation may diverge from ideal (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007); in that manner, the qualitative data could be informed by and used to explain the quantitative results. The study began with quantitative surveys and preliminary analyses, followed by qualitative focus groups and their respective analyses. We then integrated the data and presented it to community stakeholders for their feedback to flesh out our findings.

I (S.B.) considered other methods, such as sequential *exploratory* mixed methods, in which the qualitative data are collected and analyzed first in order to develop the quantitative hypothesis testing. This approach has many merits and would have allowed us to measure and test unique findings that arose in our focus groups that we had not anticipated from the extant literature. I also considered *concurrent* mixed methods, in which the quantitative and qualitative data are collected at the same time.

I (S.B.) primarily chose our *explanatory* approach for practical reasons: (1) I wanted participants to be exposed to the concepts that would be discussed at the focus groups prior to participating, (2) participating in a survey is less invasive and time-consuming, so we felt better able to garner interest for the survey and then, once rapport had been built, we could recruit focus group participants; and (3) the dissertation committee could approve of all data collection and analysis plans from the outset.

Our sequential explanatory mixed-method design provided many benefits: The methods helped us develop a more comprehensive account of acculturation by both demonstrating statistically significant relations and providing a better sense of the process. The qualitative data helped to explain the findings generated by quantitative analyses, particularly when we came across surprising relations. The qualitative data also illuminated the quantitative findings to make them more understandable, useful, and applicable to a wider audience. We could capitalize on the strengths and compensate for the weaknesses of each method. For example, a prime strength of qualitative research—contextual understanding—was combined with a major strength of quantitative research—relations among variables. Combining methods allowed for increased
confidence in the integrity of the findings as they corroborated one another.

---

Research Method in Action

Securing Grant Funding

Because this project necessitated travel for me (S.B.), technology to collect and analyze the data, and compensation for participants, I first worked to secure grant funding. I looked into funding opportunities through my doctoral program, university, professional associations, and private foundations. I ultimately applied for and was awarded a public policy grant from the Society for Community Research and Action, which funded most of the study. The remaining portions were funded through my doctoral program, the graduate school at my university, and an award from the Global Alliance for Behavioral Health and Social Justice. Obtaining funding for community research can be challenging. We encourage readers to talk with mentors and look for smaller, innovative funding mechanisms.

Developing a Research Team

For our research to be possible, we had to start with building rapport in the community. Because our study involved working with Latinx immigrants, I (S.B.) recruited research assistants who were already active members of their local Latinx communities. For example, some research assistants were students in local universities, members of predominately Latinx soccer leagues, or had previous research experience with community leaders. Their engagement allowed insights for building community maps in each state. Language played a critical role in the demographics we studied. For that reason, I chose research assistants with fluency in Spanish. In that manner, we could ensure participants felt comfortable in the two predominant languages of the community. We encourage research team leaders to consider the “soft” skills of prospective team members. The ability and willingness to collaborate, navigate complex community dynamics, and communicate effectively are not as easily taught as the more “hard” skills of data collection, management, and analysis.

Fourteen individuals in four site teams (Baltimore, Maryland; Richmond, Virginia; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Phoenix, Arizona) were then involved in the study. We completed readings prior to the project and then had in-person experiential trainings at each site regarding community research, the research questions and topic, community engagement and participant recruitment, community mapping, and data collection. We practiced having conversations with community stakeholders and potential participants and then set out on nurturing existing relationships with community stakeholders and developing new relationships through them. Prior to the focus group portion of data collection, we again completed additional readings and
training on focus group facilitation and note-taking. Throughout the project, our full team participated in bi-weekly conference calls for continual mutual learning and each site team held its own meetings.

**Building Community Partners**

Based on our community mapping, we used our networks to engage with local stakeholders. Directors of local multicultural liaison offices, supervisors in non-profit organizations and teachers at ESL and GED courses are some examples of key figures that helped in this phase. We shared the aims of our study, solicited feedback, and worked with them to make sure the project was relevant to their communities. We developed plans for both recruiting participants and sharing findings. Building those relationships takes time and patience, and is vital for building a useful and successful study.

**Recruiting Participants**

Although random selection is the gold standard, recruiting immigrant participants through this sampling method is met with multiple obstacles, particularly for individuals not authorized to reside in the country. Many immigrants are not included in public access databases and immigrants often experience challenges not as frequently faced by U.S.-born people. For example, media often portray immigrants as criminals and Immigration and Customs Enforcement comes to workplaces and homes to make arrests, which can make individuals wary of engaging with strangers. Consequently, we used a stratified snowball sampling strategy to locate the participants. We recruited participants primarily through our research team and key stakeholders at community establishments that serve Latinx immigrants and at settings that attract a diverse array of people, such as markets, sports leagues, festivals, universities, barber shops, laundromats, parks, libraries, and community centers. Information about the project was also displayed on flyers around the community and shared in both print and auditory formats. For example, we wrote newsletters and newspaper articles and one of our site teams participated in a radio show interview. We engaged potential participants with respect and normalized/demystified the research process by explaining the project in their preferred language, answering all questions, and providing contact information (Martinez, McClure, Eddy, Ruth, & Hyers, 2012).

**Collecting Quantitative Data**

Once we developed a relationship with the community and gained access to services and gatherings, it was time to administer the survey. During this phase, each team member’s job was to facilitate the survey-taking experience and be present if questions arose. Technology served as a useful tool. We had paper and electronic versions of the survey that could be taken
in-person on research member’s tablets or accessed at home via mobile devices or laptops. The online survey was useful, as it automatically sensed the participant’s browser language to display the correct text, and it allowed participants to select their cultural identity at the beginning of the survey, inputting the identity throughout the remainder of the survey. However, we found that many of our participants preferred paper surveys, so we had to have multiple versions on hand to account for participants’ varying languages and cultural identities. We found it most effective to be present while participants took the survey to ensure completion of all metrics and answer any questions. Our survey was extensive and participant fatigue could ensue. To combat this challenge, we set up meeting times with the participants to have them focus blocks of times on the survey. Some team members used computer labs so multiple participants could complete the survey at once. Others waited in lobbies so participants could take the survey before and after appointments at organizations.

Any person who completed the survey could choose to be entered into a raffle for gift cards. Visa gift cards (as opposed to checks or money orders) were offered so that participants without access to identification or a bank could still access the incentive. Participants could also indicate if they wished to participate in a focus group about the topics in the survey. Finally, participants were given flyers to share with others who had similar or different experiences.

Analyzing Quantitative Data

We then conducted path analysis in SPSS. Path analysis allows us to examine whether the correlations of the variables fit the theory of how and in what ways they are related. Overall, we found that our path models fit the quantitative data well; macrosystem, microsystem, and individual factors impacted acculturation through sense of community and intergroup anxiety. In fact, our socio-ecological models of acculturation accounted for nearly 50% of the variance in both cultural change and maintenance. In contrast, ideal cultural change and maintenance were only able to account for 15% and 28%, respectively. We concluded that examining acculturation in context could better illuminate the process. Nevertheless, we found some surprising findings in our quantitative data analyses. For example, we found that participants living in states with restrictive public policies made more cultural changes overall—the opposite of what we hypothesized. We needed to collect additional data to better understand these relations.

Collecting Qualitative Data

To better illuminate the path model relations and to understand surprising findings, we conducted focus groups. We contacted participants who expressed interest in the focus groups, and scheduled meetings to learn more from them. A maximum of 24 people (ideally
eight per group) could participate from each site. Because more participants indicated interest in the groups than there was space, participants were randomized, with the first 24 per site invited. Invitations were then extended to participants further down the list when any participants declined participation on open dates. Three attempts were made to invite each participant to a focus group via phone and email. Although efforts were made to have five to eight participants in each group, due to scheduling challenges, weather events, and late cancellations/no-shows, groups ultimately had between two and eleven participants. We compensated participants US$25 in cash for focus group participation and provided refreshments. Eating before the groups and chatting provided for a relaxed atmosphere so we could build rapport and get to know each other before the discussion.

Our focus group guide was semi-structured so we could have a guided yet open discussion. Questions were created to expand on subjects from the survey. Primary questions were as follows:

1. When you first came to the United States, in what ways did you want to adopt U.S./"American" culture? In what ways did you want to maintain your original culture?
2. Has there been a time or event when you were (or were not) able to adopt U.S./"American" culture in the way you wanted? How come?
3. Has there been a time or event when you were (or were not) able to maintain your original culture in the way you wanted? How come?
4. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

Helpful tips for effective focus groups:

- **Speak to participants before the focus group begins.** As individuals start arriving, talk to them. Focus groups can be intimidating or nerve racking for some; small talk helps put people at ease and gains their trust.
- **Allow participants to choose their own pseudonyms.** Consider allowing participants to choose nicknames rather than using their real names or numbers. That way, calling on participants feels more natural and participants can recognize their words when you quote them in community presentations while remaining anonymous. Giving them that option also works as an ice-breaker and facilitates a comfortable environment.
- **Provide pen and paper.** It may seem a miniscule detail but never underestimate the power of pen and paper in a focus group. Once the discussion has gained momentum, individuals become engaged and may feel inclined to interject, potentially interrupting another participant. The enthusiasm is great, but can quickly turn chaotic—most noticeably once you reach the transcribing phase and need to write word for word what was said. Ask
participants to allow everyone the space to finish their thoughts by writing down anything that comes to mind and bring it to the table once the other person is finished. Keep those papers; the notes are additional data.

- **Have questions at hand.** It’s easy to get off topic when the conversation flows. Inform the participants there are questions in the beginning of the focus group. Let them be aware you might interrupt to veer the conversation back to the topics in which you’re interested.
- **Bring two audio recorders.** Recording the conversation provides you the opportunity to thoroughly analyze participants’ thoughts. Having two audio recorders allows you to place them in different corners of the room to capture voices best and saves you if one malfunctions!
- **Have a facilitator and a note-taker.** Be sure that at least two research team members are present for the groups so that one can ask questions and the other can take detailed notes. Good notes are crucial for not only capturing nonverbal language, but also matching voices with statements when you later transcribe.
- **Allow space for the less inclined to speak.** There will be participants that dominate the conversation. Prompt with, “I’d like to hear the perspective of those who haven’t had a chance to talk as much.” This will open up the space to hear from others without targeting an individual participant.
- **Be mindful of your own voice.** You want to hear their opinion on the topic, not a reflection of your own. The questions asked should be phrased as such.
- **Thank participants.** Members of underrepresented communities in research can be deterred from participating for a variety of aforementioned reasons. Make sure community members understand their participation and voices are valuable.

### Analyzing Qualitative Data

After qualitative data collection was complete, we used our theoretical constructs to guide our analyses as well as the recommendations from constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006). In this way, we generated theory from, rather than ascribing it to, the data.

We conducted analyses using a five-phase team approach (see Table 1; Brodsky, Buckingham, Scheibler, & Mannarini, 2016; Brodsky, Mannarini, Buckingham, & Scheibler, 2016). Transcribing focus groups is time-consuming and can become tedious. To keep ourselves accountable, we set aside time for bi-weekly calls with every team member. In our calls, we could discuss recurring themes that we encountered, tactics to make transcribing more efficient, and set goals for ourselves. Constant communication alleviates the heaviness of transcribing and made each member feel they were not alone. After transcribing came coding. As a team, we coded one transcript of a focus group together. It helped us to further develop
our codebook and made sure we had a similar understanding of our coding process. Afterwards each site divided up and coded their site’s focus groups. The thought of everyone coding everything seemed productive as each team member would then be exposed to all data to identify recurring themes, but it would have been too time consuming. Splitting it up allowed us to shorten the coding process and cross reference our findings. In site teams, each team member coded transcripts individually and then we met as a site team to compare our coding; resolving any discrepancies. The team leader (SB) coded all transcripts and joined all coding discussions so that she could make sure coding stayed consistent across site teams and so she could communicate novel codes and themes back to our full research team.

Table 1. Phases of the Data Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>Tape-recorded focus groups were transcribed into written documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record of observations and thoughts</td>
<td>Observations from the focus groups, research diary notes, and initial thoughts/interpretations were recorded in documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Initial coding</td>
<td>Each segment of the focus groups was examined as a data point; coinciding actions, events, or thoughts were coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant comparative methods (A)</td>
<td>Comparisons were made between each initial coding segment to sort them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection</strong></td>
<td>Focused coding</td>
<td>The most frequent and significant initial codes were grouped into focused codes to categorize a great amount of data in a precise manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant comparative methods (B)</td>
<td>Comparisons were made between individual focused codes within one group, across multiple groups in one site, and across all sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Categorization</td>
<td>The focused codes were grouped thematically into higher order categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The categories were compared and connected as they were grouped into more abstract concepts, resulting in preliminary theoretical constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimation and corroboration</th>
<th>Memo writing</th>
<th>Preliminary theoretical constructs were organized to corroborate perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memo presentation</td>
<td>Memos were presented to advisors/consultants, the research team, and community partners to validate findings and reduce biases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memo revising</td>
<td>Memos were revised based on feedback during presentation, furthering theory development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Representation of the account | Writing the final document | The resulting theory was woven into a rich, descriptive narrative and combined with the quantitative data, so that the theory remains contextually grounded in the data |

**Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Results**

We then used the qualitative results to help illustrate the quantitative results. Qualitative data helped to present a more complete and nuanced picture of the results, as stories helped to bring the numeric relations to light. Qualitative data were particularly useful for explaining the surprising quantitative relations. For example, as we mentioned earlier, we found that participants living in states with restrictive policies made more cultural changes as compared to participants living in states with less restrictive policies. It was the opposite of our hypothesis—and, with the survey data alone, we would not have been able to get a glimpse into why that happened. However, by integrating both types of data, we found three explanations for this finding:

1. **Policies forced undesired changes.** Although participants in states with restrictive policies were more likely to make cultural changes, they were less likely to make desired cultural changes. Participants frequently felt forced to make changes to “blend in” and not “cause any trouble.”

2. **Policies were not always implemented as intended.** Participants living in states with supportive policies, like in-state tuition for unauthorized young adult immigrants who went to high school in the state (“DREAMers”), found themselves having to fight for that in-state tuition rate. Participants living in states with restrictive policies, like no access to driver’s licenses...
licenses for unauthorized immigrants, took seminars on how to drive without a license and not get pulled over.

3. **Policy changes created confusion.** Participants expressed confusion about what local and state policies did and did not allow, seemingly due to frequent changes and disagreements among local government and larger entities.

By integrating quantitative and qualitative data, we developed more comprehensive and meaningful findings. A key point was administering focus groups *after* the collection of our surveys. It allowed us to explore the findings from our data collection even further.

**Sharing Back Results With Communities**

Results “share-backs” were imperative for both data analysis and results dissemination. We developed 2- to 4-page documents and site-specific presentations for community partners and advisors/consultants to legitimate findings and minimize team biases (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To date, nearly 30 community share-backs have been held across all four sites and included participants, educational program coordinators, cultural/immigrant liaisons in government offices, community activism/organizing leaders, immigration lawyers, social workers, therapists, public health officials, religious leaders, Chamber of Commerce staff, and other stakeholders.

Although all share-backs took different forms and ranged in length, audience, focus, mode (e.g., in-person, telephone, video-conferencing), and degree of formality (e.g., formal presentation, review of documents, more informal discussion), they usually involved a preliminary findings presentation and discussion. New insights from these meetings provided further shape and form to our conclusions.

Another benefit to mixed-methods design comes in the moment of share-backs with the community. With both types of data, we could demonstrate our findings statistically and supplement them with stories and examples directly from the participants. It was important for us to share back the results with the community. We wanted our participants to understand the worth of their contribution, and we wanted organizations to know what was going well in communities and what was challenging for Latinx immigrant community members. Community partners could then use the findings to facilitate positive changes in communities. For example, in the Virginia site, we met with leaders of government offices and non-profit organizations to share our findings. Community leaders were specifically interested in knowing what the participants felt was working efficiently and what could be improved. We could not only inform them of programs participants praised, but also the strengths and challenges of communities in other parts of the United States. The results gave them a clear window into the perspective of the people they serve and the ability to use data for grant proposals to further their impact.
Practical Lessons Learned

There were lessons we both learned as research team leader (S.B.) and research team member (K.V.G.) in conducting community-based explanatory mixed-method research. The participants encountered are different from a controlled setting such as what you would find in a lab. Recruiting takes time because you’re building relationships within the community and that does not always translate into automatic engagement. Below are some of the most notable practical lessons we gathered from this project:

1. *Building community partnerships takes time.* When you are conducting research within a community, patience is vital. You want to develop rapport because at the end of the day, the results of the data are meant to influence the same community in which the study was conducted. For that reason, time should be taken to develop trust with community leaders. If they believe in your research as much as you do, the reach for participants is broadened and useful data can be collected.

2. *The length of a survey can affect participation.* There are pros and cons to having a long survey. We could have individual participants answer a wide variety of metrics, which allowed for sufficient data on diverse factors to analyze. The downside of utilizing a long survey was challenges maintaining the commitment of participants. If we allowed a participant to take home the survey without a follow-up, it was less likely they would commit to completion. Previous preparation and training of the research team members gave those involved the tools to handle this challenge. Maintaining bi-weekly conference calls also allowed the discussion of effective tactics to supplement original training.

3. *Mixed methods are crucial for producing actionable findings for stakeholders.* Qualitative data were useful for helping to bring the quantitative results to life for many of our community partners. Stakeholders desired the “hard numbers” and statistical relations and needed to hear participants’ individual experiences to understand what those relations looked like in practice.

4. *Still, explanatory mixed methods have a significant downside.* There were things we missed that we could have taken account for had we done qualitative research before finalizing our surveys. For example, participants highlighted characteristics about themselves and resources in their communities that influenced their acculturation processes. Because we did not anticipate these findings, we did not measure these constructs in the surveys, and thus, we were unable to quantitatively test the relations.

5. *Maintaining the health of our volunteer community-based research team was key.* Working with individuals across the country who had a broad array of expertise in divergent issues and experience in community research made for rich mutual learning and skill development.
Because of diverse backgrounds, it was important for me (S.B.) to get to know all team members, support their individual goals, help them set attainable site and national team goals, and hold them accountable. As all research team members were volunteers and many were students who also held jobs and were very involved in their communities, there were times in which the research lagged. Not only were team members stretched for time, but the research tasks could be completed at unscheduled times and thus were open for procrastination, or simply less interesting—such as transcribing the focus group interviews. We supported our team’s health through:

- Clear yet flexible expectations from the outset
- A supportive environment for individual and team growth
- Accountability via regular individual conversations, site meetings, and full team conference calls

Sequential explanatory mixed-methods design can produce enriching contextualization of statistical data. Collecting the quantitative data first permitted findings that could be further explained through qualitative research. For instance, data from the survey indicated individuals living in areas with more restrictive policies were more likely to make cultural changes yet accounts from the qualitative data demonstrated they were not the participants’ desired changes. Utilizing this research design comes with its own set of drawbacks. For example, we were unable to quantitatively measure all factors that arose from the qualitative data. With that in mind, future research can expand those drawbacks. It is up to you, as you develop your research aims and questions, to determine what methods will work best for your study.

Exercises and Discussion Questions

1. Why did the authors choose to use mixed methods in their research design, as compared to only collecting and analyzing one type of data?
2. What must you consider when designing a community research project that involves people who are often underrepresented in research and justifiably skeptical of it?
3. What are the merits of conducting research in a community as opposed to a laboratory? What are some unique challenges you would face?
4. How does the selection of your research team influence your project? What characteristics would you look for in your research team members? How would you ensure that the research is conducted similarly across settings?
5. What are effective methods of participant recruitment in community research? What key figures can help you in the process?
6. Choose an issue that impacts a community underrepresented in research. Design a study
using sequential explanatory mixed methods. Describe your study’s strengths and weaknesses.

7. How can you ensure a community may benefit from the findings of your research?

Further Reading


Web Resources

The Community Toolbox: [http://ctb.ku.edu/en](http://ctb.ku.edu/en)
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