

Identifying_Quantitative_Design .edited.docx

by

Submission date: 21-Sep-2021 10:53AM (UTC-0600)

Submission ID: 1653973197

File name: Identifying_Quantitative_Design.edited.docx (19.79K)

Word count: 1464

Character count: 8182

Identifying Quantitative Design

Name:

Institution:

Course:

Instructor:

Date:

Identifying Quantitative Design

The methods adopted in the study, in my view, were the best in an attempt to answer the research question. Many research studies have been conducted, but none has focused on the correlation between suicide thought and attempted suicide affecting veterans enrolled in prime healthcare programs, like the one discussed in the study. The method employed is the best because it answers the research question, which aims to determine the correlation between self-murder imagination and actual suicide try among the veterans as the dependent variables. In contrast, non-dependent variables are the demographic and clinical aspects.

The methods adopted for this study were the best for different reasons, like the demographic under investigation. Many veterans continue to commit suicide regularly; even those who actively seek medical intervention are not excluded from the menace. The study was conducted among a focused demographic that included veterans in the primary mental health program, part of the additional assessment (Ashrafioun et al., 2016). The study focused on the past year of suicide ideation among the participants, which was rated from none to low, and high using two of the best tools for research; Paykel Suicide Scale and the multinomial logistical regression models. The Paykel Suicide Scale is an essential tool in understanding suicide ideation and the actual act of committing suicide. More importantly, Díez Gómez et al. (2020) suggest it is a self-report tool, meaning that the study participants are not coerced or swayed in any way to make a favorable response to the research question. On the contrary, they offer their insights regarding how they feel about the topic in question. That is why it is effective in this study. The scale has five elements with a dichotomous reaction structure comprising of 'yes' or 'no' responses. The higher scores denote high severity in suicide thoughts, whereas the low

scores show low levels of suicide thoughts. The use of the scale was one of the best approaches in answering the research question.

Moreover, adopting the multinomial logistic regression formula makes the research approach the best in answering the research question. In essence, multinomial logistic regression was used to determine the declarative position in the classification of predictor variables based on the independent factors. Independent variables can be discrete or constant. For purposeful explanation, the technique necessitates careful thought of the number of respondents, as was done in the research with the survey participants. The multinomial logistic approach is considered appealing since it does not presume normality, high precision, or covariance. Besides that, it is based on the assumption of non-perfect isolation. Regardless, it offers meaningful insights into the correlation between suicide attempts and suicide ideation.

Inner and exterior validity are constructs that designate whether or not a survey's verdicts are consistent and applicable. While inner validity addresses how investigation is conducted (its framework), external validity is affected by how pertinent the study results are to the physical world (Lesko et al., 2017). Also, there is nothing like a perfect investigation. Central validity is the scope to which a survey demonstrates a reliable correlation amid suicide ideation and suicide attempt. It also reflects the ability of a given analysis to rule out alternative theories for a discovery. As per Lesko et al. (2017), internal validity is not a binary principle that can be answered "yes" or "no." Alternatively, it recognizes how convinced one can be due to a study predicated on whether it excludes snares that could call the observations into question. The lower the possibility of "confounding" in a survey, the greater the level of validity and the greater confidence we can have in the conclusions. Confounding is a condition where other variables enter the picture and disrupt the result of a survey. External validity depicts how well a study's

findings can be presumed to relate in different contexts. In other words, the generalizability of the observations is referred to as this type of applicability. Do the research results, for example, apply to other individuals, setups, scenarios, and time frames? Internal and external validity are essentially the same thing. A survey with high internal validity may represent the contemporary world, but it may also be meaningless to the physical world (Lesko et al., 2017). Nevertheless, on the other hand, one can conduct a field experiment highly related to the current world. Still, the outcomes are not reliable in terms of understanding what factors prompted the results observed.

Since internal validity is affected by attrition, confounding, diffusion, and bias, it is never possible to control all these factors. The same can be said about external validity, which is affected by sample features, selection bias, and situational outcomes. Regardless, the goal is to strike a balance when dealing with threats to validity, both internal and external threats to validity. The threats to internal validity can be addressed using strategies like Blinding. Respondents, and often investigators, who are oblivious of the involvement they are obtaining (for example, by using a lower dose in a medicine survey) to prevent this insight from biasing their beliefs and expectations, hence the survey's conclusion. An experimental alteration involves changing an independent variable in a survey rather than simply watching a correlation without intervening. Also known as randomization, this method consists in selecting respondents at unexpected times or in such a way that they are representative of the general population being studied.

According to Handley et al. (2018), researchers can address the threats to external validity in the following manner: The first is to contemplate psychological practicality. Consider psychological pragmatism: assuring respondents that the research occurrences are actual events

by informing them a "headline story" about the survey's goal. Otherwise, if respondents know what is coming or what the focus of the research is, they may act differently than in actual situations. Reprocessing and configuration are also options. It entails the application of statistical techniques to account for external validity issues. Recreating entails repeating the experiment with multiple sample sizes or in diverse situations to see if the findings are the same. When a considerable proportion of studies have been undertaken, meta-analysis is used to ascertain whether or not the impact of predictor variables is accurate. A field study in a natural context should also be attempted. It is critical to use the inclusion and exclusion approach to guarantee that the sample under inquiry is strictly outlined.

The study's strength is that it focuses on a demographic with a problem, hence offering first-hand insights on suicide ideation and suicide attempt. From the findings, one can argue that they can understand the extent of the problem because the participants have experience with suicide, whether through attempt or ideation. In addition, the study identifies conditions like depression, mania, PTSD, psychosis, and anxiety disorder as the leading cause of suicide ideation, but not a suicide attempt. The latter can be associated with illicit drug consumption among the study population, providing clear insight into the causes of suicide attempts among the demographic under study. The study's weakness is that it is cross-sectional, which according to Wang and Cheng (2020) mean that it cannot make a causal inference to a certain extent because the sample size is limited. The sample group is selected from a larger group of people experiencing the same problem. In addition, the study focused on a solitary clinical setting, with the analyses having limited strength.

To sum it up, in my clinical work, the information from the study is helpful in different ways. For instance, the study findings enlighten me that the differential correlates of the factors

determined in the research are crucial when dealing with clients experiencing similar problems like that of the sample size. I can choose what causes suicidal ideation and actual suicide attempts and address these issues when seeing different clients. I am better positioned to help clients battling suicide ideation by understanding some of the causal factors and assessing the various interventions available to address the issue.

References

- Ashrafioun, L., Pigeon, W., Conner, K., Leong, S., Oslin, D. (2016). Prevalence and correlates of suicidal ideation and suicide attempts among veterans in primary care referred for a mental health evaluation. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 189, 344-350.
- Díez Gómez, A., Pérez Albéniz, A., Ortuño Sierra, J., & Fonseca Pedrero, E. (2020). SENTIA: An adolescent suicidal behavior assessment scale. *Psicothema*.
- Handley, M. A., Lyles, C. R., McCulloch, C., & Cattamanchi, A. (2018). Selecting and improving quasi-experimental designs in effectiveness and implementation research. *Annual review of public health*, 39, 5-25.
- Lesko, C. R., Buchanan, A. L., Westreich, D., Edwards, J. K., Hudgens, M. G., & Cole, S. R. (2017). Generalizing study results: a potential outcomes perspective. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 28(4), 553.
- Wang, X., & Cheng, Z. (2020). Cross-sectional studies: strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. *Chest*, 158(1), S65-S71.

Identifying_Quantitative_Design.edited.docx

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off