HANDBOOK OF METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH

Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods

Edited by
LEONARD A. JASON
DAVID S. GLENWICK

OXFORD

HANDBOOK OF METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH

HANDBOOK OF METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH

Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods

EDITED BY

LEONARD A. JASON

AND

DAVID S. GLENWICK

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide.

Oxford New York
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by
Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

A copy of this book's Catalog-in-Publication Data is on file with the Library of Congress
ISBN 978–0–19–024365–4

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2
Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

It seems like only yesterday that I prepared a foreword for the first edited volume on community-based research methods by Leonard Jason and David Glenwick (2012). At the time, I explained that my words would attempt to prepare readers for what lay ahead, that is, a *groundbreaking* presentation of widely diverse and, I assumed for many readers, unfamiliar methods that could be applied to the study of community-based issues. Since one is asked to prepare forewords later in one's career, I had no reservation about acknowledging my own lack of familiarity with a number of the methods presented. I could also readily acknowledge that I learned much in reading the volume. In that foreword, I encouraged readers to proceed deliberately through the volume because:

> As noted, readers should proceed with caution—but they should also be buoyed by scholarly curiosity and professional enthusiasm—for I would predict that, if read carefully, the contents of this volume are very likely to change the questions that readers ask and the solutions that they seek. As a consequence, the discipline's rigor will be enhanced, along with its heuristic contributions to our understanding of human behavior within real-life settings and under real-life circumstances. The methods described in this volume add substantially to the tools we will have available to understand, predict, and ultimately influence the healthy development of individuals, groups, and communities. Readers will complete the volume with a broadened sense of community psychology's impact on and relationships with multiple other disciplines. With methodological pluralism will come disciplinary pluralism! (Lorion, 2012, p. xvi)

In the brief short years between publication of that volume with its "mere" 13 chapters and the finalization of this 35-chapter volume, the array of methods available for community-based studies appears to be expanding exponentially! Consider that the 2012 volume distributed the 12 substantive chapters across four groupings:

- Pluralism and Mixed Methods in Community Research (3 chapters)
- Methods Involving Grouping of Data (3 chapters)
- Methods Involving Change Over Time (2 chapters)
- Methods Involving Contextual Factors (4 chapters)

By contrast, the current volume's 34 substantive offerings address three groupings:

- Qualitative Approaches (11 chapters)
- Quantitative Approaches (10 chapters)
- Mixed Methods Approaches (13 chapters)

Each grouping's contents is nearly as large as the original volume's substantive offerings. How

can that be? The breadth of topics in each category seemingly reflects both an increase in, and the differentiation within, methods. But more than that, however, I would propose that the first volume's publication legitimized the utilization, and consequently the innovative expansion, of methods by community psychologists. Jason and Glenwick (2012) may have planted seeds that have blossomed into new approaches. Likely they also opened awareness among community psychologists of the opportunity to find and apply information-gathering and analytic methods from disciplines near and far from community-based inquiries. Whatever the case, the tools available to us have expanded dramatically! I can report evidence to that effect based on my experiences as the editor of the *Journal of Community Psychology*. In that capacity, I can attest to the seemingly unending adoption of methods from other disciplines, as well as the creation of entirely new approaches to gather and analyze information. Since the 2012 volume appeared, I have seen increasing numbers of submissions applying the very methods described in the current volume. For several years now, I have regularly been receiving manuscripts whose conclusions were derived through the application of (a) highly sophisticated statistical procedures on quantitative findings; (b) systematically applied analytic methods on qualitative findings; (c) findings based on entirely innovative methods, including photographic images, narrated experiences, and public art (e.g., graffiti); and (d) conceptualizations of community-based processes based on conversations with key informants. The breadth of qualitative, quantitative, and especially mixed methods reports crossing my virtual desk appears to increase monthly.

It goes without saying that community psychology has come a long way from its founders who 50 or so years ago struggled with selecting among a limited number of nonparametric or parametric statistics. As I and many of my generation were punching data on computer cards to cautiously deliver to a computer center that covered an entire floor of a university building, we marveled at the potential of factor analyses (with and without rotation) for uncovering interconnections among seemingly disparate variables. We dismissed the potential value of qualitative reports as unscientific and strove for "hard" findings that would align with our preparation as "scientist-practitioners" and pass muster with colleagues engaged in basic research.

Jason, Glenwick, and I shared much in common as graduates of the University of Rochester's doctoral program in clinical-community psychology. Central to that experience was the opportunity to be mentored by Emory Cowen, a founding member of our discipline and originally a stickler for quantitative analyses. Just as many of us were completing our studies or entering initial positions, something changed. Cowen (1980) publicly distinguished research relating to the generation of hypotheses from that focused on their confirmation. The former acknowledged all that could be learned through systematic observation, qualitative interviewing, focus groups, and other qualitative avenues to gathering information. These new pathways to knowledge were to deepen our understanding of the phenomena before us and thereby enrich our appreciation of the complexity of community processes.

At the time, few tools were either available to us or acceptable to psychology's broader discipline wherein we had to establish our academic bona fides. Those who chose to apply these new methods were also responsible for determining how best to analyze the information they acquired and how to justify its value to journal editors, funding sources, and, as noted, tenure-determining colleagues. Fortunately, that era has generally passed, and the diversity of methods presented in this volume provides a quiver full of arrows to apply to targets of inquiry.

What the present volume does not, however, address is the nature of the targets or even of the hunt. From the outset, community psychology has reflected tension between its pursuit of recognition as a science within clinical psychology's tradition of the scientist-practitioner and its desire to effect change in the lives of those who are underserved, underrecognized, and disempowered. Community psychology began as an ally of the community mental health movement, whose defining purpose was to serve the needs of those with limited access to and acceptance of the reigning intervention strategies. The lack of access was to be addressed by relocating services to the communities in which the underserved lived. The lack of acceptance was to be addressed by creating new forms of intervention tailored to the lives and needs of intended recipients. The lack of effectiveness for those in need was

to be addressed in part by broadening the range of options in terms of (a) length (e.g., time-limited therapies), (b) service provider (e.g., paraprofessional and natural caregiver agents), and especially (c) point of intervention (e.g., primary and secondary prevention) along the etiological pathway. Our originating intent was to serve through both innovative services and the gathering of information that would enable our clinical colleagues to enter the communities and lives of those who to that point had been ill-served or underserved.

I raise this point because that same tension lies just beneath the surface of many of this volume's chapters. Focused on explaining the rationale and procedures of their methods, the authors provide the technical details that introduce readers to the potential applications and informational benefits of their procedures. Woven through their recipes and especially their case examples are the variously stated but present themes of gathering new and deeper insights into the lives of the disenfranchised, the disempowered, and the underserved. At times subtly stated and at times explicit, the agenda for applying these innovative quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods can be found, that is, to create, enable, and accomplish *change*! Albeit variously stated, understanding the status quo is precedent to designing its alteration in a nonrandom intentional direction.

Tempted though I might be to present the evidentiary base for such an assertion, I believe that the authors and readers will be better served by conducting their own investigations to determine whether my conclusion is sustainable. Much is said about the value of the methods for theory-building or confirmation without exactly identifying the theoretical base being referenced. Now and again we see references to paradigm without exactly knowing what is paradigmatic about the work or feeling confident that the nature of a paradigm and the breadth of its scientific implications are applicable (Kuhn, 1962). Both "theory" and "paradigm" appear to be stated more as evidence that the work described is truly scientific rather than being presented as the foundation on which the accumulation of information is gathered and its contribution to the "work of normal science" demonstrated.

Assigning the aforementioned underlying tension to community psychology may, admittedly, reflect projection on my part. My career can be perceived as blindly subservient to the principles of positivism or as focused on seeking and applying practical solutions to real problems. Throughout much of that career, I could call upon colleagues such as Seymour Sarason and Robert Newbrough for reassurance that it need not be either-or but rather both-and. Most convincing, however, was Dokecki's (1992) contribution to a special issue (edited by Newbrough, 1992) of the *Journal of Community Psychology* focused on the future of the discipline in a postmodern world. In his paper, Dokecki explained how Schon's (1983) concept of the "reflective practitioner" offers our discipline a valid alternative to clinical psychology's scientist-practitioner model. The latter gathers knowledge to inform and shape practice. The former model, by contrast, has a different purpose, for it "intends to improve the human situation through the close interplay of knowledge use and knowledge generation" (Dokecki, 1992, p. 27).

Note that for the reflective practitioner knowledge is gathered to serve needs, not to build theory! In support of the legitimacy of that purpose, Dokecki (1992) introduced Macmurray's (1957, 1961) analysis of the person-in-community. My reading of this work reframed the gathering of information through investigation from responding to the question of "What do we want to know?" to "What do we want to do?" In this foreword, I am arguing that the latter question is more applicable to the methods and their intent than is the former. I would further contend that such a defining rationale is entirely consistent with the aforementioned underlying theme perceived by me in reading across this volume's content.

Accepting the possibility that community psychology's purpose is to impact the quality of life and effectiveness of communities for their residents does not lessen its worth but rather focuses its efforts. Participatory action research can be acknowledged as an essential element of community-based interventions both because it assures localization of the work but more importantly engages those to be impacted in both acknowledging need and acting to mitigate that need and thereby alter the status quo to a locally preferred condition. Participatory action research allows those receiving services to define both their nature and the limits of their application. "Better" is determined by participants rather than by provider.

Acknowledging that we engage with communities to "do something" together does not mean we

abandon the accumulation of information that has theoretical or paradigmatic import. It does mean, however, that doing takes priority over knowing and that our work and our responsibility are not completed with the acquisition of knowledge or the advancement of science. Those accomplishments add value to our efforts and, admittedly, may lead to tenure, external funding, or disciplinary recognition. They do not, however, lessen our professional responsibility to remain engaged, to continue *our* participation, and to continue the work until released by our partners. To truly enact a participatory action effort requires genuine empowerment of partners over *us*! If we initiate the effort and commit members of a community to engage in assessing their needs, analyzing their resources, and committing to collaboratively moving toward sustainable change, we necessarily commit ourselves (and in many cases our institutions) to remain engaged, however long it takes.

I applaud Jason and Glenwick for their unparalleled success in recruiting the breadth of methodologists gathered for this volume. I further applaud the methodologists for their acknowledgment (intended or not) that community psychology's need for this diversity of methods lies not simply with its evolution as an applied science but most of all with its founding commitment to understanding human needs that would otherwise go unrecognized, underserved, disrespected, and devalued. Our discipline is unlike psychological, social, public health, or public policy sciences, and that difference lies in our defining commitment to become part of the community, wherein we can collaborate with the community as it defines and activates sustainable responses to its needs.

Raymond P. Lorion
Towson University
June 2015

REFERENCES

Cowen, E. L. (1980). The wooing of primary prevention. *American Journal of community Psychology, 8*, 258–284.

Dokecki, P. R. (1992). On knowing the community of caring persons: A methodological basis for the reflective-generative practice of community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology, 20*, 26–235.

Jason, L. A., & Glenwick, D. S. (2012). (Eds.), *Methodological approaches to community-based research*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lorion, R. P. (2012). Foreword. In L. A. Jason & D. S. Glenwick (Eds.), *Methodological approaches to community-based research* (pp. xv–xviii). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Macmurray, J. (1957). *The self as agent.* London, England: Faber.

Macmurray, J. (1961). *Persons in relation.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Newbrough, J. R. (1992). Community psychology in the postmodern world. *Journal of Community Psychology, 20*, 10–25.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are deeply appreciative of our chapter authors, who, on tight time schedules, produced stimulating, integrative, and readable contributions and who graciously worked to comply with our length and style requests. We also are indebted to Raymond Lorion and Anne Bogat for their thoughtful Foreword and Afterword commentaries. In addition, we thank Edward Stevens, Steven A. Miller, Christopher Beasley, Ronald Harvey, Daphna Ram, Doreen Salina, John Moritsugu, and Ariel Stone for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Finally, we greatly appreciate the unflagging support and encouragement of Oxford University Press's editorial staff, particularly Sarah Harrington and Andrea Zekus.

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Leonard A. Jason is a professor of psychology at DePaul University, where he is the director of the Center for Community Research. Dr. Jason received his doctorate in clinical and community psychology from the University of Rochester. He has published over 600 articles and 75 book chapters on such social and health topics as the prevention of, and recovery from, substance abuse; preventive school-based interventions; multimedia interventions; the diagnosis and treatment of myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome; and program evaluation. Dr. Jason has been on the editorial boards of seven peer-reviewed journals and has edited or written 23 books. Additionally, he has served on review committees of the National Institute of Drug Abuse and the National Institute of Mental Health and received more than $34 million in federal research grants. He is a former president of the Division of Community Psychology of the American Psychological Association and a past editor of *The Community Psychologist*.

David S. Glenwick is a professor of psychology at Fordham University. He has been the director of its graduate program in clinical psychology and is currently the co-coordinator of its specialization in clinical child and family psychology. Dr. Glenwick received his doctorate in clinical and community psychology from the University of Rochester. He has edited six books and authored more than 120 articles and book chapters, primarily in the areas of community-based interventions, clinical child psychology, and developmental disabilities, and has been on the editorial boards of four peer-reviewed journals. Dr. Glenwick is a fellow of seven divisions of the American Psychological Association (APA) and has been a member of the APA Continuing Education Committee. He is a past president of the International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology and a former editor of the journal *Criminal Justice and Behavior.*

CONTRIBUTORS

Caterina Arcidiacono
University Federico II, Naples

Adeyinka M. Akinsulure-Smith
City College, City University of New York

James Allen
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Nicole E. Allen
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Valerie R. Anderson
Michigan State University, Michigan

Fabricio Balcazar
University of Illinois, Chicago

John P. Barile
University of Hawaii, Manoa

Brian J. Bishop
Curtin University, Bentley

G. Anne Bogat
Michigan State University, Michigan

Neil M. Boyd
Bucknell University, Lewisburg

Shane R. Brady
University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma

Lauren J. Breen
Curtin University, Bentley

Anne E. Brodsky
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Fiorella Bucci
Ghent University, Ghent

Sara L. Buckingham
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Sarah Callahan
DePaul University, Chicago

Agostino Carbone
University Federico II, Naples

Gina Cardazone
JBS International

Renzo Carli
University of Rome, Sapienza

Brian D. Christens
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Tracy Chu
Brooklyn College, City University of New York

Brian Clark
Habitat for Humanity, Roanoke Valley

Katherine Cloutier
Michigan State University, Michigan

Christian M. Connell
Yale University, Connecticut

Daniel Cooper
Adler School, Illinois

E. J. R. David
University of Alaska, Anchorage

Urmitapa Dutta
University of Massachusetts, Lowell

Emily R. Dworkin
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Peta L. Dzidic
Curtin University, Bentley

Victoria Faust
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jesica Siham Fernández
University of California, Santa Cruz

David Florido del Corral
University of Seville

Patrick J. Fowler
Washington University, St. Louis

Jacob Furst
DePaul University, Chicago

Jennifer Gaddis
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Fiammetta Giovagnoli
University of Rome, Sapienza

David S. Glenwick
Fordham University, New York

Megan R. Greeson
DePaul University, Chicago

Javier Hernández-Ramírez
University of Seville

Mara Hill
University of Alaska, Anchorage

Daniel Holgado
University of Seville

Paula Tran Inzeo
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Leonard A. Jason
DePaul University, Chicago

Shabnam Javdani
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

R. Burke Johnson
University of South Alabama, Alabama

Fraenze Kibowski
Nottingham Trent University, UK

Mariah Kornbluh
Michigan State University, Michigan

Michael J. Kral
Wayne State University, Detroit

Regina Day Langhout
University of California, Santa Cruz

Jennifer A. Lawlor
Michigan State University, Michigan

John Light
Oregon Research Institute, Eugene

Andrew Lohmann
California State University, Long Beach

Raymond P. Lorion
Towson University, Towson

Terri Mannarini
University of Salento, Italy

Mark A. Mattaini
University of Illinois, Chicago

Isidro Maya-Jariego
University of Seville

Daniel McLinden
Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati

Jennifer Watling Neal
Michigan State University, Michigan

Zachary P. Neal
Michigan State University, Michigan

Bradley Olson
National Louis University, Chicago

Emily J. Ozer
University of California, Berkeley

Rosa Maria Paniccia
University of Rome, Sapienza

Fortuna Procentese
University Federico II, Naples

Daniela Stan Raicu
DePaul University, Chicago

Andrew Rasmussen
Fordham University, New York

Stephanie Riger
University of Illinois, Chicago

Rebecca Volino Robinson
University of Alaska, Anchorage

Carolina S. Sarmiento
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jorge Savala
University of California, Santa Cruz

Jill E. Scheibler
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

Erynne Shatto
University of South Alabama, Alabama

Rannveig Sigurvinsdottir
University of Illinois, Chicago

Shannon M. Sparks
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Tres Stefurak
University of South Alabama, Alabama

Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar
University of Illinois, Chicago

Nathan R. Todd
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Ryan Tolman
University of Hawaii, Manoa

Teresa Tuozzi
University Federico II, Naples

Lisa M. Vaughn
Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati

Judah J. Viola
National Louis University, Chicago

Angela L. Walden
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Glenn A. Williams
Leeds Beckett University, UK

Denise Wyldbore
University of California, Santa Cruz

HANDBOOK OF METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH

1

Introduction to Community-Based Methodological Approaches

LEONARD A. JASON AND DAVID S. GLENWICK

Over the past few decades, community-based applications of the newest research methodologies have not kept pace with the development of dynamic theory and multilevel data collection techniques. To address this gap, the present handbook focuses specifically on aiding community-oriented researchers in learning about relevant cutting-edge methodologies. With this end in mind, it presents a number of innovative methodologies relevant to community-based research, illustrating their applicability to specific social problems and projects. Besides representing a comprehensive statement of the state of the science and art with respect to methodology in the area, the volume is intended to point the way to new directions and hopefully further advances in the field in the coming decades.

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND ORGANIZATION

The methodologies presented in this book adopt a social change perspective that is wider than more typical, person-centered health and clinical interventions (Tolan, Keys, Chertok, & Jason, 1990). Community psychology, as an exemplar of community science, emerged about 50 years ago. As the field evolved, certain recurring themes emerged: prevention (versus treatment), competencies (versus weaknesses), collaboration across disciplines, ecological understanding of people within their environments, diversity, and community building as a mode of intervention. These concepts provided a focus on new ways of thinking about contextual factors and how participants could be more involved in applied research efforts, as well as considering more public health–based, systems-oriented, and preventive approaches (Kloos et al., 2012; Moritsugu, Vera, Wong, & Duffy, 2013). At an influential community methods conference, Tolan et al. (1990) responded to a multitude of issues facing the field, including tensions between achieving scientific rigor through the use of traditional reductionistic research designs and accurately capturing processes involved in real-world interventions with persons in the context of community settings. That conference introduced a dialogue regarding criteria necessary to define research of merit and methodological considerations in implementing ecologically driven research. At a later conference (Jason et al., 2004), leaders in the field further explored the gap between scientific knowledge and practice in community-based research methodologies, with an emphasis on consumer participation (i.e., participatory research).

Complementing methodology and practice in community science is a third realm, that of theory. Heuristically useful theories allow us to describe, explain, and predict phenomena. Additionally, the operationalization of a particular theory through our research aids us in uncovering and specifying the theory's limits with regard to its boundary conditions and ability to generate valid predictions. The methodology that is used in community science research may naturally flow from theory, but this is most possible within the context of a clearly articulated theory. Thus, both clear articulation of theoretical community-related constructs and valid measurement of such constructs are necessary in refining theory and explicating real-world phenomena.

We do not advocate for one predominant theory for community science. Many topics in community science will never coalesce around one theory because they are complex systems

comprising multiple mechanisms of operation and change. At a descriptive level, theories in community science, we would argue, should specify what specific aspects of context influence what specific aspects of individuals. Furthermore, the specific mechanisms by which this occurs should be articulated. Ideally, such theoretical positing should lead to relatively unambiguous predictions concerning community-based phenomena (Jason, Stevens, Ram, Miller, & Beasley, 2015). Methods provide the means to test the predictions generated from theories. Given the desirability of theoretical pluralism, we also do not argue for a single method, believing, rather, that there should be a matching between method (or methods, in the case of mixed methods research), on the one hand, and the theoretical underpinnings of a particular research question, on the other hand.

With respect to one salient construct in community science, namely *community*, Heller (2014) recently noted that there is often a lack of a clear theoretical statement about how communities should be conceptualized. Part of the problem stems from the definition of the closely related concept of *neighborhood*, which can vary from a block in a residential community to an online network. In addition, there are a number of mediators of neighborhood effects, including the quality of resources (e.g., libraries, schools, parks), level of community integration (e.g., how well members know each other), and the quality of social ties and interactions. Additional considerations are that not all families respond to community issues in the same way and that neighborhoods change over time. Heller (2014) indicated that impediments that communities confront, such as inadequate resources or insufficient technical knowledge, may require a variety of different strategies. Heller's (2014) ideas have implications for methodology, particularly with respect to the need for community-based researchers to (a) investigate mediators and moderators of phenomena, both within a level and between levels, and (b) conceptualize and operationalize the diverse ways that we can think about community and communities.

Ecological analysis—the overarching framework of the present volume—seeks to understand behavior in the context of individual, family, peer, and community influences (Kelly, 1985, 1990, 2006). As noted by Revenson and Seidman (2002), the field of community psychology (as a discipline within the larger arena of community-based research) has perennially had as its focus the transactions between persons and community-based structures, or, in other words, individuals' and groups' behavior in bidirectional interaction with their social contexts, with an emphasis on prevention and early intervention. Consonant with this perspective, the methodological approaches in this book explore such transactions and provide examples of how to implement and evaluate interventions conducted at the community level. A decade or so ago, Jason et al. (2004) and Revenson et al. (2002) highlighted methodological developments that supported the goals of empirically examining complex individual–environment interactions. A more recent work, by Jason and Glenwick (2012), also described some of the more promising community-level methods but focused just on quantitative methods, to the exclusion of qualitative and mixed methods approaches.

In this chapter we provide an overview of the volume's goals, organizational framework, and individual chapters, with attention to qualitative, quantitative, and (the more recent and burgeoning area of) pluralistic, mixed methods approaches in conceptualizing and addressing community-based problems. The handbook describes how the methodological approaches presented can facilitate the application of the ecological paradigm to the amelioration of social ills. Each chapter discusses how its particular methodology can be used to help analyze data dealing with community-based issues. Furthermore, it illustrates the benefits that occur when community theorists, interventionists, and methodologists work together to better understand complicated person-environment systems and the change processes within communities.

This handbook is intended to reach three critical audiences. The first involves scholars desiring a summary of existing contemporary methods for analyzing data addressing a variety of health and mental health issues. The second involves graduate students in psychology, public policy, urban studies, education, and other social science/human services disciplines designed to prepare students for careers in applied research, public administration, and the helping professions. The third involves practitioners in these fields who conduct program evaluation and consultation activities and who are interested in learning more about and applying these community-based methods.

The volume consists of three sections. Section I focuses on qualitative approaches; Section II on quantitative approaches; and Section III on mixed methods approaches, which combine qualitative and quantitative methods within the same study or project. Qualitative approaches are characterized by (a) an emphasis on understanding the meaning of the phenomenon under consideration to those who are experiencing it; (b) data which typically consist of words, providing "thick description" of the participants' experiences; and (c) active collaboration between the researchers and the participants throughout the research/intervention process (Gergen, Josselson, & Freeman, 2015; Kloos et al., 2012). Examples of qualitative methods are participant observation, qualitative interviews, focus groups, and case studies. Quantitative approaches, in contrast, have the following hallmarks: (a) an emphasis on trying to establish cause-and-effect relationships; (b) data that typically consist of numbers, obtained by the use of standardized measures; and (c) an attempt to produce generalizable findings, as opposed to a qualitative approaches focus on specific contexts (Kloos et al., 2012; Moritsugu et al., 2013). Illustrative of quantitative methods are quantitative description, randomized field experiments, nonequivalent comparison group designs, and interrupted time-series designs.

To promote consistency in format, each chapter is composed of two parts. The first is a critical review of the methodological approach that is the focus of that chapter. Included is the theory underlying the approach, a summary of the steps involved in the use of the approach, and consideration of the approach's benefits and drawbacks. This is followed by a second part presenting either (a) the explication of a social problem or (b) the evaluation of a community-based intervention, thereby demonstrating for the reader how to apply the approach in real-world settings, including analyzing and interpreting the data so obtained.

OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS

Qualitative Approaches

Section I, on qualitative methods, is introduced by Anne E. Brodsky, Sara L. Buckingham, Jill E. Scheibler, and Terri Mannarini (Chapter 2). Their discussion includes the general elements and precepts of the methodology, as well as its utility and applicability to the study, practice, and values of community-oriented research. Brodsky et al. discuss how community psychology, which arose from other movements of the 1960s to question and rethink the dominant paradigms in wellness promotion and illness prevention at the individual and community levels, shares its roots with qualitative methods, which themselves arose from alternative scientific paradigms. The authors mention that this connection goes further, in that the methods that we use are dependent on the paradigms and worldviews that we hold. Thus, Brodsky et al. emphasize that community psychology and qualitative methods are natural partners. The chapter concludes with an example of qualitative community-based work done by the chapter's first author in Afghanistan to explore risk and resilience processes in women's communities.

In Chapter 3, Andrew Rasmussen, Adeyinka M. Akinsulure-Smith, and Tracy Chu discuss grounded theory. Consistent with community psychologists' aim of empowering participants, grounded theory emphasizes developing theoretical frameworks from a close, ground-level examination of data, as opposed to interpreting data by testing a set of a priori hypotheses. This is done through iterative examination of (usually, but not limited to) qualitative data, building from molecular to molar analyses. After a brief history of the basic tenets, the chapter's primary focus is on the specific methods most often currently used and the steps involved in textual analyses (e.g., analyzing transcripts of interviews), leading to the derivation of themes and, ultimately, theory. Several dimensions are presented, from how heavily grounding is emphasized, the role of sensitizing concepts and literature reviews (i.e., a priori knowledge), defining codes, interrater reliability, and the role of research collaborators. Demonstration of the method highlights the authors' involvement in a project involving individual interviews and focus groups with West African immigrant parents and children in New York City, providing stakeholder feedback (i.e., community members' voices) to social service providers.

In Chapter 4, Stephanie Riger and Rannveig Sigurvinsdottir consider thematic analysis, a technique for analyzing qualitative data that involves looking for patterns of meaning that go beyond counting words or phrases. Underlying themes

or issues in data are identified and form the basis for theory. Data are analyzed in a several-step process: (a) data familiarization, (b) initial code generation, (c) searching for themes, (d) reviewing themes, (e) defining and naming themes, and (f) reporting the analysis. The authors begin the chapter by placing thematic analysis within the context of qualitative methods in general. They then describe the process of conducting a thematic analysis and illustrate this process with a study of barriers to addressing substance abuse among perpetrators and victims of intimate partner violence in domestic violence court.

Bradley Olson, Daniel Cooper, Judah Viola, and Brian Clark contribute Chapter 5 on community narrative evaluation, a method derived from the personal narrative approach. Personal narratives are structured around individuals' stories, while community narratives, analogously, consist of personal stories collectively forming the foundation of a group's or community's identity. Thus, the two levels are intimately intertwined. Each community has a unique set of narratives that is a potential source of growth and a way for that community to creatively find its alternative narratives as a means of contrasting itself with other, competing, and dominant narratives in society. One primary approach to gathering personal stories and community narratives is through a life story methodology, in which participants describe key episodes in their lives or within the historical life of their community (such as high, low, or transition points). The case example in this chapter focuses on the use of community narratives in the evaluation of a housing and broader community coalition effort to increase the quality of life in a neighborhood in Roanoke, Virginia.

In Chapter 6, Neil Boyd discusses appreciative inquiry (AI). This change methodology focuses on elevating and expanding communities' strengths. Many participatory action research methodologies tend to start with a focus on fixing community problems. In contrast, AI begins with the premise that a community is a center of relatedness and that extending its strengths invokes a reserve of capacity, which, in turn, reshapes its images such that previously viewed challenges can be confronted in radically different ways. The four-stage AI process involves (a) discovering what is good within the system, (b) envisioning positive images of the future, (c) creating actionable designs, and (d) reaching design and goal outcomes. The example of AI presented involved helping injured workers and their representatives achieve their goals over an 18-month period following an AI change intervention.

In Chapter 7, Shane R. Brady discusses the Delphi method, which emphasizes the insights and perspectives of community participants in order to make informed decisions within a direct practice, social planning, and policy context. Grounded in pragmatism, the Delphi method can promote empowerment by giving voice to historically vulnerable groups. It provides a means for dealing with "difference" through providing community participants the opportunity to engage and participate as equals with professional experts and decision makers in generating decisions about a specific issue. The method creates a circle of dialogue among participants on a specific issue of interest, in which they provide direct responses/nominations (and comments on these) until a consensus is reached. The author provides an example of how the Delphi method has been utilized with members of several neighborhoods within a large urban city in decision making about the community's needs and priorities within the context of community development.

Urmitapa Dutta addresses critical ethnography in Chapter 8. This is an approach that connects detailed cultural analysis to wider social structures and systems of power by simultaneously examining dimensions of race, class, culture, gender, and history. The author first discusses the evolution of ethnography in the social sciences; the philosophical assumptions underlying ethnographic approaches; the critical role of the ethnographer in the research process; and key ethical and validation issues in ethnographic research, data collection, analysis, and dissemination. Next, she considers the influence of feminist, critical, indigenous, and postmodern approaches on ethnographic research. The steps involved in conducting collaborative, participatory, and activist ethnographic research are outlined. In the second part of the chapter, research on youth and protracted ethnic conflict in northeast India illustrates how critical ethnographic approaches can reframe existing social problem definitions in ways that underscore marginalized perspectives and create avenues for community-based interventions.

In Chapter 9, Regina Day Langhout, Jesica Siham Fernández, Denise Wyldbore, and Jorge

Savala present participatory action research (PAR) methodology. PAR is an epistemological approach rooted in a critical theory research paradigm. To create social change, researchers and community members collaborate through a systematic process, in which they develop an agreed-upon problem definition to determine what to study, decide on the method(s) to collect and analyze data, arrive at and implement actions to address the problem, and evaluate these actions and their outcomes. The authors describe the underlying theory of PAR and elucidate the steps involved in the process, with attention to the approach's benefits and drawbacks. They then demonstrate how multiple qualitative methods (in this case, photovoice and house meetings) can be combined to collect data within the PAR approach. This case study shows how PAR enabled the authors and the community members to better understand how people in a heterogeneous unincorporated area thought about their neighborhoods, with the goal of developing better strategies for community-based organizing.

Andrew Lohmann's chapter on geographic information systems (GIS) (Chapter 10) reviews several methodologies (e.g., resident-defined, behavioral approaches, experiencing sample method, and grid approaches) actually or potentially incorporating GIS to understand and operationally define neighborhoods. These methodologies fall on various interconnected spectra: (a) from being completely phenomenological (e.g., resident defined) to almost exclusively administrative (e.g., census units), (b) being emically (i.e., within a group) or etically (i.e., between groups) defined, (c) having stability or variability with respect to neighborhood spatial areas, and (d) the availability of the data. The implications of these dimensions are discussed. As an example of how GIS has been used to define and study neighborhoods in spatial terms, the author describes the utilization of the approach as a way of measuring resident-defined neighborhoods in order to investigate manifestations of localized bonding social capital.

In Chapter 11, Lauren J. Breen, Peta L. Dzidic, and Brian J. Bishop consider causal layered analysis (CLA), a methodology that enables the assessment of worldviews and cultural factors, as well as social, economic, and political structural issues, to be considered in understanding the present and in formulating alternative future projections. CLA utilizes a range of textual, visual, and experiential data sources, such as interview transcripts, photos, videos, and field notes. The analysis is structured according to four conceptual layers, progressing from a topical interpretation of the issue, at the topmost layer, to underlying mythologies and metaphors that underpin the issue, at the deepest layer. By identifying these qualities of the issue being investigated, it is argued that there is a greater propensity for the root of the issue to be identified and therefore the opportunity for meaningful, second-order change to occur. An illustration of CLA is provided involving a relational women's sports community, specifically women's participation in roller derby. In this example, CLA facilitated the uncovering of broad social and cultural understandings of the women's roles and expectations.

In Chapter 12, Renzo Carli, Rosa Maria Paniccia, Fiammetta Giovagnoli, Agostino Carbone, and Fiorella Bucci's discuss emotional textual analysis (ETA), a method used in contextual research. As we are aware, words can convey emotional components of a text (e.g., an interview transcript). ETA analyzes the symbolic level of texts as a part of applied research and interventions. In this approach, language is thought of as an organizer of the relationship between the individual contributor of the text and his or her context, rather than as a detector of the individual's emotions. Tracks of these written representations are viewed within the complexity of this relationship. A case example is presented showing the use of ETA in analyzing the interviews of the inhabitants of an urban area regarding their degree of satisfaction and fulfillment with respect to their employment situations.

Quantitative Approaches

Section II focuses on quantitative analytic approaches. In the introduction to this section (Chapter 13), Christian M. Connell provides an overview of these approaches, emphasizing salient considerations that should be taken into account when selecting a quantitative method. He notes both traditional and more sophisticated statistical methods that are relevant in addressing the aims of various types of research questions. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the quantitative methods used in empirical papers within the *American Journal of Community Psychology*

from 2012 through 2014, highlighting the growth in the utilization of more contexualized, complex methods.

In Chapter 14, Megan R. Greeson discusses latent growth curves and how they are particularly fruitful for analyzing complex, changing community phenomena over time. Latent growth curves are a subset of structural equation modeling that can be used to examine within-case change across repeated measures. One of its key strengths is its ability to capture nonlinear change, which is often characteristic of both naturally occurring phenomena (e.g., phenomena that oscillate in up-and-down patterns) and intervention responses (e.g., lagged intervention effects). Another key strength is the ability to examine variability in change trajectories, which facilitates investigation of group differences over time. The author presents a case study examining nonlinear change over time with respect to the impact of adolescent dating violence on women's annual earned income.

Chapter 15 by Glenn Williams and Fraenze Kibowski on latent class analysis (LCA) and latent profile analysis (LPA) complements Chapter 14. The main aim of LCA is to split seemingly heterogeneous data into subclasses of two or more homogeneous groups or classes. In contrast, LPA is a method that is conducted with continuously scaled data, the focus being on generating profiles of participants instead of testing a theoretical model in terms of a measurement model, path analytic model, or full structural model (as is the case, for example, with structural equation modeling). As an example of LCA and LPA, the authors present findings on sustainable and active travel behaviors among commuters, separating the respondents into classes based on the facilitators of, and hindrances to, certain modes of travel.

In Chapter 16, John P. Barile writes about multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM), which offers many advantages over traditional regression approaches in understanding community-based data. MSEM techniques enable researchers to assess individual- and higher level data simultaneously, while minimalizing individualistic and ecological fallacies commonly present in evaluation and intervention research. An advanced statistical methodology such as MSEM is often required to understand the diverse web of ecological determinants of individual and community well-being. The chapter presents the basic tenets of MSEM and identifies circumstances in which this approach is most appropriate. It concludes with a case example of the use of MSEM in an evaluation of community coalitions, in which data from multiple sources at both the individual and collaborative levels were utilized to better comprehend the processes and outcomes associated with successful collaboration.

In Chapter 17, Nathan R. Todd and Patrick Fowler present (a) cluster-randomized trials (CRTs) as a useful research design for evaluating community-level interventions and (b) multilevel modeling (MLM) as an appropriate way to analyze such data. A CRT design is characterized by assigning intact social groups (e.g., schools or neighborhoods) to intervention and control conditions. This design enables studying naturally occurring groups where individual randomization is not possible or where spillover effects within a setting are of concern. Moreover, the design is useful when the intervention target involves changing something about the environment or setting rather than intervening directly with individuals. This is a strong experimental design and can be used to show how intervention at the group level shapes individual outcomes. The authors then discuss the use of MLM as an analytic strategy for determining and interpreting the magnitude and significance of intervention success. Finally, as an example of the design, they highlight preventive school-based interventions aimed at decreasing suicide.

Mark Mattaini, Leonard A. Jason, and David S. Glenwick in Chapter 18 discuss the use of behavioral methods for implementing and analyzing change over time. There is a long tradition of operant designs that have been employed to effect and evaluate change in individual behavior, but these same types of designs also have been utilized to evaluate community-level data. The authors demonstrate how this orientation, including the utilization of time-series data (i.e., data on a particular behavior/phenomenon that are collected and analyzed on several occasions over a period of time), can be invaluable in providing evidence for the impact of ecological domains on community-based phenomena. The chapter concludes with an example of the application of this methodology to document change in urban littering behavior, with discussion of the intervention's policy implications resulting in legislative change.

In Chapter 19, Jacob Furst, Daniela Stan Raicu, and Leonard A. Jason describe data mining

(also known as artificial intelligence), which can uncover patterns and relationships within large samples of people, organizations, or communities that would not otherwise be evident because of the size and complexity of the data. Data mining often uses decision trees, which attempt to predict a classification (e.g., high-risk neighborhoods in a community), based on successive binary choices. At each branch point of the decision tree, a characteristic is examined (e.g., gang activity within a community), and the decision tree determines whether a characteristic is important in the outcome or classification. In data mining, multiple characteristics are reviewed, and an algorithm is ultimately developed that best predicts class membership (e.g., high- versus low-risk status). The authors illustrate the application of this method to a chronic health condition, showing how computer-generated algorithms helped guide community organizations and government bodies in arriving at more valid and less stigmatizing ways of characterizing patients.

Zachary P. Neal and Jennifer Lawlor present the use of agent-based simulations to model community-level phenomena in Chapter 20 . This is a methodology in which agents (which can represent, for example, individual people, households, or community organizations) interact with one another by following simple rules within a context specified by the researcher. The goal of these models is to understand how different behavioral rules and contextual factors interact and lead to different outcomes. Such models are able to capture the complexity of community dynamics, which are often nonlinear and unpredictable. The authors provide an example of the model, exploring how spatial patterns of residential segregation impact social networks and the likelihood of relationships between different groups.

In Chapter 21, Mariah Kornbluh and Jennifer Watling Neal describe social network analysis (SNA), which focuses on identifying patterns of relationships among sets of actors in a particular system (e.g., friendships among children in a classroom or collaboration among organizations in a coalition). In this chapter, they describe how to collect network data and how to apply network measures to examine phenomena at multiple levels of analysis, including the (a) setting (i.e., characteristics of the whole network), (b) individual (i.e., an actor's position within the network), and (c) dyad (i.e., network characteristics of pairs of actors). In their case example, the authors illustrate how SNA was used to understand how the structure of teacher-advice networks could facilitate or hinder the spread of classroom intervention practices.

Dynamic social network models are the subject of Chapter 22 by Leonard A. Jason, John Light, and Sarah Callahan. This paradigm is distinguished from other approaches by its emphasis on the mutual interdependence between relationships and behavior change over time. As such, it provides a framework for conceptualizing and empirically describing two-way transactional dynamics. Network studies in community-based research have typically been based on "personal" network data, whereby one person rates all of the other people in his or her network, but the linkages among those individuals are usually not known. This chapter, instead, focuses on the more informative models that can be developed from "complete" network data (i.e., where all possible dyadic relationships among individuals or other entities, such as organizations, are measured, providing a structural map of an entire social ecosystem). The authors provide an example showing how the dimensions of trust, friendship, and mentoring changed over time in the relationships among persons living in substance abuse recovery residences.

Mixed Methods Approaches

Section III of the volume contains chapters featuring mixed methods, illustrating the use and integration of both qualitative and quantitative approaches within a single study or project. In Chapter 23, Valerie R. Anderson provides an introduction to mixed methods approaches in community-based research. The chapter begins with a definition of mixed methods research, an overview of key concepts, and ways in which qualitative and quantitative methodologies can be employed in tandem. This is followed by a review of mixed methods studies in community-based research, with a particular focus on the specific techniques utilized and on how mixing methods can add to scientific rigor. Next, the benefits and challenges of integrating qualitative and quantitative data are discussed. The chapter concludes with an illustrative example of a mixed methods case study of a juvenile court system.

In Chapter 24, Brian Christens, Victoria Faust, Jennifer Gaddis, Paula Tran Inzeo, Carolina S. Sarmiento, and Shannon M. Sparks describe the

orchestration of cyclical processes of action and research that mutually inform each other. This chapter elucidates the conceptual foundations of action research and demonstrates its utility as a framework for knowledge generation in collaboration with community organizations. Although action research is often conducted using qualitative methods, the authors make a case for methodological pluralism. Principles for designing and conducting mixed methods action research are provided, drawing specifically on an example of an ongoing collaboration with a community organizing network working on multiple issues, including immigration and transit.

Michael J. Kral and James Allen contribute Chapter 25 on community-based participatory research (CBPR). A defining feature of this perspective is the engagement, as co-researchers in the research process, of the people who are the community of concern. This act of engagement involves a sharing of power and a democratization of the research process, along with, typically, a social action component. The authors trace the historical roots of this approach, which is interconnected with concepts of community empowerment, ecology, social justice, feminism, and critical theory. Their example of the use of mixed methods in CBPR describes key events and outcomes from a collaborative project involving members of a grassroots Alaska Native sobriety effort and university-based researchers, in which a qualitative discovery-based research phase guided the development of measures for a quantitative second phase.

In Chapter 26, Emily J. Ozer's discussion on youth-led participatory action research (YPAR) presents a change process that engages students in identifying problems that they want to improve, conducting research to understand the nature of the problems, and advocating for changes based on research evidence. It explicitly focuses on the integration of systematic research implemented by young people with guidance from adult facilitators. The author describes YPAR's core processes, identifying similarities and distinctions between YPAR and other approaches to youth development, as well as factors that support YPAR projects' functioning and sustainability. She also makes links to the broader practice of CBPR (the approach discussed in Chapter 25), noting special considerations in conducting CBPR with youth. The chapter concludes with a case study in which qualitative and quantitative methods were used to assess the effects of participatory research on adolescents and their schools with respect to such dimensions as youth–adult power sharing and youth engagement.

Rebecca Volino Robinson, E. J. R. David, and Mara Hill write on participatory mixed methods across cultures in Chapter 27. Mixed methodology is particularly useful when researching in cross-cultural or cultural contexts, as it allows for both etic (i.e., between groups) and emic (i.e., within a group) investigations of phenomena. Participation occurs on a continuum from informal consultation with community representatives to fully integrated, participatory methodology that centralizes the community voice throughout all aspects of the research process and dissemination. Strengths and challenges faced when conducting participatory mixed methods research in a cultural context are discussed. As an example of this approach, they describe a participatory mixed methods investigation of resilience amid forced displacement in the context of Somali culture.

In Chapter 28, Katherine Cloutier presents (a) the utilization of performance ethnography within a CBPR framework and (b) the combination of this qualitative approach with quantitative methods. Performance ethnography considers such forms of performance as photo, video, fiction, and narrative histories (as well as other traditional or innovative formats that may fall under creative analytic processes) as integral components of an ethnographic research process. The author discusses the benefits and challenges of employing this approach within a CBPR framework. The chapter's case study describes the incorporation of elements of performance ethnography (specifically video creation and documentary work) into a sexual health education program in secondary schools in Barbados. The author demonstrates how this approach paved the way for a mixed methods, multiphase study that emerged as a result of initial fieldwork.

In Chapter 29, Gina Cardazone and Ryan T. Tolman focus on data visualization and its potential uses in participatory research, exploratory data analysis, program evaluation, and dissemination of research results. Although quite broad in scope, data visualization can be used in reference to ubiquitous items such as static bar charts or maps. User-friendly interactive data visualizations may enable people to manipulate large data

sets, allowing for instant reconfiguration of the display based on specified variables. Participatory researchers with indigenous knowledge of their community who are able to interact effectively with data sets may generate predictions or research questions that may never occur to social scientists. Data visualization also has considerable potential with respect to the interpretation and dissemination of research results, enabling individuals, organizations, and policymakers to better understand complex concepts and relationships and make data-informed decisions. The case example presented explores how interactive data visualizations were employed in partnership with a Hawaii-based coalition targeting the prevention of child abuse and neglect.

Lisa M. Vaughn and Daniel McLinden discuss concept mapping in Chapter 30. This is an integrative mixed methods research approach that uses brainstorming and unstructured sorting combined with the multivariate statistical methods of multidimensional scaling and hierarchical cluster analysis to create a structured, data-driven visual representation of the ideas of a group. Concept mapping is uniquely suited to conducting research in a community and can be used within a participatory research framework. Unlike other group processes, concept mapping is not a consensus-building process but rather enables the multiple, diverse perspectives of various community stakeholders/participants to emerge. First, individuals work independently to generate ideas about a target issue. These ideas are then shared with the entire community and sorted into categories. Finally, results of the multivariate analysis visualize what the community members think about the issue. The authors present a project in which concept mapping was utilized to determine specific strategies to prevent teen suicide.

In Chapter 31, Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar and Fabricio Balcazar present a mixed methods approach to community development that combines the concerns report (a qualitative approach)—a survey that is developed in a participatory way by a group of community members—with a behavioral functional analysis (a quantitative approach). They describe how multiple factors play a role in the process of addressing community needs and ultimately can influence the success of the methodology's implementation. The chapter demonstrates how, taking into account contextual factors, the approach can help facilitate the skill development of community members leading action projects. The chapter's case study shows how these methods were utilized to aid a rural community in Mexico in promoting community and economic development.

Isidro Maya-Jariego, David Florido del Corral, Daniel Holgado, and Javier Hernández-Ramírez discuss network analysis and stakeholder analysis within mixed methods research in Chapter 32. Particular attention is paid to network visualization as a valuable tool for collecting, exploring, and analyzing data and as a way of presenting relational data. The chapter illustrates how such qualitative and quantitative analyses can be combined and integrated within the intervention process. The case example demonstrates the application of network analysis and stakeholder analysis to improving participation in organizations of fishermen and skippers in the Andalucia region of Spain.

In Chapter 33, Nicole E. Allen, Angela Walden, Emily Dworkin, and Shabnam Javdani discuss how qualitative approaches can be combined with quantitative ones (e.g., MLM) to enrich understanding of the contextual realities that shape the way that settings function and exert influence. A mixed methods approach to multilevel, multisetting inquiry allows examination of the strategic interplay of qualitative and quantitative methods at multiple stages of the inquiry process from data collection to interpretation. The chapter describes this interplay, drawing on theory in mixed methods regarding sequential design in the data collection process (in which one data collection method informs the next), analysis, and meaning making. This approach is illustrated by its application to a statewide network of family violence coordinating councils, which had a common mission and desired outcomes but were embedded within unique local community contexts.

In Chapter 34, Tres Stefurak, R. Burke Johnson, and Erynne Shatto describe dialectical pluralism, which is a process theory for dialoging across differences and effecting dynamic integration of divergent perspectives and methods to produce a more complex and meaningful whole. Recognizing that reality is dynamic, process theory provides a procedure, mechanism, and approach for obtaining desired outcomes, with equal participation and effective communication as key elements. The authors demonstrate how dialectical pluralism can be used to integrate the views of multiple

stakeholders and findings from multiple methods. They also examine the benefits and costs of utilizing a values-based program evaluation lens based on dialectical pluralism. The approach is illustrated by a case study involving the evaluation of a community-based intervention program for juvenile offenders.

In the final chapter (Chapter 35), Caterina Arcidiacono, Teresa Tuozzi, and Fortuna Procentese describe the community profiling technique, a method that enables researchers and community members to identify the needs, resources, and deficiencies of communities and of local institutions and services. The approach involves the gathering of three types of data: (a) objective (e.g., demographic information and economic indicators), (b) subjective (mainly drawn from interviews with key informants from diverse contexts), and (c) symbolic (e.g., through dramatization and drawing). In this way, a community's strengths and weaknesses, as well as priorities and critical points for possible action plans and interventions, can be identified. The authors demonstrate the application of this approach with respect to a community development project in Naples, Italy.

We hope that the present work stimulates academically based social scientists, community-based professionals, and graduate students from various disciplines to contribute to the further maturation of community-based research and intervention by utilizing a wide array of methods that are theoretically sound, empirically valid, and creative. By addressing questions of import for the communities in which and with whom the authors work, community-oriented researchers and community-based organizations can facilitate ever more meaningful understanding and beneficial change within these communities.

REFERENCES

Gergen, K. J., Josselson, R., & Freeman, M. (2015) The promises of qualitative inquiry. *American Psychologist*, *70*, 1–9.

Heller, K. (2014). Community and organizational mediators of social change: A theoretical inquiry. In T. P. Gullotta & M. Bloom (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of primary prevention and health promotion* (2nd ed., pp. 294–302). New York, NY: Springer.

Jason, L. A., & Glenwick, D. S. (2012). (Eds.), *Methodological approaches to community-based research*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Jason, L. A., Keys, C. B., Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Taylor, R. R., Davis, M., Durlak, J., & Isenberg, D. (2004). (Eds.). *Participatory community research: Theories and methods in action*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Jason, L. A., Stevens, E., Ram, D., Miller, S. A., & Beasley, C. R. (2016). *Theories and the field of community psychology*. Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice.

Kelly, J. G. (1985). The concept of primary prevention: Creating new paradigms. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, *5*, 269–272.

Kelly, J. G. (1990). Changing contexts and the field of community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *18*, 769–792.

Kelly, J. G. (2006). *Becoming ecological: An exploration into community psychology*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Kloos, B., Hill, J., Thomas, E., Wandersman, A., Elias, M. J., & Dalton, J. H. (2012). *Community psychology: Linking individuals and communities.* Stamford, CT: Wadsworth.

Moritsugu, J., Vera, E., Wong, F. & Duffy, K. (2013). *Community psychology* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Revenson, T. A., D'Augelli, A. R., French, S. E., Hughes, D. L., Livert, D., Seidman, E., . . . Yoshikawa, H. (Eds.).(2002). *A quarter century of community psychology: Readings from the American Journal of Community Psychology*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Revenson, T. A, & Seidman, E. (2002). Looking backward and moving forward: Reflections on a quarter century of community psychology. In T. A. Revenson, A. R. D'Augelli, S. E. French, D. L. Hughes, D. Livert, E. Seidman, . . . H. Yoshikawa (Eds.), *A quarter century of community psychology: Readings from the American Journal of Community Psychology* (pp. 3–31). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Tolan, P., Keys, C., Chertok, F., & Jason, L. A. (Eds.). (1990). *Researching community psychology: Issues of theories and methods*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

SECTION I

Qualitative Approaches