

Correlational methods



Running head: CORRELATIONAL METHODS Correlational Methods 23 June

The choice of variables and methods usually predetermines the quality and validity of study results. This paper is a brief summary and evaluation of three research articles. Brief information regarding the title of each article, sample and research procedures, results and confounding factors is provided. An evaluation of the validity and reliability of the study results is included. Keywords: sample, method, article, study, results, validity.

Correlational Methods Fleschner, N. & Zlotta, A. R. (2007). Prostate cancer prevention: Past, present, and future. *Cancer*, 110(9), 1889-1999. The research was conducted by Neil Fleschner, M. D. and Alexander E. Zlotta, M. D. The authors used simple descriptive methodology to review the past, present, and future of prostate cancer and their implications for medicine. No empirical methods were used, but the authors limited their review to the scientific data and evidence on available prevention strategies and pharmacological interventions, including the results of the Prostate Cancer Prevention Trial. The results indicate that the prevention of prostate cancer is one of the most thoroughly investigated issues in contemporary clinical practice. The absence of empirical results suggests that personal bias could affect the interpretation of primary and secondary data related to the prevention of prostate cancer. Killbridge, K. L., Fraser, G., Krahn, M., Nelson, E., Conaway, M., Bashore, R. et al. (2009). Lack of comprehension of common prostate cancer terms in an underserved population. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 27(12), 2015-2021. The research was completed by a team of clinical professionals from a variety of medical institutions, including the Massachusetts General Hospital, Central Virginia Community Center, Washington University, and others. No information about the researchers' <https://assignbuster.com/correlational-methods-book-report-samples/>

positions and credentials was provided. The researchers reviewed a broad range of education materials and quality-of-life materials for patients, related to prostate cancer, to identify how sexual, bowel, and urinary function were defined. Face-to-face interviews with 105 respondents were conducted to assess their understanding of the terms. Respondents were enrolled through the Central Virginia Community Health Center in Buckingham County and the University Medical Associates Clinic at University of Virginia, after official agreement was received from the respondents' nurses and physicians.

Semiquantitative methods were used to assess the degree of comprehension in the sample. The researchers discovered that the degree of comprehension in the sample participants was directly related to their level of literacy. Given that the majority of respondents demonstrated literacy levels between fourth and sixth grades, they also had difficulties with understanding the terms and were poorly equipped with knowledge about the disease under

consideration. Previous knowledge of prostate cancer and selection bias could affect internal validity of the study results. Arnold-Reed, D. E., Hince, D. A., Bulsara, M. K., Ngo, H. et al. (2008). Knowledge and attitudes of men about prostate cancer. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 189(6), 312-314. The

research was completed by a group of professionals, whose professional achievements and credentials are unknown. The researchers sought to assess the degree of understanding of prostate cancer and available treatments among older males. The study took place between January and August 2006, and a convenience sample of 503 men aged 40-80 years was hired through five general practices in metropolitan Perth and Western Australia. The questionnaire with 17 multiple-choice questions was administered verbally. The results indicated that 80% of men had no

knowledge of prostate function, whereas 35% knew nothing of prostate cancer treatments. Selection bias could become a serious confounding variable affecting generalizability of the study results. Final Comments The use of empirical methods lends credibility to any study results. Therefore, it is possible to assume that the results of Fleshner and Zlotta's (2007) study are the weakest and most questionable of all studies discussed here.

Simultaneously, convenience sampling in Arnold-Reed et al (2008) renders the study results less credible, as long as a convenience sample may not be representative of the study population/ group. Future research must focus on the analysis of the discussed study results. Randomization should be use to enhance internal validity of the research findings. References Arnold-Reed, D. E., Hince, D. A., Bulsara, M. K., Ngo, H. et al. (2008). Knowledge and attitudes of men about prostate cancer. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 189(6), 312-314. Fleschner, N. & Zlotta, A. R. (2007). Prostate cancer prevention: Past, present, and future. *Cancer*, 110(9), 1889-1999. Killbridge, K. L., Fraser, G., Krahn, M., Nelson, E., Conaway, M., Bashore, R. et al. (2009). Lack of comprehension of common prostate cancer terms in an underserved population. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 27(12), 2015-2021.