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Discussion

Question 1

Choosing the right method of research for assessing disaster events involve challenges for the researcher. Qualitative methods are not well suited for research on disaster events. I think that quantitative methods are more practical for conducting research on the implications of such events. The primary reason for choosing quantitative methods is that they allow quantifying the data. This makes it easy for the researcher to evaluate the information collected from participants (Oermann & Gaberson, 2017). Because disaster events are focused on determining the quality of support programs or relief policy, it is more useful to rely on quantitative methods.

If I had to design research in New Orleans for studying the immediate aftermath of Hurricane Katrina I would have adopted quantitative methods. This is because quantitative methods can be computed easily in numerical format. Surveys can rely on a closed-ended questionnaire that will provide clear and concise information to the participants. Closed-ended questions are more appropriate because for disaster-related research because outcomes can be evaluated with accuracy and convenience. Such survey saves time because respondents can easily understand the questions and they only need to mark the right options. The researcher can provide options such as; ‘yes’, ‘no’ or use a Likert scale. The scale will provide different options as; strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. This will be effective for assessing the reactions of the participants towards disaster events like Katrina (Oermann & Gaberson, 2017). I will choose a quantitative methodology because it will be easy to quantify the answers of the respondents. A practical tool for conducting quantitative research is through a close-ended questionnaire. The common analytical tools include sample t-test, correlations, and descriptive statistics. The questionnaire is also a practical tool for determining the feelings of the victims associated with disaster events. A 3-point Likert scale is used for assessing the responses of the participants. The options available on the scale are; agree, disagree and don’t know (Mulango, Atashili, Gaynes, & Njim, 2018). The computational and statistical tools will be employed for evaluating the findings of the survey. Closed-ended questions are more effective because victims may not be willing to give more time for the survey.

The researcher faces unique challenges in conducting research on disaster events. the primary challenge that the researcher encounter is targeting the right population of disasters. The survey must target the victims who were directly affected by the hurricane. Following ethical guidelines also pose challenges for the researcher. This method requires that the researcher must be able to prove the validity of the survey and justification for the selection of sample size. As the evaluation of larger population is based on the selected sample size, the researcher will need to include sufficient questions that could prove the reliability of the tool (Oermann & Gaberson, 2017). It is important to consider if the instrument (questionnaire) provides the same results under a similar situation.

Response

I like the post of Riley S Odams because he answered the question related to research methods on disaster research. In order to conduct research, Odams has considered many sources on disaster and identified qualitative methods that are appropriate for research. qualitative methods are practical for disaster studies because they allow representation of a large amount of individual human feelings. This is useful in determining how people respond to situations that involve adversities (Mulango, Atashili, Gaynes, & Njim, 2018). I agree with Odams statement that quantitative method is effective for identifying the implications of disasters such as the amount of damage and number of displaced people. These methods are useful for identifying the feelings and reactions of people in different situations. Open-ended questions are easy to handle as it allows research to assign numeric values for assessing participants responses. In this process, the participants are given options and asked to pick the right one. They can be effective for assessing the feelings of the people.

I agree with the viewpoints of Odams because he provides a realistic example for determining the efficiency of quantitative methods. The implications of Hurricane Katrina can be examined more appropriately by using quantitative methods. The process involves asking direct questions from the victims. Their answers to the questions in numeric values permit the researcher to compute them. Open-ended questions are easy for respondents to understand (Oermann & Gaberson, 2017). This will explain their satisfaction or concerns associated with the recovery programs. These questions allow the researcher to study the perceptions and views of victims associated with the recovery plan. Observations collected through such methods are useful because they help policymakers to recognize the gaps that undermine the effectiveness of the recovery programs. This is also a practical method for exploring the weaknesses and limitations of the support programs. The quantitative methods can be employed for studying the challenges faced by the victims of disasters. I agree with Odam's post that open-ended questions allow participants to express their feelings and attitudes towards an event more appropriately. The responses collected through quantitative methods allow the researcher to assess the feelings or respondents.

I like the post of Rebecca A Bianchi because she discusses the strengths of quantitative methods. The chosen methods are useful for evaluating victim responses to disaster events like Hurricane Katrina. I agree that the articles provide a better understanding of how Katrina could be examined by incorporating quantitative research methodology. The purpose of choosing this research is to conduct a survey that allow the researcher to directly investigate the victims of the event. I agree that quantitative methods are useful because they allow the researcher to inquire about the larger population. This is also a practical approach for studying the behaviors of people associated with adverse events. The data can be obtained geographically by targeting a specific population. I think that such methods can be utilized for assessing the attitudes of people who suffered natural disasters. This can also be helpful in finding the effectiveness of the recovery programs offered by the state or community.

I agree with Bianchi that it is not ethical to conduct interviews during the time of disaster. This is because victims are seeking help and there are going through a bad time. In such a situation, it is not appropriate to engage them in interviews. The researcher has a responsibility to conduct surveys by complying to the ethical guidelines. However during disasters the researcher exhibit greater risks of discomforting the victim of the disaster. I agree that a better approach is to investigate people when they receive help and have settled. Observational methods are an effective tool for collecting information on disastrous events and their implications on the people. I agree that "observational methods would provide a detailed description of the rescue and supply delivery process”. if the researcher fulfills the ethical requirements of the survey it is possible to find information that will help in improving the programs and quality of services for the victims of natural disasters. I agree that findings will be effective for forming effective policy measures in the future. Quantitative methods will be useful in determining concerns of the people who are affected by disasters directly or indirectly. Observations can be presented in numerical format.
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