

Chapter 1 : What Is Purposive Sample? When and How to Use It? - EnkiVillage

Purposeful sampling is widely used in qualitative research for the identification and selection of information-rich cases related to the phenomenon of interest. Although there are several different purposeful sampling strategies, criterion sampling appears to be used most commonly in implementation.

But it does mean that nonprobability samples cannot depend upon the rationale of probability theory. At least with a probabilistic sample, we know the odds or probability that we have represented the population well. We are able to estimate confidence intervals for the statistic. In general, researchers prefer probabilistic or random sampling methods over nonprobabilistic ones, and consider them to be more accurate and rigorous. However, in applied social research there may be circumstances where it is not feasible, practical or theoretically sensible to do random sampling. Here, we consider a wide range of nonprobabilistic alternatives. We can divide nonprobability sampling methods into two broad types: Most sampling methods are purposive in nature because we usually approach the sampling problem with a specific plan in mind. The most important distinctions among these types of sampling methods are the ones between the different types of purposive sampling approaches. Accidental, Haphazard or Convenience Sampling One of the most common methods of sampling goes under the various titles listed here. I would also argue that the typical use of college students in much psychological research is primarily a matter of convenience. In clinical practice, we might use clients who are available to us as our sample. In many research contexts, we sample simply by asking for volunteers. Purposive Sampling In purposive sampling, we sample with a purpose in mind. We usually would have one or more specific predefined groups we are seeking. For instance, have you ever run into people in a mall or on the street who are carrying a clipboard and who are stopping various people and asking if they could interview them? Most likely they are conducting a purposive sample and most likely they are engaged in market research. They might be looking for Caucasian females between years old. They size up the people passing by and anyone who looks to be in that category they stop to ask if they will participate. Purposive sampling can be very useful for situations where you need to reach a targeted sample quickly and where sampling for proportionality is not the primary concern. With a purposive sample, you are likely to get the opinions of your target population, but you are also likely to overweight subgroups in your population that are more readily accessible. All of the methods that follow can be considered subcategories of purposive sampling methods. We might sample for specific groups or types of people as in modal instance, expert, or quota sampling. We might sample for diversity as in heterogeneity sampling. Or, we might capitalize on informal social networks to identify specific respondents who are hard to locate otherwise, as in snowball sampling. In all of these methods we know what we want -- we are sampling with a purpose. Modal Instance Sampling In statistics, the mode is the most frequently occurring value in a distribution. In sampling, when we do a modal instance sample, we are sampling the most frequent case, or the "typical" case. In a lot of informal public opinion polls, for instance, they interview a "typical" voter. There are a number of problems with this sampling approach. First, how do we know what the "typical" or "modal" case is? We could say that the modal voter is a person who is of average age, educational level, and income in the population. And, how do you know that those three variables -- age, education, income -- are the only or even the most relevant for classifying the typical voter? What if religion or ethnicity is an important discriminator? Clearly, modal instance sampling is only sensible for informal sampling contexts. Expert Sampling Expert sampling involves the assembling of a sample of persons with known or demonstrable experience and expertise in some area. Often, we convene such a sample under the auspices of a "panel of experts. First, because it would be the best way to elicit the views of persons who have specific expertise. In this case, expert sampling is essentially just a specific subcase of purposive sampling. You might convene an expert panel consisting of persons with acknowledged experience and insight into that field or topic and ask them to examine your modal definitions and comment on their appropriateness and validity. The disadvantage is that even the experts can be, and often are, wrong. Quota Sampling In quota sampling, you select people nonrandomly according to some fixed quota. There are two types of quota sampling: In proportional quota sampling you want to represent the major characteristics of

the population by sampling a proportional amount of each. Will it be by gender, age, education race, religion, etc.? Nonproportional quota sampling is a bit less restrictive. In this method, you specify the minimum number of sampled units you want in each category. Instead, you simply want to have enough to assure that you will be able to talk about even small groups in the population. This method is the nonprobabilistic analogue of stratified random sampling in that it is typically used to assure that smaller groups are adequately represented in your sample. Another term for this is sampling for diversity. In many brainstorming or nominal group processes including concept mapping, we would use some form of heterogeneity sampling because our primary interest is in getting broad spectrum of ideas, not identifying the "average" or "modal instance" ones. In effect, what we would like to be sampling is not people, but ideas. We imagine that there is a universe of all possible ideas relevant to some topic and that we want to sample this population, not the population of people who have the ideas. Clearly, in order to get all of the ideas, and especially the "outlier" or unusual ones, we have to include a broad and diverse range of participants. Heterogeneity sampling is, in this sense, almost the opposite of modal instance sampling.

Snowball Sampling In snowball sampling, you begin by identifying someone who meets the criteria for inclusion in your study. You then ask them to recommend others who they may know who also meet the criteria. Although this method would hardly lead to representative samples, there are times when it may be the best method available. Snowball sampling is especially useful when you are trying to reach populations that are inaccessible or hard to find. For instance, if you are studying the homeless, you are not likely to be able to find good lists of homeless people within a specific geographical area. However, if you go to that area and identify one or two, you may find that they know very well who the other homeless people in their vicinity are and how you can find them.

Chapter 2 : Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling :: Science Publishing Group

Purposive sampling (also known as judgment, selective or subjective sampling) is a sampling technique in which researcher relies on his or her own judgment when choosing members of population to participate in the study. Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling method and it occurs when.

Open in a separate window Embedded in each strategy is the ability to compare and contrast, to identify similarities and differences in the phenomenon of interest. Nevertheless, some of these strategies e. The latter are similar to the use of quantitative central tendency measures e. Moreover, certain strategies, like stratified purposeful sampling or opportunistic or emergent sampling, are designed to achieve both goals. As Patton , p. Each of the strata would constitute a fairly homogeneous sample. For instance, the range of variation in a sample from which purposive sample is to be taken is often not really known at the outset of a study. To set as the goal the sampling of information-rich informants that cover the range of variation assumes one knows that range of variation. Second, there are a not insignificant number in the qualitative methods field who resist or refuse systematic sampling of any kind and reject the limiting nature of such realist, systematic, or positivist approaches. However, even those who equate purposeful sampling with systematic sampling must offer a rationale for selecting study participants that is linked with the aims of the investigation i. What qualifies them to address the aims of the study? While systematic sampling may be associated with a post-positivist tradition of qualitative data collection and analysis, such sampling is not inherently limited to such analyses and the need for such sampling is not inherently limited to post-positivist qualitative approaches Patton, Purposeful Sampling in Implementation Research Characteristics of Implementation Research In implementation research, quantitative and qualitative methods often play important roles, either simultaneously or sequentially, for the purpose of answering the same question through convergence of results from different sources, answering related questions in a complementary fashion, using one set of methods to expand or explain the results obtained from use of the other set of methods, using one set of methods to develop questionnaires or conceptual models that inform the use of the other set, and using one set of methods to identify the sample for analysis using the other set of methods Palinkas et al. A review of mixed method designs in implementation research conducted by Palinkas and colleagues revealed seven different sequential and simultaneous structural arrangements, five different functions of mixed methods, and three different ways of linking quantitative and qualitative data together. However, this review did not consider the sampling strategies involved in the types of quantitative and qualitative methods common to implementation research, nor did it consider the consequences of the sampling strategy selected for one method or set of methods on the choice of sampling strategy for the other method or set of methods. For instance, one of the most significant challenges to sampling in sequential mixed method designs lies in the limitations the initial method may place on sampling for the subsequent method. As Morse and Neihaus observe, when the initial method is qualitative, the sample selected may be too small and lack randomization necessary to fulfill the assumptions for a subsequent quantitative analysis. On the other hand, when the initial method is quantitative, the sample selected may be too large for each individual to be included in qualitative inquiry and lack purposeful selection to reduce the sample size to one more appropriate for qualitative research. The fact that potential participants were recruited and selected at random does not necessarily make them information rich. An additional three studies Henke et al. The remaining 20 studies provided no description of the sampling strategy used to identify participants for qualitative data collection and analysis; however, a rationale could be inferred based on a description of who were recruited and selected for participation. Of the 28 studies, 3 used more than one sampling strategy. For instance, in a series of studies based on the National Implementing Evidence-Based Practices Project, participants included semi-structured interviews with consultant trainers and program leaders at each study site Brunette et al. Six studies used some form of maximum variation sampling to ensure representativeness and diversity of organizations and individual practitioners. Two studies used intensity sampling to make contrasts. Aarons and Palinkas , for example, purposefully selected 15 child welfare case managers representing those having the most positive and those having the most negative views

of SafeCare, an evidence-based prevention intervention, based on results of a web-based quantitative survey asking about the perceived value and usefulness of SafeCare. Kramer and Burns recruited and interviewed clinicians providing usual care and clinicians who dropped out of a study prior to consent to contrast with clinicians who provided the intervention under investigation. One study Hoagwood et al. County mental directors, agency directors, and program managers were recruited to represent the policy interests of implementation while clinicians, administrative support staff and consumers were recruited to represent the direct practice perspectives of EBP implementation. Table 2 below provides a description of the use of different purposeful sampling strategies in mixed methods implementation studies. Criterion-i sampling was most frequently used in mixed methods implementation studies that employed a simultaneous design where the qualitative method was secondary to the quantitative method or studies that employed a simultaneous structure where the qualitative and quantitative methods were assigned equal priority. Three of the six studies that used maximum variation sampling used a simultaneous structure with quantitative methods taking priority over qualitative methods and a process of embedding the qualitative methods in a larger quantitative study Henke et al. Two of the six studies used maximum variation sampling in a sequential design Aarons et al. The single typical case study involved a simultaneous design where the qualitative study was embedded in a larger quantitative study for the purpose of complementarity Hoagwood et al. Although not used in any of the 28 implementation studies examined here, another common sequential sampling strategy is using criteria sampling of the larger quantitative sample to produce a second-stage qualitative sample in a manner similar to maximum variation sampling, except that the former narrows the range of variation while the latter expands the range. Table 2 Purposeful sampling strategies and mixed method designs in implementation research Sampling strategy.

Chapter 3 : Purposive sampling | LÃird Dissertation

Critical case sampling is a type of purposive sampling technique that is particularly useful in exploratory qualitative research, research with limited resources, as well as research where a single case (or small number of cases) can be decisive in explaining the phenomenon of interest.

Sampling Methods for Quantitative Research Sampling Methods Sampling and types of sampling methods commonly used in quantitative research are discussed in the following module. Explain probability and non-probability sampling and describes the different types of each. Researchers commonly examine traits or characteristics parameters of populations in their studies. A population is a group of individual units with some commonality. For example, a researcher may want to study characteristics of female smokers in the United States. This would be the population being analyzed in the study, but it would be impossible to collect information from all female smokers in the U. Therefore, the researcher would select individuals from which to collect the data. This is called sampling. The group from which the data is drawn is a representative sample of the population the results of the study can be generalized to the population as a whole. The sample will be representative of the population if the researcher uses a random selection procedure to choose participants. The group of units or individuals who have a legitimate chance of being selected are sometimes referred to as the sampling frame. If a researcher studied developmental milestones of preschool children and target licensed preschools to collect the data, the sampling frame would be all preschool aged children in those preschools. Students in those preschools could then be selected at random through a systematic method to participate in the study. This does, however, lead to a discussion of biases in research. For example, low-income children may be less likely to be enrolled in preschool and therefore, may be excluded from the study. Extra care has to be taken to control biases when determining sampling techniques. There are two main types of sampling: The difference between the two types is whether or not the sampling selection involves randomization. Randomization occurs when all members of the sampling frame have an equal opportunity of being selected for the study. Following is a discussion of probability and non-probability sampling and the different types of each. Probability Sampling â€” Uses randomization and takes steps to ensure all members of a population have a chance of being selected. There are several variations on this type of sampling and following is a list of ways probability sampling may occur: Random sampling â€” every member has an equal chance Stratified sampling â€” population divided into subgroups strata and members are randomly selected from each group Systematic sampling â€” uses a specific system to select members such as every 10th person on an alphabetized list Cluster random sampling â€” divides the population into clusters, clusters are randomly selected and all members of the cluster selected are sampled Multi-stage random sampling â€” a combination of one or more of the above methods Non-probability Sampling â€” Does not rely on the use of randomization techniques to select members. This is typically done in studies where randomization is not possible in order to obtain a representative sample. Bias is more of a concern with this type of sampling. The different types of non-probability sampling are as follows:

Chapter 4 : Nonprobability sampling - Wikipedia

A purposive sample is a non-probability sample that is selected based on characteristics of a population and the objective of the study. Purposive sampling is also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling. This type of sampling can be very useful in situations when you need to reach a.

The methods most commonly used in qualitative studies are given here, including the purpose for which the method is especially useful and its disadvantages.

Convenience sampling Convenience sampling is a method in which, for convenience sake, the study units that happen to be available at the time of data collection are selected in the sample. Many health facility or drug-outlet-based studies use convenience samples. If you wanted to study information provision on medicines in pharmacies, you could observe all client-drug-seller interactions during one particular day. This is more convenient than taking a random sample of people in the village and it gives a useful first impression. A drawback of convenience sampling is that the sample may be quite biased. Some people may be overselected, others underselected or missed altogether. In this example, the interactions observed may be biased because the pharmacist does not work on the day observed. You also miss the clients who obtain their medicines from other sources. Informal drug outlets in communities are often as important as pharmacies as sources of medicines. It is necessary to study interactions at those outlets as well, to get a good impression of the provision of information on drugs.

Maximum variation sampling This sampling method aims to select study units which represent a wide range of variation in dimensions of interest. For example, the researcher may be interested in the reasons that people do not comply with antibiotic prescriptions, and assume that gender and socio-economic status are important background variables. The researcher is afraid to miss men, who are often not at home when researchers visit to conduct semi-structured interviews. Therefore, the researchers decide to conduct interviews during the day and in the evenings, and to ensure that at least 15 men and women are included in the sample. Maximum variation can also be used as a strategy to select communities in which to do research. In the example, this would imply that the researcher selects one relatively rich and one poor community. Maximum variation sampling is also often used when deciding on which groups to involve in focus group discussions. Remember, the informants participating in each FGD should be relatively homogenous as far as key background variables for the study are concerned.

Snowball sampling Snowball sampling is perhaps the most common sampling method used in qualitative studies. The researcher starts by identifying some at least two individuals who are relevant to the study, for example, women with pre-school children in a study on home-treatments in malaria, and then asking them to locate other useful informants, i. The advantage of this method is that one informant refers the researcher to another, so that the researcher has a good introduction for the next interview. A disadvantage is that the variation in the sample may be limited because it consists of informants who belong to the networks of the index cases. This is why it is important to have at least two different additional entrances in the community.

Sampling contrasting cases Comparative studies sampling will involve two or more population groups with distinct characteristics. This sampling method is useful in comparative studies that aim to explain problems by establishing which factors are associated with them or cause them. For example, in a study aimed at understanding why mothers do not use oral rehydration therapy ORT to prevent childhood death in diarrhoea cases, both women who use ORT and those who do not can be sampled and compared. Contrast sampling can also be used in selecting research sites. For example, when evaluating a health programme, a research site can be selected where according to statistical information the programme has been successful for example, in promoting ORT and where this is not the case. Comparison can help in analysing which factors contribute to success and which factors constrain programme success. Contrast sampling can also be used to select participants for focus group discussions. Within each group the informants should be relatively homogenous in terms of the important dimensions of the study; but for the different groups you select contrasting cases for example, men and women; younger and older; users and non users. Qualitative sampling respondents for semi-structured interviews and FGDs The qualitative methods presented in Chapter 3 for investigation on drug use include semi-structured interviews and FGDs. How can we sample respondents for these methods?

Sampling for semi-structured interviews First you need to define whom you want to interview. If you are aiming to get an overview of drug use problems, it is best to select a wide range of individuals. If you are analysing a specific drug use problem, you concentrate on people who have direct experience with the drug use practice that is problematic, and people who are knowledgeable about it. Snowball sampling is the most common sampling method used in selecting respondents for semi-structured interviews. You can also decide to conduct contrast sampling. You can get an idea about which groups to select by reviewing your problem analysis diagram. Which socio-cultural factors seem to be related to the problem? Can we test these assumptions by comparing ideas and practices in different groups? It is also useful to contrast groups that use drugs appropriately with those who do not. Information on whether or not drugs are used appropriately can be obtained from the focused illness recalls. By conducting semi-structured interviews with both groups and comparing findings you can get an idea of the reasons for appropriate and inappropriate practices.

Sampling for focus group discussions The main decision you need to take when planning focus group discussions is what focus you intend to have, and how many FGDs you intend to hold. Decide which population sub-groups need to be interviewed. Limit the scope of the study to those sub-groups which have direct experience with the problem. Usually local leaders are asked to select respondents for the focus groups. Aim for around 6-8 participants per group; and conduct at least two FGDs per population group involved. So, for example, two with men and two with women, or two with adults and two with adolescents. If the conclusions of the two groups are not in agreement you may need to hold a third FGD to further investigate the issues.

Chapter 5 : SAGE Reference - Purposive Sampling

Purposeful sampling is widely used in qualitative research for the identification and selection of information-rich cases related to the phenomenon of interest.

References A key part of any research project is getting workable data from the general population. Without this, your research is shallow, one-sided and lacking in any real proof. It is for this reason that some form of sampling is generally carried out, and one of the most popular sampling methods is a process known as purposive sampling. What Is Purposive Sampling? So, what is purposive sampling and why would you use it? Simply put, purposive sampling is when a researcher chooses specific people within the population to use for a particular study or research project. Unlike random studies, which deliberately include a diverse cross section of ages, backgrounds and cultures, the idea behind purposive sampling is to concentrate on people with particular characteristics who will better be able to assist with the relevant research. For example, if you are researching workplace packages that include dental benefits, then, logically, you would not include people who are unemployed or who have not been offered a benefits package by their place of work; they would be unable to relate anything relevant to your study. Rather, you would focus on people who were employed and who had dental included in their workplace benefits package. Since there are several different types of purposive sampling e. This variety will, in turn, give you a better cross-section of information. Qualitative research usually involves a number of different phases, with each phase building progressively onwards from the original. This being the case, purposive sampling is useful to a researcher because they can use the variety of methods available to build and increase their research data. For example, you could start with critical case sampling, and then using the information gathered, progress to expert sampling in stage two. The main disadvantage of purposive sampling is the high probability of researcher bias, as each sample is based entirely on the judgment of the researcher in question, who generally is trying to prove a specific point. For this reason, researchers need to strive to make decisions based on accepted criteria, not on what will best support their theory. When a researcher publishes their findings, they need to be able to successfully defend their proposal from critics. Because of the non-probability nature of purposive sampling, it can be more difficult for a researcher to mount a solid defense. Commonly Used Purposive Sampling Methods With the introduction above, you must have known a lot about purposive sampling. Also known as "Heterogeneous Sampling", it involves selecting candidates across a broad spectrum relating to the topic of study. For example, participants in Homogenous Sampling would be similar in terms of ages, cultures, jobs or life experiences. The idea is to focus on this precise similarity and how it relates to the topic being researched. For example, if you were researching long-term side effects of working with asbestos, for a Homogenous Sampling, you would only select people who had worked with asbestos for 20 years or longer. Candidates are generally chosen based on their likelihood of behaving like everyone else. For example, if you were researching the reactions of 9th grade students to a job placement program, you would select classes from similar socio-economic regions, as opposed to selecting a class from a poorer inner city school, another from a mid-west farming community, and another from an affluent private school. An example would be a study into heart surgery patients who recovered significantly faster or slower than average. Researchers would be looking for variations in these cases to explain why their recoveries were atypical. In this instance, the best sampling method to use is Total Population Sampling. TPS is a technique where the entire population that meet your criteria e. Total Population Sampling is more commonly used where the number of cases being investigated is relatively small. This sort of sampling is useful when your research is expected to take a long time before it provides conclusive results or where there is currently a lack of observational evidence. Expert sampling is a positive tool to use when investigating new areas of research, to garner whether or not further study would be worth the effort.

Chapter 6 : Purposive Sampling and its Types | Mathstopia

A form of non-probability sampling in which decisions concerning the individuals to be included in the sample are taken by the researcher, based upon a variety of criteria which may include.

Alkassim To cite this article: Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics. This article studied and compared the two nonprobability sampling techniques namely, Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. Although, Nonprobability sampling has a lot of limitations due to the subjective nature in choosing the sample and thus it is not good representative of the population, but it is useful especially when randomization is impossible like when the population is very large. It can be useful when the researcher has limited resources, time and workforce. It can also be used when the research does not aim to generate results that will be used to create generalizations pertaining to the entire population. Therefore, there is a need to use nonprobability sampling techniques. The aim of this study is to compare among the two nonrandom sampling techniques in order to know whether one technique is better or useful than the other. Different articles were reviewed to compare between Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling and it is concluded that the choice of the techniques Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling depends on the nature and type of the research. Purposive Sampling Methods 3. Maximum Variation Sampling 3. Typical Case Sampling 3. Critical Case Sampling 3. Total Population Sampling 3. Convenience Sampling Versus Purposive Sampling 6. Introduction Sample is a portion of a population or universe [20]. However, by population, many often consider to people only. Population does not necessarily mean a number of people [22]. It can also refer to total quantity of the things or cases which are the subject of our research. Probability sampling is defined as having the "distinguishing characteristic that each unit in the population has a known, nonzero chance of being included in the sample" [8]. It is described more clearly as "every participant has an equal probability of being selected" from the population [6]. In probability sampling, each element in the population has a known nonzero chance of being selected through the use of a random selection procedure [1]. In nonprobability sampling, randomization is not important in selecting a sample from the population of interest. Rather, subjective methods are used to decide which elements are included in the sample. Hence, nonprobability sampling is a sampling technique where the samples are gathered in a process that does not give all the participants or units in the population equal chances of being included. Why would researcher consider using nonprobability sampling? In some situations, the population may not be well defined. In other situations, there may not be great concern in drawing inferences from the sample to the population. Perhaps, the most common reason for using nonprobability sampling is that it is cheaper than probability sampling and can often be implemented more quickly [1]. It is very crucial for a researcher to determine which non probability sampling technique is applicable to his study. The technique to be used depends on the type, nature and purpose of the study. When subjects are chose because of the close proximity to a researcher, that is, the ones that are easier for the researcher to access, the researcher is making a convenience sampling. But for purposive sampling, a researcher has something in mind and participants that suit the purpose of the study are included. Convenience Sampling In every type of research, it would be superlative to use the whole population, but in most cases, it is not possible to include every subject because the population is almost finite. This is the rationale behind using sampling techniques like convenience sampling by most researchers [5]. Convenience sampling also known as Haphazard Sampling or Accidental Sampling is a type of nonprobability or nonrandom sampling where members of the target population that meet certain practical criteria, such as easy accessibility, geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or the willingness to participate are included for the purpose of the study [4]. It is also referred to the researching subjects of the population that are easily accessible to the researcher [18]. Ecological data are often taken using convenience sampling, here data are collected along roads, trails or utility corridors and hence are not representative of population of interest. Other example of convenience sampling include data taken subjectively near camp, around parking areas, or an areas where density is known to be high. Biologist often use convenience sampling in the field work because it is easier like walking on a

road and stop occasionally to record numbers. With numbers derive from convenience sampling, one can make only weak statement about some characteristic of the sample itself rather than a formal inductive inference concerning the population of interest. Convenience Sampling is affordable, easy and the subjects are readily available. It is compulsory for the researcher to describe how the sample would differ from the one that was randomly selected. It is also necessary to describe the subjects who might be excluded during the selection process or the subjects who are overrepresented in the sample [5]. The main objective of convenience sampling is to collect information from participants who are easily accessible to the researcher like recruiting providers attending a staff meeting for study participation. Although commonly used, it is neither purposeful nor strategic [11]. The main assumption associated with convenience sampling is that the members of the target population are homogeneous. That is, that there would be no difference in the research results obtained from a random sample, a nearby sample, a co-operative sample, or a sample gathered in some inaccessible part of the population [10]. Point out that the obvious disadvantage of convenience sampling is that it is likely to be biased [13]. They advise researchers that the convenience sampling should not be taken to be representative of the population. Still, there is another problem of great concern related to convenience sampling, i. Because of the high self-selection possibility in non-probability sampling, the effect of outliers can be more devastating in this kind of subject selection. Outliers are cases whom consider as not belonging to the data. In a convenience sample, on the contrary, neither biases nor their probabilities are quantified [7]. In fact, the researcher does not know how well a convenience sample will represent the population regarding the traits or mechanism under research. What makes convenience samples so unpredictable is their vulnerability to severe hidden biases [12].

Benchmark Problem A psychologist is interested in the impacts of social network on study habits of Nigerian university students. To test the whole population, the researcher would need all current university students and hence, a lot of time, energy and resources. A sample would be a selection of few students from all of the Universities in Nigeria, which the researcher has to get for the testing. The convenience sample here would be a group of students from Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi, a Nigerian University where the Psychologist is working as lecturer. We learnt from the above that, the psychologist was subjective as the only students of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi were included in the study. With this sample the researcher would utilize little time and resource. The selected students in this study are different from other Nigerian University students. Thus, this may undermine the ability of the Psychologist to make generalisations from the sample to the population. Therefore, in convenience sampling, the individuals selected by the researcher may not be applicable to the research problem. Hence, there is a risk of collecting poor quality data due to poor research outcomes and as such, difficult to convince others to accept the findings of research based on poor foundation [16]. Some methods literature disregards convenience sampling as being an inappropriate method in social research due to the severe limitations [12].

Purposive Sampling Data gathering is crucial in research, as the data is meant to contribute to a better understanding of a theoretical framework [2]. It then becomes imperious that selecting the manner of obtaining data and from whom the data will be acquired be done with sound judgment, especially since no amount of analysis can make up for improperly collected data [21]. The purposive sampling technique, also called judgment sampling, is the deliberate choice of a participant due to the qualities the participant possesses. It is a nonrandom technique that does not need underlying theories or a set number of participants. Simply put, the researcher decides what needs to be known and sets out to find people who can and are willing to provide the information by virtue of knowledge or experience [2]. It is typically used in qualitative research to identify and select the information-rich cases for the most proper utilization of available resources [17]. This involves identification and selection of individuals or groups of individuals that are proficient and well-informed with a phenomenon of interest [3]. In addition to knowledge and experience, [2] and [19] note the importance of availability and willingness to participate, and the ability to communicate experiences and opinions in an articulate, expressive, and reflective manner. Unlike random studies, which deliberately include a diverse cross section of ages, backgrounds and cultures, the idea behind purposive sampling is to concentrate on people with particular characteristics who will better be able to assist with the relevant research.

Maximum Variation Sampling The idea behind MVS is to look at a subject from all

available angles, thereby achieving a greater understanding. Also known as "Heterogeneous Sampling", it involves selecting candidates across a broad spectrum relating to the topic of study. For example, if one was researching an education program would include students who hated the program, students classed as "typical" and students who excelled. This type of sampling is useful when a random sample is not taken, for instance, if the sample pool is too small. Homogeneous Sampling This form of sampling, unlike MVS, focuses on candidates who share similar traits or specific characteristics. For example, participants in Homogenous Sampling would be similar in terms of ages, cultures, jobs or life experiences. The idea is to focus on this precise similarity and how it relates to the topic being researched. For example, if one was researching long-term side effects of working with asbestos, for a Homogenous Sampling, the only people who had worked with asbestos for 20 years or longer are included. Typical Case Sampling TCS is useful when a researcher is dealing with large programs, it helps set the bar of what is standard or "typical". Candidates are generally chosen based on their likelihood of behaving like everyone else. For example, if one was researching the reactions of 9th grade students to a job placement program, would select classes from similar socio-economic regions, as opposed to selecting a class from an a poorer inner city school, another from a mid-west farming community, and another from an affluent private school. This form of sampling is more often used when researchers are developing "best in practice" guidelines or are looking into "what not to do". An example would be a study into heart surgery patients who recovered significantly faster or slower than average. Researchers would be looking for variations in these cases to explain why their recoveries were atypical. Critical Case Sampling Extremely popular in the initial stages of research to determine whether or not a more in depth study is warranted, or where funds are limited, Critical Case Sampling is a method where a select number of important or "critical" cases are selected and then examined. The criterion for deciding whether or not an example is "critical" is generally decided using the following statements: Total Population Sampling On occasion, it may be that leaving out certain cases from your sampling would be as if you had an incomplete puzzle - with obvious pieces missing. In this instance, the best sampling method to use is Total Population Sampling. TPS is a technique where the entire population that meet the criteria e. Total Population Sampling is more commonly used where the number of cases being investigated is relatively small. Expert Sampling As indicated by the name, Expert Sampling calls for experts in a particular field to be the subjects of the purposive sampling. This sort of sampling is useful when the research is expected to take a long time before it provides conclusive results or where there is currently a lack of observational evidence.

Chapter 7 : Purposive Sampling - SAGE Research Methods

Despite some drawbacks, purposive sampling is a thorough and useful tool that can be used in the field of research. A careful consideration of focus group size, funding and research goals can help to determine which method of sampling will be most beneficial.

Jump to navigation Jump to search Sampling is the use of a subset of the population to represent the whole population or to inform about social processes that are meaningful beyond the particular cases, individuals or sites studied. Probability sampling, or random sampling, is a sampling technique in which the probability of getting any particular sample may be calculated. Nonprobability sampling does not meet this criterion and, as any methodological decision, should adjust to the research question that one envisages to answer. Nonprobability sampling techniques are not intended to be used to infer from the sample to the general population in statistical terms. Instead, for example, grounded theory can be produced through iterative non-probability sampling until theoretical saturation is reached Strauss and Corbin, Thus, one cannot say the same on the basis of a nonprobability sample than on the basis of a probability sample. The grounds for drawing generalizations e. Researchers working with the notion of purposive sampling assert that while probability methods are suitable for large-scale studies concerned with representativeness, non-probability approaches are more suitable for in-depth qualitative research in which the focus is often to understand complex social phenomena e. One of the advantages of nonprobability sampling is its lower cost compared to probability sampling. Moreover, the in-depth analysis of a small-N purposive sample or a case study enables the "discovery" and identification of patterns and causal mechanisms that do not draw time and context-free assumptions. Non-probability sampling is often not appropriate in statistical quantitative research, though, as these assertions raise some questions "how can one understand a complex social phenomenon by drawing only the most convenient expressions of that phenomenon into consideration? What assumption about homogeneity in the world must one make to justify such assertions? Alas, the consideration that research can only be based in statistical inference focuses on the problems of bias linked to nonprobability sampling and acknowledges only one situation in which a non-probability sample can be appropriate "if one is interested only in the specific cases studied for example, if one is interested in the Battle of Gettysburg, one does not need to draw a probability sample from similar cases Lucas a. Non-probability sampling is however widely used in qualitative research. Examples of nonprobability sampling include: Convenience, haphazard or accidental sampling " members of the population are chosen based on their relative ease of access. To sample friends, co-workers, or shoppers at a single mall, are all examples of convenience sampling. Such samples are biased because researchers may unconsciously approach some kinds of respondents and avoid others Lucas a, and respondents who volunteer for a study may differ in unknown but important ways from others Wiederman Consecutive sampling " also known as total enumerative sampling, [1] is a sampling technique in which every subject meeting the criteria of inclusion is selected until the required sample size is achieved. The friend also refers a friend, and so on. Such samples are biased because they give people with more social connections an unknown but higher chance of selection Berg, but lead to higher response rates. Judgmental sampling or purposive sampling " The researcher chooses the sample based on who they think would be appropriate for the study. This is used primarily when there is a limited number of people that have expertise in the area being researched, or when the interest of the research is on a specific field or a small group. Different types of purposive sampling include: Deviant case " The researcher obtains cases that substantially differ from the dominant pattern a special type of purposive sample. The case is selected in order to obtain information on unusual cases that can be specially problematic or specially good. Case study " The research is limited to one group, often with a similar characteristic or of small size. Ad hoc quotas " A quota is established e. Nonprobability sampling should not intend to meet the same type of results neither to be assessed with the quality criteria of probabilistic sampling Steinke, Studies intended to use probability sampling sometimes end up using nonprobability samples because of characteristics of the sampling method. For example, using a sample of people in the paid labor force to analyze the effect of education on earnings is

to use a non-probability sample of persons who could be in the paid labor force. Because the education people obtain could determine their likelihood of being in the paid labor force, technically the sample in the paid labor force is a nonprobability sample for the question at issue. In such cases results are biased. The statistical model one uses can also render the data a non-probability sample. For example, Lucas b notes that several published studies that use multilevel modeling have been based on samples that are probability samples in general, but nonprobability samples for one or more of the levels of analysis in the study. Evidence indicates that in such cases the bias is poorly behaved, such that inferences from such analyses are unjustified. These problems occur in the academic literature, but they may be more common in non-academic research. For example, in public opinion polling by private companies or other organizations unable to require response , the sample can be self-selected rather than random. The samples in such surveys should be treated as non-probability samples of the population, and the validity of the findings based on them is unknown and cannot be established.

Chapter 8 : Purposive Sampling | Educational Research Basics by Del Siegle

Statistics Definitions > Purposive Sampling / Deliberate Sampling A purposive sample is where a researcher selects a sample based on their knowledge about the study and population. The participants are selected based on the purpose of the sample, hence the name.

These categories are provided only for additional information for EPSY students. Patton has proposed the following cases of purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is popular in qualitative research. Maximum Variation â€” Purposefully picking a wide range of variation on dimensions of interestâ€”documents unique or diverse variations that have emerged in adapting to different conditions. Identifies important common patterns that cut across variations. Homogeneous â€” Focuses, reduces variation, simplifies analysis, facilitates group interviewing. Typical Case â€” Illustrates or highlights what is typical, normal, average. Stratified Purposeful â€” Illustrates characteristics of particular subgroups of interest; facilitates comparisons. Snowball or Chain â€” Identifies cases of interest from people who know people who know people who know what cases are information-rich, that is, good examples for study, good interview subjects. Criterion â€” Picking all cases that meet some criterion, such as all children abused in a treatment facility. Theory-Based or Operational Construct â€” Finding manifestations of a theoretical construct of interest so as to elaborate and examine the construct. Confirming or Disconfirming â€” Elaborating and deepening initial analysis, seeking exceptions, testing variation. Opportunistic â€” Following new leads during fieldwork, taking advantage of the unexpected, flexibility. Random Purposeful â€” still small sample size Adds credibility to sample when potential purposeful sample is larger than one can handle. Reduces judgment within a purposeful category. Not for generalizations or representativeness. Politically Important Cases â€” Attracts attention to the study or avoids attracting undesired attention by purposefully eliminating from the sample politically sensitive cases. Convenience â€” Saves time, money, and effort. Poorest rational; lowest credibility. Combination or Mixed Purposeful â€” Triangulation, flexibility, meets multiple interests and needs. Patton, Patton, M. Qualitative evaluation and research methods 2nd ed.

Chapter 9 : Social Research Methods - Knowledge Base - Nonprobability Sampling

Abstract. The purpose of this paper is to provide a typology of sampling designs for qualitative researchers. We introduce the following sampling strategies: (a) parallel sampling designs, which represent a body of sampling strategies that facilitate credible comparisons of two or more different subgroups that are extracted from the same levels of study; (b) nested sampling designs, which are.

Received Jul 14; Accepted Jan This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. Abstract Background An increasing number of qualitative evidence syntheses papers are found in health care literature. Many of these syntheses use a strictly exhaustive search strategy to collect articles, mirroring the standard template developed by major review organizations such as the Cochrane and Campbell Collaboration. The hegemonic idea behind it is that non-comprehensive samples in systematic reviews may introduce selection bias. However, exhaustive sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis has been questioned, and a more purposeful way of sampling papers has been proposed as an alternative, although there is a lack of transparency on how these purposeful sampling strategies might be applied to a qualitative evidence synthesis. Methods We have chosen a mixed purposeful sampling, combining three different strategies that we considered the most consistent with our research purpose: Results The concept of purposeful sampling on the meta-level could not readily be borrowed from the logic applied in basic research projects. It also demands a considerable amount of flexibility, and is labour-intensive, which goes against the argument of many authors that using purposeful sampling provides a pragmatic solution or a short cut for researchers, compared with exhaustive sampling. Opportunities of purposeful sampling were the possible inclusion of new perspectives to the line-of-argument and the enhancement of the theoretical diversity of the papers being included, which could make the results more conceptually aligned with the synthesis purpose. Conclusions This paper helps researchers to make decisions related to purposeful sampling in a more systematic and transparent way. Future research could confirm or disconfirm the hypothesis of conceptual enhancement by comparing the findings of a purposefully sampled qualitative evidence synthesis with those drawing on an exhaustive sample of the literature. Qualitative evidence synthesis, Purposeful sampling, Sexual adjustment, Cancer treatment Background An increasing number of qualitative evidence synthesis papers are appearing in the health care literature [1 , 2]. Qualitative evidence synthesis methods have the potential to generate answers to complex questions that provide us with novel and valuable insights for theory development and clinical practice, hereby moving beyond review questions only related to the effectiveness of interventions and causation [3 , 4]. Over 20 different approaches to qualitative evidence synthesis have been developed [5]. Meta ethnography developed by Noblit and Hare is currently one of the most commonly used synthesis approaches [2 , 6 , 7]. Meta-ethnography enables a systematic and detailed understanding of how studies are related, through the comparison of findings within and across studies, ultimately providing an interpretation of the whole body of research [7]. It has known a considerable uptake in the field of healthcare [8 , 9]. Furthermore, it has the capacity to generate hypotheses for future testing or comparison with trial outcomes [10]. In our review project, we opted for a meta-ethnographic approach to synthesize findings on the sexual adjustment of cancer patients and their partners across a number of qualitative studies. We noticed that many of the meta-ethnographies published adopt a linear approach to synthesizing the literature, mirroring the standard template developed by major review organizations such as the Cochrane and Campbell Collaboration. Consequently, in most meta- ethnographic synthesis projects, a strictly exhaustive search and information retrieval strategy is used to collect data and relevant studies are assessed for quality before being included in the synthesis. The idea to work with comprehensive samples of the literature is strongly influenced by the risk of bias discourse, suggesting that non-comprehensive samples may introduce a selection bias in systematic reviews, for example [11 – 13]. However, the usefulness of the review strategy promoted by organizations such as Cochrane and Campbell, and thus of exhaustive search techniques and sampling, has been questioned by a substantial proportion of members of the qualitative research community. It has been argued that exhaustive sampling is a highly rigorous and formalistic approach that risks to be too time consuming because

the searches often retrieve very large data sets that are impractical to screen [14 , 15]. Moreover, exhaustive sample risks to produce rather superficial synthesis findings, with a large number of studies that fail to go beyond the level of description [16]. Consequently, some authors are proposing a more purposeful way of sampling papers as an alternative for exhaustive sampling [17]. Purposeful sampling techniques for primary research have been well described by Patton , p. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry, thus the term purposeful sampling. Studying information-rich cases yields insights and in-depth understanding rather than empirical generalizations. However, several review authors specializing in qualitative evidence synthesis have also provided a more theoretical background to the choice for purposeful sampling. It follows that these types of reviews require variation to enable new conceptual understandings to be generated [11 , 17 , 18]. To guarantee a sufficient level of conceptual richness, review directions may be divergent and iterative, rather than linear [20]. This thus contradicts the classic prospective approach of exhaustive searching [1]. Although several qualitative researchers have recommended purposeful sampling in the context of qualitative evidence synthesis, the published literature holds sparse discussion on how these strategies might be applied to a qualitative evidence synthesis [15]. To develop a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena that is been researched in the synthesis

Maximum variation sampling Identifying key dimensions of variations and then finding cases that vary from each other as much as possible. To identify essential features and variable features of a phenomenon among varied contexts Identifies important patterns that cut across variations To construct an holistic understanding of the phenomenon Homogenous sampling Picking a small, homogeneous sample. They are a source of rival interpretations as well as a way of placing boundaries around confirmed findings To shake our complacent acceptance of popular myths and generalizations in a field Stratified purposeful sampling Sampling within samples where each stratum is fairly homogeneous To examine variations in the manifestation of a phenomenon as any key factor associated with the phenomenon is varied. In a research synthesis, this factor may be contextual, methodological, or conceptual. Opportunistic sampling Adding cases to a sample to take advantage of unforeseen opportunities after fieldwork has begun To be used in a research area which is at its exploratory stage or when the synthesis does not have an insider status in the relevant field of research Suitable to participatory syntheses where the synthesis purpose evolves in response to the changing needs of the participant co-synthesists Purposeful random sampling Adds credibility to sample when potential purposeful sample is larger than one can handle. Reduces judgment within a purposeful category To locate most of the primary research reported on a topic and then randomly select a few reports from this pool for in-depth discussion Sampling politically important cases Selecting a politically sensitive site or unit of analysis To gain attention of different stakeholders and the synthesis findings get used. Suitable for synthesis of hot topics, in which several stakeholders are interested Convenience sampling Involve selecting cases that are easy to access and inexpensive to study Not a recommendable technique, because its neither purposeful, nor strategic Combination or mixed purposeful sampling To use a combination of two or more sampling strategies to select evidence that adequately addresses their purpose To facilitate triangulation and flexibility in meeting the needs of multiple stakeholders Open in a separate window Despite this promising effort by Suri to theoretically present the different options of sampling for synthesis, researchers who claim to have used a purposeful sampling approach often fail to create a transparent audit trail on the review process. In addition, early pioneers such as Campbell and colleagues who explored purposeful sampling remain close to a positivist sampling strategy, opting for an arbitrary, random sampling technique to select a subset of papers to extract [21]. Noblit and Hare , the initiators of the meta-ethnographic approach, introduce the idea of sampling purposefully without developing it further [7]. This indicates that there is a unilateral focus on exhaustive sampling methods, as well as a lack of transparency on how to effectively use and report on purposeful sampling techniques. Therefore, we discuss in this paper why and how we have used purposeful sampling in our qualitative evidence synthesis. The following issues will be addressed: Suri urges authors to carefully identify sampling strategies that are conceptually aligned with the synthesis purpose, that are credible, that sufficiently address the synthesis purpose, and that are feasible, ethical and efficient. Little guidance is thus available for the practical implementation of theoretical sampling. Following the example of

theoretical sampling guides in primary research, we choose to see theoretical sampling as an umbrella approach, i. We have therefore chosen a combination consisting of a intensity sampling at first, then a b maximum variation sampling and finally c disconfirming case sampling. This combination of sampling techniques was chosen as these aligned with the different steps of analysing towards a theoretical construct, and in accordance with Corbin and Strauss, who also connected specific sampling strategies to different types of analysing [24]. In what follows, we describe and discuss how these sampling procedures have been integrated into our review procedure. As well we describe why we used the specific sampling technique in alliance with a specific step in the analysis. Scoping review Initially, we compiled a database of potentially relevant articles based on a scoping review. Scoping is an exploratory and systematic way of mapping the literature available on a topic [17]. Scoping exercises are perceived as the ideal way of doing preparatory work for an exhaustive systematic review. In our case, we have used them for building an archive of data for our qualitative evidence synthesis. We searched 4 major databases: Medline, Psychinfo, Cinahl and Dissertation Abstracts. A search string was developed for each database with the support of a specialized team. For each database we added a methodological filter to these search strings in order to extract qualitative research articles [25 – 27]. Studies included had to be written in English and be carried out between and , for pragmatic reasons. The qualitative studies retrieved were qualitative studies matched against the following inclusion criteria. Type of studies We considered all sorts of qualitative designs. Opinion pieces and editorials were excluded. The study reports should be qualitative in nature. Phenomenon of interest Studies should partially focus on the relational aspects of sexuality, namely the sexual intimacy of patient and partner, in a context of a cancer diagnosis. First one researcher CB applied the inclusion and exclusion criteria to the retrieved abstracts. A full text was requested for each of the relevant studies. These studies were further assessed by the same researcher, rechecking them against the same inclusion and exclusion criteria. As can be seen in Fig.