

Texas A&M University-Commerce
College of Education
Department of Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education
COUN/PSY 695: *Research Methodology*
Spring 2014

Instructor: Dodie Limberg, Ph.D.
Telephone: 903 886 5142
Office: Binnion 223
E-Mail: dorothy.limberg@tamuc.edu
Office Hours: by Appointment
Meeting Day: Wednesday 4:30-7:10pm
Location: Commerce Campus

Text (Required):

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for general causal inferences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Other required selections (journal articles) will be distributed in class.

Students are expected to read assigned chapters/articles prior to each class meeting.

Catalog Course Description:

695. *Research Methodology*. Three semester hours.

An overview of research methodology includes basic concepts employed in quantitative and qualitative research methods. Includes computer applications for research. Meets requirements for a Level I research tool course.

Prerequisites: Doctoral status or consent of the instructor.

Whom the Course is intended:

Research Methodology is intended for students admitted and enrolled in the Ph.D. in Education Program.

How Course is related to Other Courses:

Research Methodology expands beyond the research foundation established doctoral students' Master-level research course(s). In addition, *Research Methodology* is intended to support the development of students' understanding of research methodology, promoting their ability to construct sound empirical investigations and become critical consumers of research.

Course Goals:

1. Students increase their understanding of research concepts and procedures
2. Students develop and expand their appreciation of the importance of research in education
3. Students increase their knowledge of ethical and legal practices in conducting research in education across disciplines
4. Students increase their understanding of research design in education
5. Students examine both strengths and limitations in various research designs
6. Students will develop their skills in preparing a research project and research manuscript
7. Students will increase their understanding of the dissertation process and a dissertation proposal.

This course is the first course in a doctoral studies research curriculum. There are several stages in conducting research: planning, piloting, data collecting, data analyzing, and reporting. This class will not cover all of these areas but will provide the blueprint for these areas, which will be elaborated upon in future course work.

Course Objectives:

Research Methodology students should have learned and/or be able to demonstrate the following dispositions, knowledge, skills, and attitudes:

1. Understand the nature, purpose, and types of educational research
2. Understand the procedures for reviewing research literature and develop their skills to construct a sound initial literature review
3. Develop the necessary skills to construct an empirical investigation that aligns with ethical and legal practices (Institutional Review Board, IRB)
4. Understand sampling procedures *and* procedures for selecting and administering measurements in research
5. Understanding concepts and procedures relating to research design develop their understanding of diverse data collection methods in educational research across disciplines

6. Develop their understanding of diverse research designs in education across disciplines (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods)
 - a. Quantitative Research Designs
 - I. Non-experimental Research Designs
 - i. Descriptive Research
 - ii. Causal-Comparative Research
 - iii. Correlational Research
 - II. Experimental Research Designs
 - i. True Experimental Research
 - ii. Quasi-Experimental Research
 - iii. Single-Subject Research
 - b. Qualitative Research Designs
 - I. Case Study Research
 - II. Phenomenological Research
 - III. Ethnographic Research
 - IV. Historical Research
7. Develop their understanding of diverse data analysis procedures (e.g., quantitative & qualitative)
8. Actively participate in one or more component of a research study through experiential learning with a research mentor (faculty).
9. Develop the necessary skills to construct a written initial research prospectus
 - a. Students will identify an area necessitating investigation to advance research and practice
 - b. Students will develop a sound, initial literature review, which introduces constructs of interest
 - c. Students will generate sound research questions to address their area of investigation
 - d. Students will operationally define constructs and/or variables to be investigated (“*Operational definitions clarify important terms in a study so that all readers understand the precise meaning the research intends.*” Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009, p. 72)
 - e. Students will identify an appropriate research design (e.g., quantitative—experimental, quasi-experimental, correlational, descriptive; qualitative—ethnography, phenomenological study, case study) to answer their research questions
 - f. Students will identify appropriate data collection procedures to address their research questions (e.g., random selection, purposive sampling; incentives, IRB)
 - g. Students will identify appropriate data analysis procedures to address their research questions
 - h. Students will identify potential limitations of their proposed study based on their research design, sampling, and data collection procedures

CACREP (2009) Accreditation Standards Addressed in COUN 695:

1. CACREP (2009) Doctoral Standards: Professional Identity
 1. C.5. Design, implementation, and analysis of quantitative and qualitative research
2. CACREP (2009) Doctoral Standards: Doctoral Learning Outcomes
 1. Research and Scholarship
 - i. E.2. Understands qualitative designs and approaches to qualitative data analysis
 - ii. F.1. Demonstrates the ability to formulate research questions appropriate for professional research and publication.
 - iii. F.2. Demonstrates the ability to create research designs appropriate to quantitative and qualitative research questions.

Primary Course Content

1. Introduction to the development of a sound literature review
2. Introduction to ethical and legal practices (Institutional Review Board, IRB) in empirical research
3. Introduction to diverse research designs in education across disciplines (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods)
4. Introduction to diverse data collection methods in educational research across disciplines
5. Introduction to diverse data analysis procedures (e.g., quantitative & qualitative)
6. Introduction to becoming a critical consumer of empirical research (critique diverse research designs)
7. Introduction to the construct of sound empirical research reports (dissemination of research findings)

Course Requirements

1. Courses Quizzes (9 quizzes, 8 quizzes count)	25%
2. Complete IRB training	10%
3. Participate in research with faculty	10%
4. Initial Literature Review Paper	10%
5. Initial Written Research Prospectus Paper	25%
6. Poster Presentation of Initial Research Prospectus	10%
7. Class Participation & Attendance	10%
Total	100%

Grading Scale:

- A = 90-100
- B = 80-89
- C = 70-79
- F = Below 70

Mode of Instruction

As a Ph.D. Seminar, it is expected that all students will prepare for class and actively be engaged in discussion. In addition, *Research Methodology* will integrate lecture, guest speakers, multimedia presentations, and eCollege.

Attendance & Participation (10% of Final Grade):

Given the interactive nature of *Research Methodology*, student attendance is necessary for them to develop the knowledge, dispositions, and skills to be effective researchers and scholars. Therefore, each class meeting students attend, they may earn **two points** (*attended & participated*) or **one point** (*attended, but limited participation*) or **no points** (*did not attend class meeting*). To earn the participation points, students should (a) have completed assigned reading prior to class; (b) have completed all assigned work prior to class; and (c) actively participate in class discussions. (*30 possible points may be earned*)

** Being present in class & doing other activities (e.g., drawing, playing on computer, being on phone, talking) is not considered being actively involved*

Quizzes (10 Quizzes; 30% of grade):

The development of your knowledge of significant issues in education and research methodology is paramount to your continued professional development as scholar-researchers. The quizzes will cover material from assigned readings. A quiz consisting of ten (10) multiple choice and True/False questions will be given. The quizzes will be given at the beginning of each class and students will be able **to drop their lowest quiz grade**. If a student is tardy or absent from class, he or she will be unable to make-up the quiz. **(11 quizzes, 10 of which count – one each class on assigned reading)**

Complete IRB Training (10% of grade)

To ensure the protection of human participants and meet federal regulation guidelines, all research investigators at TAMUC must complete, and show verification that they have received appropriate training in human subjects research. Therefore, all students enrolled in *Research Methodology* will need to complete the CITI training. Due to the nature of this assignment, students' grades include: $\sqrt{+}$ (99%, for having completed the CITI training & provided support documentation to the instructor) and 0 (did not complete CITI training &/or did not providing supporting documentation to the instructor).

Students will need to complete the Responsible Conduct in Research & Scholarship (RCR) modules and the Protection of Human Subjects modules. All modules can be found online:

<http://www.tamuc.edu/research/compliance/trainingCompliance.aspx>

Participate in Research with Faculty (10% of grade)

Students will actively participate in one aspect of research (literature review, data collection, data analysis etc.) with a faculty member. Students will find a faculty member to partner with. The faculty member and the student will decide what the expectations/needs are for the research study. The research can be a new study or a study already in progress. The level of involvement of the student is decided by the faculty. Due to the unique aspects of this assignment, students' grades include: $\sqrt{+}$ (99%, for having completed & provided support documentation to the instructor [e.g., faculty evaluation]) and 0 (did not &/or did not providing supporting documentation to the instructor [e.g., product of research]). Students will complete a 1-2 page summary of their experience.

Initial Literature Review Paper (10% of grade)

“A thorough, sophisticated literature review is the foundation and inspiration for substantial, useful research” (Boote & Beile, 2005, p. 3). In addition, strong scholar-researchers possess effective scholarly writing skills and attributes, supporting their success in tenure-track academic positions (Lambie, Sias, Davis, Lawson, & Akos, 2008). Therefore, students will construct a brief research of the literature focused on one construct of interest (e.g., teacher empathy). Specifically, students will construct a three-page literature review that:

1. Introduces the construct of interest (e.g., counselor empathy)
2. Presents the significance of the construct of interest (e.g., higher counselor empathy correlates to higher client satisfaction scores and client outcomes)
3. Reviews empirical research related to construct of interest (e.g., Smith [2010] investigated the relationship between counselors’ level of empathy [$N = 30$] and their clients’ outcomes [$N = 303$] as measured by the counselors’ satisfaction).

The Initial Literature Review Paper should be **4 pages** (*not including title page and references*).

Some other guidelines:

- Keep paper titles and headings within the paper as short as possible (APA, 2010, p. 229)
- Double-space all material, including references and quotations (1 inch margins)

Consult APA (2010) *Publication Manual* often & frequently.

Student Name: _____ Doctoral Track: _____

Research Methodology

Initial Literature Review Paper Evaluation Rubric

- Unacceptable (0 points)** = Student **Does Not** Demonstrate Competency at the Doctoral Level
- Developing (1 point)** = Student **Does Not** Demonstrate Competency at the Doctoral Level; however, the Student Demonstrates Some Level of Proficiency
- Proficient (2 points)** = Student Demonstrates Competency at the Doctoral Level
- Exemplary (3 points)** = Student Demonstrates Strong Competency at the Doctoral Level

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
1. Title Page: Adherence to APA (2010) <i>Publication Manual</i> guidelines (pp. 23-25)	Paper includes APA formatted title page with more than 4 errors	Paper includes APA formatted title page with more than 3 or 4 errors	Paper includes APA formatted title page with 1 or 2 errors	Paper includes APA formatted title page with no errors	
2. Introduction to the Study: <i>Introduction</i> – paper provides orientation to topic & constructs of interest (e.g., <i>counselor empathy</i>)	Paper does not include a clear orientation to the topic & constructs of interest &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper includes a partly clear orientation to the topic & constructs of interest &/or four or five writing errors	Paper includes a clear orientation to the topic & constructs of interest &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a clear orientation to the topic & constructs of interest &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
3. Introduction to the Study: <i>Rationale</i> – paper provides sound argument/position for the importance of the identified construct to practice & theory (e.g., <i>higher empathy correlates to higher client satisfaction scores</i>)	Paper does not include a sound position for the importance of the identified construct to practice & theory &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper includes a partly sound position for the importance of the identified construct to practice & theory &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes a sound position for the importance of the identified construct to practice & theory &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a sound position for the importance of the identified construct to practice & theory &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
4. Review Empirical Research related to Construct of Interest: <i>Review of Empirical Research</i> – paper reviews primary research investigating constructs of interest in a systematic & purposeful manner (e.g., <i>Smith [2010] investigated the relationship between counselors' level of empathy [N = 30] and their clients' outcomes [N = 303] as measured by the client assessment</i>)	Paper does not include a sound review of the primary research investigating constructs of interest in a systematic & purposeful manner &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper includes a partly sound review of the primary research investigating constructs of interest in a systematic & purposeful manner &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes a sound review of the primary research investigating constructs of interest in a systematic & purposeful manner &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a sound review of the primary research investigating constructs of interest in a systematic & purposeful manner &/or section contains no more than one writing error	

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
<p>5. Review of the Literature <i>Writing Structure</i> – paper presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs follow a logical format – all works cited are included in Reference section – author uses appropriate citations to support positions/claims</p>	<p>Paper does not present essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs do not follow a logical format &/or section contains more than six writing errors</p>	<p>Paper partly presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs somewhat follow a logical format &/or section contains four or five writing errors</p>	<p>Paper presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs follow a logical format &/or section contains two or three writing errors</p>	<p>Paper presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs follow a logical format &/or section contains no more than one writing error</p>	
<p>6. References Comprehensiveness & adherence to APA (2010) <i>Publication Manual</i></p>	<p>Paper does not include a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contains more than six writing errors</p>	<p>Paper partly includes a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contains four or five writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contains two or three writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contain no more than one writing error</p>	
<p>7. Overall clarity & readability The syntax, grammar, and punctuation errors impede the readability of the paper (<i>doctoral level work?</i>)</p>	<p>Paper is not written at the doctoral level as evident by having more than 24 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper</p>	<p>Paper is somewhat written at the doctoral level as evident by having 16 to 23 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper</p>	<p>Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 8 to 15 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper</p>	<p>Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 1 to 7 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper</p>	
<p>8. Overall adherence to <i>Publication Manual</i> (APA, 2010; <i>doctoral level work?</i>)</p>	<p>Paper is not written at the doctoral level as evident by having more than 24 APA writing errors throughout the paper</p>	<p>Paper is somewhat written at the doctoral level as evident by having 16 to 23 APA writing errors throughout the paper</p>	<p>Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 8 to 15 APA writing errors throughout the paper</p>	<p>Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 1 to 7 APA writing errors throughout the paper</p>	
<p>Total Points per Evaluation Criterion (out of 24 points)</p>					24
					points

Feedback from the Instructor:

Initial Written Research Prospectus (30% of grade)

Developing a sound research prospectus is significant in conducting quality research. A research prospectus provides a rationale and road-map to the research investigation (Clark, 2007). The requirements for a research prospectus vary among universities and programs; however, most research prospectus include three major components: (a) introduction to the study, (b) review of the literature, and (c) research methods to be employed (e.g., research design, data collection procedures, data analysis processes).

It is important to note, when writing a research prospectus, a student should use the **future tense** in referring to his or her study (the proposal is what you “*plan on doing*”).

For your Research Prospectus, you will construct a brief working proposal for an empirical investigation you may like to conduct in the near future. Specifically, you will develop a paper that:

1. Provides a rationale for the proposed investigation (*Introduction to the Study*)
2. Reviews the primary constructs to be investigated and the related research (*Review of the Literature*)
3. Presents the research questions &/or hypotheses to be investigated
4. Introduces the research methodology: (*Research Design & Methodology*)
 - a. Research design
 - b. Sampling
 - c. Data collection procedures and instruments
 - d. Data analysis procedures
5. Discusses the potential contributions and limitations of the study.

The Initial Written Research Prospectus should be a minimum of **10 pages** (*not including title page, references, and appendices*); however, the paper should be no longer than **13 pages** (*will stop reviewing paper after 13 pages*).

Some other guidelines:

- Keep paper titles and headings within the paper as short as possible.
- Double-space all material, including references and quotations (1 inch margins)
- **Consult APA (2010) *Publication Manual* often & frequently.**

CACREP (2009) Doctoral Standards Accessed by Research Methodology

1. Doctoral Learning Outcomes: Research and Scholarship
 - a. E.2. Understands qualitative designs and approaches to qualitative data analysis
 - b. F.1. Demonstrates the ability to formulate research questions appropriate for professional research & publication.
 - c. F.2. Demonstrates the ability to create research designs appropriate to quantitative and qualitative research questions.
-

Student Name: _____ Doctoral Track: _____

Research Methodology

Initial Written Research Prospectus Evaluation Rubric

Unacceptable (0 points)	=	Student Does Not Demonstrate Competency at the Doctoral Level
Developing (1 point)	=	Student Does Not Demonstrate Competency at the Doctoral Level; however, the Student Demonstrates Some Level of Proficiency
Proficient (2 points)	=	Student Demonstrates Competency at the Doctoral Level
Exemplary (3 points)	=	Student Demonstrates Strong Competency at the Doctoral Level

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
1. Title Page: Adherence to APA (2010) <i>Publication Manual</i> guidelines (pp. 23-25)	Paper includes APA formatted title page with more than 4 errors	Paper includes APA formatted title page with more than 3 or 4 errors	Paper includes APA formatted title page with 1 or 2 errors	Paper includes APA formatted title page with no errors	
2. Introduction to the Study: <i>Introduction</i> – paper provides orientation to topic & constructs related to proposed investigation	Paper does not include a clear orientation to the constructs of interest &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper includes a partly clear orientation to the constructs of interest &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes a clear orientation to the constructs of interest &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a clear orientation to the constructs of interest &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
3. Introduction to the Study: <i>Rationale</i> – paper provides sound argument/position for the necessity of the proposed investigation (e.g., <i>void in the research, etc.</i>)	Paper does not include a sound position for the necessity of the proposed investigation &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper includes a partly sound position for the necessity of the proposed investigation &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes a sound position for the necessity of the proposed investigation &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a sound position for the necessity of the proposed investigation &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
4. Review of the Literature <i>Constructs of Interest</i> – paper provides thorough introduction to the constructs to be investigated	Paper does not include a thorough introduction to the constructs to be investigated &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper includes a partly thorough introduction to the constructs to be investigated &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes a thorough introduction to the constructs to be investigated &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a thorough introduction to the constructs to be investigated &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
5. Review of the Literature <i>Research of Interest</i> – paper reviews primary research investigating constructs of interest in a systematic & purposeful manner (e.g., <i>N = ##</i>)	Paper does not include a sound review of primary research investigating constructs of interest &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper includes a partly a sound review of primary research investigating constructs of interest &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes a sound review of primary research investigating constructs of interest &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a sound review of primary research investigating constructs of interest &/or section contains no more than one writing error	

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
<p>6. Review of the Literature <i>Writing Structure</i> – paper presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs follow a logical format – all works cited are included in Reference section – author uses appropriate citations to support positions/claims</p>	<p>Paper does not present essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs do not follow a logical format &/or section contains more than six writing errors</p>	<p>Paper partly presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs somewhat follow a logical format &/or section contains four or five writing errors</p>	<p>Paper presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs follow a logical format &/or section contains two or three writing errors</p>	<p>Paper presents essential elements of reviewed research & paragraphs follow a logical format &/or section contains no more than one writing error</p>	
<p>7. Statement of the Problem Paper presents a clear & logical problem statement based on reviewed research and theory</p>	<p>Paper does not include a clear & logical problem statement &/or section contains more than six writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes a partly clear & logical problem statement &/or section contains four or five writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes a clear & logical problem statement &/or section contains two or three writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes a clear & logical problem statement &/or section contains no more than one writing errors</p>	
<p>8. Research Methodology <i>Research Questions / Hypotheses</i> – paper presents clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses – constructs to be investigated are operationally defined (e.g., “as measured by ...”)</p>	<p>Paper does not include clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains more than six writing errors</p>	<p>Paper include partly clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains four or five writing errors</p>	<p>Paper include clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains two or three writing errors</p>	<p>Paper include clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains no more than one writing error</p>	
<p>9. Research Methodology <i>Research Design</i> – paper presents appropriate research design (e.g., quantitative—<i>experimental, quasi-experimental, correlational, descriptive; qualitative—ethnography, phenomenological study, case study</i>) to answer research questions &/or hypotheses (include orientation to selected research design with appropriate citations)</p>	<p>Paper does not include the presentation of appropriate research designed to answer research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains more than six writing errors</p>	<p>Paper partly includes the presentation of appropriate research designed to answer research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains four or five writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes the presentation of appropriate research designed to answer research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains two or three writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes the presentation of appropriate research designed to answer research questions &/or hypotheses &/or section contains no more than one writing error</p>	
<p>10. Research Methodology <i>Population & Sampling</i> – paper presents logical & appropriate sampling methods (e.g., <i>random selection, purposive sampling, potential response rate, statistical power, 95% confidence level, etc.</i>)</p>	<p>Paper does not include the presentation of logical & appropriate sampling methods &/or section contains more than six writing errors</p>	<p>Paper partly includes the presentation of logical & appropriate sampling methods &/or section contains four or five writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes the presentation of logical & appropriate sampling methods &/or section contains two or three writing errors</p>	<p>Paper includes the presentation of logical & appropriate sampling methods &/or section contains no more than one writing error</p>	

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
11. Research Methodology <i>Data Collection Procedures</i> – paper presents specific steps the researcher will take in his or her data collection process (e.g., <i>IRB, incentives, recruitment of participants, etc.</i>)	Paper does not include presentation specific steps the researcher will take in his or her data collection process &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper partly includes presentation specific steps the researcher will take in his or her data collection process &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes presentation specific steps the researcher will take in his or her data collection process &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes presentation specific steps the researcher will take in his or her data collection process &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
12. Research Methodology <i>Instrumentation / Data Gathering</i> – paper reviews information regarding the soundness of researcher’s data collection instruments (e.g., <i>quantitative – psychometrics of instruments; qualitative – triangulation, trustworthiness, member checking, peer debriefing, external auditor</i>)	Paper does not include presentation of information regarding the soundness of researcher’s data collection instruments &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper partly includes presentation of information regarding the soundness of researcher’s data collection instruments &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes presentation of information regarding the soundness of researcher’s data collection instruments &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes presentation of information regarding the soundness of researcher’s data collection instruments &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
13. Research Methodology <i>Data Analysis Procedures</i> – paper presents concise description of data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis (appropriateness per research design & data collection)	Paper does not include presentation of specific data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper partly includes presentation of specific data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes presentation of specific data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes presentation of specific data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
14. Discussion <i>Potential Limitations of the Study</i> – paper presents the potential limitations for the proposed investigation (e.g., <i>research design, sampling, data collection, etc.</i>)	Paper does not include presentation of specific limitations for the proposed investigation &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper partly includes presentation of specific limitations for the proposed investigation &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes presentation of specific limitations for the proposed investigation &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes presentation of specific limitations for the proposed investigation &/or section contains no more than one writing error	
15. Discussion <i>Potential Contribution of the Study</i> – paper presents the potential contribution of the research study’s findings to both practice & research	Paper does not include presentation of potential contribution of the research study’s findings to both practice & research &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper partly includes presentation of potential contribution of the research study’s findings to both practice & research &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes presentation of potential contribution of the research study’s findings to both practice & research &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes presentation of potential contribution of the research study’s findings to both practice & research &/or section contains no more than one writing error	

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
16. References Comprehensiveness & adherence to APA (2010) <i>Publication Manual</i>	Paper does not include a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contains more than six writing errors	Paper partly includes a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contains four or five writing errors	Paper includes a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contains two or three writing errors	Paper includes a clear Reference section (e.g., congruence between works cited in paper & those included in the Reference section) &/or section contain no more than one writing error	
17. Overall clarity & readability The syntax, grammar, and punctuation errors impede the readability of the paper (<i>doctoral level work?</i>)	Paper is not written at the doctoral level as evident by having more than 30 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper	Paper is somewhat written at the doctoral level as evident by having 20 to 29 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper	Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 10 to 19 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper	Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 1 to 9 grammar & punctuation errors throughout the paper	
18. Overall adherence to <i>Publication Manual</i> (APA, 2010; <i>doctoral level work?</i>)	Paper is not written at the doctoral level as evident by having more than 30 APA writing errors throughout the paper	Paper is somewhat written at the doctoral level as evident by having 20 to 29 APA writing errors throughout the paper	Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 10 to 19 APA writing errors throughout the paper	Paper is written at the doctoral level as evident by having 1 to 9 APA writing errors throughout the paper	
Total Points per Evaluation Criterion (out of 54 points)					
					Out of 54 points

Instructor Feedback / Comments:

Poster Presentation & Discussion of the Research Prospectus (10% of grade)

The dissertation proposal defense is a professional presentation and dialogue wherein the doctoral candidate and his or her dissertation committee members discuss the merit of the doctoral dissertation research proposal. A primary goal of the dissertation proposal defense is to assist the doctoral candidate in developing a “strong” research study and dissertation. The structure of the dissertation proposal “defense will depend on the norms of your institution and the preferences of your committee” (Joyner et al., 2013, p. 151). Most dissertation “proposal conferences will last about one hour; some require additional time if major problems occur or if difference arise among the committee members (Joyner et al., 2013, p. 151). To begin the dissertation proposal process, the doctoral candidate takes about 15-30 minutes to present his or her proposed investigation (often accomplished with a PowerPoint presentation). Upon completion of the doctoral candidate’s presentation, the dissertation chairperson and committee members will begin discussing their perspectives about the study with the doctoral candidate (typically, [a] areas of strength of the study, [b] areas of limitation of the study, [c] areas necessitate additional elaboration, and [d] areas requiring strengthening).

For your Research Methodology, you will construct a poster presentation for the Proposed Research Investigation, aligning with a presentation that may be offered at a refereed conference (typically, PowerPoint presentation slides). In addition, faculty will be invited to the poster presentations to provide students with additional feedback

The poster presentations should include the following:

1. Rationale for the study (nature & scope of the problem)
2. Relevance of the study to field of study
3. Problem state (statement of the problem)
4. Research questions &/or hypotheses
5. Research design
6. Population and sampling procedures (e.g., anticipated sample size, statistical power, transferability of qualitative findings)
7. Data collection procedures
 - √ IRB
 - √ Recruitment / Methods will be collected (e.g., mail, interviews, etc.)?
 - √ Instrumentation (psychometrics) / Trustworthiness, Fidelity, & Rigor
8. Primary data analysis procedures per research question &/or hypotheses
9. Potential limitations of the investigation
10. Potential areas for future research
11. Potential implications for field of study

CACREP (2009) Doctoral Standards Accessed by Research Prospectus

1. Doctoral Learning Outcomes: Research and Scholarship
 - a. E.2. Understands qualitative designs and approaches to qualitative data analysis
 - b. F.1. Demonstrates the ability to formulate research questions appropriate for professional research & publication.
 - c. F.2. Demonstrates the ability to create research designs appropriate to quantitative and qualitative research questions.
-

Student Name: _____ Doctoral Track: _____

Research Methodology

Poster Presentation for Initial Research Prospectus Evaluation Rubric

- Unacceptable (0 points)** = Student **Does Not** Demonstrate Competency at the Doctoral Level
- Developing (1 point)** = Student **Does Not** Demonstrate Competency at the Doctoral Level; however, the Student Demonstrates Some Level of Proficiency
- Proficient (2 points)** = Student **Demonstrates** Competency at the Doctoral Level
- Exemplary (3 points)** = Student **Demonstrates** Strong Competency at the Doctoral Level

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
1. Rationale for the Study: Presenter & poster communicates sound argument / position for the necessity for the proposed investigation (e.g., <i>void in the research, etc.</i>)	Presenter & poster do not communicate sound argument / position for the necessity for the proposed investigation	Presenter & posters party communicate sound argument / position for the necessity for the proposed investigation	Presenter & posters communicates sound argument / position for the necessity for the proposed investigation	Presenter & posters provide strong argument / position for the necessity for the proposed investigation	
2. Relevance of the Study to Field of Study: Presenter & poster provides reasoning why proposed investigation will contribute to theory & practice	Presenter & poster do not provide reasoning why proposed investigation will contribute to theory & practice	Presenter & poster party provide reasoning why proposed investigation will contribute to theory & practice	Presenter & poster provides reasoning why proposed investigation will contribute to theory & practice	Presenter & poster provide strong reasoning why proposed investigation will contribute to theory & practice	
3. Statement of the Problem: Presenter & poster provide a clear & logical problem statement based on research & theory	Presenter & poster do not provide a clear & logical problem statement based on research & theory	Presenter & poster party provide a clear & logical problem statement based on research & theory	Presenter & poster provide a clear & logical problem statement based on research & theory	Presenter & poster provide a strong , clear, & logical problem statement based on research & theory	
4. Research Questions &/or Hypotheses: Presenter & poster communicate clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses based on identified problem statement – constructs to be investigated are operationally defined (e.g., <i>“as measured by ...”</i>)	Presenter & poster do not communicate clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses based on identified problem statement – constructs to be investigated are operationally defined	Presenter & poster party communicate clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses based on identified problem statement – constructs to be investigated are operationally defined	Presenter & poster communicate clear & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses based on identified problem statement – constructs to be investigated are operationally defined	Presenter & poster provide strong , clear, & appropriate research questions &/or hypotheses based on identified problem statement – constructs to be investigated are operationally defined	

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
<p>5. Research Design: Presenter & poster communicates clear & appropriate research design per identified research questions &/or hypotheses – defines specific research design</p>	<p>Presenter & poster do not communicate clear & appropriate research design per identified research questions &/or hypotheses – defines specific research design</p>	<p>Presenter & poster partly communicate clear & appropriate research design per identified research questions &/or hypotheses – defines specific research design</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates clear & appropriate research design per identified research questions &/or hypotheses – defines specific research design</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates a strong, clear, & appropriate research design per identified research questions &/or hypotheses – defines specific research design</p>	
<p>6. Population & Sampling Procedures: Presenter & poster communicates logical & appropriate sampling methods (<i>e.g., random selection, purposive sampling, statistical power</i>)</p>	<p>Presenter & poster do not communicate logical & appropriate sampling methods</p>	<p>Presenter & poster partly communicate logical & appropriate sampling methods</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates logical & appropriate sampling methods</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates strong, logical, & appropriate sampling methods</p>	
<p>7. Data Collection Procedures: Presenter & poster communicates specific steps the researcher will take in his or her in data collection process (<i>e.g., IRB, incentives, recruitment, data collection instruments [validity & reliability], etc.</i>)</p>	<p>Presenter & poster do not communicate specific steps the researcher will take in his or her in data collection process</p>	<p>Presenter & poster partly communicate specific steps the researcher will take in his or her in data collection process</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates specific steps the researcher will take in his or her in data collection process</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates specific steps the researcher will take in his or her in data collection process in a strong fashion</p>	
<p>8. Primary Data Analysis Procedures: Presenter & poster communicates description of data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis (<i>appropriateness per research design & data collection</i>)</p>	<p>Presenter & poster do not communicate description of data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis</p>	<p>Presenter & poster partly communicate description of data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates description of data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates strong description of data analysis procedures that will be employed per research question &/or hypothesis</p>	
<p>9. Limitations & Areas for Future Research: Presenter & poster communicates the potential limitations for the proposed investigation & areas for future research to address identified limitations</p>	<p>Presenter & poster do not communicate the potential limitations for the proposed investigation & areas for future research to address identified limitations</p>	<p>Presenter & poster partly communicate the potential limitations for the proposed investigation & areas for future research to address identified limitations</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates the potential limitations for the proposed investigation & areas for future research to address identified limitations</p>	<p>Presenter & poster communicates the potential limitations for the proposed investigation & areas for future research to address identified limitations in a strong fashion</p>	

Task Description	Unacceptable (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Proficient (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)	Score
10. Potential Implication of Study: Presenter & poster communicates the potential contribution of the research study's findings to both practice & research	Presenter & poster do not communicate the potential contribution of the research study's findings to both practice & research	Presenter & poster partly communicate the potential contribution of the research study's findings to both practice & research	Presenter & poster communicate the potential contribution of the research study's findings to both practice & research	Presenter & poster communicates the potential contribution of the research study's findings to both practice & research in a strong fashion	
11. Quality of Poster Presentation Comprehensiveness & clarify of PowerPoint slides / information	Poster is not comprehensive & provides clear information	Poster is somewhat comprehensive & provides clear information	Poster is comprehensive & provides clear information	Poster is comprehensive & provides exceptional information	
12. Presenter's Overall Performance Professionalism, engagement, and thoughtfulness of the presenter	Presenter is not professional, engaging, & thoughtful	Presenter is somewhat professional, engaging, & thoughtful	Presenter is professional, engaging, & thoughtful	Presenter is very professional, engaging, & thoughtful	
Total Points per Evaluation Criterion					Out of 36 points

Instructor Feedback / Comments:

ALL ASSIGNMENTS MUST BE TYPED & IN APA (2010) FORMAT

Please note: Any assignment not turned in at the designated class meeting, on the due date & time will result in a grade of zero. No late work will be accepted.

IF YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS WITH ASSIGNMENTS &/OR DUE DATES, PLEASE CONTACT THE INSTRUCTOR PRIOR TO THE DUE DATE SO POSSIBLE ACCOMMODATIONS MAY BE MADE IF NECESSARY.

Accommodating Students with Special Learning Needs:

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA; 20 U.S.C Section 1400 et seq.), the American with Disability Act of 1990 (ADA; 42 U.S.C., Section 12101 et seq.), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. Section 794 et seq.) requires the University of Texas A&M Commerce provide “reasonable accommodations to any individual who advises us of a physical or mental disability.” Students wishing to receive some instructional accommodation because of a documented disability should meet with the instructor to discuss accommodations. Please arrange a meeting with me at your earliest convenience. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact:

Office of Student Disability Resources and Services**Texas A&M University-Commerce****Gee Library, Room 132****Phone (903) 886-5150 or (903) 886-5835****Fax (903) 468-8148****Student Conduct & Academic Integrity:**

By enrolling in this course, you have accepted the responsibility to abide to policies and procedures set forth by the University of Texas A&M Commerce. "All students enrolled at the University shall follow the tenets of common decency and acceptable behavior conducive to a positive learning environment." (See Student's Guide Handbook, Polices and Procedures, Conduct) "Graduate students at Texas A&MUniversity-Commerce are expected to maintain high standards of integrity and honesty in all their scholastic work." (See Section A13.12, Academic Honesty, A&M-Commerce Procedures.)

UNIVERSITY CLOSING DUE TO WEATHERCheck <http://www.tamu-commerce.edu/> regarding class cancellations. Also, KETR radio on 88.9 FM and Television channels 4, 5, and 8 (channel 7 for Tyler & Longview area).

Professionalism:

Due to the experiential, interpersonal, and intrapersonal nature of *Research Methodology* professionalism is critical. Within course discussions, students will need to display the ability to accept constructive feedback and collaborate with their peers. It is the instructor's responsibility to ensure that doctoral students in education possess the abilities to handle these professional responsibilities. Please see the instructor if you have any concerns.

Please do not allow cell-phones and beepers to interrupt class time. The instructors respectfully ask that you deactivate these prior to class. THANKS!!

**THE SYLLABUS, TENTATIVE SEMESTER OUTLINE, FORMAT OF
ASSIGNMENTS, AND READINGS MAY BE ADJUSTED OVER THE COURSE OF
THE SEMESTER**

Tentative Topical Outline

Informal Class Meeting

January 29, 2014

Introduction & Orientation to the Course

Review Syllabus & Course Expectations

Class #1

February 5, 2014

Epistemologies of Research Inquiry

Ethics in Human Subjects Research & Academia

Institutional Review Boards (IRB) Training

Graduate Student Integrity & Academia

Research Integrity / Plagiarism & Self-Plagiarism

Research Misconduct / Integrity in Data Management (e.g., falsification, confidentiality)

Doctoral Student Research Identity

Discuss Plan for Participation in Research Assignment

Readings:

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon. – **Chapters 1 & 3**

Lambie, G. W., Hayes, B. G., Griffith, C., Limberg, D., & Mullen, P. R. (2013). Doctoral education students' levels of research knowledge, research self-efficacy, and interest in research: A cross-sectional investigation. *Journal of Innovative Higher Education*, 39(2) DOI 10.1007/s10755-013-9264-1.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for general causal inferences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. – **Chapter 9 (pp. 279-290)**

Quiz #1

Class #2

February 12, 2014

Constructing a Sound Literature Review

Developing a Sound Research Report

Becoming a Strong Scholarly Writer (e.g., getting published)

Doctoral Student Research Identity

Review Initial Literature Review Paper Requirement

Readings:

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3-15.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon. – **Chapters 2 & 4**

Quiz #2

Due: Documentation of IRB Training Due to Instructor & Plan for Participation in Research

Class #3 February 19, 2014 **Data Collection & Analysis**
Hybrid/eCollege Basic Statistical Techniques
 No face-to-face meeting Selecting a Sample

Readings:

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon. – **Chapters 5 & 6**

Quiz #3

Class #4 February 26, 2014 **Research Designs: Quantitative Designs**
Non-experimental Research Designs
 Review of Basic Statistical Techniques
 Descriptive Research Designs
 Causal-Comparative Research Designs
 Correlational Research Designs

Readings:

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon. – **Chapters 10 & 11**

Quiz #4

Class #5 March 5, 2014 **Research Designs: Quantitative Designs**
 Review Basic Statistical Techniques
Experimental Research Designs

Readings:

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon. – **Chapter 12**
 Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for general causal inferences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. – **Chapters 1 & 8**

Quiz #5

Due: Initial Literature Review Paper

Spring Break March 12: No Class

Class #6 March 19, 2013 **Research Designs: Quantitative Designs**
Quasi-Experimental Research Designs

Readings:

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon. – **Chapter 13**
 Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for general causal inferences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. – **Chapters 4, 5, & 6**

Quiz #6

Class #10 April 16, 2014 **Developing Your Initial Written Research Prospectus**
APA (2010) Common Issues
Constructing & Refining Your Research Prospectus
Poster Presentation Preparation

Readings:

Students should be working on their poster & initial research prospectus

Due: Bring Draft of Initial Written Research Prospectus to Class

Class #11 April 23, 2014 **Poster Presentation for Initial Research Prospectus**

Students will be facilitating their poster presentations during scheduled class meeting time

Due: Poster Presentation for Initial Research Prospectus

Readings:

Students should continue working on their initial research prospectus

Class #12 April 30, 2013 **Initial Written Research Prospectus**
Course Summary

Hardcopy of Initial Research Prospectus Papers Must Be Turned-In to the Instructor at Class Time

Due: Initial Written Research Prospectus & Summary of Research Participation

Final Exam Week May 7, 2013

Guiding Principles of Scientific Research

The Committee (NCR) argued that all the sciences, including scientific educational research, shared a set of epistemological or fundamental guiding principles. The Committee argued that all scientific endeavors should:

1. Pose significant questions that can be investigated empirically
2. Link research to relevant theory
3. Use methods that permit direct investigation of the questions
4. Provide a coherent and explicit chain of reasoning
5. Attempt to yield findings that replicate and generalize across studies
6. Disclose research data and methods to enable and encourage professional scrutiny and critique.

These principles do not constitute an algorithm, checklist, or “how-to” guide; no single study is likely to encompass them all (although a well-designed and coordinated program of scientific research would). Rather, the Committee viewed the principles as professionally internalized norms that reflect dedication to the primacy of evidence; to healthy skepticism about knowledge claims; to ruling out all alternative explanations (“*competitive argumentation*”; see Schoenfeld, Smith, & Arcavi, 1993); to elucidating and reducing biases that might affect the research process; to disciplined, creative, and open-minded thinking; and to the free flow of constructive criticism.

Bibliography

Dissertation & Scholarly Writing Resources

- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. Washington, DC: Author.
- APA Publication and Communication Board Working Group on Journal Article Reporting Standards. (2008). Reporting standards for research in psychology: Why do we need them? What might they be? *American Psychologist*, 63(9), 839-851.
- Bair, C. R. (1999). *Doctoral student attrition and persistence: A meta-synthesis*. (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago). Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Microform 9917754.
- Biklen, S. K., & Casella, R. (2007). *A practical guide to the qualitative dissertation*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bolker, J. (1998). *Writing your dissertation in fifteen minutes a day: A guide to starting, revising, and finishing your doctoral thesis*. New York: Holt Press.
- Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, 34(6), 3-15.
- Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Best practices for enculturation: Collegiality, mentoring, and structure. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 101, 87-94.
- Bryant, M. T. (2004). *The portable dissertation adviser*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Butin, D. W. (2010). *The education dissertation: A guide for practitioner scholars*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Calabrese, R. L. (2006). *The elements of an effective dissertations and thesis: A step-by-step guide to getting it right the first time*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Clark, I. L. (2007). *Writing the successful thesis and dissertation: Entering the conversation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cone, J. D., & Foster, S. C. (2006). *Dissertation and theses from start to finish: Psychology and related fields*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- D'Andrea, L. M. (2002). Obstacles to completion of the doctoral degree in colleges of education: The professors' perspective. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 25(3), 42-58.
- Dunleavy, P. (2003). *Authoring a PhD: How to plan, draft, write and finish a doctoral thesis or dissertation*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Faghihi, F. Y. (1998). A study of factors related to dissertation progress among doctoral candidates: Focus on student research self-efficacy as a result of their research training and experience. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Memphis, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59/05, 1456.
- Farmer, E. I., & Rojewski, J. W. (Eds). (2001). *Research pathways: Writing professional papers, theses, and dissertations in workforce education*. Lanham, MD: University Press of American, Inc.
- Finn, J. A. (2005). *Getting a PhD: An action plan to help manage your research, your supervisor and your project*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Galvan, J. L. (2009). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences* (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
- Gardner, D.C., & Beatty, G. (1980) *Dissertation proposal guidebook: How to prepare a research proposal and get it accepted*. Springfield, IL: Thomas
- Glatthorn, A. A., (1998). *Writing the winning dissertation: A step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Glatthorn, A. A. (2002). *Publish or perish: The educator's imperative: Strategies for writing effectively for your profession and you school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Glatthorn, A. A., & Joyner, R.L. (2005). *Writing the winning dissertation: A step-by-step guide* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Irby, B., & Fredrick, C. (2007) *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral Sciences*. New York: Corwin Press.
- Joyner, R., L., Rouse, W. A., & Glatthorn, A. A. (2013). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step guide* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Kline, W. B., & Farrell, C. A. (2005). Recurring manuscript problems: Recommendations for writing, training, and research. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 44, 166-174.
- Lambie, G. W., Sias, S. M., David, K. M., Lawson, G., & Akos, P. (2008). A scholarly writing resource for counselor educators and their students. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 86(1), 18-25.
- Lester, J. D., & Lester, J. D. Jr., (2007). *Writing research papers: A complete guide*. New York: Pearson-Longman.

- Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2014). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2007). *Making the implicit explicit: Creating performance expectations for the dissertation*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing
- Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2012). *The literature review: Six steps to success* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Martin, R. (1980). *Writing and defending a thesis or dissertation in psychology and education*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Nickerson, E. T. (1993). *The dissertation handbook: A guide to successful dissertations* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendal / Hunt Publishing Company.
- Ogden, E. O., (2007). *Complete your dissertation or thesis in two semesters or less* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Pan, M. L. (2008). *Preparing literature reviews: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. (3rd ed.). Glendale, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
- Pycszak, F., & Bruce, R. R. (2007). *Writing empirical research reports: A basic guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences* (6th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
- Roberts, C. M. (2010). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2007). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ruszkiewicz, J., Walker, J. R., & Pemberton, M. A. (2006). *Bookmarks: A guide to research and writing* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Stripling, L. H. (2004). All-but-dissertation non-completion of doctoral degrees in education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65/02, 382.
- Szuchman, L. T. (2008). *Writing with style: APA style made easy* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Thomas, R. M., & Brubaker, D. L. (2008). *Theses and dissertations: A guide to planning, research, and writing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
-

Research Design Resources

- Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago, R. McNally.
- Creswell, J. (2003) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods* (2nded.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Gall, M. D., Gall., J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2006). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gall, M. D., Gall., J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2010). *Applying educational research* (6th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. W. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Fraenkel, J. R, Wallen, N. E, & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2008). *Research design in counseling* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson.
- Houser, R. (2009). *Counseling and educational research: Evaluation and application* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2000). *Educational research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kelly, A., & Lesh, R. (Eds). (2000). *Handbook of research design in mathematics and science education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Press
- McMillan, J. H. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (6th ed.). Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2000). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. NY:Longman
- Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2004). *Research design explained* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rallis, S. F., & Rossman, G. B. (2012). *The research journey: Introduction to inquiry*. New York: The Guilford Press
- Rugg, G., & Petre, M. (2007). *A gentle guide to research methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Sales, B. D., & Folkman, S. (2000). *Ethics in research with human participants*. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for general causal inferences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Shavelson, R. J., & Towne, L. (Eds.). (2002). *Scientific research in education*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- Trochim, W. M. K., & Donnelly, J. P. (2008). *The research methods knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Wester, K. L. (2011). Publishing ethical research: A step-by-step overview. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89(3), 301-307.
-

Qualitative Research Resources

- Biklen, S. K., & Casella, R. (2007). *A practical guide to the qualitative dissertation*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bloomberg, L., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A roadmap from beginning to end* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Choudhuri, D., Glauser, A., & Peregoy, J. (2004). Guidelines for writing a qualitative manuscript for the *Journal of Counseling & Development*. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 82(4), 443-446.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 124.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Farber, N. K. (2006). Conducting qualitative research: A practical guide for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, 9(5), 367-375
- Freshwater, D., Cahill, J., & Walsh, E. (2010). Qualitative research as evidence: Criteria for rigor and relevance. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 15(6), 497-508.
- Glesne, C. (2006) *Becoming qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Grbich, C. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. (2011). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Hayes, D. G., & Wood, C. (2011). Infusing qualitative traditions in counseling research designs. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89(3), 288-295.
- Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 196–205.
- Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25, 517–572.
- Hunt, B. (2011). Publishing qualitative research in counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89(3), 296-300.
- Kline, W. B. (2008). Developing and submitting credible qualitative manuscripts. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 47(4), 210-217.
- Kline, W. B., & Farrell, C. A. (2005). Recurring manuscript problems: Recommendations for writing, training, and research. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 44, 166-174.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2010). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McLead, J. (2011). *Qualitative research in counseling and psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L., & Collins, K. M. T. (2010). Innovative data collection strategies in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 696-726.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 52, 137–145.

- Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophies of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 126–136.
- Thomas, E., Magilvy, J. K. (2011). Qualitative rigor or research validity in qualitative research. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing*, 16, 151-155.
- Wertz, F. J. (2005). Phenomenological research methods in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 167–177.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
-

Quantitative Research Resources

- Algina, J., & Olejnik, S. (2003). Sample size tables for correlational analysis with applications in partial correlations and multiple regression analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 38(3), 309-323.
- Balkin, R. S., & Sheperis, C. J. (2011). Evaluating and reporting statistical power in counseling research. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89(3), 268-272.
- Bernstein, B. A. (2008). An introduction to sample size and power. *Journal of Developmental and Behavior Pediatrics*, 69(6), 516-522.
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge, Taylor, & Francis Group.
- Cohen, J. (1970). Approximate power and sample size determination for common one-sample and two-sample hypothesis tests. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 811-831.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J. (1990). Things I have learned (so far). *American Psychologist*, 45(12), 1304-1312.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155–159.
- Cohen, J. (1994). The earth is round ($p < .05$). *American Psychologist*, 49(12), 997-1003.
- Cowles, M., & Davis, C. (1982). On the origins of the .05 level of statistical significance. *American Psychologist*, 37(5), 553-558.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2012). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dimitrov, D. M. (2012). *Statistical methods for validation of assessment scale data in counseling and related fields*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2008). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Foster, L., Steuart, W., Meeks, C. & Young, S. (2002). Single-subject research design for school counselors: Becoming an applied researcher. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(2), 146-154.
- Ghosh, S. (1999). *Multivariate analysis, design of experiments, and survey sampling*. New York: Marcel Dekker
- Glass, G. (1980) *Quasi-experiments: The case of interrupted time series*. Washington, D.C: American Educational Research Association
- Granello, D. H. (2007). Publishing quantitative manuscripts in *Counselor Education and Supervision*: General guidelines and expectations. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 47, 66-75.
- Grimm, L. G., & Yarnold, P. R. (Eds.). (1995). *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Horner, R. H., Carr, E. G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 71(2), 165-179.
- Hoyle, R. H. (Ed). (2012). *Handbook of structural equation modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hsu, L. M. (1993). Using Cohen's tables to determine the maximum power attainable in two sample tests when one sample is limited in size. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 303-305.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- Kline, R. B. (1991). Latent variable path analysis in clinical research: A beginner's tour guide. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47(4), 471-484.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1990). *Design sensitivity: Statistical power for experimental research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lomax, R. G., & Hahs-Vaughn, D. L. (2012). *Statistical concepts: A second course* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Lundervold, D. A., & Belwood, M. F. (2000). The best kept secret in counseling: Single-case ($N = 1$) experimental designs. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78*, 92-102.
- Marsh, H.W., Hau, K-T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers of overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling, 11*, 320-341.
- Martin, W. E., & Bridgmon, K. D. (2012). *Quantitative and statistical research methods: From hypotheses to results*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Monette, D. R., Sullivan, T. J., & DeJong, C. R. (2011). *Applied social research: A tool for the human services* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Leech, N. L. (2004). Post hoc power: A concept whose time has come. *Understanding Statistics, 3*(4), 201-230.
- Osborne, J. W. (2013). *Best practices in data cleaning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Petrocelli, J. V. (2003). Hierarchical multiple regression in counseling research: Common problems and possible remedies. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 36*, 9-22.
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Ruckdeschel, D. E. (2007). An overview of coefficient alpha and a reliability matrix for estimating adequacy of internal consistency coefficients with psychological research measures. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 105*, 997-1014.
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2006). *A first course in structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: Psychology Press.
- Richards, S. B., Taylor, R., Ramasamy, R., & Richards, R.Y. (1999) *Single subject research: Applications in educational and clinical settings*. San Diego, CA: Singular Pub. Group,
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, L. G. (2010). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Sink, C. A., Stroh, H. R. (2006). Practical significance: The use of effect sizes in school counseling research. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(5), 401-411.
- Snijders, T. A. B., & Boshier, R. J. (2012). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Streiner, D. L. (2010). Measure for measure: New developments in measurement and item response theory. *Research Methods in Psychiatry, 55*(3), 180-186.
- Tanguma, J. (2000). *Steps in test construction*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Psychological Association, Dallas, TX.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Thomas, R. M. (1998). *Conducting educational research: A comparative view*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Trusty, J. (2011). Developing studies for publication in counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 89*(3), 261-267.
- Veldkamp, B. P. (2002). Optimal test construction. (Report No. RR-02-08). Faculty of Educational Science and Technology, University of Twente, P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands. E-mail: Fox@edte.utwente.nl.