

Negotiated Exam Guidelines

Introduction [2-3 pages]

Theory Section [roughly 20 pages]:

Justify your choice of theories (whether it be 2, 3, or some other number)—why are these the most relevant/appropriate to your interest—this also (or instead) could go in introduction section.

Explain what criteria/guidelines you will utilize to critique your chosen theories (See section titled Criteria for critiquing theory).

Critique each theory using those criteria. Each theory also needs to be evaluated from the perspective of usefulness to the writer.

Research Section [roughly 20 pages]:

Select 4-6 articles (depending upon committee recommendation) that are relevant to your topic of interest—these can and often are related to the theories selected above.

Justify your choice of articles, taken into consideration the participant pool, methodologies, etc. [Ask yourself whether these provide a good representation of what is out there in the literature as well as a broad enough range of demonstration of your ability to critique research

Explain criteria/guidelines you will utilize to critique your research articles (e.g., different criteria for different methodologies?) (See sections titled Criteria for Critiquing Factor Analysis, Correlation, Regression, and Survey Studies; Criteria for Analyzing and Designing True and Quasi-Experimental Research Designs; and Criteria for Critiquing Qualitative Methods.

Critique each article accordingly [use remaining pages left for this rough section allotment and divide by the number of articles selected.

Synthesis Section [3-5 pages]:

So, what have you learned?

What are your conclusions?

Where are the gaps in the literature?

Where are your gaps in knowledge?

Implications for future research?

Implications for YOUR future research/where to from here??

References

Negotiated Exam should be written in APA style, with headings and subheadings to organize it appropriately for its content.

A brief prospectus must be submitted to committee approximately 2 weeks prior to Negotiated Exam Proposal meeting and approved by that meeting, which includes information on each section above sufficient for committee to make determination on appropriateness of topic, theories, research articles, etc.

Criteria for Critiquing Theory

Assumptions and Premises

What are the assumptions stated by the theory?

Key Constructs (i.e., ideas, concepts)

What are the key constructs and ideas proposed by the theory? How are key constructs defined?

Definitions

What important definitions are included in the theory?

Precision (i.e., clarity)

Usefulness (i.e., applicability to stated issue or problem)

Is the theory precise, clear, useful? How is the theory useful? Applicable? With what populations? In what contexts?

Testability

Can hypotheses be generated from the theory that can be tested empirically and clinically?

Comprehensiveness

How is the theory comprehensive?

Generalizability

Integration of previous theory and research

Does the theory integrate previous theory and/or research? Describe previous theory and/or research are integrated with this theory

Integration of multiculturalism and diversity concepts

Does the theory integrate multiculturalism and diversity concepts? Describe and explain, for example, cultural values; multiple dimensions of identity; universal and cultural-specific strategies; individualism and collectivism, as they are addressed by the theory.

Integration of historical, social, political, economic, and other relevant contextual information

Does the theory integrate historical, social, political, economic, and other relevant contextual information? Describe and explain, for example, client and client systems; prejudice, discrimination, and racism at the individual, institutional, and cultural level, as they are addressed by the theory.

Integration of social justice concepts

Does the theory integrate social justice concepts? Social justice refers to the commitment to ensuring change locally, nationally, and internationally based on the valuing of fairness and equity in resources, rights, and treatment for marginalized individuals and groups of people who do not share equal power in society because of their immigration, racial, ethnic, age, socioeconomic, religious heritage, physical ability, or sexual orientation status groups. (Constantine, Hage, Kinaichi, & Bryant, 2007, p. 24)

Implications for organizing existing knowledge and for placing it in a context meaningful to researchers, practitioners, and training programs

Does the theory help to meaningfully organize and contextualize information for researchers, practitioners, and training programs?

Criteria for Critiquing Factor Analysis, Correlation, Regression, and Survey Studies**Factor Analysis Studies**

Was the rationale for the study sufficient?

Did the goals or research questions clearly indicate the true purpose of a factor analysis?

Were the population and sample defined or described clearly and comprehensively enough, and is the sample representative enough to make the findings useful? Is it large enough?

Was the measurement scale described sufficiently and does it seem valid and reliable?

Was the data collection process unobtrusive?

Was the type of factor analysis identified? (e.g., exploratory, confirmatory, principal factors, principal components), and was the choice appropriate?

Were the steps in the analysis presented clearly? (e.g., rotation method, derived factor, eigenvalues, correlations, percent of variance accounted for)

Were the results presented accurately and appropriately?

Were the names of the derived factors presented clearly?

Were there tables that summarized the intercorrelations and the relevant values associated with the derived factor?

Did the tables stand alone?

Were the findings discussed in conjunction with the research questions or goals?

Were the findings discussed in relation to previous findings and identified theories?

Were the implications for professional practice and further research discussed?

Were there any potential generalizations of the findings?

Correlation Studies

Was the rationale for the study sufficient?

Did the goals or research questions clearly indicate the true purpose of a correlation analysis?

Was the sample defined or described clearly and comprehensively enough, and was it representative enough to make the findings useful? Was it large enough?

Were the measurement scales defined sufficiently, and did they seem to be reliable and valid?

Did the measures have sufficiently wide ranges in the scales?

Was the data collection process unobtrusive?

Were the steps in the analysis stated clearly?

Was the strength of the relationships reported? (i.e., r squared)

Was the correlation matrix provided so that all correlation relationships are reported? (r and p values, positive—negative, significant—non-significant)

Do the tables stand alone?

Were the findings discussed in relation to the goals or research questions?

Were the findings discussed in relation to previous research?

Were there recommendations for practice and for further research?

Were there any potential generalizations of the findings?

Regression Studies

Was the rationale for the study sufficient?

Did the goals or research questions clearly indicate the true purpose of a regression analysis?

Was the sample defined or described clearly and comprehensively enough, and was it representative enough to make the findings useful? Was it large enough?

Were the measurement predictor and criterion scales defined sufficiently, and did they seem to be reliable and valid?

Was the data collection process unobtrusive?

Was the type, or the types, of regression analysis or analyses identified and explained?
Was the type used appropriate?

Were the steps in the analysis stated clearly?

Were the best predictors identified?

Were the standardized Betas reported?

Was the strength of the relationships reported? (i.e., R squared)

Was the correlation matrix provided so that all correlation relationships are reported? (R and p values, positive—negative, significant—non-significant)

Do the tables stand alone?

Were the findings discussed in relation to the goals or research questions?

Were the findings discussed in relation to previous research?

Were there recommendations for practice and for further research?

Were there any potential generalizations of the findings?

Survey Studies

Was the rationale for the study presented clearly?

Was the purpose or goal of the survey study presented clearly?

Were the population sample defined clearly? Was the sample representative enough?

Were the procedures for recruiting participants presented clearly?

Was there a follow-up in order to increase the sample size, and were the follow-up recruiting efforts appropriate?

Was the return response rate reported? Was it high enough to accept the findings and recommendations?

Was the survey development process presented clearly and in enough detail?

Did the survey item categories seem to match the goals?

Was there any evidence of validity and reliability for the survey scale?

Were the methods for collecting and scoring the responses provided clearly? Were they appropriate?

Were all of the findings presented in the narrative and tables?

Did the tables stand alone?

Were the findings presented accurately and appropriately?

Were the findings discussed regarding: (a) the research questions or goals, (b) implications for professional practice, (c) implications for research, and (d) previous research and theory?

Criteria for Analyzing and Designing True and Quasi-experimental Research Designs

Preliminary Questions

Is the study based on descriptive, difference, or relationship question?

Is it a field or laboratory study?

Using the notations provided in the Heppner et al. (2008) text (e.g., R X O) diagram the design of the study

Basic Questions

What are the research questions?

What are the research hypotheses?

If applicable, what are the independent and dependent variables?

Was the independent variable appropriately operationalized?

Was the definition of the independent variable similar to previous uses?

Were the dependent variables appropriately operationalized?

Were the definitions of the dependent variables similar to previous uses?

Was there random assignment of participants to treatments?

If yes, how did that impact threats to internal validity?

If no, were any of the following procedures employed?

Random assignment of intact groups to treatments

Pretest manipulations to compare groups prior to the intervention

Were there a sufficient number of participants to avoid a Type II error?

Were the participants aware of the research hypotheses?

If yes, what was done to adjust for this and how was it manipulated?

What population did the participants represent?

In what ways was the potential homogeneity of the sample a limitation?

Was anything done to adjust for the potential homogeneity of the sample (e.g., analysis of covariance)?

Was this recognized as a possible limitation in the discussion?

Was there evidence of participant attrition?

If so, what was done to adjust for it?

Was the content of the independent variable standardized?

Was the independent variable manipulated prior to collecting dependent measure data?

How many exemplars of the independent variable were there?
(Any evidence of mono-operation bias?)

How many ways was the independent variable operationalized?
(Any evidence of mono-method bias?)

Were experimenters aware of the research hypotheses?

If yes, what was done to adjust for potential experimenter bias?

What was done to make all independent variable treatments appear valuable while also keeping them independent of each other?

Was the treatment intervention too long, too short, or appropriate in duration?

Were the dependent measures sufficiently standardized?

Did the dependent measures have sufficient evidence of reliability and validity?

Were the dependent measures appropriate for the population sample?

Were the collections of the dependent measure data independent of each other?

Were the dependent measures sufficiently different and independent of each other?

How many exemplars were there for each dependent variable?
(Was there evidence of mono-operation bias?)

How many ways were the dependent variables operationalized?
(Was there evidence of mono-method bias?)

Were the dependent measure data collections conducted concurrently?

Were there a number of statistical comparisons?

If yes, what was done to avoid a Type I error (e.g., multiple analysis of variance)?

In what ways was the independent variable treatment intervention generalizable beyond the present study?

Was generalizability of the intervention treatment addressed in the discussion?

What real world settings were represented in the study?

How generalizable are the findings to other settings?

Criteria for Critiquing Qualitative Methods

Is the qualitative approach inductive or deductive?

Is the approach either postpositivist, constructivist, or emancipatory?

Is the role of the participants emic or etic? What are the strengths and challenges to each approach?

If coders were used, how were they trained?

What are the advantages and disadvantages of having one or multiple coders?

What data sources were used?

What type of coding was used?

How were data collected?

Describe the observation and transcription process.

How were themes or categories developed?

How were data reported?

What was the process for inter-rater agreement (i.e., reliability)?

How were threats to generalizability reduced?

Trustworthiness: How could the researcher's understandings be inaccurate?

Describe the differences among Credibility, Transferability, Dependability and Confirmability

References

Theory

Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Quantitative Methods

Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, Jr., D. M. (2008). *Research design in Counseling* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson*Brooks/Cole.

Qualitative Methods

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research*. In N.K. Denzin & Y.W. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.