

PSYCHOLOGY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION 952
Advanced Counseling Theory and Research

Spring, 2009

Course #82989

Instructor: James W. Lichtenberg 214C JR Pearson Hall

Office hours: Wednesday 1:30 - 3:20, but best by appointment

Phone: (785) 864-9656 **Email:** jlicht@ku.edu

Schedule: 8:00 -10:45 AM Tuesdays

Room: 143 Joseph R. Pearson Hall

Text/Readings: Wampold, B.E.. (2001). *The great psychotherapy debate*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (cited as **Wampold**)

Norcross, J.C., Beutler, L.E., & Levant, R.F. (Eds.) (2006). *Evidence-based practices in mental health: Debate and dialogue on the fundamental questions*. Washington, DC: APA. (cited as **Norcross**)

** A list of supplemental (noted as **Supp.**) readings is included at the end of this syllabus. The **Supp.** readings are required readings. Copies of the **Supp.** readings are available “on-line” through the **BlackBoard** (Bb) site established for this class. And of course you may locate most of the readings by going directly to the journals or texts.

Occasionally, I will suggest additional readings. Such readings are not required, but they are recommended as interesting and/or important readings having relevance to the issues being discussed.

OVERVIEW: In this course we will be examining a variety of topics that are central to and common across the theory, research and practice of counseling and psychotherapy. Focus will be on research methods and methodological issues in the development of empirical support for therapeutic interventions and on the examination of common and specific variables in therapeutic change.

As an advanced course, it presumes that students entering the course already have a reasonable background in theories of counseling and psychotherapy and that they are reasonably conversant about the major therapeutic approaches to behavior change. This course will not be a re-survey of traditional counseling theories—nor will it focus on specific “named-theories.” Students needing such coursework should consider enrolling in CPSY 742: Counseling Theories and Techniques. Nor will the course be a survey of research on particular therapeutic approaches. Students interested in this coursework should consider enrolling in PSYC 946: Clinical Psychotherapy or PSYC 949 Empirically Supported Treatments.

This course is required for all doctoral students in the department’s counseling psychology program. Students who are not in this program are permitted to enroll in the course, space permitting, only with the consent of the instructor.

Relation of the course to the School of Education's mission and conceptual framework: The primary mission of the School of Education is to prepare leaders in education and human services fields. As stated in the School Code

Within the University, the School of Education serves Kansas, the nation, and the world by (1) preparing individuals to be leaders and practitioners in education and related human service fields, (2) expanding and deepening understanding of education as a fundamental human endeavor, and (3) helping society define and respond to its educational responsibilities and challenges.

The components that frame this mission for our graduate programs are (a) Research and Best Practice, (b) Content Knowledge, and (c) Professionalism. These interlocking themes build the School's training model and conceptual framework, and to these ends, the objectives of this course are as follows:

1. To understand issues of evidence and justification as they related to the identification of empirically-validated/empirically-supported interventions in psychotherapy.
2. To understand and appreciate competing perspectives on issue of evidence-based interventions as "best practices" in professional psychology.
3. To understand the social context in which evidence-based psychotherapy has arisen and implications of this context for one's professional practice.
4. To understand the empirical research in psychotherapy as it relates to purported causal mechanisms that bring about therapeutic change.
5. To develop/enhance one's research conceptualization and design skills as they relate to psychotherapy research.
6. To develop/enhance one's critical thinking, professional writing, and oral presentation skills as they relate to psychotherapy theory and research.

Note: *Any student in this course who has a disability that prevents the fullest expression of her or his abilities or effort should contact me personally and as soon as possible so that we can discuss the appropriate accommodations necessary to complete the course requirements.*

GRADES: The course will be graded A-F (plus/minus). **Note:** Graduate School policy states that "the letter **I** (incomplete) is used to indicate coursework that has been of passing quality, some part of which is, for good reason, unfinished." If you anticipate that you can't complete the work for the class on time and don't have a legitimate reason, please consider withdrawing from the course. Otherwise, missing work will be graded as **F**. In all cases, incomplete grades (**I**) must be discussed with me beforehand and a timeline for completion of the work must be established.

Academic misconduct: The University defines academic misconduct as including, but not limited to, "disruption of classes; threatening an instructor or fellow student in an academic setting; giving or receiving of unauthorized aid on examinations or in the preparation of notebooks, themes, reports or other assignments; knowingly misrepresenting the source of any academic work; unauthorized changing of grades; unauthorized use of University approvals or forging of signatures; falsification of research results; plagiarizing of another's work; violation of regulations or ethical codes for the treatment of human and animal subjects; or otherwise acting dishonestly in research." Please refer to <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/USRR.htm#art2sect6> for the University's policy on academic misconduct.

EVALUATION: Course evaluations (i.e., grades) will be based on the following: (a) a midterm and final exam—both “take-home exams” (see below), (b) a research idea and reaction log, (c) a research proposal and its presentation in class, (d) regular class attendance and (e) informed class discussion/participation. Approximate "weightings" for these aspects/elements of the course are: exams = 60%, research proposal/presentation = 30%, class participation, punctuality, and log = 10%.

Course Element	% of Grade
Midterm exam	30
Final exam	30
Research proposal	20
Proposal presentation	10
Attendance/participation/log	10
Total	100

Examinations: The distinction is sometimes made between "learning" and "thinking" -- the former referring to the acquisition of knowledge and skills, and the latter referring to the use of what is acquired. I am concerned with both. That is, while I believe that it is important that you learn and memorize facts, concepts and principles, I am also concerned with what you do with the material once you've stuffed it into your head. That having been said, each exam is will involve several essay questions, and may include short-answer identification items as well. More will be said about the exams as we progress through the material. Suffice it to say that it is not my intent to keep you in the dark about the exams. *I anticipate that each exam will be a take-home exam. If for some reason I decide that either or both exams will not be a take-home exam, I will announce that at least 2 weeks ahead of the exam. If the final exam is not a take-home exam, it will be held on **Monday, May 15 from 7:30-10:00am – see the Final Examination Schedule--Spring 2009, <http://www.registrar.ku.edu/exams/finals.shtml>***

Exam questions will be evaluated using the following 6-point grading scale.

Rating:	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	outstanding	strong	adequate	limited	seriously flawed	fundamentally deficient	Off-topic, non-responsive

The scoring rubric for the scale is provided at the end of this syllabus. Scores for short-answer identification questions will be averaged to derive a single “essay-weight score” for the combined items. The grade for each exam will based on the point average for across the exam questions:

Rating:	6	5	4	3	2	1	0					
	-----A-----		-----B-----		-----C-----		-----D-----		-----E-----		-----F-----	

A	≥4.8
B	3.8-4.7
C	3.0-3.7
D	2.2.-2.9
F	<2.2

Reaction log: (To be discussed in class.) This is intended to allow (or force) you to reflect on class presentations and discussions, on your readings, and on the research questions and professional

issues that come up for you as we progress through the course. The log is to be a narrative presentation and fleshing-out of research questions and ideas and issues that have been stimulated by your reading and our discussions—a journal of your thoughts and reactions to the material we cover in the course, and an opportunity for us to “dialogue” about research questions and issues that arise for you from the readings and our class discussions. What I am looking for (and expecting) is thoughtful consideration of and reflection on the readings and our class discussions, and a willingness to “stretch” to consider, question, and/or apply what you have covered. What I am NOT looking for is a simple affective critique of the readings or commentary on the readings that is limited to your gut-response to them (e.g., “I really enjoyed the article by...”). The time period/readings to be addressed in the log entry are the readings and class discussions preceding the date of its submission. (It is fine to go back further to tie ideas together.)

You should keep some sort of loose-leaf notebook or folder to use as a “log book”—one from which you will be able to remove pages to hand-in, but something in which to keep returned log pages and to continue recording your reflections while I review the pages you've submitted. I will read and comment on your log as the semester goes along, but I not grade your log entries each time you submit them; instead, the log (as a whole) will be evaluated. If you should be “off-track” in this regard, I will let you know. Logs are to be turned-in every other week (see schedule below: **log due) and should be typed. (Please attach the logs to an email and send them to me before the class date on which they are due.)

Research proposal and presentation/discussion: This assignment is a “team project.” Students may form their own teams, or I will assign you to teams. Because I do not know at the time of preparation of this syllabus, how many will be in the class, I am unable to say at this time how many students will be on a “team.” I assume, however, that the class will have a mix of students at different levels in the program; and I encourage each team to include a “mix” of beginning and more advanced students. Teams should be formed by the end of class on **February 1st**.

By the middle of the semester (no later than **March 1st**), I would like each team is to have identified and settled on a research topic/issue/question of some particular interest to its members (and relevant to the course and your program), and to have submitted a concise abstract (1-2 pages) of the research issue(s) and question(s) for which the team will be developing a detailed research proposal. The proposal may address either “basic” (theory-testing) or “applied” issues, or both, but it should be realistic/modest/do-able, and grounded in psychological theory (i.e., be “theory-driven”). Although you may be “cutting new territory” in your proposal, it is expected that there will be a theoretical and/or research basis or foundation for your study.

The final paper/proposal (written by the team) should conform to “APA style”—including a title page, abstract, appropriate use of **(a)** headings (center, side, paragraph), **(b)** reference citations (within the text and in the reference list), and **(c)** page headings and numbering. The paper should be double-spaced throughout, and should be limited in length to 30 pages (including abstract and references). One-inch margins should be used on all sides. If you don’t already have a copy of the Publication manual of the APA (5th ed.), get one!

NOTE: Two useful on-line reference guides to APA format are:

http://owl.english.Purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_apa.html
<http://www.uwsp.edu/psych/apa4b.htm>

Additional on-line assistance with regarding to writing can be found at the KU Writing Center’s website: <http://www.writing.ku.edu/>

The proposal should include:

1. **Introduction** section: This should include a clear rationale for the study and a synopsis of the literature informing and supporting your study, and your hypotheses (Note: You may, if you wish, divide the Introduction into two sections: an Introduction [e.g., statement of the problem, purpose of the study] and a Review of Literature.).
2. **Method** section: This should include a description of your participants, instrumentation, procedures, research design and proposed analyses—all of which should be tied clearly to and justified by your research question(s) and hypotheses.
3. **Results/Discussion** section: You will not have data to analyze, so statistical results cannot be presented. However, I would like you to think through and include in this section what your results might look like and mean under various outcome situations--e.g., if your data (**a**) supported your hypotheses/predictions, (**b**) were the opposite of what you expected, and (**c**) presented mixed or random effects.
4. **Proposed budget**: Provide an itemized estimated budget for supplies (e.g., instruments, scoring materials, supplies), photocopying, postage, etc. Also, include funding projections you will need for personnel (e.g., if you will be hiring or paying participants[therapists, clients, experts], raters/evaluators, or other specialize personnel). Do not included members of the research team in the personnel budget. Be reasonable in creating your budget—the need for each line item should be stipulated. This is not a time to insert humor into your research proposal. Your budget must not exceed \$1000.

Let me allay any concerns you might have about requisite backgrounds in statistics and design. Although we will be discussing research methods and, to some extent, statistical analyses in this course, it is not a course in research design or statistics per se, and you will not be held accountable for competency in advanced design or statistical procedures—although a reasonable degree of “smarts” with respect to design (including threats to internal, external, construct, statistical, and hypothesis validity) and basic descriptive and inferential statistics is expected. (Each of you at this point will have completed an introductory research methods/design course and at least one course in inferential statistics for the behavioral sciences.) You are strongly encouraged to consult about design and statistical issues, and I am available to you not only to discuss and help focus/direct and polish your proposal but to discussion design, methodology, and analysis issues. You should also feel free to consult with other faculty on design or statistical analysis issues. (Also see: Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 365-489; and The Counseling Psychologist, 27 (Nos. 3-4) [special issues on quantitative foundations of counseling psychology research].) Whatever analyses you propose, you need to understand them sufficiently well to be able to discuss them and to explain how and why they help address the research question(s) you are trying to answer.

This is not intended to be “just another paper.” Trite as it might sound, I want it to be a “learning experience” that encourages an interest in research in counseling psychology and helps develop your sense of competence and self-efficacy in translating clinical or theoretical issues into research questions. **Please do not use a proposal that has been submitted for or used in another class. Doing so will result in grade of F for project for all members of the research team.** I also want this to be a “team effort.” Research is best done “collaboratively.” It is generally more fun, more efficient, and of better quality when “multiple minds” contribute to the research effort—especially when the members of the research team compliment each other’s research strengths and weaknesses. However, it is neither fun nor efficient when team members cannot or do not work collaboratively.

In this regard, each research team member is expected to actively, constructively and equally contribute to the proposal (the conceptualization and design of the study, and the preparation and writing of the paper) and in the presentation of the proposal to the class. Significant disparities in team

members' contributions to the overall proposal/presentation effort will be reflected in the assignment of different grades for the same project. If there is a "problem" on a team, the team should work to resolve the problem as soon as possible; but if that is not possible, the team should meet with me to discuss and resolve the problems.

Each team will take approximately **1 hour** to present its proposal to the class for consideration, questions, and discussion. (Please leave time for questions and discussion.) This will be scheduled during one of our class sessions late in the semester. The use of handouts and/or overhead transparencies (or other "technology") is encouraged. Each person on a team is expected to share in the presentation. Please keep in mind, however, that the technology you use is to help present you're material and enhance your audience's understanding your proposal. The addition of "entertaining media" into your presentation must be germane to enhancing the explanation your proposed study. In this regard, I am more interested in the content of the proposal than in your savvy with PowerPoint.

COURSE SEQUENCE: The following is a schedule of topics and readings for the semester. As noted earlier, the **Supp.** readings are required. Their full citations appear in the in the reading list accompanying this syllabus. The pacing of the topics and readings may vary somewhat from this schedule during the course of the semester, but the schedule should be "in the ball park." Even if the schedule "drags" a bit, please keep up with the assigned readings, and be prepared for the assignments and exams on their scheduled dates. Note on the schedule, exam dates and the "due dates" for the submission of your research logs (noted with **) and for the semester project.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic/Reading(s)</u>
Jan. 20	Introduction: Framing the issues
Jan. 27	Psychological science and clinical practice: Competing perspective
	<u>Readings:</u> Wampold (Chapt. 1) Norcross (prologue)
	<u>Supp:</u> McFall (1996) Peterson (1996)
**Feb. 3	Research strategies and evidentiary rules
	<u>Readings:</u> Wampold (Chapt. 2) Norcross (Chapt. 1 and 2)
Feb. 10	The benefits of counseling and psychotherapy: Absolute and relative efficacy
	<u>Readings:</u> Wampold (Chapt. 3 and 4)
**Feb. 17	Empirically-supported interventions: General principles
	<u>Readings:</u> Norcross (Chapt. 3 and 4)
	<u>Supp:</u> Chambless & Hollon (1998) Wampold, Lichtenberg & Waehler (2002)

- Feb. 24** **Empirically-supported interventions: Issues and controversy**
- Readings: **Wampold** (Chapt. 5)
 Norcross (Chapt. 5 and 6)
- Supp. Chambless & Ollendick (2001)
- **Mar. 3** **Empirically-supported interventions: Issues and controversy**
- Readings: **Wampold** (Chapt. 6, 7, 8)
 Norcross (Chapt. 7)
- Mar. 10** **Empirically-supported interventions and clinical practice**
- Readings: **Wampold** (Chapt. 9)
 Norcross (Chapt. 8 and 9)
- Supp: Frank (1982)
 Wampold (2001)
- Mar. 17** **SPRING BREAK**
- **Mar. 24** **Common therapeutic factors**
- Readings: [none]
- Supp: Frank (1982)
 Wampold (2001)
- Therapeutic variables: The therapy relationship**
- Readings: [revisit **Wampold**, Chapt.6]
- Supp: Gelso & Carter (1985)
- Mar. 31** **Therapeutic variables: Interpretation and attribution retraining**
- Readings: [revisit **Wampold**, Chapter 7)
- Supp: Claiborn (1982)
 Forsterling (1986)
 Levy (1963)
- **Apr. 7** **Therapeutic variables: Social influence**
- Readings: [revisit: **Wampold**, Chapt. 8)
- Supp: Dorn (1986)
 Heppner & Claiborn (1989)

Apr. 14 Clinical judgment and decision-making

Readings: [none]

Supp: Rosenhan (1973)
Dumont (1993) OR Ruscio (2007)

****Apr. 21 Common and specific factors: Implications for training and treatment**

Readings: **Wampold** (Chapter 9)

Supp: Calhoun, et al. (1998)
Davison (1998)

Apr. 28 Research team presentations

****May 5 Research team presentations**

*** A take-home final exam will be distributed at the end of class; it will due (typed) on Monday, May 11, by 10:00am. Turn in the exam to the School of Education **Welcome Center** [210 JRP] with directions to give the exam to me.

Note: Monday, May 11, from 7:30 – 10:00am is the assigned examination date and time. The final exam for this course will be a take-home exam. The EXAM is DUE by 10:00am on this Monday.

Supplemental Readings (required)

Calhoun, K., Moras, K., Pilkonis, P., & Rehm, L. (1998). Empirically supported treatments: Implications for training. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, *66*, 151-162.

Chambless, D., & Hollon, S. (1998). Defining empirically supported therapies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, *66*, 7-18.

Chambless, D., & Ollendick, T. (2001). Empirically supported psychological interventions: Controversies and evidence. Annual Review of Psychology, *52*, 685-716.

Claiborn, C. D. (1982). Interpretation and change in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, *29*, 439-454.

Davison, G. (1998). Being bolder with the Boulder Model: The challenge of education and training in empirically supported treatments. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, *66*, 163-1670.

Dorn, F. J. (1986). The social influence model: An overview. In F. Dorn (Ed.), The social influence process in counseling and psychotherapy (pp. 3-16). Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Dumont, F., (1993). Inferential heuristics in clinical problem formation: Selective review of their strengths and weaknesses. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, *24*, 196-205.

- Forsterling, F. (1986). Attributional conceptions in clinical psychology. American Psychologist, 41, 275-285.
- Frank, J. D. (1982). Therapeutic components shared by all psychotherapies. In J. Harvey & M. Parks (Eds.), Psychotherapy research and behavior change (pp.9-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gelso, C. J., & Carter, J. A. (1985). The relationship in counseling and psychotherapy: Components, consequences, and theoretical antecedents. The Counseling Psychologist, 13, 155-244.
- Heppner, P., & Clairborn, C. (1989). Social influence research in counseling: A review and critiques. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36, 365-387.
- Levy, L. H. (1963). Psychological interpretation (chapter 1 plus portions of chapter 9). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- McFall, R. (1996). Making psychology incorruptible. Applied and Preventative Psychology, 5, 9-15.
- Peterson, D. (1996). Making psychology indispensable. . Applied and Preventative Psychology, 5,1-8.
- Rosenhan, D. (1973). On being sane in insane places. Science, 179, 250-258.
- Ruscio, J. (2007). The clinician as subject: Practitioners are prone to the same judgment errors as everyone else. In S. Lilienfeld & W. O'Donohue (Eds.), The great ideas of clinical science: 17 principles that every mental health professional should know (pp. 29-48). New York: Routledge.
- Wampold, B. (2001). Contextualizing psychotherapy as a healing practice: Culture, history and methods. Applied and Preventative Psychology, 10, 69-86.
- Wampold, B., Lichtenberg, J., & Waehler, C. (2002). Principles of empirically-supported interventions in counseling psychology. The Counseling Psychologist, 30, 197-217.

Additional Suggested Readings/Resources

*NOTE: These references are not required readings for the course—although I believe you will find them to be intriguing and useful references.

Ahn, H., & Wampold, B. (2001). Where oh where are the specific ingredients?: A meta-analysis of component studies in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48, 251-257.

Beutler, L. (1998). Identifying empirically supported treatments: What if we didn't? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66, 113-120.

Beutler, L., Williams, R., Wakefield, P., & Entwistle, S. (1995). Bridging scientist and practitioner perspectives in clinical psychology. American Psychologist, 50, 984-994.

Bohart, A., O'Hara, M., & Leitner, L. (1998). Empirically violated treatments: Disenfranchisement of humanistic and other psychotherapies. Psychotherapy Research, 8, 141-157.

Bordin, E. (1955). Ambiguity as a therapeutic variable. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 19, 9-15.

Borkovec, T., & Castonguay, L. (1998). What is the scientific meaning of empirically supported therapy? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66, 136-142.

Cohen, L. W., Sargent, M. M., & Sechrest, L. B. (1986). Use of psychotherapy research by professional psychologists. American Psychologist, 41, 198-206.

Consumer Reports (1995, November). Mental health: Does it help? pp. 734-739.

Corrigan, J., Dell, D., Lewis, K., & Schmidt, L. (1980). Counseling as a social influence process: A review [monograph]. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 395-441.

Dance, K. A., & Neufeld, R. W. J. (1988). Aptitude-treatment interaction research in the clinical setting: A review of attempts to dispel the "patient uniformity" myth. Psychological Bulletin, 104, 192-213.

Dawes, R. M. (1994). House of cards: Psychology and psychotherapy built on myth. New York: Free Press.

Deffenbacher, J., Oetting, E., & DiGiuseppe, R. (in press). Principles of empirically-supported interventions applied to anger management. The Counseling Psychologist, 30, 262-280.

Dobson, K. S., & Craig, K. D. (Eds.) (1998). Empirically supported therapies: Best practice in professional psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dumont, F., & Lecomte, C. (1987). Inferential processes in clinical work: Inquiry into logical error that affect diagnostic judgments. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18, 433-438.

Elliot, R. (1998). Editor's introduction: A guide to the empirically supported treatments controversy. Psychotherapy Research, 8, 115-125.

- Fisher, S. (1956). Plausibility and depth of interpretation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 20, 249-256.
- Forsyth, D. R., & Strong, S. R. (1986). The scientific study of counseling and psychotherapy: A unificationist view. American Psychologist, 41, 113-19.
- Gambrill, E. (1990). Critical thinking in clinical practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Garb, H. N. (1998). Studying the clinician: Judgment research and psychological assessment. Washington, DC: APA.
- Garfield, S. (1998). Some comments on empirically supported treatment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66, 121-125.
- Gelso, C. J. (1979). Research in counseling: Methodological and professional issues. The Counseling Psychologist, 8 (3), 7-36.
- Gelso, C., & Hayes, J. (1998). The psychotherapy relationship: Theory, research and practice. New York: Wiley.
- Gilovich, T. (1991). How we know what isn't so: The fallibility of human reason in everyday life. New York: Free Press.
- Goldfried, M., & Wolfe, B. (1998). Toward a more clinically valid approach to therapy research. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66, 143-150.
- Grisson, R. (1996). The magical number $.7 \pm .2$: Meta-meta analysis of the probability of superior outcome in comparisons involving therapy, placebo, and control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64, 973-982.
- Haaga, D., & Stiles, W. (2000). Randomize clinical trials in psychotherapy research: Methodology, design and evaluation. In C. R. Snyder & R. Ingram (Eds.), Handbook of psychological change: Psychotherapy processes and practices for the 21st century. New York: Wiley.
- Henry, W. P. (1998). Science, politics, and the politic of science: The use and misuse of empirically validated treatment research. Psychotherapy Research, 8, 126-140.
- Hertel, R. (1972). The application of stochastic process analyses to the study of the psychotherapeutic process. Psychological Bulletin, 77, 421-430.
- Hill, C. (1992). Almost everything you ever wanted to know about how to do process research on counseling and psychotherapy but didn't know who to ask. In E. Watkins & L. Schneider (Eds.), Research in counseling (pp. 85-118). New York: Erlbaum.
- Horan, J. J. (1980). Experimentation in counseling and psychotherapy. Part I: New myths about old realities. Educational Researcher, 9 (12) 5-10.
- Jacobson, N., & Truax, P. (1991). Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining meaningful change in psychotherapy research. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59, 12-19.

- Kendall, P. (1998). Empirically supported psychological therapies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66, 3-6.
- Lichtenberg, J. (1986). Counseling research: Irrelevant or ignored? Journal of Counseling and Development.
- Lilienfeld, S., & O'Donohue, W. (Eds.) (2007). The great ideas of clinical science: 17 principles that every mental health professional should know. New York: Routledge
- Lipsey, M., & Wilson, D. (1993). The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment: Confirmation from meta-analyses. American Psychologist, 48, 1181-1209.
- Mahrer, A. R. (1988). Discovery-oriented psychotherapy research: Rationale, aims, and methods. American Psychologist, 43, 694-702.
- McFall, R. (2000). Elaborate reflections on a simple manifesto. Applied and Preventative Psychology, 9, 5-21.
- Meehl (1957) When shall we use our heads instead of the formula? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 4, 268-273.
- Mitchell, K., Bozarth, J., & Krauft, C. (1977). A reappraisal of the therapeutic effectiveness of accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness. In A. Gurman & A. Razin (Eds.), Effective psychotherapy (pp. 482-502). New York: Pergamon.
- Morrow-Bradley, C., & Elliott, R. (1986). Utilization of psychotherapy research by practicing psychotherapists. American Psychologist, 41, 188-197.
- Nisbett, R., & Ross, L. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Paulos, J. A. (1988). Innumeracy: Mathematical illiteracy and its consequences. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Persons, J., & Silberschatz, G. (1998). Are results of randomized controlled trials useful to psychotherapists? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66, 126-135.
- Peterson, D. (1995). The reflective educator. American Psychologist, 50, 975-983.
- Roth, A., & Fonagy, P. (1996). What works for whom? A critical review of psychotherapy research. New York: Guilford.
- Seligman, M. (1995). The effectiveness of psychotherapy: The Consumer Reports study. American Psychologist, 50, 965-974.
- Sexton, T., & Alexander, J. (2002). Family-based empirically-supported interventions. The Counseling Psychologist, 30, 238-261.
- Sexton, T., & Whiston, S. (1994). The counseling relationship: An empirical review. The Counseling Psychologist, 22, 6-78. (also see the Reactions to the paper)

- Shapiro, D. A., & Shapiro, D. (1982). Meta-analysis of comparative therapy outcome studies: A replication and refinement. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 581-604.
- Smith, M., & Glass, G. (1977). Meta-analysis of psychotherapy outcome studies. American Psychologist, 32, 752-760.
- Stiles, W. B., Shapiro, D. A., & Elliott, R. (1986). "Are all psychotherapies equivalent?" American Psychologist, 41, 165-180.
- Stricker, G., & Trierweiler, S. (1995). The local clinical scientist: A bridge between science and practice. American Psychologist, 50, 995-1002.
- Strong, S. (1970). Causal attributions in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 388-399.
- Strong, S. R. (1991). Theory-driven science and naive empiricism in counseling psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 204-210.
- Strupp, H., & Hadley, S. (1977). A tripartite model of mental health and therapeutic outcomes. American Psychologist, 32, 187-196.
- Wampold, B. (2000). Outcomes of individual counseling and psychotherapy: Empirical evidence for two fundamental questions. In S. Brown & R. Lent (Eds.), Handbook of counseling psychology (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Wampold, B., Davis, B., & Good, R (1990). Hypothesis validity of clinical research. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58, 360-367.
- Wampold, B., Wondin, G., Moody, M., Stich, F., Benson, K., & Ahn, H. (1997). A meta-analysis of outcome studies comparing bona fide psychotherapies: Empirically, "All must have prizes." Psychological Bulletin, 122, 203-215. (also see comments and responses following the article)
- Watley, D. (1968). Do counselors know when to use their heads instead of the formula? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 84-88.
- Whiston, S. (2002). Application of the principles: Career counseling and interventions. The Counseling Psychologist, 30, 218-237.

Additional Useful References

- Heppner, P., Kivlighan, D., & Wampold, B. (1992). Research design in counseling. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Kazdin, A. E. (Ed.) (1998). Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: APA.
- Leong, F., & Austin, J. (1996). The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Levy, D. A. (1997). Tools of critical thinking: Metathoughts for psychology. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago.
(Synopsis of the original by F. Pajares, online: <http://www.philosophers.co.uk/current/science.htm>)
- Meltzoff, J. (1998). Critical thinking about research: Psychology and related fields. Washington, DC: APA.
- Schloss, P. J., & Smith, M. A. (1999). Conducting research. Upper Saddle Rive, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Wierzbicki, M. (1993). Issues in clinical psychology: Subjective versus objective approaches. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

PRE 952: Advanced Counseling Theory and Research Exam Scoring Rubric

Scoring Guide: Analysis of an Argument or Proposal or Position

SCORE 6-OUTSTANDING

A 6 answer present a cogent, well-articulated analysis of the complexities of the issue(s) presented in the question. A typical answer in this category

- develops a position on the issue with insightful reasons and/or persuasive examples, using relevant current literature
- sustains a well-focused, well-organized discussion
- expresses ideas clearly and precisely

SCORE 5-STRONG

A 5 answer presents a well-developed analysis of the complexities of the issue(s) and an understanding of the area. A typical answer in this category

- develops a position on the issue with well-chosen reasons and/or examples from the current literature
- is focused and generally well organized
- expresses ideas clearly and well

SCORE 4-ADEQUATE

A 4 question presents a competent analysis of the issue and demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject matter. A typical answer in this category

- develops a position on the issue with relevant reasons and/or examples from the literature
- is adequately organized
- expresses ideas clearly

SCORE 3-LIMITED

A 3 answer demonstrates some competence in its analysis of the issue but is plainly flawed. Knowledge of the subject matter is limited. A typical answer in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics:

- is vague or limited in developing a position on the issue
- is weak in the use of relevant reasons or examples
- is poorly focused and/or poorly organized
- has problems expressing ideas clearly
- uses terms imprecisely or inaccurately
- contains occasional errors of fact or finding

SCORE 2-SERIOUSLY FLAWED

A 2 answer demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical thinking. A typical answer in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics:

- is unclear or seriously limited in developing a position on the issue
- provides few, if any, relevant reasons or examples
- is unfocused and/or disorganized
- contains numerous and/or serious errors of fact or in use of terminology

SCORE 1-FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT

A 1 answer demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical thinking and knowledge base, and provides little evidence of the ability to develop or organize a coherent response to the question.

SCORE 0

A 0 answer is off-topic, or merely restates the topic or question.

Scoring Guide: Perspectives on an Issue

SCORE 6-OUTSTANDING

A 6 answer presents a cogent, well-articulated critique of the argument and demonstrates mastery of the subject matter. A typical answer in this category

- clearly identifies important features of the argument and analyzes them insightfully
- develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically, and connects them with clear transitions
- effectively supports the main points of the critique using relevant current literature

SCORE 5-STRONG

A 5 answer presents a well-developed critique of the argument and demonstrates good knowledge of the subject matter. A typical answer in this category

- clearly identifies important features of the argument and analyzes them in a generally thoughtful way
- develops ideas clearly, organizes them logically, and connects them with appropriate transitions
- demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter

SCORE 4-ADEQUATE

A 4 answer presents a competent critique of the argument and demonstrates adequate control of the elements of writing. A typical answer in this category

- identifies and analyzes important features of the argument
- develops and organizes ideas satisfactorily but may not connect them with transitions
- supports the main points of the critique with relevant literature
- demonstrates sufficient knowledge of the subject matter to convey ideas

SCORE 3-LIMITED

A 3 answer demonstrates some competence in its analysis of the issue and in its control of the elements of writing but is plainly flawed. A typical answer in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics:

- does not identify or analyze most of the important features of the argument, although some analysis of the argument is present
- mainly analyzes tangential or irrelevant matters, or reasons poorly
- is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas
- offers support of little relevance and value for points of the critique
- contains occasional errors of fact or reasoning

SCORE 2-SERIOUSLY FLAWED

A 2 answer demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing skills. A typical answer in this category exhibits one or more of the following characteristics:

- does not present a critique based on logical analysis, but may instead present the writer's own views on the subject
- does not develop ideas, or is disorganized and illogical
- provides little, if any, relevant or reasonable support
- contains numerous and/or serious errors of fact or reasoning

SCORE 1-FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT

A 1 answer demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing skills. A typical answer in this category exhibits more than one of the following characteristics:

- provides little evidence of the ability to understand and analyze the argument
- provides little evidence of the ability to develop an organized response
- has severe and pervasive errors of fact or reasoning

SCORE 0

A 0 answer is off-topic or merely restates the topic