

University of Redlands

School of Education

Location Address

University Hall North
On Brockton Avenue
Between University Street & Grove Street

Phone

(909) 748-8064

Mailing Address

1200 East Colton Avenue
P.O. Box 3080
Redlands, CA 92373

Fax

(909) 335-5204

COURSE SYLLABUS

Course: EDUC 637
Course Title: Master's Seminar
Term: September, 2014
Sections: ED 02
Days/Times: Tuesdays, irregular, 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm
Location: Larsen Hall 227
Laboratory: Sessions 2 and 5 only, TBD

Faculty: Ross E. Mitchell, Ph.D.
Office: University Hall North 116
Phone: (909) 748-8819 Home: (909) 389-0309 Text: 909-486-2762
E-mail: ross_mitchell@redlands.edu

Catalog Course Description

This course is the culminating research experience of the master's program. Students will have the opportunity to identify, explore and research an area in depth and then communicate their findings to the professional community. Prerequisite: permission from the School of Education faculty and successful completion of EDUC 603 and 604.

The following CTC Counseling Standards are partially addressed in this course:

Generic Standard 4	Assessment
Generic Standard 6	Professional Ethics and Legal Mandates
Generic Standard 15	Technological Literacy
Specialization Standard 30	Research, Program Evaluation and Technology

Course Objectives

At the end of this course, students will:

- 1) Select a timely topic for a master's project. (CTC Counseling Standard 30)
- 2) Identify at least one article that will serve as a model for the student's project. (CTC Counseling Standard 30)
- 3) Identify journals that would ideally be publishers for the project. (CTC Counseling Standard 4, 15 & 30)
- 4) Develop a research project in accordance with APA standards. (CTC Counseling Standard 4, 6, 15)
- 5) Produce a project that is of publishable quality both in terms of content* and writing style. (CTC Counseling Standard 6 & 30)
- 6) Demonstrate effective computer skills and use of technology, including on-line database search, Moodle, excel spreadsheet tables, and word processing in completing written work. (CTC Counseling Standard 15)

* Content should be worthy of publication, in principle, though the methodological treatment is only expected to be as sophisticated as the MA curriculum offers.

Required Readings

- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author. [BF76.7 .P83 2010, Reference Desk]
[Note: The Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL) is a great resource if you cannot access the APA manual itself; see <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/2/10/>.]
- Bem, D. J. (1995). Writing a review article for *Psychological Bulletin*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118(2), 172–177. Available online: http://www.jdl.ac.cn/how_to_research/doc/Writing%20a%20Review%20Article.htm
- Callahan, J. L. (2010). Writing literature reviews: A reprise and update. *Human Resources Development Review*, 13(3), 271–275. Available online: [http://0-hrd.sagepub.com/books.redlands.edu/content/13/3/271.full.pdf+html](http://0-hrd.sagepub.com/books/redlands.edu/content/13/3/271.full.pdf+html)
- Randolph, J. J. (2009). A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(13). Available online: <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v14n13.pdf>
- <http://writingcenter.unc.edu/resources/handouts-demos/specific-writing-assignments/literature-reviews>
 - <http://library.ucsc.edu/help/howto/write-a-literature-review>
 - <http://libguides.library.ncat.edu/literaturereview>
 - <http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/specific-types-of-writing/literature-review>

Recommended Readings

- Boell, S. K., & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2014). A hermeneutic approach for conducting literature reviews and literature searches. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 34, Article 12. Available online: http://skb.unifind.de/publications/2014_CAIS-Boell,Cecez-Kecmanovic-A_Hermeneutic_Approach_to_Literature_Reviews.pdf

- Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006). Writing narrative literature reviews for peer-reviewed journals: Secrets of the trade. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 5(3), 101–117. Available online: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2647067/pdf/main.pdf>
- Majchrzak, A., & Markus, M. L. (2014). Synthesize existing evidence. *Methods for policy research: Taking socially responsible action* (pp. 41–61). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. Available on Moodle.
- Suri, H., & Clarke, D. (2009). Advancements in research synthesis methods: From a methodologically inclusive perspective. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 395–430. Available online: <http://0-rer.sagepub.com.books.redlands.edu/content/79/1/395>
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resources Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367. Available online: <http://0-hrd.sagepub.com.books.redlands.edu/content/4/3/356.full.pdf+html>

Candidate Assessment

- 1) Positive class participation, attendance, punctuality as well as meeting individual appointments with the instructor.
Due Sessions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and Individual Sessions 1 and 2. 8 percent of your grade.
- 2) Develop a template for recording summaries of studies (citations) included in your literature review.
Due Session 2. 4 percent of your grade.
- 3) Share with the class your critique of a model article (Representative Article Critique). This article should be taken from the references listed in your paper. This presentation should be 6 minutes in length and will be followed by up to 2 minutes of discussion and questions.
Due Session 3. 5 percent of your grade.
- 4) Share with the class the journal or journals in which you would expect to find a study like yours. This presentation should be no more than 2 minutes in length.
Due Session 4. 3 percent of your grade.
- 5) Literature review: A complete first draft is required for this assignment. This draft should be professionally presented, reflecting excellent written skill, appropriate use of technology to present data in graphic or tabular form, and with complete bibliography.
Empirical study: Complete proposal describing precisely what work you intend to do and how you intend to do it, as well as a literature review describing how your work relates to that done by others. Any one of the following empirical approaches is acceptable and requires a complete proposal: a) Action research project, b) Program evaluation, c) Historical study, d) Policy analysis, or e) Case study.
Due Session 4. 10 percent of your grade.
- 6) Complete a Purpose and Peer Review (“What’s Your Point?”) paper exchange with a classmate. This activity should require about 1 hour in class.
Due in Session 4. 5 percent of your grade.
- 7) Complete a Purpose and Peer Review (“What’s Your Point?”) paper exchange with a classmate. This activity should require about 1 hour in class.
Due in Session 5. 5 percent of your grade.

8) Share with the class your paper (i.e., oral-visual presentation with one-page executive summary). This presentation should be no more than 5 minutes in length and will be followed by up to 3 minutes of discussion and questions.

Due Session 6. 10 percent of your grade.

9) Complete research project and paper that is responsive to all comments and criticisms provided. This should be professionally presented, follow APA format and integrate all changes from previous drafts, to ensure that the final submission is of publishable quality, and incorporates technology as appropriate to the subject matter of the project.

Due Session 6 (last day of class). 50 percent of your grade.

Grading System/Scale

Evaluation of your work will be based on the following criteria:

A/4.0: Assignment is complete, on time, thorough, well edited, and exceeds stated course requirements. All written work shows superior graduate level quality in expression, *attention to detail*, evidence of originality, organization, reflection, and *demonstration of concepts mastered in class*. All discussions demonstrate *careful* preparation for class, and thoughtful contributions as an individual and group member.

A-/3.7: Assignment is complete, *on time, thorough, well* edited, and *exceeds* stated course requirements. All written work shows *superior* graduate level quality in expression, *evidence of originality*, organization, and reflection. All discussions demonstrate preparation for class, and thoughtful contributions as an individual and group member.

B+/3.3: Assignment is complete, edited, and at least meet all stated course requirements. All written work shows graduate level quality in *expression*, organization, and reflection. All discussions demonstrate preparation for class, and *thoughtful* contributions as an individual and group member.

B/3.0: Assignment is complete, edited, and at least meet *all* stated course requirements. All written work shows *graduate level quality* in organization and reflection. All discussions demonstrate *preparation* for class, and *contributions* as an individual and group member.

Note: It is important to realize that overall course grades below 3.0 indicate a problem. The cumulative grade point average must remain at 3.0 or higher, so grades lower than this can affect the student's degree and/or credential receipt.

B-/2.7: Assignment is complete, *edited*, and *meet most stated course requirements*. Written work is *slightly* below graduate level quality. Preparations for class and contributions as an individual and group member are slightly below an acceptable level.

- **Student should arrange a conference with the professor.**

Note: For an overall course grade of 2.7, the student should arrange conferences with the professor and advisor to discuss grade performance.

C+/2.3: Assignment is complete and *some meets most stated course requirements*. Written work is below expected graduate level quality. *Preparation* for class and *contributions* as an individual and group member is slightly below an acceptable level.

- **Student should arrange a conference with the professor.**

Note: For an overall course grade of 2.3, the student should arrange conferences with the professor; and a conference with the advisor is required.

C/2.0: *Assignment is complete* but does not meet stated course requirements. *Written work* is well below expected graduate level quality.

- A meeting with the professor **must** be arranged.

Note: For an overall course grade of 2.0, a meeting with the professor must be arranged; and a meeting with the advisor is **required**. The professor will notify the advisor of the grade.

D/1.7 and F 1.3 – 0.0: Assignment is not met.

- A meeting with the professor **must** be arranged.

Note: Overall course grades below 2.0 are not acceptable for credit toward a degree or credential.

A conference with the advisor is **required** and a plan to correct the problems that led to the grade will be developed. Further unacceptable grades could lead to the students being dropped from the program. The professor will notify the advisor of the grade.

Academic Honesty

All students are expected to demonstrate integrity and honesty in completion of class assignments. Students must give credit to appropriate sources utilized in their work. Plagiarism can result in dismissal from the University.

Academic honesty stands at the center of intellectual pursuits in the academic community. Faculty and student scholarship in all forms, individual and collaborative, expresses our understanding and esteem for intellectual honesty. Nurturing and sustaining a climate of honesty are the responsibilities of every member of the community. The academic policy statement includes standards of academic honesty, obligations and responsibilities of the members of the academic community for cultivating a climate of academic honesty, violations of academic honesty, and procedures for addressing academic dishonesty. (For complete text see pp. 16-22 of the 2014-2016 University of Redlands Catalog)

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

I am happy to provide accommodations to students with disabilities. Please contact the University of Redlands Disability Services office to set up these arrangements. Disability Services can be reached by telephone at 909-748-8108 (FAX: 909-335-5296) or e-mail at amy_wilms@redlands.edu (Amy Wilms, Assistant Dean of Academics and Student Life) or carole_weeks@redlands.edu (Carole Weeks, Administrative Secretary, Disability Services). Disability Services has a highly trained staff that has the experience and expertise to assist students with a wide range of disabilities.

Evaluating Individual Work Products

The instructor will use the following rationale to evaluate each individual student work product (note strong parallel to overall grading system):

- 4.0 Work is complete, *on time*, thorough, *well edited*, and *exceeds stated course requirements*. All written work shows *superior graduate level quality in expression, attention to detail, evidence of originality*, organization, reflection, and *demonstration of concepts mastered in class*.

Presentations reflect *careful preparation* for class, incorporate *thoughtful contributions* that are independent and individual, and are both *fluent and fluid*.

- 3.0 Work is complete, edited, and at least meets *all* stated course requirements. All written work shows *graduate level quality* in organization and reflection. Presentations reflect *preparation* for class, incorporate independent and individual *contributions*, and have a *clear organization*.
- 2.0 *Work is complete* but does not meet all stated course requirements. Written work is *below expected graduate level quality*. Presentations are on topic, incorporate independent and individual *contributions*, and *cover all required elements*.
- 1.0 Work is *late* and does not meet all stated course requirements. Written work is *well below expected graduate level quality*. Presentations are *disorganized* and *do not cover all required elements*.
- 0 *Work is not completed*.

Topic Outline, Readings and Activities

<u>Class Session</u>	<u>Activities</u>	<u>California CTC Counseling Standards</u>
Session 1 9/9/14	Introduction of course objectives and discussion of criteria for appropriate master's paper Review expectations for summarizing studies (citations) Review expectations of article critique Individual assessment of status and plan for completion of project (<i>Review of IRB requirements</i>)	4, 6, 15 & 30
Draft of "proposal" due Friday, September 12, 2014 Submit as an e-mail attachment to Dr. Mitchell (<i>ross_mitchell@redlands.edu</i>)		
Session 2 9/16/14	Citation Summaries Template developed and utilized Develop a template appropriate to the type of review being done	6, 15 & 30
Session 3 9/23/14	Representative Article Critique presentations due Incorporate professionally designed work, with appropriate writing skills, and use of computer technology	6, 15 & 30
Revised draft of proposal due Thursday, September 25, 2014 Submit <u>printed copy</u> to Dr. Mitchell, or to his faculty mailbox if he is not in his office IRB applications due no later than Thursday, October 9, 2014 @ 4:00 PM <i>Written, with professor's signature, to Psychology Department, Larsen Hall 135, and electronic forms to chairperson</i>		
Individual Session 1 (I.S. 1)	Individual critiques of revised draft returned to candidates <i>Timelines for empirical studies reviewed and finalized</i> Discussion of any questions or concerns with revised proposal draft and suggested rewrite techniques	30
Session 4 10/14/14	First full draft of literature review, or final draft of proposal, due in class. Brief (< 2 minute) class presentation on target journal(s) for paper Purpose and Peer Review (literature-review-only papers <i>and empirical study proposals</i>)	6 & 30

I.S. 2 <i>(by Friday, 10/28/14)</i>	Individual critiques of first full draft returned to candidates Discussion of any questions or concerns with first draft and suggested rewrite techniques <i>Analysis plans or analysis coaching for empirical studies</i>	30
I.S. 3 <i>(by Friday, 11/19/14)</i>	Individual critiques of additional drafts returned to students <i>Additional analysis coaching provided</i> NOTE: Necessity of session determined by the outcome of I.S. 2	30
Session 5 11/18/14	Second full draft of literature review, or first full draft of empirical study, due in class. Computer laboratory session for technical support with papers and presentations, as well as editing and analysis Purpose and Peer Review (literature review or empirical study)	30
Session 6 12/2/14	Presentation and final draft of paper due. Review of material to ensure integration of all suggested revisions and present findings to class in a brief (5 minute) presentation Also handout a 1 page “executive summary” of your study Course evaluation <i>Note: final corrections must be received by December 5.</i>	30

Outline for Proposal

- Introduce the *topic, issue, or problem*
- Provide a *framework* for understanding, organizing, and limiting the scope of the study
- For a literature review paper:
Describe the *methods* to be used for identification, collection, and selection of literature

or
For an empirical research paper:

Describe the *methods* to be used for data collection and analysis
- List all *sources cited* following style guidelines in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.)

Representative Article Critique

Assignment:

The purpose of this assignment is to discuss a scholarly work, typically a peer-reviewed journal article. This work should be

- a model of the best work in the field that has
- high relevance to your paper.

This work, ideally, would be drawn from your reference list. Your discussion should:

- a) Demonstrate your ability to accurately summarize a piece of scholarly writing;
- b) Evaluate the technical quality and specific value of this work; and
- c) Identify how your paper/proposal is related to this work through specific comparisons and contrasts.

How to meet the three (a-c) discussion requirements:

Part (a)—To demonstrate your ability to accurately summarize your chosen scholarly work, you should be able to write a structured abstract to represent its content (see “Guidance for Writing the Summary Portion of Annotated Bibliography Entries”).

Part (b)—Your evaluation of the technical quality and specific value of your chosen scholarly work should include, to the best of your ability:

- a very brief discussion about whether the study design, data collection, and analysis strategies were appropriate and well executed, and
- an assessment of why this reference is of high importance to your own paper.

Part (c)—Identifying the relationship between your chosen scholarly work and your own paper should include:

- statements about how what you are doing is like or differs from this reference work,
- in what way you and the reference author(s) have theoretically or conceptually framed your respective studies similarly (or differently), and
- whether you are writing to the same audience as that intended for the reference work.

Expectations of your presentation:

Your presentation should take about five to six (5-6) minutes, but absolutely no more than six minutes. You are not expected to fully retell the reference work but to make the link between it and your work. (Note on time: If you were to read a prepared written statement of 600 words in length aloud to the class, it would take about five to six minutes.)

You should have one and only one of the following to assist your audience in following your presentation:

- PowerPoint slides (up to 6), [meets technology requirement—other technology use okay]
- handouts,
- a poster, or
- notes to write on the chalkboard (or whiteboard).

Failure to do so will not be penalized but may indirectly affect the quality of your brief presentation. Displays may enhance the presentation, but you and what you say is primary, not what is displayed.

Do not do the following:

- distribute structured abstracts, a written paper, or other lengthy materials; or
- have long and wordy PowerPoint slides, or otherwise attempt to put all or most of what you have to say on what you display for the class.

Guidance for Writing the Summary Portion of Annotated Bibliography Entries

A bibliography consists of a list of scholarly sources (articles, books, technical reports, etc.), typically limited to citation information such as author, title, when and where published, etc. *An annotation is a comment or explanation.* Therefore, an **annotated bibliography** includes an explanation for or commentary on each scholarly source. When an annotated bibliography is prepared as a stand-alone document for others to read, however, each annotation should provide a full summary as well as any explanatory or critical comments that may be offered. *This document provides a suggested protocol for writing the full summary portion of annotated bibliographies, along with a rationale for that protocol.*

To oversimplify things, research publications have two parts: the setup and the outcomes. That is, there are a number of preliminaries that must be addressed before what was learned from the study gets reported. This is “the setup” part. Once the preliminaries have been addressed, the rest of the publication reports the results and interpretations of the investigation. This is “the outcomes” part.

When summarizing a research publication, which is what you do when writing an entry in your annotated bibliography, there is more to it than simply the setup and the outcomes. *The approach to writing a summary for this course is to use what is called a structured abstract*, which typically has five sections. The setup part has three sections: the background on the study, the purposes or questions to be answered by the study, and the conduct of the study. Here is an outline of the setup in terms of key question words along with approximately how many sentences should be written for each section.

The Setup for the Study (gets no more than **12 sentences**)

The “Why” of the Study (gets **6 sentences**)

1. Background/Context/Literature (*3 sentences*)
2. Research Question(s)/Purpose(s)/Objective(s)/Focus of Study/Hypotheses (*3 sentences*)

The “Who, Where, and When,” the “What,” and the “How” of the Study (gets **6 sentences**)

3. Research Design/Methods
 - a. Participants/Subjects/Population/Sample/Setting (*2 sentences*)
 - b. Data Collection (*2 sentences*)
 - c. Data Analysis (*2 sentences*)

The outcomes part has two sections: the findings or results of the study and the conclusions of the study. Here is an outline of the outcomes part with approximately how many sentences should be written for each section.

The Outcome(s) and Recommendations of the Study (gets about **6 sentences**—large or complicated studies may need an extra sentence or two)

4. Findings/Results (gets about **3 sentences**)
5. Conclusions/Recommendations/Implications (gets about **3 sentences**)

On the following page is *an example of what the full summary portion of an annotated bibliography entry should look like* when you follow the structured abstract format.

A description of what the **Commentary** portion may address, which follows the full summary, is included at the end.

EXAMPLE

Mitchell, R. E., & Karchmer, M. A. (2006). Demographics of deaf education: More students in more places. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 151(2), 95-104.

Background/Context/Literature:

This paper addresses “the perception that the population of deaf and hard of hearing students is steadily shrinking and becoming more dispersed, that they are ‘pebbles in the mainstream’” (p. 95). The roots of this perception are twofold. Federal special education law has encouraged “mainstreaming” students with disabilities, rather than having them attend special schools for the deaf, and vaccination and other modern health practices have eliminated a number of causes of childhood deafness.

Purposes:

There are two research questions: 1) Is the deaf and hard of hearing student population shrinking? 2) Are deaf and hard of hearing students more dispersed across the nation’s schools than was true in previous years? In addition to answering the two research question, the authors discuss research challenges arising from the size and dispersion of this special student population.

Research Design/Methods:

Participants/Subjects/Population/Sample/Setting: This study reanalyzes annual (cross-sectional) data over a three-decade timeframe (to the present at time of publication) from two national-scale data collection activities pertaining to various demographic characteristics, as well as instructional services and settings, of deaf and hard of hearing students enrolled in schools and programs that have identified them for special education or related services: 1) the *Annual Survey of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth* (hereafter, Annual Survey), and 2) the federal Child Count reported in each *Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. The former is a large-scale convenience sample of the national population while the latter is intended to be a complete census of students whose primary disability classification is deaf or hard of hearing.

Data Collection: Most of the reanalysis summarizes aggregated and previously published data reports, in particular, the Child Count. However, some original analyses are reported based on data from the 2002-2003 Annual Survey, which collected individual student data report forms recorded by school officials from the schools and programs in which these students received their special education services.

Data Analysis: The Child Count was analyzed graphically in order to identify trends in relation to the two research questions (i.e., whether the population was shrinking and whether it was more dispersed). The Annual Survey data were analyzed using a weighting scheme that corrects for convenience sampling bias to calculate more recent prevalence estimates.

Findings:

Since the late 1980s the deaf and hard of hearing child population has been on the increase and is not shrinking, though its prevalence has remained stable. However, it is much more dispersed than at any previous time—the most dispersed it has ever been. Additionally, the deaf and hard of hearing student population tends to reflect the diversity of students in the nation as a whole, but reports of co-morbidity and cochlear implantation have increased.

Conclusions:

Identifying “what works” with deaf and hard of hearing children is likely to become more difficult with the increasing dispersion of this low-incidence disability group because identifying and obtaining a large sample will be very expensive. It will be even more difficult to study any subgroups within this diverse and heterogeneous population of students with hearing loss or deafness. Finally, without assistance in interpreting federal laws relating to education and health data, schools may be reluctant to provide data without a variety of data release provisions being met.

Commentary:

[This section is not part of the summary described on the prior page, but it is required; critical or explanatory commentary is in addition to the full summary of the article. Your evaluation of the technical quality and specific value of this article should include, to the best of your ability: (1) a very brief discussion about whether the study design, data collection, and analysis strategies were appropriate and well executed; and (2) an assessment of why this reference is of high importance to your own paper.]

Outline for Literature Review

- Introduce the *topic, issue, or problem*
- Provide a *framework* for understanding, organizing, and limiting the scope of the literature
- Describe the *methods* used to identify, collect, and select the literature that is reviewed
- Present the *analysis* of the selected literature
- Discuss the current *strengths and weaknesses* of the knowledge base represented by the reviewed literature
- Propose *further research* to:
 - answer the questions arising from within the scope of the review, or
 - improve the strength of the knowledge base that was reviewed
- Recommend *solutions* to the identified problem
- List all *sources cited* following style guidelines in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*

Elements of Literature Review Methodology

This handout provides two examples of how various authors have described the methods they followed to develop their literature review papers. These examples are provided as partial models for how to write your own methods section for your literature review paper. As will become obvious, there is no single correct method. However, there are five (5) basic requirements for a complete description of the methods employed in a literature review.

- 1) The methods section may *reiterate* whether the primary *purpose* is to establish how people think about or discuss a topic versus the quality and consistency of empirical findings for a topic. This reiteration is not always present, but it is important to be aware that reviews may be oriented toward the theoretical or the empirical—the ideas shaping work in the field or the results of field or laboratory investigations. Though a theoretical review typically needs to reference the success of the ideas revealed by empirical research, and an empirical review often requires discussion of relevant theory, how the literature is identified, organized, and analyzed depends on whether the motive is primarily to review theoretical versus empirical knowledge.
- 2) The *identification* process must be described. Various strategies may be employed to identify what has been written on the topic under review. A complete description of these strategies and the extent to which they were employed must be included in the methods section.
- 3) The *collection* process should be specified. This is important because some publications may be difficult to obtain, some references may be to unpublished materials, and some Internet-based sources may no longer be available. How the references have been or must be obtained is important information to the reader.
- 4) The methods section must include the *selection* process used to decide which references to report from all of the identified and collected literature. The quality or design of a published study may affect whether it adequately contributes to the purpose of the literature review. A clear description of the criteria used to include or exclude a reference must be provided.
- 5) Finally, if any *analysis* is performed, such as a meta-analysis or other specific method for combining, synthesizing, or summarizing results in the literature, this method of analysis must be identified, if not described. This is a technical matter that does not appear in all literature reviews, but must be included when it applies.

Examples

Example 1

The following description of literature review methods for a meta-analytic review is quoted directly from “Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives” (Colquitt et al., 2013, pp. 205-206).

We followed a four-step process for finding relevant articles for our meta-analytic review. First, we conducted a PsycINFO search using terms adapted from previous justice meta-analyses (e.g., Barsky & Kaplan, 2007; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Fassina et al., 2008; Hauenstein, McGonigle, & Flinder, 2001; Skitka et al., 2003; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002). Those terms included *(un)fairness* and *(in)justice*, along with terms referencing specific justice dimensions (e.g., *organizational, workplace, procedural, distributive, interpersonal, informational, interactional*). Those

terms also included *(in)equity*, *(mis)treatment*, and *self-interest*. Second, we gathered the articles listed in the References sections of the previous justice meta-analyses. Third, we conducted a manual search of all of the journals included in the References sections of those reviews, going back to 1999 (the cutoff date for the articles coded in Colquitt et al.'s, 2001, review). Fourth, we searched for and included justice-themed papers from recent Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology and Academy of Management conferences to capture unpublished manuscripts. In general, the results of published studies converged with the results of unpublished studies, yielding little evidence of publication bias.

Our search efforts netted 1,155 total articles. We established seven exclusion rules for deciding which articles from our search pool would be coded. First, we excluded articles that were not empirical. Second, we excluded articles that were not relevant, meaning that they did not include a relationship either between justice dimensions or between a justice dimension and an outcome. Third, given our focus on social exchange theory in employee–authority relationships, we excluded articles that focused on how fairly someone else was treated. Fourth, for the same reason, we excluded articles that focused on coworker- or customer-focused justice. Fifth, given our desire to present results at the dimension level for justice, we excluded articles that utilized measures of overall fairness. Sixth, we excluded articles that did not report sufficient information for calculating a zero-order effect size. Seventh and finally, we excluded articles that reported only nested or unit-level results—such as studies on justice climate or studies utilizing experience-sampling methodology—as it may be inappropriate to combine those effect sizes with individual-level results (Ostroff & Harrison, 1999). These exclusions resulted in a final set of 413 codable manuscripts, representing 493 independent samples. To put that number in some context, the number of independent samples for the earlier reviews was 190 for Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001), 183 for Colquitt et al. (2001), and 89 for Skitka et al. (2003). The total number of samples was not given in Viswesvaran and Ones (2002) but appeared to be around 50.

Example 2

The following description of literature review methods for a meta-analytic review is quoted directly from “Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis” (Cornelius-White, 2007, pp. 116-117).

The synthesis was designed to satisfy all of the eight criteria Mackay, Barkham, Rees, and Stiles (2003) used to appraise the quality of 255 syntheses, only 11% of which met all eight criteria. They included clear questions, a comprehensive search for primary studies, inclusion criteria, the validity of primary studies, accuracy and bias control, the analysis of variation in findings, the appropriate combination of findings, and adequately supported conclusions.

Procedures

I used comprehensive search mechanisms to locate studies, including PsycINFO, the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), reference lists from other included studies, published bibliographies (including those of Carkhuff, 1983; Schmid, 2006; and Stanley & Purkey, 2001), and experts’ knowledge of the existence of additional studies (e.g., Barbara McCombs, Judith Meece, Reinhard Tausch, Dave N. Aspy, R. R. Carkhuff,

Howard Kirschenbaum, William W. Purkey, and Jerome Freiberg). Some studies (mostly unpublished) were identified but were not obtained during the data collection phase, between August 2002 and May 2004. The inclusion criteria cast a wide net, requiring only that a study have statistics, be written in English or German, and include one or more independent and one or more dependent variables. However, only independent variable words and synonyms in some cases (e.g., congruence for genuineness) were used as descriptors for the locations of studies. I entered the independent (teacher) variables, which included empathy, warmth, genuineness, nondirectivity, higher order thinking, encouraging learning/challenge, adapting to individual and social differences, and composites of these, as the independent variables into the PsycINFO and ERIC databases. I read the titles of the identified manuscripts, and moved on to abstracts and/or full text as needed to determine if the reference was an acceptable study (i.e., having one or more independent and dependent variables and statistics).

Example 3

The following description of literature review methods for a narrative review is quoted directly from “How many people use ASL in the United States? Why estimates need updating” (Mitchell, Young, Bachleda, & Karchmer, 2006, pp. 312-313).

Methods

Similar to any review of research literature, we depend on tools such as search engines, databases, major reference works, and citation indices to locate our sources. However, because our topic of interest is any reference to an estimate of the number of people in the United States who use ASL, regardless of attribution to its source, a comprehensive and exhaustive search is not possible. Instead, we searched the Internet (using Google, followed by a trail of various links once productive sites were identified), topical research databases (ERIC, PubMed, LexisNexis Academic Universe, and PsycINFO), a major reference work (Gallaudet Encyclopedia of Deaf People and Deafness [Van Cleve 1987]), and the Social Sciences Citation Index (ISI Web of Science) to identify the range of estimates and follow available source citations. Keywords for the search included American Sign Language, ASL, and deaf, alone or in combination with demographics, people, population, signers, and users. Not all of the terms functioned as indexed keywords in each database, but they were effective when used as text strings. Table 1 shows the correspondence among these terms.

Once estimates were identified, we also searched the Internet (Google) using certain phrases (e.g., “3rd most-used language”) to determine the extent of particular claims and identify leads to different claims or estimates. When we could find no new estimates or prevalence claims about ASL use, we ceased our search for estimates and focused our efforts on sources. As is apparent in the discussion of our findings, the number of identified sources is small and leads to clear stopping points for the search.

Table 1. Search Term Correspondence among Internet Search Engines and Electronic Databases

Google	ERIC	PubMed (Medline)	PsycINFO	LexisNexis Academic Universe
American Sign Language	<i>American Sign Language</i>	<i>sign language</i>	<i>sign language</i>	American Sign Language
ASL	ASL	*ASL	ASL	ASL
deaf	<i>deafness</i>	<i>deafness</i>	<i>deafness</i>	deaf
demographics	<i>demography</i>	<i>demography</i>	<i>demography</i>	demographics
people	people	<i>persons</i>	<i>people</i>	<i>people</i>
<i>population</i>	<i>population</i>	<i>population</i>	population	population
signers	signers	signers	signers	signers
users	users	users	users	users

Notes: Terms in regular type are text strings used to locate websites or citations; italicized terms are database keywords used to index citations.

*Because of the prevalence of technical terms abbreviated as ASL, this text string was searched only in conjunction with other keywords.

References

- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(2), 199-236.
- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 113-143.
- Mitchell, R. E., Young, T. A., Bachleda, B., & Karchmer, M. A. (2006). How many people use ASL in the United States? Why estimates need updating. *Sign Language Studies, 6*(3), 306-335.

Purpose and Peer Review

"What's Your Point?"

(Session 5)

At this time, you should be nearly done and have a clear idea of what your paper is supposed to accomplish. That is, you should be able to answer the question, *"What's your point?"*

In the space below, write down the key point(s) of your paper. You should not have more than four (4) points. (If you do, you may still be doing too much and need to narrow your focus.) You should be able to express each point in a single sentence (though it may require a compound-complex sentence).

1.

2.

3.

4.

Next, exchange this sheet with a peer, along with a copy of your paper. Read your peer's paper and review it for whether each paragraph is clearly in service of the key point(s) identified. **Mark each paragraph as:**

- **Clearly** in service of **point(s)** ____;
- **Partly** in service of **point(s)** ____ [*identify or highlight* which part(s) serves which point(s)];
- **Maybe** in service of **point(s)** ____; or
- **Not** clearly in service of any point.

Also, **comment** as to whether you feel any of the key points requires more or clearer attention.

Finally, exchange back the *"What's Your Point?"* sheet and paper draft with your peer. On the second copy you brought with you, copy your partner's remarks and turn that in to Dr. Mitchell before you go.

Your **next step** is to edit your paper so that each paragraph is fully in service of your key point(s), and any need for elaboration or extension has been met. Also, since you will not have another Individual Session before the final paper is due, seek out proofreading assistance. This will ensure that your paper reads well and is error free.

Purpose and Peer Review

"What's Your Point?"

(Session 4)

At this time, you should be nearly done and have a clear idea of what your paper is supposed to accomplish. That is, you should be able to answer the question, "*What's your point?*"

In the space below, write down the key point(s) of your paper. You should not have more than four (4) points. (If you do, you may still be doing too much and need to narrow your focus.) You should be able to express each point in a single sentence (though it may require a compound-complex sentence).

1.

2.

3.

4.

Next, exchange this sheet with a peer, along with a copy of your paper. Read your peer's paper and review it for whether each paragraph is clearly in service of the key point(s) identified. **Mark each paragraph as:**

- **Clearly** in service of **point(s)** ____;
- **Partly** in service of **point(s)** ____ [*identify or highlight* which part(s) serves which point(s)];
- **Maybe** in service of **point(s)** ____; or
- **Not** clearly in service of any point.

Also, **comment** as to whether you feel any of the key points requires more or clearer attention.

Finally, exchange back the "*What's Your Point?*" sheet and paper draft with your peer. On the second copy you brought with you, copy your partner's remarks and turn that in to Dr. Mitchell before you go.

Your *next step* is to edit your paper so that each paragraph is fully in service of your key point(s), and any need for elaboration or extension has been met. If possible, bring an edited version of the paper—this does not have to be a completed redrafting, just an improved draft—to your next Individual Session. If you do not have an edited version for Individual Session 2 you will be required to schedule a third Individual Session.