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Introduction

The Counseling Psychology Psy.D. Program (CPP) at Universidad del Turabo (UT) offers training in the Practitioner tradition of Professional Psychology. Within this perspective students are trained and afford opportunities to develop the skills needed to conceptualize clinical cases based upon extant literature and theoretical orientations and to utilize the scientific method to explore the application of those theories to particular cases. As a capstone experience for the acquisition of these competencies the CPP requires its students to engage in an Intensive Case Study project or an intensive research project with implications to the theory and practice of Counseling Psychology. The projects most conform to the specifications herewith presented. Therefore, students will utilize the present manual to guide their efforts in satisfying this academic and research requirement.

The Psy.D doctoral project consists of an original, scholarly work that provides an applied contribution to the field of professional Counseling Psychology. The doctoral project is conducted independently by the student under the supervision of a faculty member who serves as a mentor and a second faculty member serving as DP reader. Experts in the field of study of the DP who are not faculty members of the program may qualify as DP reader with the approval of the Associate Dean of Psychology and Social Work Programs. In completing the DP, students will have the opportunity of integrating the sequence of educational activities and training experiences that will constitute one of the activities fostering life-long learning competencies.

The Doctoral Project (DP) differs in various ways from a traditional doctoral dissertation. The type and nature of the doctoral project can address a diversity of theoretical themes, clinical conditions or interventions. Approval from the Associate Dean and of the student’s Doctoral Project mentor is required. Examples of possible doctoral projects may include: a thorough and systematic review of the treatment literature for a specific condition; a case study in a specific problem that contributes to Counseling Psychology; develop treatment materials for a patient population, creation of a clinical training manual/program among others. The doctoral project allows students to demonstrate the competencies for evaluating and integrating scientific knowledge to the professional practice of psychology.
Students should select a doctoral project topic and request a Project Mentor while registered in CPSY 957 (Doctoral Project I) which is taken simultaneously with CPSY 835 (Practicum I). The main objective of Doctoral Project I is the identification and selection of topic or area of interest that may provide the foundation for the development of their DP. Students selecting the Intensive Case Study DP alternative may identify an appropriate case from their clinical site placement to which they are assigned through for their Doctoral Practicum experience. Students not completing the requirements of Doctoral Project I will receive an Incomplete (I) and will have one semester to complete the required work. If the work is not completed, a grade of “NP” will be conferred and the student will have to repeat the course.

Students must approve the Doctoral Project I course (defense of proposed project) by October 31 of the year PRIOR to the year in which Internship will be conducted, since this is a requirement for internship application. Internship application takes place during the month of November for the following academic year.

Students completing DP I may subsequently enroll in Doctoral Project II and in Practicum II through which additional work may be done with their DP. Doctoral Project I requires students to develop a DP proposal. Doctoral Project II requires students to conduct the project and to write a final draft. With this material completed, students will be ready to defend their DP.

Students are expected to defend their DP and to conclude all editing and corrections required by the following semester. Student not completing the DP II course requirements must re-enroll in Doctoral Project II Students are expected to finalize the DP prior to entering the pre doctoral internship. When not completing the requirements set forth by the Doctoral Project II syllabus, students will continue to register in DP II until completing the defense of the project and submitting the final draft of the project.

**Doctoral Project Process**

Universidad del Turabo requires all students conducting research with humans to have completed specific IRB training and acquired corresponding certificates. This pre-requisite is usually satisfied while enrolled in the Ethics and Professional Standards course (PSY 800) taken at the onset of your cohort enrollment semester.

The doctoral project is structured so that students may work on it during their two (2) doctoral practicum. It is recommended that students identify a specific case assigned during their
first (1) practicum to use as a “case study” or intensive literature review” project. However, students desiring to conduct a project in other areas are encouraged to do so. Doctoral Project I course is taken concurrently with Doctoral Practicum I. Subsequently, Doctoral Project II is taken consecutively with Advanced Doctoral Practicum II.

Successful and timely culmination of the project requires students to adhere to the following timely sequence of events. Failure to comply with the procedures and specified dates may cause students not to culminate the process until further on during their program.

**Sequence of Events**

**Selection of Committee (matriculation in Doctoral Project I - CPSY 957 recommended but not required at this stage)**

- Chair of the Committee must be a full-time faculty professor of UT or an adjunct faculty of the doctoral program. All committee members must be approved by the Associate Dean.
- Outside committee member must be approved by the Associate Dean. Attached to the *Application for Doctoral Project Committee Approval* form, must include the proposed outside committee member’s CV, and degree transcript.

**Submission of Application for Doctoral Project Committee Approval form**

- Attached to the form, the student must include a brief description of his/her intended project that shall include:
  - Suggested title
  - Purpose of study
  - Justification with a brief literature review
    - Contribution to the field of counseling psychology
  - Brief methodology (integration of science to practice)
  - Copy of matriculation in course CPSY 957

**IRB (If applicable)**

- Student must have current Universidad del Turabo IRB certification
Submit copy of IRB certification attached to Application for Doctoral Project Committee Approval Form

- Project Committee Chair must have current Universidad del Turabo IRB certification

Approval/disapproval of committee

- Approval by the Associate Dean
  - Approval with no changes recommendations
    - Meet with committee and commence project
  - Approval with recommendations/modifications
    - Meet with committee and commence project discussing changes and recommendations
- Not approval
  - Re-submit application

During enrollment in Doctoral Project I (CPSY 957)

- Regular meetings with committee to follow-up on the project
- Defend Doctoral Project Proposal
  - Proposals not defended by last day of classes of the semester, must enroll in CPSY 957-1 (continuation of doctoral project I) and evidence provided to the Committee Chair.

Doctoral Project II (CPSY 958)

- Enroll in CPSY 958 (Chair must have submitted a grade of “P” to registrar’s office for CPSY 957)
- Submit to IRB (If applicable)
- Commence with investigation
- Regular meetings with committee to discuss progress
- Once doctoral project is final, it must be submitted to an approved editor by the Graduate Studies Deanship
- Edited document submitted to committee for final review and acceptance
- Public announcement of Oral Defense, in the Programs Bulletin Board at least two weeks in advance.
- Doctoral Project Oral Defense
  o The oral defense is expected to be in a room that fit at adequate amount of people
  o The Committee Chair will preside the defense.
  o The student will be given approximately 40 minutes to present.
  o 10 minute Q&A section from the Committee and the public will follow
    ▪ The Q&A section will begin with the Committee Member questions and then the Committee Chair
    ▪ The questions formulated by the public must be relevant to the project theme and will be filtrated by the Committee Chair who will decide if the question is acceptable or not.
  o Deliberation process by the Project Committee (5 to 10 minutes)
    ▪ Must use the proper forms attached to this manual
    ▪ The decision must be announced to the student and the public using the following reference
      • Approved with no recommendations/changes
      • Approved with minor changes
      • Not approved
    ▪ The proper forms (program’s documents and Graduate Study Deanship forms) originals must be submitted to the Doctoral program no later than the next business day after the oral defense
      • It is recommended that the student and the committee retain a copy the forms
  o If Project is not approved the student must
    ▪ Meet with committee to discuss plan of action. This plan of action must be in writing and a copy must be submitted to the Doctoral Program Coordinator.
- Projects not defended and approved by last day of classes of the semester, must enroll in CPSY 958-1 (continuation of doctoral project II)
  - Associate Deans review of final document (compliance with program requirements)
  - Submit final document to Graduate Studies Deanship for final approval
  - Final approval by Graduate Studies Deanship is need by required semester date for graduation application

**Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval**

The role of the IRB is to protect research participants. If the doctoral project is an empirical study or otherwise involves human participants, once the proposal is accepted, and in collaboration with the Chair, students must complete the Roosevelt University Institutional Review Board form.

Students should apply for IRB approval only after the proposal meeting because of the possibility of changes in methodology that may arise at the meeting. Submit the IRB information to the Department’s secretary, who will monitor the progress of the proposal through the IRB Committee.

*Students may not begin data collection until they have passed a proposal meeting and received IRB approval.* Research involving human participants that has been conducted without prior IRB approval will not be approved by the Office of Graduate Studies. Students engaging in such behavior will be recommended for review of their status in and ability to continue with the Program; dismissal from the Program may be recommended. When collecting data from a site outside the University, students may also need to submit an IRB request to that site's administration. IRB form must be completed and submitted to the Department secretary and obtain IRB approval:

CPSY 967 and 958 are not classes per se; they will address the time spent by the student with the project chair. In addition to the time spent by the student conducting the required project documentation, literature review, and other project related tasks.
Doctoral Project: Guideline to the Project Process and Content

I. Selection of DP Project
   - Identification of theoretical, scientific or professional area of interest
   - Critical literature review to determine knowledge available

II. Selection of Method
   - Intensive Case Study,
   - Literature Review,
   - Program Development,
   - Hypothesis Testing research,
   - Among others.

III. IRB Submission and approval.

IV. Data Gathering Technique
   - Interview, scales, observation, etc.

V. Data Analysis Procedure
   - Qualitative or quantitative data analysis methods

VI. Design of reporting Format
   - According to type of project and method used

Components of the Doctoral Project Document

Title page

Description of the Case Study Project

The case selected for the Case Study Project must represent an area of needed in-depth analysis in the practice of counseling psychology. The case studied should represent diversity and individual differences and the application of treatment models in novel ways in order to respond effectively to our client population. The case study includes a description of the client and his or her presenting problems, the larger context (e.g., family, educational, work, relationship, and medical histories), the orientation used to conceptualize the case and guide

---

treatment, the case conceptualization, the assessment plans and implementation, the treatment plan and implementation, the outcomes, and a final evaluation of the case.

Important issues to keep in mind when writing the case study:

- The conceptualization and treatment plan is of and for a client, not one or more problems, and thus the presentation of the case should be “descriptively thick,” as Fishman (2005) recommends.
- The client exists within a context, and that context may influence or may be inseparable from the client’s problems and resources.
- The rationale for and design of the extended case study is based in part on proposals from the following two articles. Students should review these articles in preparation for writing a case study: Hersen, M. (2002). Rationale for clinical case studies: An editorial. Clinical Case Studies. Available at http://ccs.sagepub.com/content/vol1/issue1/ Fishman, D. B. (2005). From single case to database: A new method for enhancing psychotherapy practice. Pragmatic Case Studies in Psychotherapy. Available at http://pcsp.libraries.rutgers.edu/index.php/pcsp/issue/view/47 See in particular Figure 2 from Fishman (2005), p. 50, for a diagram of the several possible components of a case study and the interactions between them.

Note that these are not explicit component requirements for the Psy.D Program doctoral project (which are listed below), but provide a general illustration of the relationship among components of a case study. For examples (on a different scale than that of the doctoral project) of the integration of theory, research, and practice with clinical cases from a primarily cognitive-behavioral perspective see the various chapters in Barlow’s Clinical Handbook of Psychological Disorders (4th ed., 2007). For more extended examples of case studies from a variety of theoretical orientations, see Pragmatic Case Studies in Psychotherapy, at http://pcsp.libraries.rutgers.edu, and Clinical Case Studies, at http://ccs.sagepub.com/.

Components of the case study

The components of the case study are similar in name and somewhat parallel in content to those of an empirical study (see below for a detailed description of these components).

I. Introduction
a. Client and context
b. Presenting problems, history
c. Context: family, community, medical, economic, etc.
d. Theory

II. Research
a. Methods
b. Setting
c. Assessment
d. Case conceptualization
e. Treatment plan

III. Results
a. Interventions (treatment as actually delivered, including modification of treatment in response to monitoring evaluation)
b. Monitoring evaluation
c. Concluding evaluation

IV. Discussion
a. Overall review of study
b. Treatment implications
c. Recommendations for clinicians, researchers.

V. References

Development of the extended case study proposal
The doctoral project extended case study proposal explains the case and the theoretical orientation(s) used in treatment. The proposal thus includes descriptions of:

1. the client,
2. the presenting problems,
3. the importance and uniqueness of the case,
4. the orientation or orientations to be used in conceptualizing the case and developing the treatment plan,
5. the literature on the orientation(s) that will be reviewed in the final project,
6. the assessment methods and instruments to be used, and
7. the final reference section.

There are several steps in developing a good case study proposal:

1. Identifying the relevance, importance, and uniqueness of the case;
2. Collecting necessary documentation for the case, including attention to issues of confidentiality;
3. Conducting a thorough and complete review of the literature on the client’s problems and the theoretical orientation used in conceptualization and treatment planning;
4. Integrating the research with the particulars of the case, including the conceptualization and the treatment plan;
5. Identifying areas where the particular case may differ from or offer challenges to the evidence-based research;
6. Providing a list of references that will be used in the final document.

Proposal requirements:

- Length: minimum 12 pp. plus references.
- References: minimum 30 references, primarily primary sources

Writing the extended case study

Introduction

The introduction is an expansion of basic information provided in the proposal. The introduction provides a detailed description of the client, the client’s presenting problems, and the context, including such issues as family of origin, education, relationship, work, medical, and current family histories. Social factors should be clearly identified (e.g., the contribution of socioeconomic or neighborhood factors).

This description is then followed by an explication of the theoretical orientation or orientations that were used in the conceptualization of the client’s case and the treatment plan and a review of the research on that orientation that is relevant to the client’s particular problems and context. Headings are helpful for identifying sections such as presenting problems, family history, education, treatment orientation, etc.
Method

This section is somewhat similar to the method section of an empirical study, in that it includes descriptions of the setting within which treatment was delivered and of the assessment methods and instruments and literature supporting their use. However, in the extended case study this section also includes a case conceptualization and treatment plan. Headings also should be used to identify the components of the Method section.

Setting

The description of the setting should include the type of facility (e.g., community mental health center, VA, psychiatric hospital), the program within the facility (e.g., intensive outpatient program), the typical populations served and problems addressed by the site (e.g., severe and chronic mental illness in an economically disadvantaged neighborhood), a general description of the clinical training provided at the site, and the supervision provided during treatment of the particular case.

Assessment methods and instruments

The description of the assessment methods and instruments should include both process- and outcome-oriented assessments (for formative and summative evaluations). This portion of the Method section provides the reader with information on how the client’s strengths and weaknesses were identified, how the progress of therapy was monitored throughout the course of treatment, and a final evaluation of the client’s status at the conclusion of treatment.

Case conceptualization

The case conceptualization is a critical component of the extended case study, in that here one integrates the theoretical orientation with the history, presenting problems, and current assessment of the particular case, including identification of those areas where the particulars of the case are similar to and differ from those in the literature.

Treatment plan

The final component of the Method section is the treatment plan. As with the case conceptualization, treatment must be clearly integrated with a theoretical orientation or orientations. The treatment plan should specify short- and long-term goals, anticipated process variables (based on the assessment and conceptualization), orientation-related techniques, etc. The treatment plan need not be a session-by-session plan, although some manualized therapies
may provide such plans; rather it should focus on the process and goals that are relevant to the particular case. Although a treatment plan may be provided in outline form in an Appendix, it must also be described in narrative form in the body of the project.

**Results**

The Results section also parallels that of an empirical study in that it provides information on the outcome of the intervention. However, it also includes a description of the treatment as it was actually delivered; that is, descriptions of modifications that were made to the plan described in the Method section and the reasons for those changes. The Results section also includes descriptions of the outcomes of evaluations that were done during therapy (formative evaluations) and at the conclusion of treatment (summative evaluations).

**Discussion**

The concluding section of the extended case study includes an overall review of the case, the treatment, and the outcomes. This is not a repetition of information that was already presented, but a summative and critical evaluation of the uniqueness and challenges of the case, the appropriateness of the orientation to the case, the problems and successes in applying the treatment, and any changes that might have been made with the benefit of hindsight. This is followed by a discussion of implications of the case for treatment of similar persons and problems (treatment recommendations) and for clinical researchers (areas needing further study, via case or group designs, described in detail).

**References**

All references should be in APA style. All references cited in the proposal should be in the Reference section; all references in the References section should be cited in the paper.

**Final doctoral project requirements**

- Length: minimum 40 pages plus references
- References: minimum 30

**The critical literature review**


Review articles…are critical evaluations of material that has already been published. By organizing, integrating, and evaluating previously published material, the author of a
review article considers the progress of current research toward clarifying a problem. In a sense, a review article is tutorial in that the author:

- defines and clarifies the problem;
- summarizes previous investigations in order to inform the reader of the state of current research;
- identifies relations, contradictions, gaps, and inconsistencies in the literature; and
- suggests the next step or steps in solving the problem. (p. 7)

Thus writing a literature review involves two tasks: 1) describing work done on a specific area of research, and 2) evaluating this work. Both the descriptive and evaluative elements are important parts of the review. Do not simply describe past work without evaluating it, and do not just discuss recent theories in an area without both describing the work done to test those theories and discussing each theory’s advantages and inadequacies. Review articles are valuable information sources not only because they cite every important piece of research in the area surveyed, but also because they compare and evaluate all the key theories in a particular area of research.

See the journal Psychological Bulletin for examples of review articles, and see Bem’s (1995) instructive and humorous article about writing review articles for this journal. There are two general approaches to a literature review:

- Choose an area of research, read all the relevant and most important studies, and devise a meaningful way to organize the studies. One example of an organizing theme is a conflict or controversy in an area; in this case, publications presenting all sides of the controversy should be reviewed.
- Trace the development of a particular concept over time, concluding with a critical analysis of the present state of the question and suggestions for further research.

Thus the review topic must be narrow and focused enough that all the important research on the topic can be addressed within the limits of the project, but broad enough that there will be enough research to warrant such a review.
**Critical literature review vs. literature review of an empirical study**

The literature review doctoral project differs from the review of literature component of an empirical study. In the latter, the goal of the review is to provide a clear rationale for the current study. By the end of the review it should be clear to the reader why the particular study is being done and how it is the next logical step in that line of investigation. The literature review doctoral project, on the other hand, should conclude with a review of *multiple* areas of inquiry:

- Areas of relative consensus,
- Areas of continuing debate, and
- Issues needing further research (note the plurals).

Important issues to keep in mind when preparing a critical literature review:

- In order to identify the literature that is most relevant to their topic, students will have to read a *great deal more* than is eventually included in the final project.
- The development of a literature review is usually an *iterative* process. That is, the specific details of the project, or even its major direction, may change as the student accumulates more knowledge on the topic.
- Thus it is critically important for students to be in *regular contact with their Chairs* to discuss the evolution of the project and to avoid any blind alleys or projects that are either too extensive or insufficient.

**Components of the critical literature review**

I. **Introduction**
   a. General topic
   b. Specific issue and its importance
   c. Argument and plan

II. **Review of literature**

III. **Discussion**
   a. Conclusions
   b. Implications
   c. Recommendations for future research

IV. **References**
**The critical literature review proposal**

The preparation of a doctoral project **proposal** is the focus of CPSY 957, the **Doctoral Project Course**. The student develops the project in collaboration with the doctoral project chair and reader. These faculty members assist the student in:

- Identifying a topic that is appropriate in content and scope,
- Determining the literature that needs to be reviewed, and
- Developing a detailed work plan.

**Guidelines for proposal components**

The **introduction** provides a rationale for the proposed doctoral project, including a description of the context and the importance of the topic (e.g., in terms of how widespread a problem is the costs of a problem, discrepancies in theories and research findings about a particular issue). This introduction will also be the first component of the final literature review. It is helpful to adopt a “funnel” approach, where the general area of research is introduced, then that area is narrowed to the specific topic of the review. This section may be one paragraph to a few pages. For example, a recent review was of substance abuse treatment programs for offenders. The introduction made reference to the prevalence of substance abuse in the general population and in prisons and jails, the relationship between substance use and abuse and crime, and the consequent need for effective treatment programs.

In the next section one presents the **argument,** the main point or points that will be made by the review as a whole. For example, continuing with the same literature review, the argument was that although there has been an increase in substance abuse treatment programs in prisons and jails, the long-term impact on recovery and related crime has not been as large as it could be because of the lack of transition programs that would be available to offenders once they are released into the community.

The next section, or **plan paragraph,** includes a description the scope of the work, including the several issues that will be addressed in the order that they will be presented, and the methods to be used in developing the review. These issues should be explicitly related to the argument through the use of clear and logical links and related to one another by clear and meaningful transitions.
The next section of the proposal includes summary descriptions of each major issue to be covered by the review, with salient references for each topic. Multiple examples of the research to be reviewed should be included for each issue, not just one sample reference. The proposal itself and the References section of the proposal should include the majority of the references that will be included in the final review. The purpose of the proposal is to insure that the final product will address the topic thoroughly and critically; the committee cannot make a clear judgment about whether or not the proposal review is adequate without a substantial body of references.

The penultimate section should include a paragraph or several about what will be expanded upon in the final paper. This is to insure that the doctoral project committee understands which references and issues will be elaborated upon, and where more references will be added.

The final section is the References section. All references cited in the proposal (and in the final project) must appear in the References section, and all references in the References section must be cited in the paper. Students should take care to review and master APA style for references and citations before submitting their proposals. Committee members should be able to focus on the substance of the review and not on stylistic details.

Primary vs. secondary sources

The literature review is a review of empirical research (although it may also include theoretical and methodological articles if appropriate to the topic). Thus the focus should be on primary, not secondary sources. Primary sources are original research articles, preferably peer-reviewed work; secondary sources are other reviews, books, and so forth where an author summarizes others’ (or his or her own) work. Secondary sources may be good initial sources of information, but they should only be used as guides to the original literature.

Headings

Using headings to identify major topics will not only make the issues to be addressed clear in the proposal, but can be used as the “skeleton” or structure of the final paper; see p. 319 of the Publication Manual (American Psychological Association, 2001) for heading formats. However, transitions must be explicit; a heading is a summary statement of the topic to follow, but transitional sentences that demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between topics and the continuity of the narrative or argument of the project are still essential.
Definitions

The proposal and final review should also include clear definitions of key terms as they are used in the review. For example, child abuse would need to be defined to specify whether it includes abuse suffered by adults as children or participants who are currently children; whether it includes physical, verbal, or sexual abuse; which types of sexual events are included and excluded; and so forth. The review should also address the implications of various definitions, differences in definitions between authors using the same term, and cases where different terms are used for the same construct.

Proposal requirements

- Length: minimum 10 pp. plus references
- References: minimum 20 references, primarily primary sources

Writing the critical literature review

Selecting and reading the articles

A good understanding of the literature is essential for a well written literature review, and understanding the literature requires reading, re-reading, and mentally digesting complex ideas. A careful reading will reveal subtle (and sometimes not-so-subtle) differences in theoretical outlook. Thorough reading is followed by digestion and understanding of material, which is followed by critical evaluation of the material. As students collect primary sources on their topic, they will find some studies repeatedly cited in the introductory sections of research articles. These are likely critical studies on the topic and should be included in and central to the review. Articles should be selected on the basis of their quality and influence (and these criteria surprisingly are not always redundant), not on the basis of expediency or availability. In addition, it is not enough to provide an illustrative example of a study on an issue pertinent to a topic; all the quality literature on that issue must be reviewed. However, each study does not need to be described in detail; the substance of the research is most important, and a critical assertion may be supported by reference to several articles addressing that point.

Writing the text

The primary criteria for good scientific writing are accuracy and clarity. A review tells a straightforward tale with a clear, coherent narrative line. This line should stand out in bold relief, omit needless words, and avoid redundancy. A review is more difficult to organize than an
empirical report (for which there is a standardized APA format). The implication, therefore, is that a coherent review emerges only from a coherent conceptual structuring of the topic itself (thus the importance of establishing a clear “argument”).

Although no two reviews look exactly the same, they tend to be organized according to the following format, which includes most of the components of the literature review proposal:

1. Introduce the **review topic and context of the topic** (what it is, why it is worth examining). A useful strategy is the “funnel” structure: Start broadly (definition of a general topic) and progressively narrow your topic until you arrive at the specific line of research you are discussing.

2. Present the **argument** of the paper.

3. Present an overview of the paper’s structure and content, the “**plan paragraph.**” In the body of the paper, address the issues in the same order you presented them in the plan paragraph.

4. **Describe the research.** The detail should be enough to highlight the characteristics of the study that are relevant to your review.

5. **Statistical information.** Effect sizes, sample sizes, or measures employed are usually **not** relevant, unless methodological issues such as these are relevant to the purpose of the review.

6. As research is presented, **compare, contrast, and evaluate.** Making comparisons is essential; descriptions alone are not very illuminating. For example, compare…

   a) variable definitions,

   b) research assumptions,

   c) theories tested,

   d) hypotheses,

   e) research designs,

   f) results,

   g) interpretation of results, or

   h) Researcher’s speculations about future studies.

Frequently, a table displaying study names and relevant characteristics can be enlightening for both author and reader. If two or more studies have contradictory findings, discuss and evaluate the contradiction.
7. Discuss the implications of studies, in terms of what they imply about the topic, relevant theory, and practice. All assertions must be well-supported by evidence.
8. Examine all the data, not just data consistent with your presumptions.
9. The literature review should conclude with a description of
   a) what is known with some certainty,
   b) what is known with less certainty or less comprehensively,
   c) what is assumed to be known but is not as certain as assumed.
10. The **theoretical and clinical implications** of the review, the questions that remain unanswered, and suggestions for research that would help to answer those questions should be presented.
11. **Recommendations for further research** must be *specific* and linked to discussions and critiques of the literature reviewed in the body of the paper.

**Including a review article or meta-analysis in the doctoral project**

A review article, such as one in *Psychological Bulletin*, although it is a secondary source, may be discussed in a literature review as long as it is critically evaluated and integrated with the rest of the paper. For example, if a review of a topic was published 7 years ago, in addition to describing the scope and conclusions of the review, research on the topic done since that time should be reviewed and the conclusions of the initial review critiqued in light of those subsequent studies. A more recent review may be included, without such elaboration, if it is not central to the project’s main topic and is used to provide the reader with access to additional support for a relatively peripheral assertion. Finally, a review may be included if the argument of the doctoral project takes issue with or elaborates upon one or more of the original review’s conclusions.

Meta-analyses require similar handling. That is, if a meta-analysis is referenced to support a relatively peripheral assertion, extensive commentary may not be necessary. If it is more central to the argument of the project, the meta-analysis should be critiqued in more detail (re such issues as breadth and quality of studies included, the authors’ conclusions, or research published after the meta-analysis).

**A reminder**

One of the most common problems with literature reviews (and introductions to empirical studies) is a *lack of critical commentary and a lack of integration of the research presented*. 
Often studies are presented one after another, focused only on summaries of methods and results, leaving the reader unsure about the relative strengths and weaknesses of the studies, whether any consensus exists about the issues addressed by the research, what the relationship might be between one study and another and between one section and another, and how each study relates to the argument of the literature review as a whole. The writer may often have made such critical evaluations and integrations in his or her own head and assume that they will be evident to the reader, but they usually are not so evident. The project itself is designed to test whether the writer is capable of making such evaluations and integrations, an assessment that cannot be made if the writer’s critical thinking is not made explicit in the review.

**Critical Literature Review requirements**

- Length: minimum 50 pp. of text plus references
- References: minimum of 50 references, primarily primary sources

**Other projects**

Program proposals have been considered as variants of critical literature reviews. That is, in lieu of a summary critique and integration of the literature review, the student provides a proposal for an intervention program that incorporates treatment recommendations or implications of the literature reviewed.

Students may select to conduct other types of projects such as *program evaluations* and *grant proposals*. The faculty of the graduate psychology program will be developing criteria for these projects in the near future.

Articles.
Students should review these articles in preparation for writing a case study:
References
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**Evaluation Form of the Doctoral Project Oral Defense**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In a five point scale circle the number that best represent the quality of each criterion regarding the student *Doctoral Project Oral Defense*.

Excellent (5) Good (4) Satisfactory (3) Deficient (2) Poor (1)

The highest score possible is a total of 35 points (100%) and the lowest score possible to approve is a total of 20 points (80%). Each committee member must fill out an evaluation form. The final grade will be the average of the scores assigned by each committee member. The *Certification of Approval/Not Approval of the Doctoral Project Proposal* must be signed by all committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria:</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content: Literature Review and Theory:</strong> Has the presenter…discussed relevant theory and its applicability to the study reviewed (i.e., summarized and critiqued) relevant literature and described its relevance to the study and identified the main concepts and provided conceptual/nominal definitions.</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content: Methodology:</strong> Has the presenter adequately described…The research method and why it is appropriate, the study’s assumptions and delimitations, the study population and it size, the type of sample, size, its appropriateness, etc., a profile of the participant/s, the location/setting for the study, the time frame, the units of analysis, variables, operational definitions/indicators, ethical issues and their resolution, strengths of the methodology, limitations of the methodology, and data processing and analysis techniques and their appropriateness.</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content: Results and Interpretation</strong> Has the presenter… presented results in a straightforward manner, presented results that address research questions, interpreted results taking in to consideration the literature and theories, presented appropriate statistics(if applicable), and used tables, figures, graphs, etc. effectively and appropriately.</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content: Discussion, Summary, Conclusion and Suggestions for Further Research</strong> Has the presenter included (a)…summary of results, discussion of the results vis-à-vis research questions, literature, and theories, conclusions from the</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study, theoretical and clinical implications, strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for further research.</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization: Does the presentation:</strong> flow well, use transitions, make explicit connections, use examples, use supporting materials, offer evidence and clear explanations. <strong>Is the presentation</strong> …well organized and coherent</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation and Delivery: Oral Components:</strong> gestures/movement, proper pronunciation, self-confidence, enthusiasm, facial expressions, appropriate word choice, professionalism, eye contact, vocal variety, timing/pace and professional appearance</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation and Delivery: Visual Components:</strong> Are the visual aids (e.g., handouts, transparencies, PowerPoint slides, etc.)…Well organized, Clear, Readable, Relevant and Free of mechanical and grammatical errors.</td>
<td>☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Defense Proposal Document Outline

Example

1. Title Page
2. Table of Contents
3. Chapter I
   a. Introduction
   b. Purpose of the Study
   c. Problem/Situation Identification
   d. Justification
   e. Research question, hypothesis, or study explanation
   f. Definitions
   g. Brief Literature review
4. Chapter II Method
   a. For non-experimental project (E.g. literature review, intervention proposal, case study, etc.)
      1. What will be the step by step approach to the project?
      2. What the student will do first and so on?
      3. Description of assessment instruments (questionnaires, psych tests) if apply.
   b. For experimental/clinical Project
      1. Methodology
      2. Expected statistical analysis
      3. Description of assessment instruments (questionnaires, psych tests) if apply.

These are minimal requirement which should be present with minor adjustments depending on the project.