

University of Pennsylvania

SWRK903/904 – Integrative Seminar

Course Syllabus

Ram A. Cnaan
3815 Walnut – Research Building, Room 400

cnaan@sp2.upenn.edu
215.898.5523

Academic year 2007/2008

SWRK903/904 -- Course Outline/Fall and Spring Semesters

General

The integrative seminar is the doctoral program's last course. As such it is required that students will finish all other courses before or during the semester in which they take SW903. This course is very demanding in terms of work load, integrative conceptual processes, and time table. Each student is asked to assess his or her readiness to take this course and it is recommended that you will do so through an individual meeting with the instructor. The instructor reserves the right to ask students to withdraw the course for this year if s/he assesses them as not-yet-ready for such an undertaking.

Learning Objectives

As the "capstone" seminar of the doctoral program the purpose of this course is six-fold:

1. To enhance the student's ability to identify and, as appropriate, to limit the nature of knowledge in the student's chosen areas of substantive and process study.
2. To strengthen the student's capacity to think logically in identifying an internal coherence to his/her overall learning experience.
3. To enhance the student's capacity to use principles of theory development and research methodology for advancing knowledge within the student's chosen areas of

concentration/specialization, and within the social work profession more specifically.

4. To facilitate the student's work on a beginning dissertation proposal.
5. To develop the student capacity to carry out independent research.
6. To prepare the student to a successful academic career.

Seminar Expectations

Given its advanced nature, the conduct of the seminar will focus centrally on the student's written papers and oral presentations. The role of the instructor will be to facilitate seminar discussion in relation to content organized and presented by the participants themselves. The successful completion of this course will prepare students to participate in academic seminars and to submit papers for publication.

At a minimum, students will be expected to:

1. Describe fully and coherently the nature of the student's intellectual process in bringing together, integratively, learning obtained through required and elective course content, field study, occasional seminars and institutes, and other important components of their doctoral experience;
2. Identify in detail the conceptual "boundaries" that inform the nature of knowledge and its development in the student's chosen areas of substantive and process study (e.g., mental health of aging adults/practice development theory; immigration/policy analysis-, aging/research; "children-at-risk"/teaching);
3. Present a plan for study that reflects appropriate consultation with and approval by the student's Educational Committee;
4. Prepare conference presentations and present them in class; and
5. Organize and present a "beginning" proposal for dissertation research.

Students are required to actively participate in class discussions in which written papers will be criticized. Further, **students must attend and contribute to at least two defenses of dissertation proposals or completed dissertations during the course of the year.**

Prerequisites

In order to be eligible for this course, students must:

1. Complete all course work or be in the final year of their course work (students must have at least 12 doctoral level courses successfully completed before enrolling in this course).
2. Students must have a clear knowledge of the chosen area of study for their dissertation. Students who will fail to have a coherent notion of their course of study at the first half of the Fall semester (after the open letter is discussed) will be asked to leave the class.

Assessment of performance

- | | | |
|----|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. | Class Participation | 20% (In each of the two semesters) |
| 2. | Report on dissertation defenses | 10% (In each of the two semesters) |
| 1. | Conference presentation | 10% (In each semester) |
| 3. | Substance area paper | 60% (In Fall semester only) |
| 4. | Process area paper | 30% (In Fall semester only) |
| 5. | Dissertation proposal | 30% (In Spring semester only) |
| 6. | Required class attendance. As the course is designed as a participatory seminar, students who, for whatever reason, miss more than two sessions will have to drop the course or receive an F (fail) grade. | |

Statement on Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the use of the work of others without properly crediting the actual source of the ideas, words, sentences, paragraphs, entire articles, music or pictures. Using the work of other students, with or without their permission, is plagiarism if there is no clear indication of the source of the original work. Plagiarism, a form of cheating, is a serious offense and will be severely punished. When plagiarism is suspected, the instructor will inform the student of the charge; the student has the right to respond to the allegations. If a student is charged with plagiarism, procedures outlined in the IU "Student Rights and Responsibilities" statement will be followed. Students have the right to appeal any charge to the Academic Affairs Committee.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

The assignments required by this course are demanding and far-reaching. Their overarching purpose is to assure a high level of integration of the various components that make-up doctoral education and for which the student will be tested during the candidacy examinations. Therefore, students are expected to invest maximum effort in completing these assignments as requested and on a timely basis.

Assignment #1 **The Open Letter** (Due Week # 3)

The assignment should read like a free-flowing letter to the instructor (or a friend or even a relative) indicating the *evolution* of your thinking over the past several years by drawing upon your professional work experience, doctoral studies, and other experiences that have advanced your learning at the doctoral level.

The goal of this assignment is to indicate the ideas, issues, and knowledge development experiences that have become central to your focus of study. Your discussion should focus on those themes, areas of concentration, etc. that you want to serve as the basis of **your** future research and the dissertation.

Ideally this letter will range in length from 4-6 typewritten double-spaced pages but it may be longer if necessary.

Assignment #2 **A Critique of Research Related to Your Substantive Area Field of Study** (Due Week # 11)

The purpose of this assignment is three-fold:

1. To help you identify the major theoretical and empirical literatures in your substantive field of study; and
2. To ensure a high level of conceptual sophistication with respect to state of the art theory and the process of theory development within your substantive field of inquiry; and
3. To introduce you to "meta-analysis" as a specialized methodology within research that can be used for amassing knowledge from studies undertaken with: a) different theoretical orientations; b) with a multiplicity of purposes; and, c) with differing research methodologies.

The paper is to be approximately 20 tightly-written double-spaced pages. The analysis must reflect a critique of the research within your substantive field of study, i.e., of contemporary research on social work/social welfare issues relating to a particular population group or field of

practice. The term “substantive area” refers to your area of expertise in term of a certain client population (such as the elderly, teenaged mothers, volunteers, substance abusers, social work educators, nonprofit organizations or second marriage families). The idea is for the student to have a first good draft of the appropriate chapter for the dissertation or even a possible publication reviewing the literature in this substantive area.

This paper requires a carefully conducted computerized search of the literature. The search must yield from 15-25 studies of direct relevance to your substantive field of research.

Your critique of these studies must include the following elements:

1. The underlying theoretical orientation(s) of these studies and within your substantive field;
2. An appreciation for the history of ideas and knowledge development within your substantive field of study; and
3. An understanding of the major research issues and problems that confront investigators understanding further work in your substantive field.

Further, the paper must summarize the major findings, strengths and limitations of the current state of knowledge in your substantive field of inquiry. Tables, charts, graphs and other ways of summarizing this knowledge can be used throughout the paper.

The ultimate objective of this paper is to conclude with a series of major research questions (4-6, or more if necessary) as well as a comprehensive bibliography in your substantive area.

Assignment #3 **A Critique of Research on Your Process Area** (Due Week # 3 of Spring Semester)

This paper of approximately 20 tightly-written double-spaced pages should reflect a critique of research within your process area (e.g. micro-practice intervention, macro-practice intervention, prevention, program evaluation, policy analysis, etc.). The process area refers to the idea that you have regarding the population you decided to study in the previous assignment. The critique must follow the same format as Assignment #2.

Assignment #4 **Dissertation Prospectus** (Due Week # 10 of Spring Semester)

The final paper for this course is the first draft of the dissertation prospectus. The structure of the paper is to follow that outlined in the course's "research/dissertation proposal preparation" text. The general outline provided on the next page should be adhered to as closely as possible.

In preparing your draft proposal be sure to include discussions of at least the following issues in the following sections.

1. Statement of the Problem or Issues

This section may draw heavily from your substantive area paper, your process area paper, or from a combination of the two.

The primary objective of this section of the prospectus is to conclude with a set of sharply focused research questions which will serve as the guiding questions for section two.

2. Review and Critique of the Theoretical Literature

This is a new section of approximately 15 pages which uses the research questions from section one as an outline for exploring theoretical literature which provides concepts relevant to understanding your major problem or issue.

The primary objective of this section is to assess the relevant literature in order to develop a conceptual framework and set of working hypotheses. The literature sources will be drawn primarily from the social sciences. [For example, if your topic relates to teen pregnancy, you might draw upon the theories of adolescent self-concepts and identity. If your topic relates to collaborative strategies between agencies, you might draw upon the theories of inter-organizational relations. If you are looking at the impact of chronic illness upon siblings, you might look at sick role theory and family systems theory].

3. Proposed Research Methodology

This is a new section of approximately 10 pages in length. The methodology section outlines your general plan of research for the dissertation.

In this section it is important to specify all of the following:

- a. definition of terms used in the hypotheses,
- b. population to be studied and how sample will be defined and selected,
- c. instrumentation description with the beginning of a questionnaire, interview

schedule, observational rating form, or sample items from standardized instruments,

- d. description of the data analysis plan citing statistical approaches for quantitative data, and
- e. a description of the rationale and limitations of the proposed study.

4. Implementation

This section should contain a general timetable for the implementation of your planned dissertation research. Use a Gantt chart to identify the project's major tasks and to associate these tasks with a working timetable. A completed dissertation must be publicly defended by the first week of April in order for graduation to occur in May. Therefore, make your implementation plan as realistic as possible.

The draft dissertation proposal should be approximately 30-40 double-spaced pages in length. **GENERAL OUTLINE FOR DRAFT DISSERTATION PROPOSAL** (Approximate Length: 35-50 pages)

- Section I. Title (not to exceed 10 words, including subtitle)
- Section II. Introduction (5-7 pages)
 - a. General introduction to the problem, question or issue of concern in this dissertation
 - b. A formal statement of the research problem, question, or hypothesis
 - c. Significance of the issue/problem for advancing knowledge in social work practice
- Section III. Review of the Relevant Literature (10-15 pages)
 - a. Theoretical and historical perspectives
 - b. Methodological issues
 - c. Identified gaps in the literature
 - d. Restatement of research purpose of study in light of findings from literature review
- Section IV. Research Methods (10-15 pages)
 - a. Research design
 - b. Research phasing
 - c. Characteristics of subjects
 - d. Sampling plan
 - e. Description of instrumentation
 - f. Plan for data collection
 - g. Identification of consultants and other resource persons to be consulted
 - h. Working timetable (use a Gantt Chart)

Section V. Plan for Data Analysis (4-6 pages)
a. Provide sample tables, charts etc. for reporting primary and secondary findings

Section VI. Implications for the Advancement of Social Work Theory, Knowledge and/or Practice (3-5 pages)
a. Application of findings to practice
b. Weaknesses or limitations of the research
c. Suggestions for further research

Section VII. References (cite most relevant references only; annotate only where appropriate.
Use APA style 5th edition!!!)

Section VIII. Appendix(es)
a. Copies of instruments, scales, questionnaires, etc.
b. Completed Human Subjects application (based on Royse, 1991; Babbie, 1992)

Conference presentations: Students are expected to present in class two conference presentations. Each presentation should be 15-20 minutes long and introduce the basic knowledge in the field of study, research questions/hypotheses, methods of study, results, and key implications.

Assignment #5 **A conference style class presentation** (To be presented in class any time throughout the academic year)

Schedule of Classes

Note: *Due to the interdisciplinary and focus on students' individual research interests the listed session topics are subject to change.*

PART I Orientation to seminar

Week 1 Class orientation
9/05/2007 Seminar expectations and management
Review of course outline
The dissertation process
Rules of writing dissertation
The transition from a student to a scholar
The open letter

[Note: Make sure to arrange time to attend Lab in Computerized Bibliographic Searching with our librarian Ellen DeMarinis]

Week 2 The academic career
9/12/2007 Starting as a junior faculty
The six Ps
Job expectations
Dos and don't dos.
Predictors of academic success
*****Open letter is due*****

Week 3 Discussing the open letter - I
9/19/2007 Assessing study feasibility
Class critiquing of open letters
Determining who can continue the course

Week 4 Discussing the open letter - II
9/26/2007 Assessing study feasibility
Class critiquing of open letters
Determining who can continue the course
*****Create and bring to class your C.V.*****

Week 5 Setting your career on track I
10/03/2007 Exercise in search committee work.
Identifying the essence of a good C.V.
The cover letter

Week 6 Setting your career on track II
10/10/2007 Reviewing CVs
 How to build an academic career
 Specializing in one's own research
 Selecting a dissertation topic
Selecting the dissertation committee

Week 7 How to conduct a literature search
10/17/2007 Writing an essay and not an annotated bibliography – The essence of integration
 Examples of successful literature reviews
 What sources to cite and why
 When enough is enough?

PART II. Theory development in social work/social welfare

Week 8 The rules of citing – APA style
10/24/2007 Reviewing the rules of preparing a reference list
 When to quote and how
 Citing electronic sources
 Paragraphs, sections, and chapters

Week 9 The nature of theory and theory development
10/31/2007 Concepts and theories
 Examples of theories used in social work
 The development of a theory and its reputing
 Theory development in social work
 From existing to new knowledge: Generating original research questions and
 hypothesis

Week 10 Individual meetings with students
11/07/2007 Personal discussion about progress and direction
 Assessment of paper readiness

Week 11 The dissertation process
11/14/2007 Topic selection
 Committee selection
 Managing your time
 Avoiding procrastination
 From external to internal motivation

*****Substantive paper is due*****

- Week 12 Thanksgiving – No class
11/21/2007
- Week 13 Student presentation and critique - I
11/28/2007 One-two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique + Professor critique
- Week 14 Student presentation and critique - II
12/05/2007 One-two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique + Professor critique
- Week 15 Student presentation and critique - III
12/12/2007 One-two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique + Professor critique
- Week 16 Student presentation and critique - III
12/11/2007 Meet the professor and work on the process paper
One-two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique + Professor critique

Start working on your next paper!!!!!!

Second Semester (Times are tentative)

- Week 1 Theory revisited
01/16/2008 How do we know that we know?
What is knowledge and what is belief
What can and cannot be studied
Single versus multi theory(ies)
The eclectic approach – advantages and drawbacks
From theory to data or from data to theory
Grounded theory
*****Process paper due*****
- Week 2 Student presentation and critique - I
01/23/2008 Two-three students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique
Professor critique

- Week 3 Student presentation and critique – II
01/30/2008 Two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique
Professor critique
- Week 4 Student presentation and critique – III
02/06/2008 Two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique
Professor critique
- Week 5 Introduction to meta-analysis: Literature as a source of theory
02/13/2008 Systematic literature review
Qualitative meta-analysis
Quantitative methods of meta-analysis
Pros and cons with meta-analysis
- Week 6 Conference presentation
02/20/2008 Time management
The role of three points
Power point – pros and cons
How to handle negative criticism
From presentation to job interview
Students mock or real conference presentations
- Week 7 Conference presentation continued
02/27/2008 Students mock or real presentations
Class feedback
Professor feedback
- Week 8 Research designs and conceptualization - I
03/06/2008 Advanced Topics in Research Design: Positivist traditions
Advanced Topics in Research Design: Post modern traditions
From case studies to census and in between
Advanced Topics in conceptualization and operationalization
- Week 9 No class
03/13/2008 Spring recess
*****Dissertation proposal due*****
- Week 10 Research designs and conceptualization - II
03/20/2008 Advanced Topics in Measurement

The typical dissertation proposal
Using an established measure vs. developing a new one
Revisiting the rule of writing dissertation
Review of dissertation proposals
Review and Integration

Week 11
03/28/2008 Student presentation and critique - I
Two-three students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique
Professor critique

Week 12
04/03/2008 Student presentation and critique – II
Two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique
Professor critique
Conference (mock or real) presentations

Week 13
04/10/2008 Student presentation and critique – III
Two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique
Professor critique
Conference (mock or real) presentations

Week 14
04/17/2008 Student presentation and critique – IV
Two students will present their paper (20-30 minutes each)
Class critique
Professor critique
Conference (mock or real) presentations

Week 15
04/24/2008 Class evaluation and summary
Student and class evaluation
Feedback
Reason to party????

Recommended Reading List

Required Books

American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th. ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Note: Each student is required to conduct a thorough literature review in his or her area of expertise. The following list should be used to assist the student when needed.

Recommended Books

A. The Academic Career

Burka, J. B., & Yuen, L. M. (1983). *Procrastination*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Corely, E. A. (2005). How do career strategies, gender, and work environment affect faculty productivity levels in university-based science centers? *Review of Policy Research*, 22, 637-

Darley, J. M., Zanna, M. P., & Roediger III, H. L. (2004). *The complete academic: A career guide* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ferber, M. A., & Loeb, J. W. (Editors). (1997). *Academic couples: Problems and promises*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Garcia, M. (2000). *Succeeding in an academic career: A guide for faculty of color*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Mathtech. (1999). *The effects of graduate support mechanisms on early career outcomes*. Report prepared under NSF Contract No. SRS 97317954. Arlington, VA: Author.

- Miller-Loessi, K., & Henderson, D. (1997). Changes in American society: The context for academic couples. In M. A. Ferber & J. Loeb (Eds.), *Academic couples* (pp. 25–43). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Popovich, N. G. (Chair), Davis, P. J., Fuhrman, F. C., Haddad, A. M. Monk-Tutor, M. R., Romanelli, F., Meyer S. M. (2005). AACP REPORTS: Ensuring Individual Success in an Academic Career Report of the 2004-05 Academic Affairs Committee. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 69 (5) Article S20, 1-10.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2004). *Psychology 10^{1/2}: The unspoken rules for success in academia*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Thoreson, R. W., Kardash, K. M., Leuthold. D. A. & Morrow, K. A. (1990). *Gender differences in the academic career*. Volume 31 of *Research in Higher education*. Netherlands, Springer.
- B. General Research Methodology
- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods* (2nd ed). Belmont CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. (1992). *The practice of social research* (6th ed). Belmont CA: Wadsworth.
- Fowler, F. J. (1988). *Survey research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Grasso, A. & Epstein, I. (1992). *Research utilization in the social services: Innovation for practice and administration*. New York: Haworth.
- Grinnell, R. M. (1988). *Social work research and evaluation* (3rd ed). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.
- Grinnell, R. M. (Ed.). (1992). *Social work research and evaluation* (4th ed). Itasca IL: F. E. Peacock.
- Grinnell, R. M. & Williams, M. (1990). *Research in social work: A primer*. Itasca, IL: F.E.

Peacock.

Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant observation: A methodology for human studies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioral research* (3rd. ed.). N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Locke, L. F. et al. (1984). *Proposals that work: A guide to 121anninE dissertations and grant proposals*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Royse, D. (1991). *Research methods in social work*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (1989). *Research methods for social work*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Shaughnessy, J., Zechmeister, E., & Zechmeister, J. (2005). *Research methods in psychology* (7th edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: McGraw Hill.

Sudman, S. & Bradburn, N. M. ((1982). *Asking questions: A practical guide to questionnaire design*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

C. Meta-Analysis

Cooper, H. M. (1989). *Integrating research: A guide for literature reviews* (2nd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Glass, G. et al. (1981). *Meta-analysis in social research*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hedges, L. V. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. Orlando: Academic Press.

Hogarty, G. E. (1989). Meta-analysis of the effects of practice with the chronically mentally ill:

A critique and reappraisal of the literature, *Social work*, 34, 363-73.

- Hunter, J. et al. (1982). *Meta-analysis: Culminatin research findings across studies*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Press, A. et al. (1992). Chapter (19). Meta-analysis, in Grinnell, R. (Ed.) [(1992)], pp. 367-385.
- Press, A. et al. (1992). Appendix C. Synthesizing the literature, in Grinnell, R. (Ed.) [(1992)], pp. 427-438.
- Smith, M. C. (1988). *Meta-analysis of nursing intervention research*. Birmingham, AL: Birmingham Printing and Publishing.
- Tallant, S. H. (1986). Meta-analysis: Statistical considerations and applications in small group treatment research, *Social Work with Grows*, 9(3):43-53.
- Videka-Sherman, L. (1988). Meta-analysis of research on social work practice in mental health, *Social Work*, 33(4), 325-338.
- Whitley, B. (1987). The effects of discredited eyewitness testimony: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 127, 209-214.
- Wolf, F. (1986). *Meta-analysis: Quantitative methods for research synthesis*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Van Mechelen, I. (1986). In search of an interpretation of meta-analytic findings. *Psychologica Belgica*, 26(2), 185-197.
- D. Research Design
- Barlow, D. H. & Hersen, M. (1984). *Single-case experimental designs: Strategies for studying behavioral change*. New York: Pergamon.
- Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Caporascio, J. A. & Roos, L. L. (1973). *Quasi-experimental approaches: Testin2 theory and evaluating policy*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Cook, T. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

E. Qualitative Research Methods

Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. (1984). *Analyzing- social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park CA: Sage.

Riffe, D, Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (2005). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research* (2nd Edition). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Weinberg, D. (2004). *Qualitative research methods*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wolcott, H. F (2001). *Writing Up Qualitative Research (Qualitative Research Methods)*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

F. Evaluative Research

Atkinson, C. et al. (1978). *Evaluating human service programs*. New York: Academic Press.

Posavac, E. J. & Carey, R. G. (1989). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies* (3rd. ed).

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, M. J. (1990). *Program evaluation in the human services*. New York: Springer.

Weiss, C. (1972). *Evaluation research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

F. Measurement, Scales and Scaling

Beere, C. (1984). *Women and women's issues: A handbook of tests and measures*. San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Buros, O. K. (ed.) (1978). *The eighth mental measurements handbook* (2 Volumes). Highland

Park, NJ: Gryphon Press.

Cautela, J. R. (1988). *Behavior analysis forms for clinical intervention* (Volumes 1 & 2).

Campaign, IL: Research Press.

Chun, B. F., Cobb, S., & French, J. R. P. (1973). *Measures for psychological assessment: A guide to 3000 original sources and their applications*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Corcoran, K. J., & Fischer, J. (1987). *Measures for clinical practice*. New York: Free Press.

Goldman, B. A., & Busch, J. C. (1983). *Directory of unpublished experimental measures* (3 volumes). New York: Human Sciences Press.

Goldstein, G., & Hersen, M. (eds.). (1984). *Handbook of psychological assessment*. New York: Pergamon.

Hudson, W. (1982). *The clinical measurement package: A field manual*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey

Press.

Olsen, D. et al. (1982). *Family inventories*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota, College of Home Economics).

Miller, D. C. (1983). *Handbook of research design and social measurement* (4th ed). New York: Longman.

Nehemkis, A. et al. (1976). *Drug abuse instrument handbook*. Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse, DHEW Publication (ADM) 76-394).

Southworth, L. E. et al. (1981). *Screening and evaluating the young infant: A handbook of instruments to use from infancy to six years*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Sweetland, R. C. & Keyser D. J. (1983). *Tests: A comprehensive reference*. Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.

Wincze, J. P. & Lange, J. D. (1981). *Behavioral assessment of adult disorders*. New York: Guilford.

G. Statistical Reference Books

Blalock, H. M. (1972). Social statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1988). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Levin, J. (1977). Elementary social statistics (2nd. ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Weinbach, R. W. & Grinnell, R. M. (1987). Statistics for social workers. New York: Longman.

H. Writing and Evaluating Research Reports

Reid, W. (1992). Ch. 17. Writing research reports, in Grinnell, R. (Ed.) (1992), pp. 332-344.

Fischer, J. (1992). Ch. 18. Evaluating positivistic research reports, in Grinnell, R. (Ed.) (1992), pp. 347-367.

Bouey, E. & Rogers, G. (1992). Appendix B. Retrieving information, in Grinnell, R. (Ed.) (1992), pp. 402-426.

Royse, D. (1991). Ch. 13, Writing Research Reports and Journal Articles.

Babbie, E.. (1992). Appendix B, The Research Report, pp. A8-AI4.

Practice Effectiveness

Reid, W. J., & Hanrahan, P. (1982). Recent evaluations of social work: Grounds for optimism. *Social Work, 27*, 328-40.

Rubin, A. (1985). Practice effectiveness: More grounds for optimism. *Social Work, 30*, 469-76.

Thomlison, R. J. (1984). Something works: Evidence from practice effectiveness studies. *Social Work, 29*, 51-56.

Wood, K. M. (1978). Casework effectiveness: A new look at the research evidence. *Social Work, 23*, 437-58.