

The Score



DIVISION 5 PERIODICAL VOLUME 47 ISSUE 1

EDITOR: GILL SITARENIOS

ASSISTANT EDITOR: JOANNA SOLOMON



In this issue . . .

FREDERICK J. WERTZ 2
Toward an Inclusive Methodology for Psychology

RACHEL TANYA FOULADI 7
Looking Back and Around to Move Forward in a Better Way: Reckoning with Quantitative and Qualitative Methods Teaching, Research and Practice in Psychology towards Methodological Pluralism and Research Justice

GUNDELINA ALMARIO VELAZCO 10
A Global Survey on Mental Health by Methods Psychologists: A Proposal

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE 22
Publication Corner (p. 12); Links to previous issues (p. 14); Division 5 Membership Information (p. 15); Advertising in The Score (p. 16)



Frederick J. Wertz

TOWARD AN INCLUSIVE METHODOLOGY FOR PSYCHOLOGY

Frederick J. Wertz, Ph.D.

This article addresses the need for an inclusive methodology in psychology. What exactly is 'methodology,' and how does it relate to our multitude of methods for knowledge acquisition? If methodology is the *study of* methods employed by psychologists, what methods are used to acquire methodological knowledge? A few recent works on these issues by leaders of APA's Division of Quantitative and Qualitative Methods (5) are reviewed. An expanded, multifaceted conceptualization of methodology is proposed, and the methods necessary for methodological research are outlined. Recent challenges to psychological research, including crises of replication, measurement, generalization and the relationship between science and practice are delineated, and the central problem of scientifically studying consciousness (broadly conceived, including behavior) is highlighted. Edmund Husserl's rigorously scientific philosophy, little known among psychologists, is suggested to extend science to consciousness, and the phenomenological method he elaborated is suggested as fundamental for uniquely *psychological* research on lived experience. Finally, APA Division 5's recent publishing initiative to move toward an inclusive methodological normativity for psychology is presented.

In his presidential address to Division 5, entitled "Going Back to Move Forward: A Return to Methodology," Alex Beaujean (2022) insisted on the importance of methodology, which he contrasted to methods--the ordered set of practices used to acquire knowledge. Adding 'logos' to 'method,' methodology offers *knowledge of methods*, including critical justification of the ways we pursue data and arrive at knowledge claims. Methodology is not a toolbox of practices but theory--the *philosophical* understanding of methods as ways of thinking that include *norms*--how psychological knowledge *ought* to be pursued. According to Beaujean, psychology's central problem across its panoply of methods is that of how the 'psyche' (again, broadly conceived including 'consciousness,' 'lived experience,' and 'behavior'--the non-physical aspects of personal existence) can be investigated scientifically.

Jolynn Pek, President-Elect of APA Division 5, recently highlighted the importance of *quantitative methodology* with co-author Daniel Bauer (Pek & Bauer, 2023). They empirically documented problems in statistical mediation, construct validity, and power analysis that have not followed from methodological directives. They argued that extant meta-scientific (methodological and theoretical) articles have not had sufficient impact on practice, despite their high citation rate, because methodology is less valued than method (tool) development; lacks incentives for dissemination and pedagogy; is an expertise of few quantitative psychologists, and is learned without carefully developed, formal training. They recommended that psychology's funding agencies, professional societies, and research institutions enhance the incentives for quantitative methodological works and promote more synergistic relations between methodologists and empirical researchers.

Osbeck (2005) suggested that our methodology has overemphasized following explicit rules in research practice and provided examples of theoretical advances in natural science (e.g., Galileo) that broke from rigid, binding procedures. She argued that understanding multiple methods-- each with its own units of analysis, subject matter, and goals--requires an expanded view of scientific rationality, including the epistemological, ontological, and

ethical dimensions of method apart from their technical procedures. Beyond hypothesis testing, one-size-fits-all conceptions of method, and the technical rules commonly found in our curriculum, psychological scientific methods require sociocultural understanding and include observation, imagination, values and aesthetics, morality, intuitive capacities and practices, and critical historical analysis. Among the lessons of philosophers Descartes and Vico are normative principles such as clarity and distinctness of ideation, movement from the simple to the complex, comprehensive reasoning that incorporates all relevance, rhetoric--the art of eloquent expression, passion and fantasy, metaphoric and other inventive arrangements of thought, implicit practices irreducible to prior accounts of method, researchers' reflections on implicit ways of knowing, and an inclusion of diverse exemplars of good practice in achieving psychological knowledge. Osbeck's analysis compellingly suggests all these processes are crucial in psychological methods and therefore ought to be highlighted in our methodology.

Methodology not only describes methods but problematizes and critically analyzes the ways subject matters are known. It informs us not only of their subtle inner reasoning but of their history, assumptions, purposes, applications, problems, goals, potentials, limits, and relations with other methods and society. By no means value-free, methodology is *normative* in that it addresses how the subject matter *ought* to be known and how methods ought to be interrelated. The employment of methods without methodology is *methodolatry*--naive and unaccountable practice, even when it is carried out perfectly by the book. Methodology has its own methods (approaches to methodological knowledge), but the question of what methods are required to conduct methodological inquiry is rarely posed and explicitly answered.

The work of Beaujean, Pek and Bauer, and Osbeck suggest surprisingly diverse and demanding methods for the metascience of methodology. These include researchers' reflections on and accounts of their own practices and performances (beyond standardized descriptions of methods), detailed exploration of others' best practices in history and contemporary research, empirical investigations of research practices, and multidisciplinary inquiries into methods that utilize philosophy (ontology, axiology, and epistemology), history, sociology, psychology, mathematics, and linguistics. We psychologists have resources for methodological research, including critical, mathematical expertise and our rich literature on measurement and quantitative analysis. Qualitative psychological methods for investigating science and psychology include phenomenology, grounded theory, narrative and discursive methods. Our own literature includes social and historical critique of contemporary methods and a small but important psychology of science and psychology of psychology. However, the siloed development and organization of psychological methods as well as the difficulty mastering multiple methods limits comparative methodology and an inclusive, integrative normativity. Methodology that features the disciplines mentioned above is largely absent from our education and training.

The lack of a well-developed, inclusive, and rigorous methodology has significant consequences. Devine (2020) claimed that psychology is a discipline in crisis and identified the "four horsemen" of this crisis in the problems of replication, measurement, generalizability, and practicality. He argued that the replication crisis is an outcome of the other three--a consequence of our lacking methods that provide knowledge of what we are measuring, that generalize beyond research to real-life situations, and that effectively address society's most troubling problems. The essentially methodological resolution of psychology's crisis suggested by Devine is that we reconceptualize psychology's place among the sciences and in society; address the issue of values, which requires philosophical reflection; converse with thinkers in other fields to reunite psychology and the humanities; and finally transcend the limits of psychology in a collective search for truth in science.

I have found most helpful the work of Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), arguably the greatest philosopher of the 20th century and a methodologist *par excellence*. One of his central problems was epistemological, that of how conscious persons achieve knowledge that is objectively true. A student of astronomy, physics, and mathematics, Husserl greatly admired the achievements of quantitative reasoning in natural science and technology. He accepted the commitment of his mentor, Franz Brentano (1838-1917), to practicing philosophy as a rigorous science that could be extended universally to investigate consciousness in addition to and in relation to physical

nature. 'Universal' science requires understanding the distinctive features of consciousness using methods that achieve true theoretical and empirical knowledge of lived experience. Husserl (with Brentano) understood that *consciousness is not an object*, let alone a physical one, for it transcends itself in its intentional relations with objects, situations, the world. Dilthey (1833-1911), like Brentano, understood that psychological and physical realities differ essentially and that psychology requires distinctive methods to access and provide valid knowledge of *subjective meaning*, which is the fundamental property of psychological phenomena. From studying Dilthey, Husserl realized that his philosophical studies of consciousness could provide methodological and theoretical foundations for psychology and the other empirical sciences of mental life such as anthropology, sociology, history, and political science (Sakakibara, 2021).

I believe that Husserl's study of the essence of science and its history can help psychology achieve a more inclusive methodological self-understanding. Husserl (1989) viewed science, modeled on mathematics, as a *cultural ethos* rather than any fixed set(s) of methods or rules for knowing. Particular methods of science have changed dramatically over history in its adaptation to new subject matter, societal problems and insights into its phenomena. In 1923-1924, Husserl published several articles on *renewal* in the Japanese journal, *Kaizo*, that traced the ethos of universal science as it evolved from ancient Greece to recent times. Science prioritizes free, critical thinking; communal dialogue and debate among equals; the provision of *evidence* for knowledge and truth claims; and ethical responsibility for humanity's shaping of the world. Science is the antithesis of dogma, authoritarianism, prejudices of all kinds, groundless beliefs, naive conformity, and skeptical relativism. An aspirational ideal, the ethos of science has been lost in some periods of history and cultural contexts, such as the Dark Ages. This ideal has remained a latent possibility and was renewed in modernity by the natural sciences. Ironically, the historical successes of the physical sciences led to their methods being taken as an exclusive model for science, limiting its free, critical, evidence-based extension to mental life, to the most pressing problems of *humanity*. Science is not restricted to or to be identified exclusively with the methods of physical science, such as hypothesis testing or the mathematization of nature, even as successful and valuable as those practices have been. Husserl viewed twentieth century science as in crisis and in need of renewal if it is to deeply and truly address the issues of war, oppression, poverty, suffering, injustice, and phenomena that require a scientific knowledge of consciousness, personal life activities, and social institutions in addition to material nature. Husserl sought to renew science by explicating and instituting methods for achieving knowledge of humanity, including knowledge of science itself as a responsible, personal-cultural institution.

Husserl developed and employed a method capable of rigorously investigating mental life in an unprejudiced, evidence-based way (Sakakibara, 2021). He did not uniquely invent this method but *conceptually clarified* it from his own and others' practices. Husserl called this method "phenomenology" and employed it in investigations of perception, imagination, time-consciousness, empathy and intersubjectivity, the formation and development of the ego/person, logic, mathematics, and the natural and human sciences. In the 20th century, phenomenology was deliberately practiced in over 50 countries and more than 40 disciplines including psychology (Embree, 2010). This procedurally flexible method has been employed in many different ways--modified for various subject matters, disciplinary problems and goals, and diverse investigators' talents and ingenuity. At its core, this method has four interrelated constituents (Husserl, 1962, 1970). Most fundamentally, the method requires an attitude that focuses exclusively on concrete lived experiences. One puts aside theoretical and social prejudices, especially the construal of mental life as an object such as we find in material reality, and instead the investigator focuses exclusively on temporally flowing experiences of the world's *meanings, values, and purposes*. Second, this method gathers concrete examples of lived experience, necessarily through the only two ways they are accessible: *reflection* (recollections of one's own mental life) and *empathy* (understanding the expressions of others' mental lives). Third, examples are analytically clarified by means of emergent ideation at varying levels of generality, ranging from the factual characteristics of individual experiences to the essential constituents and structures found across empirical and imaginatively varied examples of subjective life. Fourth and finally, the method entails rich, detailed, high-fidelity description of the conceptual findings with illustrative evidence in concrete examples of lived experience. Like all scientific methods, this one is iterative and corrigible. It can be carried out rigorously or carelessly, formally or informally, and with or without methodological self-

consciousness. Its performances are always open to critique, modification, alternative procedures, and improvements. Methodological understanding and clear norms help establish and maintain the *best* scientific practice of phenomenological method.

My own methodological research has suggested that the so called 'phenomenological' method has been implicitly operative throughout the history of psychology, especially in the work of our most forward-moving and impactful investigators (Wertz, 2018, 2023, 2024; Wertz et al., 2011). However, this method has often not been reflectively practiced or methodologically acknowledged, let alone explicitly featured in the curriculum or institutionalized norms. Notably James (2008), in his classic investigation of religious experience, explicitly detailed and elaborated all four constituent practices of this method without any knowledge of European phenomenology. The first qualitative method published in a peer reviewed psychology journal, the Critical Incident Technique, was published by John Flanagan (1954), a psychometrician and former president of APA Division 5. The method requires putting aside theories, expert opinions and hypotheses and instead collecting concrete incidents of effective and ineffective human performances that provide a basis for original analysis and general knowledge. Other seminal psychologists as diverse as Darwin, Freud, Skinner, Kohlberg, Maslow, Bandura, and Kahneman and Tversky have practiced proto-phenomenological method without explicit acknowledgement of its scientific status. Feest (2019) documented this method in early twentieth century research in Germany by Gestalt and in the US by structuralist researchers. It is striking that the standard curriculum for research methods in psychology makes no mention whatsoever of *reflection* or *empathy*, the collection of singular examples of lived experience, or emergent analytic ideation, which are necessary for rigorously accessing and knowing psychological life. Only in the late twentieth century were these qualitative analytical practices rigorously specified (e.g., by Giorgi, 1985) and consequently accepted as scientific. Likely having adopted Newtonian physics as a model, our curriculum still fails to articulate methods specific for the investigation of psychological subject matter and to integrally relate them to more general quantitative methods.

In the late 20th century, psychology's methods became dramatically pluralistic, and the value of both qualitative and quantitative has been broadly accepted in the new century. Diverse methods have been developed but employed largely in silos. Few psychologists have an inclusive methodological grasp of the current pluralism of methods despite a growing emphasis on the value of "mixed methods." APA Division 5 includes expertise and engagement in a broad range of methods, not only basic qualitative and quantitative methods but those employed in professional practices such as assessment and evaluation, which feature the integration of multiple methods. In the past year, leaders in Division 5 have undertaken an initiative to publish a volume on *methodology* that includes the wide range of methods in the division's sections--qualitative, statistical, measurement, assessment, and evaluation. This volume, tentatively entitled *Handbook of Methodology for Psychology in the 21st Century: Progress, Critique and Future*, aims to provide an unprecedented inclusiveness and emphasis on cross-cutting issues that will facilitate a comparison, over-arching understanding, and integration of previously disparate methods. These cross-cutting issues include, for instance, the relations of qualitative and quantitative methods, construct validity, causal inference, generalization, evidence, person/culture-centered science, diversity-equity-inclusion, and the relationship between psychological knowledge and real world impactful practice. Several publishers competed strongly for the volume, which will be published by Guilford, and the royalties will be assigned to Division 5 for use in furthering psychological methodology.

The Division 5 book initiative, spearheaded by seven current and former division presidents and four leading methodologists, embodies the ethos of science articulated by Husserl. The collaborators are a community engaging in free and critical thinking, open dialogue and debate, evidence-based reasoning, and social responsibility. Collaborators (alphabetically) include Deborah Bandalos, Alexander Beaujean, Rachel Fouladi, Kurt Geisinger, Lisa Harlow, Rodney Hopson, Bianca Montrosse-Moorhead, Lisa Osbeck, Jolynn Pek, Frederick Wertz, and Cynthia Winston Proctor. This collaboration has been extraordinary in the openness, mutual respect, willingness to learn from and with each other, and creative consensus-building among participants who represent all kinds of diversity. Chapter topics were identified as representative of the multiple methods that are contributing to progress in psychology in the first quarter of the new century, ranging from psychobiography to

psychometric network modeling, cross-cultural measurement, artificial intelligence, indigenous and liberation psychology, and mixed methods. Chapter authors were selected for their methodological expertise and were encouraged to enlist co-authors with diverse points of view, ethnicities, nationalities, ages, and areas of psychology. The initiative aims to offer psychologists an overarching, critical methodological understanding of the broad spectrum of methods currently contributing to psychological knowledge in the science and profession of psychology. This collaboration seeks to guide the development of a broader and more integrative methods curriculum for the education of future generations of psychologists. The volume editors, encouraged and supported by Guilford, hope this volume initiates series of publications that will contribute to an inclusive methodological normativity for psychology.

References

- Beaujean, A. A. (2022). Going Back to Move Forward: A Return to Methodology. Presidential Address, the Annual Convention of the APA, August 5, Minneapolis, MN.
- Devine, S. (2020, March 25). The four horsemen of the crisis in psychological science. *Blog: Trial and Error*. <https://doi.org/10.36850/kr5s-q873>
- Embree, L. (2010). Interdisciplinarity within phenomenology. *The Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 10, 1-7.
- Feest, U. (2019). Gestalt psychology, frontloading phenomenology, and psychophysics. *Synthese*. DOI: [10.1007/s11229-019-02211-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02211-y)
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4), 327–358. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061470>
- Giorgi, A. (1985). Phenomenology and psychological research. Duquesne University Press.
- Husserl, Edmund. (1962). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*, translated by W. R. B. Gibson. Collier Books. (Original publication 1913)
- Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology*, translated by D. Carr. Northwestern University Press. (Original work 1954)
- Husserl, E. (1989). Aufsätze und vorträge (Essays and lectures): 1922–1937. In T. Nenon & H.R. Sepp (Eds.) *Husserliana*, Volume 27. Kluwer Publishers.
- James, W. (2008). *Varieties of religious experience: A study in human nature*. Routledge. (Original publication 1902.)
- Osbeck, L.M. (2005). Method and theoretical psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, 15(1), 6-26.
- Pek, J. & Bauer, D.J. (2023). How can we move advanced methodology into practice more effectively? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 10(1) 3–10.
- Sakakibara, T. (2021). *Husserl's phenomenology: A study of the origin and development of its method*. University of Tokyo Press.
- Wertz, F.J. (2024). Phenomenology and natural science: What kind of a discipline is psychology? *Theory and Psychology*, 34(3), 405-424. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543241248128>
- Wertz, F.J. (2023). Phenomenological methodology, methods, and procedures for research in psychology. In Cooper, H., Panter, A., Rindskopf, D., Sher, K., McMullen, L., & Coutanche, M (Eds), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol.2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological*, pp. 83-105. American Psychological Association.
- Wertz, F.J. (2018). Qualitative methods as fundamental tools: Autonomy and integration in mixed-methods research. In B. Schiff (Ed.), *Situating qualitative methods in psychological science*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Publishing.
- Wertz, F.J., Charmaz, K., McMullen, L. M., Josselson, R., Anderson, R., & McSpadden, E. (2011). *Five ways of doing qualitative analysis: Phenomenological psychology, grounded theory, discourse analysis, narrative research, and intuitive inquiry*. Guilford Press.



Rachel Fouladi

LOOKING BACK AND AROUND TO MOVE FORWARD IN A
BETTER WAY: RECKONING WITH QUANTITATIVE AND
QUALITATIVE METHODS TEACHING, RESEARCH AND PRACTICE
IN PSYCHOLOGY TOWARDS METHODOLOGICAL PLURALISM
AND RESEARCH JUSTICE

Rachel Tanya Fouladi, Ph.D.

After the American Psychological Association, which was formed in 1892, proceeded in 1944 with the approval to establish the initial Divisions, Division 5 came into being as “Evaluation and Measurement” as one of these first divisions. In this organizational structure, Division 5, now with the name “Quantitative and Qualitative Methods,” was and remains a foundational place within the APA structure for the discussion about and advancement of methodological and methods research and practice (see American Psychological Association, 2024; Beaujean, 2022; Pek & Bauer, 2024).

As the set of methodologies and methods for psychology have expanded and increasing numbers of psychologists acknowledge and incorporate these approaches and techniques, the Division has expanded its mandate. In so doing, the Division has strived to create and encourage spaces where inquiry into multiple methodologies and methods can be valued and thrive with the eye toward the development and sharing of a broader relevant methodologies and methods for the advancement of psychological science and research practices (e.g., Beaujean, 2022; Wertz, 2024; Fouladi et al., 2024).

At present, in its current form, the Division 5 is home to methodologists, scholars, and practitioners who identify across a number of subdisciplines, including evaluation, measurement, statistics, assessment, and qualitative methods. The Division has awards competitions to honour contributions towards advancing methods quantitative or qualitative approaches and most recently, as of the call for the [APA Division 5 2025 competition](#), in mixed methods approaches (c.f., APA Division 5 Awards Committee, 2024). Recent collaborations with APA and other organizations (c.f., Fouladi, 2024)) and call for the upcoming APA Annual Convention (c.f., [Call for Proposals Division Requirements - APA Convention 2025](#)) highlight the Division’s valuing of innovations in diverse and inclusive methodologies and methods.

2025 Conference Call Extract:

The APA Division of Quantitative and Qualitative Methods invites proposals on innovations in methodology and methods for psychology in measurement, statistics, evaluation, assessment, qualitative and mixed methods. We encourage proposals related to inclusive work grounded in Indigenous, quantitative, critical, and/or mixed methodologies. Potential synergistic areas of proposals could include (but are not limited to):

1. Integrating intensive longitudinal data with qualitative inquiry;
2. Consequential validity of different approaches;
3. Indigenous methodologies in assessment;
4. Use/misuse of artificial intelligence, such as ChatGPT;
5. Causal inference and evaluation; and
6. Pedagogy on methodological pluralism.

In this work, we further advance teaching, research, and practice across the spectrum of methodologies/methods for psychology and related fields with an eye toward methodological pluralism and research justice. It would be nice to think that a more inclusive but rigorous approach toward methodology/methods, (e.g., structured analysis/critique of questionnaires and/or surveys for community/construct relevance) would be considered, by most if not all, as best practice. However, we must be humble in recognizing that psychology and its methodologists have not always been the most inclusive in their (our) world views and approaches.

It is no secret that, currently, the primary approaches in psychology textbooks map to a conceptualization of “psychology as a science” based in research methodologies which prioritize (or are almost exclusively based on) quantitative methods. Required curriculum in Departments of Psychology continue to include statistics coursework, with few including qualitative methods courses. Although consistent with Aiken, West, and Millsap (2008), Aiken (2020), and others, I agree and argue that there are too few quantitative methods courses that are available to and expected of psychology students, it is also critical for students to have coursework in additional methodologies/methods at the undergraduate and graduate level beyond just standard statistics courses, including but not limited to qualitative methods. Although, there are programs particularly in Colleges of Education, where qualitative and mixed methods courses are regularly available, this is not common in Psychology programs that are outside Colleges of Education. Unfortunately, in times of budget cuts, hiring of methodologists may not be a priority or even a possibility for Departments. If “psychological science” is to be relevant, students and professionals must have necessary training through textbooks and curriculum in multiple methodologies and methods beyond what is current practice.

There have been multiple instances over the years, where testing and assessment research and practices, researchers and practitioners, have been identified for making inappropriate claims of applicability beyond the groups with whom methods were developed (c.f., APA’s [Historical chronology](#), 2021/2024). The Canadian Psychological Association and Canadian Psychological Foundation’s (2018) document “Psychology’s Response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s Report” repeatedly highlights the harms of psychology in research and treatment of Indigenous Peoples with repeated reference to problematic and harmful assessment practices (c.f. [TRC Task Force Report FINAL.pdf](#)). Importantly and unfortunately, the foundations of psychology were built by many of the leaders in psychological methodologies and methods, including statisticians are psychometricians, who were major contributors to eugenics (Yakushko, 2019). These are our academic and professional ancestors. Although there is continued work towards improved practices in testing and assessment with the collective work of the AERA, NCME, and APA (2014) on “The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing,” and APA along with other professional associations have acknowledged their role in historical and current harms, perhaps it is time for Division 5 to formally do the same and to continue to take action to do and be better..

The call to do better is not new (e.g., Naglieri, 2020). The continued calls suggest that there is the continued need to do the work. There is the continued need to learn and to strive to do better. We hope that the way that we move forward as methodology and methods researchers, practitioners, and teachers, that we can be more transparent about the origin stories of our discipline, that we develop and promote better and more inclusive methodological pedagogies and practices, and that as methodologists we can conduct ourselves in a better way and hopefully in what will be perceived and judged as a good way in our academic and host communities where we live and do our work.

References

- Aiken, L. S. (2020). Not the what of quantitative training but the who. In J. L. Rodgers (Ed.), *Teaching statistics and quantitative methods in the 21st century* (pp. 55—69). Routledge.
- Aiken, L. S., West, S. G., & Millsap, R. E. (2008). Doctoral training in statistics, measurement, and methodology in psychology: Replication and extension of Aiken, West, Sechrest, and Reno’s (1990) survey

- of PhD programs in North America. *American Psychologist*, 63(1), 32–50. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.1.32>
- American Psychological Association (2024). *APA History*. Website: <https://www.apa.org/about/apa/archives/apa-history>
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education (Eds.). (2014). Standards for educational and psychological testing. American Educational Research Association.
- APA Division 5 Awards Committee (2024). Call for Awards: Division 5 is Seeking Award Nominations. *The Score* (Division 5 Newsletter of the American Psychological Association), 46(4), 19.
- Bandalos, D. (2023). Research on culturally relevant items in educational assessments -- Examples of culturally relevant items and student responses to them. *The Score* (Division 5 Newsletter of the American Psychological Association), 45(4), 9-13.
- Beaujean, A. A. (2021). Message from the new president -- The president discusses the common thread in Div. 5: methodology. *The Score* (Division 5 Newsletter of the American Psychological Association), 43(4).
- Fouladi, R.T. & *Lu, H. (2023, August). Research Justice in Psychology: Locating past and current practices with the goal of moving the discipline forward. American Psychological Association. Washington DC. Symposium Talk in Symposium: Incorporating EDI Perspectives into Quantitative Methodology Teaching, Practice, and Research.
- Fouladi, R.T. (2024). Division 5 highlights of some events on Indigenous Methodologies in 2024. *The Score* (Division 5 Newsletter of the American Psychological Association), 46(4), 20-21.
- Naglieri, J.A. (2020). 100 years of intelligence tests: We can do better. *The Score* (Division 5 Newsletter of the American Psychological Association), 42(2).
- Pek, J. & Bauer, D. (2024). Refocusing on methodology versus method. *The Score* (Division 5 Newsletter of the American Psychological Association), 45(4), 2-4.
- Psychology's Response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's Report (2018). https://cpa.ca/docs/File/Task_Forces/TRC%20Task%20Force%20Report_FINAL.pdf
- Wertz, F. (2023). Our challenge: Heterogeneity and unity in psychological methodology. *The Score* (Division 5 Newsletter of the American Psychological Association), 45(4), 2-4.
- Yakushko, O. (2019). Eugenics and its evolution in the history of western psychology: A critical archival review. *Psychother Politics Int*. 2019;17:e1495. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppi.1495>



A GLOBAL SURVEY ON MENTAL HEALTH BY METHODS PSYCHOLOGISTS: A PROPOSAL

Gundelina Almario Velayco, Ph.D.

Gundelina Velayco

Introduction

This is a proposal for interested methods psychologists to conduct a survey on mental health in different parts of the world. A worldwide study will provide empirical data for the enhancement of mental health science and for research-based decision-making of international bodies, such as, the WHO, UN, etc., as well as individual government entities. The study could also lead to a broader understanding of the impacts of modern-day political, economic, social, and environmental challenges on humanity's mental health.

As psychologists, we may enjoy the privilege of being considered stewards of the potentials of the human mind. While the individual is the greatest unit of change, it is also important for organizations, especially psychologists to band together and act to create psychological models based on empirical data that could lead us toward the world we want.

A possible result of the survey is a series of articles analyzing the data and showcasing the variety of tools and methodologies that psychologists have in their repertoire, thus highlighting psychological science as a model for other disciplines.

Invitation

All D5 members as well as those from other divisions are welcome to join.

Procedure

1. "Brainstorming" on the survey questions – Participants are invited to suggest the survey questions to be part of the study. Following is a google doc where suggested questions are entered until January 10, 2025.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Ovcly4cUte4VVC0YBzKTNaXttPsBrkKI7uMbKHkPhP0/edit?usp=sharing>

2. Endorsement of the survey questions – Starting January 11, 2025, the participants are asked to endorse 10 questions in the same link above until January 20, 2025.

3. Finalization of the composition of the survey – The 10 questions with the highest number of endorsements will form part of the survey, to be announced on January 25, 2025.

4. Data gathering starts on January 26, 2025, finishing with the first batch of data on March 28, 2025. Participating psychologists may choose their own population/s, specifying age, gender, and any variable they deem important.

5. Data entry – Participating psychologists enter their data from January 26-March 28, 2025, occupying a column or more each in the following google doc., dividing their column/s into their different samples.

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NVpQQ0hM1tsFzFprqXWdQUv7FKTjpv0YbaIiH5pkQeI/edit?usp=sharing>

6. Data analysis and write-up – After March 28, 2025, the participants can analyze and write up their own data or compare their data with those of others', with permission and attribution. Only those who supplied data can do a write-up. Data gathering and inputting can continue with new data and new populations. The working google doc could have a life of its own and may not need an administrator.



PUBLICATON CORNER

Compiled by
Gill Sitarenios

How to think clearly about the Central Limit Theorem

The article revisits some statistical fundamentals. Its main purposes are to investigate the misconceptions of the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) among social science researchers and to address these misconceptions by clarifying the definition and properties of the CLT in a manner that is approachable to social science researchers.

Zhang, X., Olvera Astivia, O. L., Kroc, E., & Zumbo, B. D. (2023). How to think clearly about the central limit theorem. *Psychological Methods*, 28(6), 1427-1441. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000448>

Seeking a better balance between efficiency and interpretability: Comparing the Likert response format with the Guttman response format.

The Likert response format is by far the most commonly used approach in the social sciences. The benefits of using Likert scales include its relative simplicity for item-generation and the efficiency of coding responses. However, the authors of this article critique this format based on its affordance for interpretation in terms of internal structure validity evidence. They suggest that the Guttman response format provides a better approach for gathering and interpreting internal structure validity evidence. The authors illustrate how items can be developed using the Guttman format, exemplify how such items operate, and explore some comparisons between the results from the two formats.

Wilson, M., Bathia, S., Morell, L., Gochyyev, P., Koo, B. W., & Smith, R. (2023). Seeking a better balance between efficiency and interpretability: Comparing the Likert response format with the Guttman response format. *Psychological Methods*, 28(6), 1358-1373. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000462>

Sample size planning for replication studies: The devil is in the design.

Replication is central to scientific progress. Because of widely reported replication failures, replication has received increased attention in psychology, sociology, education, management, and related fields in recent years. Replication studies have generally been assessed dichotomously, designated either a “success” or “failure” based entirely on the outcome of a null hypothesis significance test (i.e., $p < .05$ or $p > .05$, respectively). However, alternative definitions of success depend on researchers’ goals for the replication. Previous work on alternative definitions for success has focused on the analysis phase of replication. However, the design of the replication is also important. One critical component of design often ignored or oversimplified in replication studies is sample size planning. Sample size planning for replication studies should correspond to the method by which success will be evaluated. Researchers have received little guidance, some of which is misguided, on sample size planning for replication goals other than the aforementioned dichotomous null

hypothesis significance testing approach. In this article, we describe four different replication goals. Then, we formalize sample size planning methods for each of the four goals.

Anderson, S. F., & Kelley, K. (2024). Sample size planning for replication studies: The devil is in the design. *Psychological Methods*, 29(5), 844–867.

Updated guidelines on selecting an intraclass correlation coefficient for interrater reliability, with applications to incomplete observational designs

Several intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) are available to assess the interrater reliability (IRR) of observational measurements. Selecting an ICC is complicated, and existing guidelines have three major limitations. First, they do not discuss incomplete designs, in which raters partially vary across subjects. Second, they provide no coherent perspective on the error variance in an ICC, clouding the choice between the available coefficients. Third, the distinction between fixed or random raters is often misunderstood. Based on generalizability theory (GT) updated guidelines on selecting an ICC for IRR are provided, which are applicable to both complete and incomplete observational designs. The authors explain four choices a researcher needs to make when selecting an ICC for IRR.

ten Hove, D., Jorgensen, T. D., & van der Ark, L. A. (2024). Updated guidelines on selecting an intraclass correlation coefficient for interrater reliability, with applications to incomplete observational designs. *Psychological Methods*, 29(5), 967–979. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000516>

LINKS TO RECENT PREVIOUS ISSUES OF “THE SCORE”



Issue Date	Vol #	Issue #	Link
October, 2024	46	4	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2024/10/issue.pdf
July, 2024	46	3	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2024/07/issue.pdf
April, 2024	46	2	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2024/04/issue.pdf
January, 2024	46	1	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2024/01/issue.pdf
October, 2023	45	4	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2023/10/issue.pdf
July, 2023	45	3	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2023/07/issue.pdf
April, 2023	45	2	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2023/04/issue.pdf
January, 2023	45	1	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2023/01/issue.pdf
October, 2022	44	4	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2022/10
July, 2022	44	3	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2022/07
April, 2022	44	2	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2022/04
January, 2022	44	1	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2022/01
October, 2021	43	4	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2021/10
July, 2021	43	3	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2021/07
April, 2021	43	2	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2021/04
January, 2021	43	1	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2021/01
October, 2020	42	4	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2020/10
July, 2020	42	3	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2020/07
April, 2020	42	2	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2020/04
January, 2020	42	1	https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2020/01

Issues of The Score can be accessed at the following webpage:

<https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/issues>

DIVISION 5 MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION



Division 5 draws together specialists in the areas of quantitative and qualitative methods. Membership includes specialists in the fields of educational psychology, industrial-organizational psychology, individual assessment, measurement, program evaluation, psychometrics, qualitative inquiry, research interviewing, research methods and statistics. Division 5 provides the opportunity to participate in this critical aspect of professional development, and is a vibrant community that serves the core interests and needs of rigorous scientific inquiry in the social sciences. Those who are interested in joining the division or who would like more information should be referred to the Division 5 website:

<https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/membership>

Advertising in *The Score*

The Score is the newsletter of the American Psychological Association's Division 5—Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics. Division 5 is concerned with promoting high standards in both research and practical application of psychological assessment, evaluation, measurement, and statistics. Approximately half of the Division 5 members are university faculty members in quantitative psychology, psychometrics, educational psychology, or industrial organizational psychology and half are engaged in careers in industry, including the areas of individual and large-scale assessment. More than 1,000 Division 5 members receive The Score each quarter. Advertisements in The Score may be in the form of display advertisements or job announcements. Both types of ads can include graphics and other design features and can be submitted as text or camera-ready display art. Prices for advertisements and size requirements are provided in the accompanying table. Submission deadlines are 45 days prior to publication: February 15 for the April issue, May 15 for July, August 15 for October, and November 15 for January.

To advertise in The Score, please contact Editor Gill Sitarenios at GSitarenios@yahoo.ca.

Size	Dimensions	Display Ad Price	Job Announcement Price
Full page	7.125" × 9.5"	\$235	Not available
Half page	7.125" × 4.75"	\$175	\$120
Third page	4.75" × 4.75"	\$125	\$90
	2.375" × 9.5"		
Sixth page	2.375" × 4.75"	\$90	Free/\$55
Notes: Insertion orders for four consecutive issues receive a 15% discount. First sixth page job ad each year free, thereafter \$55.			