



Research Methods in Clinical Psychology and Effects of Their Application on Psychology

Assoc. Prof. Caglar Sezis

To cite this article: Collaborate, Current Science, Volume 5, No. 5-9, 2023, p. 184 – 206. - 0099-0001-2309-0108.

Our studies are in a format accredited, approved, and supported by EAALS - European Academic Studies and Laboratory Services. ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia") "EAALS offers all our works, services, and publications to the world scientists at the stage of carrying our control, accreditation, and support processes to the international platform." ("CURRENT SCIENCE") ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia")

ISSN: 2667-9515

Barcode: 977266795001

Editors Group:

Concessionarie: Tsisana Kharabadze

Niyaz Bokvadze

Prof. Sabrina Corbi

1

**THIS JOURNAL INCLUDED IN MANY INDEXES, INCLUDING
ADVANCED SCIENCES INDEX. ADVANCED SCIENCES INDEX (ASI)
EUROPEAN SCIENCE EVALUATION CENTER WHERE TOGETHER
KIRCHSTRASSE 4.56761 | RHINELAND-PALATINATE, GERMANY
PHONE: +49(177) 8684-353 PHONE: +49(177) 8684-353 EMAILS:
ASI@EUROPE.DE**



CURRENT SCIENCE

Prof. Samantha Lewes

Assoc. Prof. Osman Doruk

""• *Current Science Multidisciplinary Academic Journal with Review Panel is a monthly multidisciplinary academic* ("CURRENT SCIENCE A Different Look at Traffic Sociology and Driver ...") ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia") ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia")

journal with a multi-science peer-review." ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia") ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia")

""The magazine will be at the subscriber's address in the first week of the month."" ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia")

• *The journal continues to be included in all international rankings and registrations. Quality articles and publications accelerate this* ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia")

""• *Response or rejection time for applications varies between 30 and 90 days.*"" ("Scientific Studies - Current Science Georgia")

Abstract

The use of research methodologies has significant implications for the caliber of research and the development of novice researchers. However, the potential detrimental effects of their implementation on the area of psychology remain uncertain. This systematic review aims to ascertain the research methodologies used within the discipline, as well as the manner and topics on which these approaches are applied. Additionally, it was discovered that the publications had a



CURRENT SCIENCE

deficiency in rigor and openness about the used approach, hence impacting the potential for repeatability. In summary, this article presents a comprehensive examination of the various approaches used in a selected sample of psychological publications. In addition to an unforeseen deficiency in rigor pertaining to several parts of the technique, the research underscores the prevalence and use of approaches and designs throughout the sample. It is important to consider the potential presence of sample bias while analyzing and interpreting the findings of this research. It is advisable to use the findings of this study in future research endeavors to ascertain the potential ramifications on the discipline of psychology as a scientific area, as well as to facilitate more investigations into the utilization of research methodologies. The obtained findings should serve as a basis for further investigation into the following areas of research: the impact of incompleteness or rigor on replication, the preference for certain methodologies, the presence of publication bias, and the selection of sample techniques as crucial factors. The discipline of psychology has seen significant growth and has gained considerable popularity in recent years (Gough & Lyons, 2016; Clay, 2017). The need for evidence-based research to inform development and health-related choices (Perestelo-Pérez, 2013) underscores the significance of using research methodologies within the expansive domain of psychology (Stangor, 2011; Aanstoos, 2014). Hence, research techniques are regarded as crucial instruments used by researchers for the purpose of data collection (Nieuwenhuis, 2016). These methods include several approaches, such as quantitative, qualitative, mixed method, and multiple method (Maree, 2016). In addition, scholars use several forms of literature review in order to address research inquiries (Grant & Booth, 2009).

Keywords: *Human Psychology, Clinical Psychology, Research Methods in Clinical Psychology, Practicing Psychology*

Introduction

The selection of a research technique is a multifaceted process that is influenced by several elements, such as paradigm, research topic, and skill level (O'Neil & Koekemoer, 2016; Grix, 2002; Nind et al., 2015). Understanding the use of research techniques poses a challenge, since these approaches are often depicted as possessing rigid bounds that are continually surpassed in



CURRENT SCIENCE

the realm of research (Johnson et al., 2001; Sandelowski, 2011). Illustrations of this shift may be seen in scholarly literature. For instance, Sandelowski et al. (2009) demonstrate the incorporation of quantitative elements into qualitative investigations. Similarly, Truscott et al. (2010) highlight instances when researchers claim to use a mixed-method design, although lacking the essential components associated with such an approach. The improper use of research techniques has a detrimental impact on the acquisition and application of research skills by students and researchers (Scott Jones & Goldring, 2015). It also hampers the development of theories (Ngulube, 2013) and compromises the trustworthiness of research findings (Levitt et al., 2017). The aforementioned actions have the potential to weaken the integrity of the discipline (Nind et al., 2015), impede the dissemination of scholarly knowledge via journals (Ketchen et al., 2008; Ezeh et al., 2010), and hinder endeavors to solve societal concerns by means of psychology research (Dweck).

Methodology

This has significant significance in light of the well-recognized replication issue that the discipline is now grappling with (Earp and Trofimov, 2015; Hengartner, 2018). Due to the absence of methodological clarity and the possible consequences of inadequate use of research techniques, the objective of this investigation was to examine the application of research methods in the field of psychology via a comprehensive analysis of journal articles. According to Chaichanasakul et al. (2011), the act of evaluating articles provides a valuable chance to assess the advancement, expansion, and advancement of a certain study domain, as well as evaluate the overall caliber of a scholarly magazine. Lee et al. (1999) and Bluhm et al. (year not provided) The evaluation conducted in 2011 aimed to consolidate the use of qualitative research methodologies and shown a notable rise in the prevalence of qualitative research within American and European academic publications. Scholarly investigations have also directed their attention on the use of research methodologies within certain sub-disciplines of psychology, such as Industrial and Organizational psychology. In research conducted by Coetzee and Van Zyl (2014), it was observed that a significant proportion of the publications published between 1995 and 2015 in the field of qualitative studies, as identified by O'Neil and Koekemoer (2016), consisted of longitudinal



CURRENT SCIENCE

studies that were underrepresented. Specifically, these underrepresented longitudinal studies accounted for around 21% of the total articles published during this period. According to O'Cathain (2009), there has been a growing trend in the field of health psychology towards the use of alternative research methodologies, such as Mixed method research. Nevertheless, a comprehensive examination of the use of research methodologies in the discipline of psychology as a collective entity is absent from the existing body of scholarly literature.

Hence, our study aimed to address the inquiry about the use of research techniques, the manner in which these methods are employed, and the specific topics (journal articles) to which they are applied in practice. This endeavor seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of the methodologies employed in psychology publications. The gathered data was synthesized in the following format. The areas of scientific discourse within a specific field of research or the current needs of a particular population have been identified as important factors to consider in academic studies (Bittermann and Fischer, 2018). Additionally, the selection of appropriate methods and data collection tools is crucial for ensuring the validity and reliability of research findings (Nieuwenhuis, 2016). Proper sampling techniques and the careful selection of items from a population are also essential in order to accurately represent the target group in the study (Ritchie et al., 2009). Furthermore, the utilization of effective data collection techniques and the development of a sound research strategy are critical for obtaining meaningful results (Maree, 2016). Lastly, the analysis of collected data and the subsequent discovery of knowledge can be achieved by examining data bodies (Ktepi, 2016).

Literature Review

A comprehensive analysis was undertaken, including a range of scholarly publications published between 2013 and 2017, sourced from five distinct journals within the domain of psychological research. The design of the method According to Grant and Booth (2009), systematic reviews are considered the preferred method of review for postgraduate studies. These reviews often include the use of certain components of a systematic review and may involve the use of one or two databases to compile studies after conducting an extensive literature search.



CURRENT SCIENCE

The present systematic review included many elements similar to those found in a systematic review, including a comprehensive search of the designated database and the organization of collected data in a tabular format (Grant and Booth, 2009).

Sampling

The systematic reviews conducted by Lowe and Moore (2014), Perill and Taylor (2014), and Barr-Walker (2017) demonstrate that sample sizes and timeframes may differ. Given the absence of well-defined criteria in the existing literature (Grant and Booth, 2009), the determination of the sample size for this research was guided by the specific objectives of the sample (Strydom, 2011), as well as considerations related to time and expense limitations (Maree and Pietersen, 2016). Consequently, this research study used a purposive sample (Ritchie et al., 2009) consisting of the top five psychological publications published between 2013 and 2017. According to Lee (2015), The use of current and relevant sources for data gathering is advocated by the American Psychological Association (APA), with consideration given to the contextual factors of the research project. The appropriateness of the time period specified for this research study is justified by its emphasis on the current advances in research methodologies used within the expansive domain of psychology. Psychology journals were included into the study if they were among the top five English-language journals in the field of psychology, as determined by Scimago Journal and Country Rankings (Scimago Journal and Country Rankings, 2017). The Scimago Journal and Country Ranking offers an annual compilation of journal and country-specific indicators that are produced from the Scopus® database (Scopus, 2017b). These indicators are obtained via the use of the Scimago Journal Ranking (SJR) indicator, which has been created by Scimago based on the Google PageRank algorithm. According to Scimago Journal & Country Ranking (2017), According to Scopus (2017a), the biggest worldwide database of abstracts and citations from peer-reviewed publications is Scopus. The development of the Scimago Journal and nation Ranking list was motivated by the need to provide academics with a tool for assessing scientific disciplines, comparing nation rankings, and analyzing articles (Scimago Journal & Country Rank, 2017). This aligns with the objectives of the present research project. Furthermore, the primary objectives of the journals were to concentrate on broad areas within the field of



CURRENT SCIENCE

psychology and to provide unrestricted access to whole papers, without the need for a particular research methodology to be used. The following enumeration comprises the five foremost academic periodicals that satisfy the aforementioned inclusion criteria:

- (1) *Australian Journal of Psychology*,
- (2) *British Journal of Psychology*,
- (3) *Europe's Journal of Psychology*,
- (4) *International Journal of Psychology and finally*
- (5) *Journal of Applied and Interdisciplinary Psychology*.

Participants were deemed ineligible for inclusion in this systematic review if their articles were not accessible in full-text format, if the journals explicitly expressed a preference for specific research methods, or if the journal exclusively published articles within a specific psychological research discipline (e.g., industrial psychology, clinical psychology, etc.).

The procedure was conducted in accordance with established research protocols. The investigators used a methodology that was modified based on the strategy employed by Ferreira et al. The data were gathered in a systematic manner and then coded manually, with the assistance of an independent co-coder (Grant and Booth, 2009). The variables of interest included the subject matter of the study, the approach used, the framework utilized, the sampling technique, and the methodology (the approach employed for data gathering and analysis). The codes used in this study are obtained from the phrases found inside each publication. Themes were generated via the process of coding and were afterwards managed by the co-coder. The themes identified were then organized and documented in a tabular format, in accordance with the methodology used in the systematic review.

The systematic review processes. The concept of precision refers to the level of exactness or accuracy in measurement or calculation. Johnston et al. (year) adapted the literature review, selection, and data extraction/analysis to align with the precise goal of the review. Therefore, it is important to provide a full and clear account of the procedures used in conducting a systematic



CURRENT SCIENCE

review. The selected design for this study followed the rigorous standards often associated with systematic reviews, including comprehensive search methods and the use of tabular data (Grant and Booth, 2009). Hence, the meticulous implementation of systematic review is being examined in relation to these two components. In order to guarantee a thorough investigation, this research study included measures to enhance the openness of the review process. This was achieved by adhering to a well-defined protocol that delineated the various phases of the review prior to the collection of data (Johnston et al., 2019). The procedure used in this study has resemblance to the one utilized by Ferreira et al. and underwent approval from three distinct research committees/stakeholders and researchers (Johnston et al., 2019).

Findings

The criteria for determining the eligibility of articles for inclusion were established in accordance with the research question and were explicitly articulated. Additionally, a systematic record of the inclusion process was maintained to provide a transparent and traceable evidence trail (Bandara et al., 2015; Johnston et al., 2019). Systematic reviews are widely used in research to enhance the rigor of the review process, as shown by their popularity and effectiveness (Bandara et al., 2015). The process of screening articles to determine their eligibility is a crucial component of doing a systematic review (Johnston et al., 2019). This stage was implemented in two facets of the research project, namely the identification of suitable journals and the inclusion of relevant papers. The selection of eligible articles was conducted by the primary author and afterwards evaluated by the second and third writers. All papers from the originally chosen publications were included. Subsequently, individuals who did not possess a direct relevance to the study objective, such as interview pieces and debates, were eliminated via a screening process. In order to guarantee a thorough and meticulous process of data extraction, the extraction of data was first performed by a reviewer. Subsequently, an independent individual conducted a verification of the extracted findings to ascertain their comprehensiveness and correctness (Johnston et al., 2019). According to Johnston et al. (2019), the research question had a crucial role in facilitating a systematic and efficient process of data extraction. The data underwent categorization using relevance codes and article IDs, which were used to establish audit trails including authors, titles, and the purpose of



CURRENT SCIENCE

the articles. The data were classified based on the study's objectives (Johnston et al., 2019), as well as the methodologies used. A tabular format was utilized to synthesize the application of these methodologies and their respective subject matters within the realm of psychology. With the exception of psychological practice, all of the aforementioned themes were found to have overlap with the study domains in psychology as outlined by Weiten (2010). The selection of these study fields is based on their ability to include a wide range of data and provide simple and succinct categorization of generated codes. The categorization of article codes was conducted based on certain themes/topics, according to the study area criteria established by Weiten (2010). It is crucial to acknowledge that these study domains do not pertain to distinct branches within the field of psychology, such as industrial psychology. Instead, they include larger regions that may encompass subdomains of interest within these branches.

Argument

In the field of developmental psychology, scholars engage in empirical investigations pertaining to the progression of human development over the lifespan, including the stages from infancy through to advanced age. Social psychology encompasses the study of human behavior that is influenced by social motivations. Scholars in the domain of educational psychology are now engaged in the examination of the processes by which individuals acquire knowledge and skills, as well as the identification of optimal instructional methods. The primary objective of health psychology is to investigate the impact of psychological variables on physical well-being. In contrast, physiological psychology examines the influence of physiological factors on behavior. Experimental psychology is not the only domain that employs experimental research methods and focuses on the conventional fundamental subjects of psychology, such as sensation. Cognitive psychology is a field of study that focuses on investigating and understanding the complex mental processes involved in human cognition. Psychometrics is a field concerned with the quantification and assessment of individuals' cognitive abilities or behavioral traits. The primary objective of personality study is to assess and establish the level of consistency in human behavior (Weiten, 2010). The ultimate subject of psychological practice encompasses the range of experiences, strategies, and interventions used by professionals, scholars, and researchers within the discipline



CURRENT SCIENCE

of psychology. The articles including these topics are further categorized based on their methodology, which include method, sample, design, data collecting, and data analysis. The researchers based their categorisation only on the information provided in the papers, without making any conclusions. The data has been organized into two distinct result sets, which are provided inside this article. The first group of inquiries pertains to the study's objective as seen through the lens of the highlighted concerns. The following set of findings provides a comprehensive summary of the outcomes with respect to the used methodology. This article focuses on the discussion of the second set of findings, whereas the first group is provided in a tabular manner. Hence, the present discourse offers a comprehensive examination of the methodologies used in the field of psychology, including many subjects. Simultaneously, the tabular structure furnishes readers with a detailed analysis of the methodologies employed within the specific themes that have been identified. It is our contention that the inclusion of data from several viewpoints serves to provide readers with a comprehensive comprehension of the findings. In order to manage the vast volume of data comprising our findings, we adhered to the approach used by Cichocka and Jost (2014) to streamline our results. Several papers used several methods, sampling techniques, designs, data gathering methods, and data analysis approaches in their respective investigations. The following section presents an overview of the used methodologies, their respective applications, and the specific domains within the field of psychology to which they are applied. Percentages are often given to the second decimal place in order to emphasize subtle variations in the development of the approach. The findings of our study indicate a predominant preference among researchers for using quantitative research techniques (90.22%) over other alternative research approaches.

Qualitative research emerged as the second most prevalent research methodology, with a mere 4.79% of the total use of research methods. Reviews were a substantial portion of the overall research landscape, accounting for around 3.91% of the total, so establishing itself as the third most often used research technique. Although mixed method research studies were prevalent across several subjects, they accounted for just 0.98% of the total. On the other hand, multi-method research was only referenced in a single study, representing a mere 0.10% of the recognized research techniques.



Research Methods in Psychology

The importance lies in the frequency of use of research methods on the topics. Furthermore, our investigation into the use of these research approaches has shown that. The research used a longitudinal design and identified itself as a multi-method study. The purpose of this systematic review was to classify and analyze full-length papers published in five prominent worldwide journals in order to get a comprehensive understanding of the research methodologies used in the field of psychology. The findings of the study revealed the use of several methodologies in the selected articles, elucidating the manner in which these methodologies were employed and the specific subjects they were applied to, therefore providing insight into the rationale behind their implementation. The findings should be interpreted as offering a glimpse into the application of the methodology and should not be seen as fully indicative of the aforementioned objective owing to the restricted sample size. To the best of our understanding, this research study is the first attempt to investigate the subject matter from this particular perspective. The objective of our discourse is to foster a constructive trajectory with regards to the basic ramifications of methodological use in the field of psychology, specifically within the realm of academia (Holloway, 2008). In terms of the used methodologies, our study adhered to the existing literature and utilized established research procedures (Grant and Booth, 2009; Maree, 2016), with variations seen in the extent of their implementation. Quantitative research has been widely acknowledged as the prevailing approach, as shown by scholarly works (Breen and Darlaston-Jones, 2010; Counsell and Harlow, 2017) and earlier investigations in several domains of psychology (Coetzee and Van Zyl, 2014). The enduring popularity of this research technique in psychology may be attributed to its long-standing history as the first methodology used by researchers (Leech et al., 2007), as well as the contemporary utilization of mathematical methodologies in current research practices (Toomela, 2010). Regardless of the circumstances, our findings indicate that despite the increasing prevalence of qualitative research (Demuth, 2015; Smith and McGannon, 2018), quantitative research continues to be the preferred option for article publication in major academic publications. Although it is said that the enclosed journals are receptive to submissions using various research methodologies. This observation might perhaps be attributed to the novelty of qualitative research



CURRENT SCIENCE

as a technique (Burman and Whelan, 2011) or to the heightened expectations placed on qualitative research by evaluators (Bluhm et al., 2011). There is a need for further investigations to explore potential biases in the dissemination of research methodologies. Furthermore, doing another study using a distinct sample to examine the purported expansion of qualitative research may lead to contrasting findings.

The prevalence of research studies has shifted away from multi-method and mixed-method approaches. Grant and Booth (2009) argue that the popularity of reviews is influenced by factors such as heightened awareness and improved efficacy in research funding allocation, as well as the demand for journal submissions. The scarcity of mixed method studies is in opposition to the prevailing notion in the academic literature that mixed method research is the third most often used research approach (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). The limited occurrence seen in this particular sample might perhaps be attributed to divergent perspectives on mixed methods (Gunasekare, 2015), authors' inclination to publish in journals that specifically focus on mixed methods, or the method's relatively recent emergence (Ivankova et al., 2016). Although the occurrence of mixed methods design in papers was few, its use was consistently characterized by methodological clarity. Conversely, the same level of clarity was not seen in the utilization of other research methodologies. Moreover, a considerable body of research has used a blend of techniques that do not fall under the category of mixed or multi-method studies.

The research conducted by Gunasekare (2015) demonstrates the tendency to disregard perceived fixed limits in the literature in order to investigate the objective of a study, which may lead to the development of a novel and valuable perspective on the world. Toomela (2010) posits that such occurrences are not uncommon and may be conceptualized as a kind of "structural systemic science." This can be seen, for instance, in the use of qualitative methods (observation) within the context of quantitative investigations (experimental design). Based on the obtained outcome, it is advisable to conduct more inquiry into this phenomenon and its ramifications for research methodologies, including multiple and mixed approaches. The comprehension of the use of these research approaches posed some challenges. Regarding the matter of sampling, it is observed that a majority of research, regardless of their chosen methodology, make reference to inclusion and exclusion criteria, however fail to provide a definite sample approach.



CURRENT SCIENCE

The findings of this study have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the existing body of literature and scholarly discourse. It is worth noting that the majority of the cases used in this research are drawn from the researchers' respective academic institutions (Peterson & Merunka, 2014; Laher, 2016). The inclusion of examples pertaining to relevance and the active involvement of students as participants in research studies prompts inquiries on the extent to which the findings may be generalized and used in other contexts (Peterson & Merunka, 2014). The significance of attending to sampling arises from the potential detrimental impact of improper sampling on the credibility of remarks (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2017). The study encourages future research to explore the reasons for the prevalent usage of convenience examples and its possible ramifications in the area of psychology. This line of inquiry may provide valuable insights. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that Table 6 indicates that the papers often use study designs that are not commonly utilized. This finding underscores the pressing issue of the inadequate level of rigor in the provided example. Ensuring the rigorous use of the empirical method is crucial for advancing psychology as a scientific discipline (American Psychological Association, 2020). The practice of withholding some aspects of the research process, which might potentially enhance the research abilities of others, warrants scrutiny. Additionally, it is important to assess the implications of such omissions on the replication of research findings. The rejection of publications often occurs due to insufficient rigor in the applied techniques and designs (Fonseca, 2013; Laher, 2016), hence necessitating the provision of enhanced clarity and information on the implementation of methodologies. Repetition is an essential component within the realm of scientific study and necessitates the comprehensive articulation of the used methodologies (Drotar, 2010, p. 804). The limited extent of complete disclosure may be attributed to the specific guidelines imposed by some academic publications, which mandate the reporting of certain elements pertaining to the research process, notably in the context of applied design (Laher, 20). According to the Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS-Quant) established by the American Psychological Association (APA), it is mandatory to provide explicit references to sample and designs in research articles (Appelbaum et al., 2018). Individuals who possess little understanding of the procedures involved in conducting a study deprive themselves of a significant chance to enhance the credibility of their research, enhance the understanding of others, and make essential contributions to the advancement of psychology and



CURRENT SCIENCE

methodology in its whole. In the present research investigation, our findings were confined to the stated instances and designs only. This observation suggests that certain designs, such as cross-sectional designs, are favored in the context of quantitative investigations. The process of collecting and analyzing data is often articulated in a transparent manner.

One significant outcome was the multifaceted use of surveys. Researchers use a variety of techniques to perform surveys, including survey interviews, internet surveys, and printed surveys, which are often utilized across diverse research methodologies. This observation may serve as a potential area of focus for future academic investigations. Our study has identified a new sector known as "psychological practice" based on the domains in which these strategies are used. This outcome perhaps suggests a heightened level of consciousness among researchers about their role within the research process (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003), as well as its implications for psychological practice and the generation of knowledge. Social psychology emerged as the prevailing subject of interest, garnering significant attention in scholarly publications and educational circles, so attesting to the substantial backing and prominence it has within the realm of psychology (Chrysochoou, 2015). According to Deangelis (2017), the American Psychological Association (APA) has seen a growing emphasis within the field of psychology on the impact of social factors on individuals' health. This study has several limitations that should be considered. This study used a sample of five distinct journals in order to fulfill the research study's objectives. However, it is important to acknowledge that the inclusion of these particular journals introduces a potential bias and restricts the generalizability of the research methodologies just to those published in these selected journals, despite their stated general goals on the respective journal websites.

Obtaining a more extensive collection of publications from another time period, or selecting a single journal over a lengthier time period, might potentially provide divergent findings. Another constraint arises from the use of Excel spreadsheets and electronic systems for storing articles, which entails a manual procedure and thus introduces the possibility of errors (Bandara et al., 2015). In order to address this possible concern, a widely used coding technique was used with the aim of minimizing the occurrence of errors.

No statement is made on the applicability of any certain technique or if the described methods align with the requirements of the used methods. Hence, the absence of a clearly stated



CURRENT SCIENCE

study technique or design in several papers may have an impact on the outcomes of this review. However, this outcome in and of itself was a noteworthy achievement. Subsequent investigations might potentially explore the research methodologies used in a broader selection of academic journals, using an interpretive review tool to enhance the level of rigor in the analysis. Furthermore, the authors advocate for the future use of systematic review designs as a means to promote a streamlined approach in adopting this methodology. This research study presents an analysis of the use of research methodologies in scholarly journals within the subject of psychology, along with recommendations for potential avenues of future research derived from these findings. This study aims to elucidate the intricate inquiries raised in the existing body of literature about the utilization, application, and acquisition rationales of various research procedures. In this instance, a preference was shown for quantitative approaches, using an easy sampling technique, while also highlighting the absence of detailed explanations for the other procedures. The example provides a tabulated presentation of the approaches that are expressly specified. This tabulation serves the purpose of facilitating researchers' comprehension of both the frequently used methods and the overall utilization patterns of these methods. The inadequate and insufficient disclosure of research techniques in scholarly journals has been extensively observed throughout all stages of the research process, and is potentially crucial in resolving the ongoing replication dilemma in the field of psychology. The purpose of providing recommendations for future study was to stimulate further investigation into the practical significance of the findings within the field of psychology. These recommendations included areas such as publication bias and the use of suitable cases. There is an increasing body of data suggesting that engaging in research within clinical practice has the potential to enhance the quality of clinical service delivery (Mckeon et al, 2013). Moreover, such research endeavors have been associated with better physical health outcomes and increased rates of survival (Nickerson et al, 2014; Özdemir et al, 2015; Rochon, du Bois, & Lange, 2014). Clinical psychologists primarily get training in the 'scientist-practitioner paradigm', which equips them with the skills necessary to provide psychological treatments as well as engage in research activities such as developing, conducting, analyzing, and interpreting studies (Holtum & Goble, 2006; Stricker, 2002). However, despite the fact that research outputs are a mandatory component of doctorate education, the integration of post-qualification psychological research into clinical practice is not often seen (Mitchell & Gill, 2014;



CURRENT SCIENCE

Morton, Patel & Parker, 2008). According to many studies (Barrom, Shadish, & Montgomery, 1988; Eke, Holttum, & Hayward, 2012; Norcross, Karpiak, & Santoro, 2005), there has been no significant growth in the average number of publications among clinical psychologists for over two decades. It is noteworthy that the prevailing number of publications remains at zero.

One potential explanation for the low publishing rates seen in this context is a perceived lack of connection with the position of a 'researcher' and a corresponding resistance to adopting the scientist-practitioner paradigm (Gelso, 1993; Newman & McKenzie, 2011). Nevertheless, it is crucial to expand the conceptual framework of the term 'research activity' beyond solely generating peer-reviewed publications. This expansion should encompass research consumption activities such as engaging with relevant literature, evaluating guidelines, and staying updated with the latest advancements in the respective field. Although service evaluation and audit are not explicitly included in the formal research definition, they can still be considered as forms of research due to their purpose of assessing and evaluating the quality of available care. Service evaluation focuses on identifying and judging the existing care, while audit aims to provide insights into delivering optimal care by comparing it to a predetermined standard. Therefore, it is reasonable to classify service evaluation and audit as research activities. The user did not provide any text. Nevertheless, Cooper and Graham (2009) contend that clinical psychologists may not feel entirely at ease while engaging in service assessment and monitoring endeavors.

The research endeavors within the field of clinical psychology include several aspects such as typologies, requirements, aims, and the possible engagement of team members. These activities entail the ongoing or time-limited gathering of data pertaining to a specific facet of clinical practice, as well as the subsequent assessment and enhancement of that practice to ascertain its adherence to a pre-established benchmark. Nevertheless, this explanation only offers a partial understanding of the restricted research productivity seen among psychologists in clinical practice. Regrettably, the existing body of literature exploring the underlying factors contributing to this phenomenon is scarce. McHugh and Byrne (2011) identified many limitations, such as the prioritization of clinical duties, limited time availability, and inadequate finance. Indeed, a significant majority of responders, exceeding 80%, identified time constraints or the demanding



CURRENT SCIENCE

nature of clinical duties as impediments to engaging in research endeavors. According to a recent study done by Mitchell and Gill (2014), a significant proportion of research undertaken inside the National Health Service (NHS) lacked sufficient financing. Similarly, prior studies in the United States indicated that over 40% of all research was conducted without enough financial support.

According to Silberman and Snyderman (1997), a significant proportion of studies that lack funding, namely 60%, are conducted by academics on their own time (Schroter, Tite, & Kassem, 2006). Prior studies have shown that healthcare professionals, regardless of their research activity level, identified their proficiency in seeking funds as their least developed competence. McHugh and Byrne (2011) posited that a dearth of practical experience resulting from constrained financing possibilities might potentially exacerbate deficiencies in skills acquisition. Clinicians encounter the challenging endeavor of incorporating research under the constraints of restricted time, limited resources, and often without the backing or motivation from their surrounding colleagues. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that our research ability not only enhances clinical performance and health outcomes, but also amplifies our professional visibility and impact inside this particular domain. Given the multitude of advantages and obstacles, it is necessary to contemplate tactics that might enhance the conduct of research. Our team has drawn upon our extensive clinical and research expertise across many settings to elucidate the key aspects that might impact the effective creation and integration of research into clinical practice. The consultation of relevant literature is undertaken in order to examine the empirical evidence supporting these characteristics and to provide guidance on strategies for addressing possible obstacles.

One of the contributing variables that might enhance the execution of research projects is their integration into broader occupational responsibilities. When psychologists are in the process of pursuing post-qualification roles or contemplating a move in their current positions, it is beneficial to carefully evaluate the inclusion of research components or particular projects within their work descriptions. The integration of research activity into the broader framework of tasks and responsibilities for a given job not only enables its execution, but also reflects the service's stance on the significance of this facet of clinical psychologists' expertise. In cases when research



CURRENT SCIENCE

is not explicitly addressed, it is advisable to inquire about potential possibilities, since it is plausible that such opportunities may exist to some extent. Increased exploration of research possibilities within assignments by psychologists might enhance the overall acknowledgment of research abilities as an essential element of the profession's offerings. It is worth mentioning that this particular technique is not limited to those actively seeking new employment. It is recommended that psychologists broaden their perspective and explore research possibilities within the framework of job planning meetings, the drafting of job descriptions for vacancies, or during yearly assessments.

Scope of the Research Project

One crucial aspect to consider is the choice of the study project. The dimensions and context of the service may render larger-scale investigations unfeasible due to resource constraints. Additionally, doing original research necessitates through a formal ethical review process, which may be time-consuming and hence less viable. Nevertheless, based on our collective experience, we have found that initiatives that lack quick discernible effect tend to be the most challenging to execute within the confines of normal clinical environments. While there is a prevalent argument emphasizing the intrinsic value of knowledge advancement, clinical services must navigate several conflicting goals. Consequently, they may only viably allocate resources to initiatives that have a high probability of directly enhancing service delivery and/or benefiting service users. Hence, it is advisable for clinicians to prioritize the development of research initiatives that center on patient needs and/or service enhancement, since such endeavors are more likely to get support from healthcare services and clinical teams.

Administrative Support

Based on our empirical observations, it has been shown that research endeavors pertaining to quality practices are significantly dependent on the provision of management assistance. The inclusion of team leaders, service managers, or service heads in the project seems to enhance its



CURRENT SCIENCE

feasibility, particularly in the stages of planning and development. Clinicians are advised to initiate communication with management from the inception of a research endeavor, in order to articulate their views, interests, and objectives, so influencing the direction of the project and promoting enhanced cooperation. Broaching the topic of allocating an adequate amount of time for research may present a delicate matter when engaging in discussions with management, particularly in light of the demanding workload and clinical obligations. Nevertheless, considering the aforementioned advantages and acknowledging its significance as a fundamental talent within our field, we strongly advocate for the dedicated allocation of time specifically designated for research purposes. According to a study conducted by the Research and Education Foundation in 2004, it was found that around 45% of health professionals who engage in research activities reported the need to dedicate a significant portion or the whole of their non-working hours to conduct their research. Our contention is that including research effort into a program that is already at full capacity is an unreasonable expectation. Furthermore, such an inclusion runs the danger of diminishing the value of these talents within our field. Hence, it is recommended that managers be provided with a concise overview of the project. This overview should include the following elements:

- (1) This section provides an overview of the existing problem or unresolved issue, along with its potential ramifications.*
- (2) The subsequent section outlines the potential advantages that would be realized by service users and the broader service if the project is successfully executed.*
- (3) This portion elucidates the specific methodologies to be employed, encompassing the necessary time and resources, with a preference for minimal disruption to routine service provision.*
- (4) Additionally, it is important to establish a timeframe for the project and its subsequent distribution. Optimizing Research Time: Strategies for Efficiency and Productivity*

The allocation of time for research endeavors within the constraints of a demanding clinical service is a challenging task. Although we recognize the challenges associated with implementation, we highly advise striving to establish precise timelines for doing research



CURRENT SCIENCE

activities, wherever feasible. Our study indicates that an efficient approach to optimizing time allocation is to consider working in other locations, if available. This practice aids in enhancing the precision of the study length and functions as a tangible reminder for both the researcher and other personnel involved. According to Kearns and Gardiner (2007), this particular technique has the potential to mitigate distractions and interruptions, which in turn might diminish the perceived efficacy. Clinicians may also choose to contemplate the use of technologies, such as collaborative calendars, which may effectively communicate to the broader team the allocation of research time. In order to enhance the research activity's consistency within the service, it is advisable to consider arranging it on a predetermined, recurring day and time, if feasible. It is noteworthy that psychologists have the potential to integrate their research efforts with their therapeutic obligations, indicating that a total separation between the two is not always required. Certain types of research projects, such as case studies or case series, interviews with service users, or single case experimental designs, exhibit a higher level of integration with routine clinical service delivery. Consequently, these projects necessitate a lesser amount of dedicated research time. This can be observed in studies conducted by Kaur, Murphy, and Smith (2016), Ladd, Luiselli, and Baker (2009), and Thew and Krohnert (2015). In healthcare settings, research programs need a certain degree of marketing. Once the necessary backing from management has been pursued and anticipated, it is advantageous to publicly declare the project's initiation. This may be accomplished via many means such as internal presentations, engaging in dialogues with service users, and disseminating information through service newsletters, magazines, or social media platforms. It has been seen that initiatives experience significant advantages as a result of increased exposure and, to a certain degree, enhanced legitimacy. In order to maintain a high level of visibility, it is essential to broaden the marketing strategy over the whole of the project. This may be accomplished by providing concise updates on the project's progress and dedicating time to provide feedback on the outcomes, especially to personnel who may have had a role in participant recruitment.

Additionally, it is important to exert influence on the culture of a service in order to foster greater receptiveness towards future research endeavors. The provision of financial resources for a particular purpose, commonly referred to as funding, is a Certain study may need a certain level of financial support in order to acquire essential equipment or resources, compensate clinicians for



CURRENT SCIENCE

their time, employ a research assistant, and effectively navigate the very competitive landscape of grant applications. It is important to note, however, that not all projects will require money.

Conclusion

Although funding can be a significant obstacle in certain research contexts, it is important to highlight that it is not a prerequisite for a research project to be successful. Particularly when there is enthusiasm and backing from the immediate clinical team, such as residents, interns, or a proficient individual, research endeavors can thrive even without financial resources. It is worth mentioning that in cases when financial assistance is being pursued, there are many services and trusts that provide funding opportunities to assist in the development of new research projects. These funding sources are especially inclined towards projects that aim to introduce innovative approaches or enhance the delivery of interventions for service users, with a focus on achieving greater effectiveness and efficiency. It is advisable to establish a tight collaboration with local Research and creation departments, as they may provide valuable guidance on financing prospects and provide insights into the overall creation and implementation of projects. Research projects conducted during clinical training programs often include individual investigations with a limited number of supervisors, but post-qualification research endeavors may prioritize collaborative efforts. The integration of services may occur both inside and across different healthcare providers, and establishing connections between clinical services and academic institutions has shown to be advantageous in many cases. In this context, clinicians have the opportunity to leverage the research proficiency and guidance provided by academics, while academics can gain valuable insights from the practical expertise and knowledge of clinicians. Additionally, academics may establish connections with service users who express interest in participating in research studies, further enhancing the potential benefits of collaboration (Lampropoulos et al., 2002). For instance, engagement with academic departments provides the opportunity to conduct autonomous assessments of regional clinical services and build a systematic approach and methodologies for continuous data gathering. On a more limited scope, prospective cooperation may include the supervision of research endeavors undertaken by clinical interns and young postgraduate scholars.

21

**THIS JOURNAL INCLUDED IN MANY INDEXES, INCLUDING
ADVANCED SCIENCES INDEX. ADVANCED SCIENCES INDEX (ASI)
EUROPEAN SCIENCE EVALUATION CENTER WHERE TOGETHER
KIRCHSTRASSE 4.56761 | RHINELAND-PALATINATE, GERMANY
PHONE: +49(177) 8684-353 PHONE: +49(177) 8684-353 EMAILS:
ASI@EUROPE.DE**



CURRENT SCIENCE

Collaborative endeavors have the potential to alleviate the burden placed on individual researchers, while concurrently facilitating the sustained progress of a research undertaking that is collectively pursued by numerous individuals. It is possible that individuals may be inclined to contribute to the project in an informal manner, such as aiding in recruitment or general administrative tasks. During the initial phases of projects, it is advantageous to deliberate on the extent of involvement of various collaborators and devise practical strategies to ensure effective communication and timely dissemination of relevant tasks. The timely completion of tasks and the systematic tracking of advancements Although an expected schedule for the project is often established at the outset, we have seen that establishing deadlines for various stages of the project may effectively facilitate its advancement and mitigate the risk of it being overshadowed or overlooked by the introduction of the new service. High-level priorities or duties. Undoubtedly, a certain level of adaptability will perpetually be necessary; but it may prove advantageous to adhere to a mutually established timetable and, if feasible, enlist an individual exterior to the undertaking to oversee its advancement, such as a supervisor or guide.

References

Adorno, TW, Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, DJ & Sanford, RN (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper.

Ainsworth, MDS, Blehar, MC, Waters, E. & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Albury, D. & Schwartz, J. (1982). Partial progress: The politics of science and technology. London: PlutoPress.

Allport, GW (1942). The use of personal documents in psychological science. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Allport, GW (1962). The general and the unique in psychological science. Journal of Personality, 30, 405–422.



CURRENT SCIENCE

Altman, J. (1974). Observational study of behaviour: Sampling methods. *Behaviour*, 49, 227–267.

American Psychological Association (1947). Recommended graduate training in clinical psychology. *American Psychologist*, 2, 539–558.

Bruce, V. (1990). Ethics committees. *The Psychologist*, 3, 463–464.

Bryant, CGA (1985). *Positivism in social theory and research*. London: Macmillan.

Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and quality in social research*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Butcher, JN (1999). Research design in objective personality assessment. In PC Kendall,

Campbell, DT & Fiske, DW (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81–105.

Campbell, DT & Stanley, JC (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Campbell, R. & Wasco, SM (2000). Feminist approaches to social science: Epistemological and methodological tenets. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 773–791.

Cape, J. (1991). Quality assurance methods for clinical psychology services. *The Psychologist*, 4, 499–503.

Hunter, JE & Schmidt, FL (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. London: George Allen & Unwin. (Original German edition, 1913.)

Imber, SD, Glanz, LM, Elkin, I., Sotsky, SM, Boyer, JL & Leber, WR (1986). Ethical issues in psychotherapy research: Problems in a collaborative clinical trials study. *American Psychologist*, 41, 137–146.



CURRENT SCIENCE

JN Butcher & GN Holmbeck (eds), Handbook of research methods in clinical psychology (2nd edn). New York: Wiley.

Jackson, PR (1996). Analyzing data. In G. Parry & FN Watts (eds), Behavioral and mental health research: A handbook of skills and methods (2nd edn). Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jacobson, NS & Truax, P. (1991). Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining meaningful change in psychotherapy research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 12–19

Krupnik, JL & Pincus, HA (1992). The cost-effectiveness of psychotherapy: A plan for research. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 149, 1295–1305.

Kuhn, TS (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd edn). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kurz, DE (1983). The use of participant observation in evaluation research. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 6, 93–102.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse*. New York: Academic Press.

Laing, RD (1959). *The divided self: An existential study in sanity and madness*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Nisbett, RE & Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nisbett, RE & Wilson, TD (1977). Telling more than we know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84, 231–239.



CURRENT SCIENCE

Nunnally, JC & Bernstein, IH (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd edn).

New York: McGraw Hill.

O'Sullivan, KR & Dryden, W. (1990). A survey of clinical psychologists in the South East Thames Health Region: Activities, role and theoretical orientation. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 29, 21–26.

Oakes, M. (1986). Statist Russell, B. (1961). *History of Western philosophy*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Rust, J. & Golombok, S. (1999). *Modern psychometrics: The science of psychological assessment 2nd edn*. London: Routledge.

Sackett, DL, Richardson, WS, Rosenberg, W. & Haynes, RB (1997). *Evidence-based medicine: How to practice and teach CPA*. New York: Churchill Livingstone.

Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, EA & Jefferson, G. (1974). The simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.

Tukey, JW (1977). *Exploratory data analysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

van Dijk, TA (ed.) (1997a). *Discourse as structure and process: Discourse studies (Vol. 1)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

van Dijk, TA (ed.) (1997b). *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies (Vol. 2)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Varvin, S. & Stiles, WB (1999). Emergence of severe traumatic experiences: An assimilation analysis of psychoanalytic therapy with a political refugee. *Psychotherapy Research*, 9, 381–404.



CURRENT SCIENCE

Walsh, R., Perrucci, A. & Severns, J. (1999). What's in a good moment: A hermeneutic study of psychotherapy values across levels of psychotherapy training. *Psychotherapy Research*, 9, 304–326.

Young, M. & Willmott, P. (1957). *Family and kingship in East London*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Young, RM (1979). Why are figures so significant? The role and critique of quantification. In J. Irvine, I. Miles & J. Evans (eds), *Demystifying social statistics*. London: Pluto Press.

Zeldin, T. (1994). *An intimate history of humanity*. New York: HarperCollins.

Zimbardo, PG (1973). On the ethics of interventions in human psychological research: With special reference to the Stanford prison experiment. *Cognition*, 2, 243–256.