Minority Fellowship Program

The National Board for Certified Counselors

Building Professional Excellence (Part 10 Session 2)

Writing a Rigorous Quantitative Methodology Section in Counseling Research

Webinar Follow-up Question and Answer Session With Mike Kalkbrenner, PhD, NCC

Question from Anonymous:

Perhaps the speaker will get to this, but I am wondering if tips for infusing cultural competence and social justice into quantitative methodology sections could be shared or explored.

Answer from Presenters:

Yes! The first thing that comes to mind is the importance of cross-cultural fairness considerations in selecting the instrumentation (see the PowerPoint and the "Cross-Cultural Fairness and Norming" section in the article that the presentation was based on: https://doi.org/10.15241/mtk.12.3.217). In addition to the commentary in the article, I also encourage researchers to consider the utility of creating and validating scores on new instruments within the context of a diverse culture rather than confirming scores on American-based tools. On one hand, internal structure validity is powerful and, at least partially, supports the cross-cultural fairness of scores. However, factor analysis does not take content validity into account. The same sentiment can be applied to counseling interventions (i.e., testing the utility of American-based interventions in other cultures vs. creating novel, culturally-based homegrown interventions).

Question from Anonymous:

Can we also do two separate 2-way ANOVA, one for depression, and another for anxiety? Or we have to use 2-way MANOVA?

Answer from Presenters:

Great question! It's depends on whether the data meet the statistical assumption of an absence of multicollinearity (a statistical issue in which the variables are so highly correlated that it's redundant to enter them into the same analysis). An absence of multicollinearity in the data is important because MANOVA combines the dependent variables into a linear variate/discriminant function. MANOVA assumes the dependent variables are correlated, however, not excessively correlated. In this example, if the correlation between the anxiety and depression variables is greater than .80 (or .90 depending on who you cite for the threshold), multicollinearity might be present in the data. If multicollinearity is present in the data, I'd recommend computing two separate ANOVAs. However, if multicollinearity is absent (and the data meet the rest of MANOVA's assumptions), I'd recommend computing a MANOVA. See the following article for more information about multicollinearity and the other statistical assumptions of MANOVA: https://doi.org/10.1177/15210251221123041