

RESEARCH IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
Psychology 395
Fall 2018
4:-5:20 PM Tuesday/Thursday
HH 119

Instructor: Dr. Igor Grossmann

Office: PAS 3047

Office Hours: Tuesday 2 – 3:30 or by appointment.

Phone: 888-4567, ext. 31793 Email address: igrossma@uwaterloo.ca

TA: Ethan Meyers

Office: PAS 4043

Office Hours: Monday 1:00-2:00pm or by appointment. Email address: emeyers@uwaterloo.ca

Course Aims

By the end of this course: (1) you should be competent consumers of the social psychological research, able to critically evaluate empirical articles as well as media messages about research findings; (2) you should be prepared to conduct your own social psychological research.

Background Reading

Your Psychology 29X textbook (or any textbook of research methods for the social sciences).

Also, you will need to use APA formatting in this course that adheres to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Posted on LEARN is a useful reference link to basics of APA formatting from the Purdue Writing Lab (also [here](#)).

Course Assessment

Central elements of this course include weekly seminars structured around a series of prescribed readings, and group research projects. The assigned readings for each week are organized around a particular methodology or issue, which students will explore through intensive discussion in the classroom. Group projects will provide students the opportunity to apply what they have learned by designing and conducting their very own research investigation. In both cases, regular, meaningful participation and group work is required for success.

Assessment	Date	Weight
Discussion Participant		10%
Discussion Leader		15%
Article critique	Sept 22	10%
Quiz	Sept 25	<i>Bonus 3%</i>
Ethics	Sept 27	5%
Group Project 1	Oct 2	10%
Group Project 2	Oct 16	10%
Individual p-checker report	Nov 06	5%
Replication Project Group Presentation	Nov 20 & 22	10%
Poster Fair	Dec 3	10%
Project Paper (incl. report of analyses)	Dec 6	15%

Late assignments will be docked 5% each day they are late.

Course Components

Quiz. During the second class session, we will have a quiz on basic research methods concepts. See the list of concepts below (as well as in the lecture notes for the first lecture). The quiz will

involve applying the concepts to a short empirical article. If you earn more than 80%, you will get 3 bonus points towards your grade.

The present course consists of a combination of short lecture-style introductions, group discussions, hands-on workshops, student-led discussion sessions, and presentations in class and at a research fair. Notably, throughout the class, the course benefits from lively participation. I elaborate on several of the sections and grading breakdown below.

Discussions. Discussion sessions will take place on class dates with assigned readings. On some of the days (e.g., Sept 11, 13), discussions will happen in response to instructor’s materials or group presentations. On six other days (Sept 18, Oct 4, 18, 23, 25, 30; “Discussion” days from here on), the instructor will begin with a brief review (~10-15 min) of basic points related to that week’s topic. The review will be followed by a lively and engaging student-led group discussion that should focus on cultivating a deeper understanding of the assigned reading. For each of the six discussion days, a different group of students will act as discussion LEADERS while the rest of the class will contribute as discussion PARTICIPANTS. All students should take an active role in the discussion each and every week.

PARTICIPANTS (applicable to *all* course sessions): Seminar courses are meant to enhance student learning through discussion of ideas. As such, it is critical that each student participate regularly in the conversation. To prepare for each session, students should:

- READ the assigned article(s) carefully and summarize in writing the major ideas, issues, and conclusions.
- REFLECT on the issues raised in the assigned reading(s), and on their implications for future research.
- PREPARE a few specific and insightful questions, observations, criticisms, endorsements, etc.

Students who read, reflect, and prepare for each session should have plenty to share with the class during each session. Student participation will be assessed three ways:

- CONTRIBUTION is worth 1% each of the eight discussion-driven classes. After each session, either the instructor or the TA will evaluate each student on their contributions using the following rubric:

Absent	Present but no Contribution	Limited Contribution	Satisfactory Contribution	Meaningful Contribution
0	.25	.50	.75	1.00

- PREPARED DISCUSSION QUESTION (.20%): For six discussions, each student (except for discussion leaders) will prepare and submit one meaningful discussion question prior to each of the classes. The question must be submitted to the appropriate discussion forum on LEARN by 8am in order to earn .25% per class. Questions posted after the deadline will not be given credit, so it’s recommended to have your posting completed the night before.
- PEER EVALUATION (.13%): Each student will be responsible for evaluating the discussion leaders in the form of structured peer feedback.

LEADERS (applicable to six course sessions marked as *discussion* below): In groups of three or four, students will work together to be discussion leaders once during the term – topics to be assigned on the second day. You should meet with your group outside of class time to coordinate your content. Your written thoughts generated from READ, REFLECT, and PREPARE are a good base on which to build. This is not solely a presentation of read materials; you might choose to present some information as part of your seminar, but it should not take more than 20 min of your seminar. Your chief goal is to generate discussion based on the

assumption that everyone has READ, REFLECTED, and PREPARED for the seminar. Achieving success as a leader means stimulating the contributions of the other participants, not dominating the conversation yourself.

You should plan to lead the conversation for about one hour. There are many ways to accomplish this and you are free to be creative in your efforts. You should first create a lesson plan (examples available on LEARN) and then schedule an appointment with the instructor to refine your ideas. In developing your lesson plan, you should think carefully about what your learning outcomes are, and create activities and content tailored to achieve these outcomes. You should meet with the instructor at least two days before your seminar in order to implement feedback. Students will be assessed as discussion leaders by their peers; an example of the rubric is available on LEARN.

Projects & relevant presentations. In groups of ~4, you will work together with other students to complete three assignments and to make short presentations to the class on these assignments (projects 1- 2 and replication project). The goal of the projects 1-2 is to lead you through the basic steps of creating your own research projects. The goal of the replication project is to familiarize yourself with analysis and reporting of results in line with discussions in the field.

You should use PowerPoint or another presentation software and all members of the group must speak. Your project 1-2 presentations should review theoretical background, identify the research question, explain the methods utilized, and discuss weaknesses and limitations of the project. Your replication project presentation should review the research question, explain the method, report on the results, and discuss weaknesses and limitations of the project.

The grades will be assigned as follows: Each group of 4 students will be given a grade out of 40 on their presentation; groups of 3/5 students will be given a grade out of 30/50, respectively. You will then evaluate yourself and each group member's contribution to the presentation by assigning each person a grade out of 10. The sum of all individual grades cannot exceed the total number of points that you were assigned. For example, say your group receives a mark of 36/40. You will then have 36 points to divide amongst the group members. If everyone contributed equally, you may choose to assign each person an 8/10 (i.e., divide the points equally). If contributions were not equal, you may choose a different arrangement. For example, if you feel that someone else worked very hard on the presentation and you did not put as much effort into it, you may assign that person 10/10 and assign yourself a 6/10 (and then assign the remaining 16 points to your other group members accordingly for a total of 36 points). You will submit these ratings on LEARN after each presentation and they will be **confidential**. Peer ratings are due within one week of your presentation. Your final grade for each group presentation will be determined by averaging the ratings that you received from your group members (including yourself).

ETHICS ASSIGNMENT (5%): Each group will work on the ethics application for the replication project one is assigned to. Relevant materials will be discussed in class and presented on LEARN. Assignment of a grade to the ethics form submission will be performed group-wise (i.e., each group will receive one grade). Peer-evaluations will be used to distribute the grades, equivalent to the process of peer-evaluation described in the preceding paragraph.

PSYCH398 RESEARCH FAIR (10%): Each group will also create a poster. Your team will prepare a poster that summarizes either your Projects 1-2' hypothesis and methods or the results and conclusions of the Replication Project. The choice belongs to your group. These kind of presentations are common at professional scientific conferences. Posters will be presented together in conjunction with other sections of PSYCH39x on Thursday **December 3rd** between **2pm and 4pm**. During the poster session you will be asked to evaluate six of your peers' presentations from another section, and six students from the other section will evaluate your

poster. The average of these ratings will provide a grade out of 5. A teaching assistant from the other section will also evaluate your poster out of 5. Both these grades combined will produce a score out of 10. More details about how to prepare for the poster session, and how to evaluate peer projects will be provided later in the term. **THIS IS A MANDATORY COURSE EVENT. FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE WILL EARN A GRADE OF 0 ON THE POSTER PRESENTATION, SO MARK YOUR CALENDAR IMMEDIATELY.**

Individual papers. All individual assignments are to be submitted in the corresponding drop-box on LEARN.

ARTICLE CRITIQUE. You will evaluate an empirical article. Please prepare a 1-1.5-page outline summarizing the article. Follow the example of the outline attached to this syllabus. Your papers must be typed, single-spaced, framed in 1-inch (2.5 cm) margins, and typed in 12-point font (i.e., the size of this font). Please turn in critiques online. Critiques will not be accepted after discussed in class.

P-CHECKER REPORT. You will select one of the papers from the topic relevant to the debate topic of your discussion group and perform p-checker analysis of this paper, as instructed in the class. Each student should pick a different multi-study paper for their analysis. Reports will follow a template provided by instructor in the second part of the course.

REPLICATION REPORT. The most important step in the scientific endeavour is to communicate one's findings to others. This not only allows others to learn about what you did and what you found, but to critically evaluate your research. Consequently, students will submit a 4-page report in APA format, which will document and discuss their learning experience from the replication project they will be engaged in. Replication projects will be announced early in the term. Although students will work in groups and share data, and are encouraged to consult with one another and to proof read each other's work, each student will submit his or her own original report. Specific guidelines for content, format and rubric of the replication report will be provided in the second half of the course.

Use of official UW email

Students are responsible for all e-mail that is sent to the official uWaterloo email address. Check e-mail regularly for important and time sensitive messages. See [Statement on official student e-mail address](#) for further details e.g., procedures and warnings regarding forwarding e-mail to other accounts

Attendance

Given the importance of class participation, class attendance for each *entire* class session is mandatory. For every 10 minutes absent, you will be docked 5% off your class participation mark. The whole class will count on each of you to show up! You will be allowed to miss 3 classes (excluding the first class) without penalty. Note: Even if you are absent, you are still responsible for contributing to group work, and finding out what material was covered in class and any announcements. Any additional absences (beyond 3 classes) for entire class sessions will result in 20% off your class participation mark.

Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. See the [UWaterloo Academic Integrity webpage](#) and the [Arts Academic Integrity webpage](#) for more information.

Discipline: A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about "rules" for group work/collaboration should seek

guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under Policy 71 – Student Discipline. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to [Policy 71 - Student Discipline](#). For typical penalties check [Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties](#).

Concerns About a Course Policy or Decision

Informal Stage. We in the Psychology Department take great pride in the high quality of our program and our instructors. Though infrequent, we know that students occasionally find themselves in situations of conflict with their instructors over course policies or grade assessments. If such a conflict arises, the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs (Richard Eibach) is available for consultation and to mediate a resolution between the student and instructor: Email: reibach@uwaterloo.ca; Ph 519-888-4567 ext. 38790

Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read [Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances](#), Section 4. When in doubt, please be certain to contact Richard Eibach, the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs who will provide further assistance; reibach@uwaterloo.ca.

Appeals: A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline may be appealed if there is a ground. A student who believes he/she has a ground for an appeal should refer to [Policy 72 - Student Appeals](#).

Accommodation for Students with Disabilities

Note for students with disabilities: The [AccessAbility Services](#) office, located on the first floor of the Needles Hall extension (1401), collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the AS office at the beginning of each academic term.

Accommodation for course requirements

- Students requesting accommodation for course requirements (assignments, midterm tests, final exams, etc.) due to illness should do the following:
 - Consult the University's [examination regulations](#) for information about procedures and policies for requesting accommodations
 - seek medical treatment as soon as possible
 - obtain documentation of the illness with a completed uWaterloo [Verification of Illness Form](#)
 - submit that form to the instructor within 48 hours. Students in Centre for Extended Learning (CEL) courses must submit their confirmation of the illness to CEL.
 - (if possible) inform the instructor by the due date for the course requirement that you will be unable to meet the deadline and that documentation will be forthcoming.
- In the case of a missed assignment deadline, midterm test, or quiz, the instructor will either:
 - waive the course component and re-weight remaining term work as he/she deems fit according to circumstances and the goals of the course, or
 - provide an extension.

- In the case of bereavement, the instructor will provide similar accommodations to those for illness. Appropriate documentation to support the request will be required.
- Students who are experiencing extenuating circumstances should also inform their academic advisors regarding their personal difficulties.
- Elective arrangements such as travel plans are not acceptable grounds for granting accommodations to course requirements per the uWaterloo Examination Regulations and Related Matters.

Official version of the course outline

If there is a discrepancy between the hard copy outline (i.e., if students were provided with a hard copy at the first class) and the outline posted on LEARN, the outline on LEARN will be deemed the official version. Outlines on LEARN may change as instructors develop a course, but they become final as of the first class meeting for the term.

Cross-listed course

Please note that a cross-listed course will count in all respective averages no matter under which rubric it has been taken. For example, a PHIL/PSYCH cross-list will count in the Philosophy major average, even if the course was taken under the Psychology rubric.

Mental Health Services

Mental Health Services aim is to provide holistic programming and services to help you lead a healthy and balanced life. We strive to provide a secure, supportive environment for students of all orientations and backgrounds.

Students suffering from problems with anxiety, depression, problems with sleep, attention, obsessions or compulsions, relationship difficulties, severe winter blues, etc., may make an appointment by phone or in person. Appointments are usually available within two days of initial contact with one of our medical doctors. All contacts are completely confidential.

Contact Health Services

[Health Services Building](#)

Call 519-888-4096 to schedule an appointment

Call 1-866-797-0000 for free 24/7 advice from a health professional

Contact Counselling Services

[Needles Hall Addition, NH 2401](#)

Call 519-888-4567 x 32655 to schedule an appointment

counserv@uwaterloo.ca

Concerns About the Course or Instructor (Informal Stage)

We in the Psychology Department take great pride in the high quality of our program and our instructors. Though infrequent, we know that students occasionally find themselves in situations of conflict with their instructors over course policies or grade assessments. If such a conflict arises, the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Affairs (Dr. Richard Eibach) is available for consultation and to mediate a resolution between the student and instructor. Dr. Eibach's contact information is as follows: Email: reibach@uwaterloo.ca. A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. See Policy 70 and 71 below for further details.

Student Success Office

The Student Success Office at the University of Waterloo, located on the second floor of South Campus Hall, offers tutoring, workshops, success coaching, and a variety of other resources for students looking for guidance to be successful in university. Their home page is:

<https://uwaterloo.ca/student-success/>

Writing Centre

The Writing Centre, located on the second floor of South Campus Hall, works across all faculties to help students clarify their ideas, develop their voices, and communicate in the style appropriate to their disciplines. Writing Centre staff offer one-on-one support in planning assignments, using and documenting research, organizing papers and reports, designing presentations and e-portfolios, and revising for clarity and coherence.

You can make multiple appointments throughout the term, or drop in at either the Dana Porter or Davis Centre libraries for quick questions or feedback. Group appointments for team-based projects, presentations, and papers are also available. To book a 50-minute appointment and to see drop.

Term Schedule

<u>Date</u>	<u>Wk</u>	<u>In-Class Topic</u>	<u>Readings / Due dates Unless otherwise noted, electronic assignments due on LEARN by 11PM of the day before the class.</u>
Sept 6	1	Course Overview Icebreaker, Course Syllabus	
Sept 11	2	Review and how to read and critique articles Review of basic concepts	Lecture notes &/or textbook from previous research methods course(s) Yarkoni, T. (2009). Parable of Zoltan . http://www.talyarkoni.org/blog/2009/12/22/the-parable-of-zoltan-and-his-twelve-sheep-or-why-a-little-skepticism-goes-a-long-way/
Sept 13 (SHORT session - starts LATE at 4:45 PM)		How to critique research articles	Jordan, C. H. & Zanna M. P. (1999). <i>How to read a journal article in Social Psychology</i> . In R. Baumeister (ed.). <i>The self in Social Psychology</i> . Philadelphia: Psychology Press. Prepare practice article critique, <u>following guidelines at the end of the syllabus</u> , <i>bring your practice critique to class</i> and be ready to discuss it in class.
Sept 18	3	Discussion: Generating Research Ideas Brainstorming on generating ideas Introduction of project 1 & project 1 group work	Nisbett, R.E. (1990) The Anticreativity Letters: Advice from a senior tempter to a junior tempter. <i>American Psychologist</i> . Link http://neuron4.psych.ubc.ca/~schaller/528Readings/Nisbett1990.pdf Link McGuire, W. J. (1997). Creative hypothesis generating in psychology: Some useful heuristics. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> , 48, 1-30. Fiske, S.T. (2004). Mind the gap: In praise of informal sources of formal theory. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i> . Wyer, R.S. (2004). A personalized theory of theory construction. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i> .
Sept 20		<i>Workshop</i> : Ethics & familiarizing oneself with replication projects. Goal : submit ethics for empirical projects	<u>Article critique due Sept 22st, 11pm.</u> Tri-Council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans. Link http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2-2014/TCPS_2_FINAL_Web.pdf Psychology/Honour's ethics guidelines

			Link https://uwaterloo.ca/psychology/current-undergraduate-students/psychology-courses/honours-thesis-psych-499/honours-thesis-handbook-20162017#Obtaining ethics clearance for research with human or animal participants UW Ethics application guidelines Link Link https://uwaterloo.ca/research/office-research-ethics/research-human-participants/pre-submission-and-training/human-research-ethics-training
Sept 25	4	<i>Quiz</i> Go over Article Critique <i>Project 1 group work</i>	
Sept 27		<i>Library orientation:</i> How to do lit search and use bib manager soft (@ Dana Porter – Lib 329)	Ethics due (for empirical project)
Oct 02 Oct 04	5	Project 1 presentations <i>Discussion: Research Design:</i> Review, Introduction of Project 2	Jordan, C. H. & Zanna M. P. (2007). <i>Not all experiments are created equal</i> . In R. J. Sternberg, D. Halpern, & H. L. Roediger (eds). <i>Critical thinking in psychology</i> . New York: Cambridge University Press. Cassar, A., & Friedman, D. (2004). <i>Economics lab: an intensive course in experimental economics</i> . Routledge. (Chapters 3-4). Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., & Fong, G. T. (2005). Establishing a causal chain: why experiments are often more effective than mediational analyses in examining psychological processes. <i>Journal of personality and social Psychology</i> , 89(6), 845-851. Link https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7378560_Establishing_a_Causal_Chain_Why_Experiments_Are_Often_More_Effective_Than_Mediational_Analyses_in_Examining_Psychological_Processes
Oct 09 Oct 11	6	READING BREAK (no class) Project 2 group work (supervised by TA)	
Oct 16	7	Project 2 presentations	
Oct 18		<i>Discussion: RepliGate</i>	Lawrence, P. A. (2007). The mismeasurement of science. <i>Current</i>

		<p><i>Biology</i>, 17, 583-585.</p> <p>Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. <i>PLoS Medicine</i>, 2, e124.</p> <p>Achenbach, J. (2015). The new scientific revolution: Reproducibility at last. <i>Washington Post</i> Link https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/the-new-scientific-revolution-reproducibility-at-last/2015/01/27/ed5f2076-9546-11e4-927a-4fa2638cd1b0_story.html</p> <p>Open Science Collaboration (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. <i>Science</i>, 349.</p> <p>Simonsohn, U. (2015). Small telescopes: Detectability and the evaluation of replication results. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 26, 559-569.</p>
<p>Oct 23</p>	<p>8</p> <p>Discussion: Replication debate Elderly priming / Bathing and loneliness Task: Isolate the main arguments (both good and probably not-so-good!) and formulate them succinctly. Prepare the Tweets/ Blog paragraphs / video excerpts that pinpoint the argument.</p>	<p>Elderly priming Bargh, J.A., Chen M., Burrows L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: direct effects of trait construct and stereotype-activation on action. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 71, 230-244.</p> <p>Ramscar, M., Shaoul, C., & Baayen, R.H. (2016). Why many priming results don't (and won't) replicate: A quantitative analysis Link http://psych.stanford.edu/~michael/papers/Ramscar-Shaoul-Baayen_replication.pdf</p> <p>Bathing and Loneliness Bargh, J. A., & Shalev, I. (2012). The substitutability of physical and social warmth in daily life. <i>Emotion</i>, 12(1).</p> <p>Donnellan, M.B., Lucas, R.E., & Cesario, J. (in press.). Warm water and loneliness redux: Rejoinder to Bargh and Shalev (2014). <i>Emotion</i>.</p>
<p>Oct 25</p>	<p>Discussion: Cleanliness & Morality / Ego-depletion Task: Isolate the main arguments (both good and probably not-so-good!) and formulate them succinctly.</p>	<p>Cleanliness & Morality Schnall, S., Benton, J., & Harvey, S. (2008). With a clean conscience. Cleanliness reduces the severity of moral judgments. <i>Psychological</i></p>

Prepare the Tweets/ Blog paragraphs / video excerpts that pinpoint the argument.

Science.
Meyer, M. N. & Chabris, C. (2014). Why Psychologists' food fight matters. *Slate*. [Link](http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2014/07/replication_controversy_in_psychology_bullying_file_drawer_effect_blog_posts.html)
http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2014/07/replication_controversy_in_psychology_bullying_file_drawer_effect_blog_posts.html

Ego-depletion

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: is the active self a limited resource?. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 74.
Hagger, M. S. & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2016). A multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.

Oct 30

9

Discussion: Facial feedback / Power-posing

Task: Isolate the main arguments (both good and probably not-so-good!) and formulate them succinctly. Prepare the Tweets/ Blog paragraphs / video excerpts that pinpoint the argument.

Facial feedback

Strack, F., Martin, L. L., & Stepper, S. (1988). Inhibiting and facilitating conditions of the human smile: a nonobtrusive test of the facial feedback hypothesis. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 54, 768-777.
Wagenmakers, E-J., Beek, T., Dijkhoff, L., & Gronau, Q. F. (2016), Registered Replication Report: WStrack, Martin, & Stepper (1988). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.

Power-posing

Cuddy, A. (2012). Your body language may shape who you are [video file]. [Link](#)
Simmons, J. P., & Simonsohn, U. (2017). Power posing: P-curving the evidence. *Psychological Science*, 28(5), 687-693.
Cuddy, A. J., Schultz, S. J., & Fosse, N. E. (2018). P-Curving a More Comprehensive Body of Research on Postural Feedback Reveals Clear Evidential Value For Power-Posing Effects: Reply to Simmons and Simonsohn (2017). *Psychological Science*, 29(4), 656-666. [Link](#)

Nov 01		Workshop: p-checker analysis "red flags" / cues for the trustworthiness of a study • p-curve • Find grey literature (e.g., blog posts with altmetric) Goal: Do a p-curve analysis	Schoenbrot, F. (2015). http://www.nicebread.de/in-the-era-of-repligate-what-are-valid-cues-for-the-trustworthiness-of-a-study/ http://www.altmetric.com/bookmarklet.php
Nov 06	10	Data analysis incl. effect size of the replication project	<u>Individual p-checker report due</u> Read relevant materials for the replication project
Nov 08			
Nov 13	11	Work on first draft of Results Report; prepare for next weeks' presentation of results	Submit draft results report to instructor
Nov 15		Prepare for presentation in the following week (supervised by the TA)	
Nov 20 & 22	12	Empirical Project Presentations	Submit final presentation slides to instructor
Nov 27	13	Course Wrap-up Final Reflections & Course Evaluations	
Nov 29		NO COURSE (SEE BELOW)	
Dec 3		PSYCH 39X Research Fair, 2-4 PM, Location: TBD	Individual replication project reports (incl. analyses) due Dec 6 .

QUIZ Terms you MUST know BEFORE this class, i.e., basic research concepts:

internal validity	manipulation vs. measurement
threats to internal validity	interaction
external validity	reliability of measures
construct validity	-internal consistency
experiment	-test-retest
correlational study	independent variable
demand characteristics	dependent variable
experimenter bias	continuous vs. categorical variables
between-subjects designs	operational definition
within-subject / repeated measures designs	confound
factorial design	error vs. bias
random assignment	

Article Critique Outline

(if the article includes multiple studies, **summarize only the assigned study, e.g., study 1**)

Your ID code: _____

Article reference: (e.g., Rosenberg et al., 1995—you don't need to include the rest of reference)

Authors' main hypothesis:

Why this issue is important (e.g., theoretical contribution, practical implications):

Main independent or predictor variables (**brief** descriptions):

Conceptual level—

Operational level—

Main dependent or outcome variables (**brief** descriptions):

Conceptual level—

Operational level—

Most important finding (or two):

Strengths of the study: (use point form)

Weaknesses of the study: (use point form)

Group Project #1

As a group, you are to come up with two variables (a predictor variable and a dependent variable) that you believe (based on experience or real-world observations) there to be a relation between, and are interested in understanding the relation between. The relation between these two variables must be causal in nature (according to your hypothesis), and relevant to social psychology. Your task is to operationalize both your independent and dependent variables in a true experimental design. That is, you need to decide how you can best manipulate your independent variable and measure your dependent variable. In doing so, you need to be precise. For your presentation—10 min maximum—please address the following questions:

For your presentation in the next class (10 min maximum), tell the class about the following:

1. What are your two variables at the conceptual level?
2. How do you think these two variables will relate? That is, what is your hypothesis?
3. Tell us how/why you developed your hypothesis. That is, what led you to believe your independent variable will be causally related to your dependent variable? (Hypotheses can come from anywhere; an existing theory, an example or story from your life, something you have observed, heard about, read, etc.)
4. What will the relation between these two variables tell us, if anything, about the human mind, social functioning, or social problems?
5. Provide an outline of a study to test this hypothesis.
 - a. How will you be manipulating your independent variable?
 - b. How will you measure your dependent variable? Why did you choose this particular measure? Please do not plan to use self-report measures to operationalize the dependent variables (i.e., do not ask participants questions).
6. What might potentially be confounded with your independent variable? That is, what might vary with your independent variable manipulation other than what you are interested in? If you don't think anything will vary between conditions other than what you are interested in say so, but, be warned, you're probably wrong. *Please make sure your answer to this question involves a confound that's a product of your operationalization--not something else in the context that would create a confound for any operationalization. Hint: Don't work so hard to rule out confounds that you can't identify a plausible one!*
7. Generally, we trust random assignment. But, if you could be sure that one individual difference variable was distributed equally between your conditions, what would it be? In other words, if not equally distributed between conditions, what individual difference variable might affect your dependent measure?

Group Project # 2

For your presentation (10 min maximum), please come up with a mediating variable. This is a mechanism through which your predictor variable affects your dependent variable—the link (or *a* link) in the causal chain between your predictor and dependent variable. Think of it as *why* your predictor variable has an effect on your dependent variable. (Or, at least as *part* of the reason why).

1. Describe why your original independent variable will affect your dependent variable.
2. In the experiment you described for Project 1 (or an improved version you created after class feedback), add a measure of your mediating variable.
3. Design a new experiment to test your mediating variable. That is, turn your proposed mediator into an independent variable and test its effects on your DV. You no longer have to worry about your original IV.

Extra materials for RepliGate & Debates

(desirable to skim through, particularly for discussion leaders in these four sessions)

RepliGate (debate-related links/texts apply as well)

Doris, J. (2014). <http://sometimesimwrong.typepad.com/wrong/2014/09/guest-post-by-john-doris.html>

Kahneman, D. (2012). Decision Science News: Kahneman on the storm of doubts surrounding social priming research. Retrieved from:

<http://www.decisionsciencenews.com/2012/10/05/kahneman-on-the-storm-of-doubts-surrounding-social-primingresearch/>

Yong, E. (2016). A Worrying trend for Psychology's "Simple little tricks". *Atlantic*. [Link](#)

Elderly priming

Yong, E. (2012). Not Exactly Rocket Science: A failed replication draws a scathing personal attack from a psychology professor (blog post). Retrieved from:

<http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/notrocketscience/2012/03/10/failed-replication-bargh-psychology-studydoyen/#.VSgSfRePI7g>

Bargh, J. (2012). Psychology Today: The Natural Unconscious: Nothing in Their Heads (blog post).

Retrieved from: <http://web.archive.org/web/20120307100648/http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-naturalunconscious/201203/nothing-in-their-heads>

(see pages 1-3; takes long to load!)

Yong, E. (2012). Not Exactly Rocket Science: Primed by expectations - why a classic psychology experiment isn't what it seemed (blog post). Retrieved from:

<http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/notrocketscience/2012/01/18/primed-by-expectations-why-a-classicpsychology-experiment-isnt-what-itseemed/#.VSgShRePI7g>

Bargh, J. (2012). Angry Birds. Retrieved from

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wuu8URArgZusJELXF5j4xpM26ESkFfOveYoGKBf0CHO/edit>

Bartlett, Tom (2013). Power of Suggestion. Retrieved from

<http://chronicle.com/article/Power-of-Suggestion/136907/>

Bathing & Loneliness

Donnellan, M.B., Lucas, R.E., & Cesario, J. (2015). On the association between loneliness and bathing habits: Nine replications of Bargh and Shalev (2012) Study 1. *Emotion*.

Bargh, J.A., & Shalev, I. (2015). On the association between loneliness and physical warmth---seeking through bathing: Reply to Donnellan et al. 2014 and three further replications from North America, India and Israel of Bargh & Shalev (2012) Study 1. *Emotion*.

Donnellan, M.B. What the first rule about John Bargh's data? Blog post. [Link](#)

Cleanliness & morality

Donnellan, B. (2013). The Trait-State Continuum: Go Big or Go Home – A Recent Replication Attempt (Blog post). Retrieved from <https://traitstate.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/go-big-orgo-home-a-recent-replication-attempt/>

Schnall, S. (2014). University of Cambridge: Department of Psychology: Social Media and the Crowd-Sourcing of Social Psychology (Blog Post). Retrieved from

<http://www.psychol.cam.ac.uk/cece/blog>

Schnall, S. (2014). Character and Context: Simone Schnall on her Experience with a Registered Replication Project (blog post). Retrieved from:

<http://www.spsblog.org/simone-schnall-on-herexperience-with-a-registered-replication-project/>

Gilbert, D. (2014). Some Thoughts on Shameless Bullies. Retrieved from:

<http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/~dtg/Bullies.pdf>

Schnall, S. (2014) Moral Intuitions, replication, and the Scientific Study of Human Nature. [Link](#)

Facial Feedback

Engber, D. (2016). Sad Face. *Slate*. [Link](#)

Strack, F. (2016). Commentary. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.

Hilgard, J. (2016). Comment on Strack (2016). Crystal Prison Zone. [Link](#)

Ego-depletion

Neurosceptic (2016). The end of ego-depletion theory? [Link](#)

Inzlicht, M., & Schmeichel, B. J. (2012). What is ego depletion? Toward a mechanistic revision of the resource model of self-control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(5), 450-463.

Sripada, C., Kessler, D., & Jonides, J. (2016). Sifting signal from noise with replication science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(4), 576-578.

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2016). Misguided effort with elusive implications. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(4), 574-575.

Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2016). Commentary: Misguided effort with elusive implications, and sifting signal from noise with replication science. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 621.

Power Posing

Cuddy, A. (2012). Your body language may shape who you are [video file]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/amy_cuddy_your_body_language_shapes_who_you_are/up-next

Simmons, J. P., & Simonsohn, U. (2017). Power posing: P-curving the evidence. *Psychological Science*, 28(5), 687-693.

Cuddy, A. J., Schultz, S. J., & Fosse, N. E. (2018). P-Curving a More Comprehensive Body of Research on Postural Feedback Reveals Clear Evidential Value For Power-Posing Effects: Reply to Simmons and Simonsohn (2017). *Psychological science*, 29(4), 656-666. Preprint available at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3054952