

## **Psychology 397**

### **Research Methods in Personality and Clinical Psychology**

(This schedule is tentative and subject to minor changes)

**Instructor:** Laurie A. Manwell

**Office:** TBA

**Email:** [lmanwell@uoguelph.ca](mailto:lmanwell@uoguelph.ca)

**Class Time & Room:** Tuesdays & Thursdays 10:30-12:20, PAS 2086

**Office Hours:** After class or by appointment

**Website:** TBA

**Teaching Assistant:** Jen Aquino

**Office:** TBA

**Email:** [jmaquino@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:jmaquino@uwaterloo.ca)

**Office Hours:** TBA

#### **Course Description:**

This course is about the research methods used in the scientific study of personality and abnormal psychology (psychopathology). Within the course we will be covering theory, methods, and applications through a combination of didactic and experiential learning. You will have opportunities to demonstrate your command of the materials through in-class discussions, an article critique, and a research project and presentation.

#### **Learning Objectives:**

1. To come to a better understanding of strengths and weaknesses of various research designs
2. To develop critical-thinking skills through readings, in-class activities, and written assignments
3. To demonstrate understanding of clinical research methods in a written research proposal and project
4. Evaluate research methods and conclusions using a multidisciplinary and comprehensive approach

#### **Course Format and Structure:**

Weekly reading assignments will review basics in research methods, provide a framework for understanding current directions and controversies in the field, as well as the methodological approaches used to address these questions. Assigned readings come from both the textbooks and the research literature. Assigned papers will be available online at the ACE course website. Please be sure to read the assigned papers and textbook chapters prior to attending class. Class time will include some lecture integrated with small group activities and in-class discussions being introduced after basic concepts are taught.

### **Learning Contract:**

1. Everyone has the *right to learn* and the *responsibility* not to deprive others of their right to learn
2. Every student is accountable for his or her own actions
3. In order for you to get the most out of this class, please consider the following:
  - Attend all scheduled classes and arrive on time prepared with notes
  - Late arrivals and early departures are very disruptive
  - Please let the instructor know immediately if you have a problem that is preventing you from performing satisfactorily in this class.

### **Course Website:**

There is a course website at <http://uwaterloo.ca> that is password protected and is mandatory for meeting course objectives, including assignments and lecture preparation. Students are expected to familiarize themselves with the website and to contact the instructor and classmates between classes.

### **Resources:**

There are three required course books and one journal article from Maté (2008). I have also provided additional suggestions for resources students may read for interest and ideas on their projects. Copies of these books will be made available to borrow from the library. Students should also apply for the Textbook and Technology Grant from OSAP:

<https://osap.gov.on.ca/OSAPPortal/en/A-ZListofAid/UCONT004355.html>

### **REQUIRED Books and Articles:**

John, O.P., Robins, R.W., Pervin, L.A. (2010). *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kazdin, A.E. (2003). *Research Design in Clinical Psychology*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Mate, G. (2008). *In the Realm of Hungry Ghosts: Close Encounters with Addiction*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada.

\*Journal Article: Students will sign up for one of the journal articles referenced in Maté (2008) for their article critique. The article must be approved by the instructor and students must provide a copy of the article to the instructor by Thurs. Sept. 29.

### **Formal Assessment:**

The purpose of this course is to expose students to a range of scientific ideas and research in personality and clinical psychology; critical analysis is a key component, particularly in studying multidisciplinary research and theory. Thus, there will be a significant amount of reading, writing, and discussion required to analyze these ideas. Accordingly, students will be graded largely on preparation and participation. Students can achieve a B+ by reading and preparing notes for discussions that summarize the key points and relate to the assignments. To receive an A+, students should extend their analysis to include connections to their own disciplines and other areas of study and a greater-world context, providing explicit examples. In addition, strong interdisciplinary research requires autonomy, initiative, and innovation; these criteria need to be

reflected in the final project to receive at least a B level grade. In general, grades advance or drop depending on both content and style; for an A-/A/A+, the project must demonstrate exceptional thoughtfulness, reasoning, and presentation. “A” projects involve difficult and time-consuming work – and a tremendous investment in your education and development! A solid “B” is a mark of achievement which reflects critical reasoning and/or thorough research and solid writing skills.

Students are required to have completed assigned readings and written notes and bring them to class in order to fully participate in whole class discussions. **As such, students will be required to attend 75% of all lectures and seminars to pass the course.** In cases of medical or otherwise compassionate circumstances, students should contact the instructor and/or TA to determine what arrangements can be made to ensure that course requirements are met and students successfully pass the course.

### **Course requirements are as follows:**

- 1) **Seminar Notes and Reflections: 25%** (Due for each class in Weeks 2-9 inclusive)
- 2) **Seminar Participation and Professionalism: 25%** (All seminars)
- 3) **Article Critique: 10%** (Sign-up and hard-copy of paper due Thurs. Sept. 29; In-class presentation in Weeks 9-10, Nov. 8-17)
- 4) **Research Project and Presentation: 40%** (Proposal due: Thurs. Sept 29; Final paper hard-copy due Tues. Dec. 6)

### **Seminar Notes and Reflections:**

For weeks 2 to 9 inclusive, students will submit a one-page typed summary – in point or essay form – of each class’s readings and/or reflection question; notes are for two classes each week. At the end of each class, the instructor will ask a question which students will have 5 minutes to answer on the back of the paper. Students will be required to hand in the one-page summary with the hand-written answer at the end of the class. The purpose of this assessment tool is: a) to increase discussion participation by having prepared notes to refer to in class, b) for both students and instructor to reflect on what students learned in each class, c) to track attendance, and d) to have a series of notes to use as to provide ideas for the article critique and research project. REFER TO APPENDIX A FOR RUBRIC

### **Seminar Participation and Professionalism:**

Each week students are expected to participate fully in a professional manner; for example, reviewing assigned readings, offering ideas and asking questions, and demonstrating interest and respect towards peers and their ideas. Time will be made available to focus on preparing for the final research project and presentation. There will also be some new content and readings assigned for the seminars and students must participate in seminar group work. If you must miss a seminar, please contact the instructor immediately to make arrangements for missed work. REFER TO APPENDIX B FOR RUBRIC

### **Article Critique & Discussion:**

*Note: Your critique counts as your seminar notes for that class. In weeks 9 and 10, we will be applying the principles learned earlier in the course to Mate's (2008) interdisciplinary work on the nature of drug addiction. Students will choose one of the journal articles referenced in the book to analyze and share with the class. Students must sign up by Thurs. Sept. 29 and provide a copy of the journal article to the instructor; each article will be presented on the same day that we cover the chapter that it is referenced in. The analysis must be between 3 - 5 pages (1 page = 250 words) (1.5 spaced, 12-pt Times Roman Font, 1" margins all around, APA style) and provide at least the following: i) brief summary of the article, ii) merits and limitations of the research, iii) the appropriateness of the research to Mate's use of it in support of his thesis, and iv) how it relates to the theories of personality and psychopathology that we have covered in the course. Students will share a synopsis of their analysis with the class in an informal discussion and hand in a hard-copy of the paper at the end of that class. The purpose of this assessment tool is i) to demonstrate that students can find and analyze a research paper referenced in a secondary source, ii) think critically about how it was used in the secondary source, and iii) facilitate discussions with peers regarding the merits of both works. REFER TO APPENDIX C FOR RUBRIC AND LIST OF PAPERS AND DATES.*

### **Research Project and Presentation:**

*Note: If students choose to conduct actual research, the proper ethics forms must be submitted at the time of the proposal submission. The instructor will assist with submitting the forms in a package to the Research Ethics Office. Students who choose this option are also permitted to work in groups of 2-5 people depending upon the nature of the research. Refer to appendix C for additional information.*

The research project will consist of an actual proposal, data set analysis and conclusions; the data-set will be either research-based (real) or theoretical-based (proposed). Students will select an area in personality and clinical psychology and propose a research question to be answered; a complete literature review, introduction and proposed methods section will follow. Students will then either conduct actual research or create theoretical data, analyze the data and write up the report with conclusions. *The research report MUST be written in past tense AS IF it was actually conducted.* Students are encouraged to consider cutting-edge and controversial topics and carefully explore the evidence for each. The final research report must be between 10-20 pages not including figures, tables and references (1 page = 250 words) (1.5 spaced, 12-pt Times Roman Font, 1" margins all around; APA style). Students will have time during seminars to work with the instructor, TA and peers to work on the proper development of a research-based paper. During the last two classes, students will informally share a summary of their project with the class. This project is designed to support students' understanding of the overall process of conducting research and communicating to colleagues. **A hard-copy, one-page maximum project proposal with all student names, IDs, and signatures, is due in class on Thurs. Sept. 29 and will be returned on Tues. Oct. 1 by the instructor. All projects must be approved by the instructor in writing to receive a final grade.** STUDENTS ARE ADVISED NOT TO MISS PRESENTATION CLASSES. REFER TO APPENDIX D FOR RUBRIC

## **UW-ACE:**

UW-ACE will be used on a regular basis for the course. In addition to the course outline, you will find lecture slides, assignments, and useful resources on the UW-ACE website. You are advised to check the [UW Home Page](http://www.uwaterloo.ca/) (<http://www.uwaterloo.ca/>) as well as UW-ACE for important announcements should an emergency arise.

## **E-Mail Communication:**

The preferred methods of e-mail communication with your instructors and teaching assistants are: (1) messages to e-mail addresses listed on the front of this course outline, or (2) messages through the course account in UW-ACE.

It is your responsibility to check e-mail regularly for important and time sensitive messages. You should use your UW account for all e-mail correspondence to UW personnel for reasons such as identification, reliability, and security. Note that higher priority may be given to e-mail received from UW accounts versus other accounts such as hotmail, yahoo, etc. See "[Official Student Email Address](#)" for further details:

<http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infocist/emailuse.html>

## **The 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 ACE, the outline on ACE will be deemed the official version. Outlines on ACE may change as instructors develop a course, but they become final as of the first class meeting for the term.

## **Students with Disabilities:**

The Office for Persons with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, 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 OPD at the beginning of each academic term.

## **Accommodation due to Illness or Bereavement:**

Students who are requesting accommodation for course requirements (assignments, midterm tests, final exams, etc.) due to illness should do the following:

- seek medical treatment as soon as possible and obtain a completed UW Verification of Illness Form:  
[http://www.healthservices.uwaterloo.ca/Health\\_Services/verification.html](http://www.healthservices.uwaterloo.ca/Health_Services/verification.html)
- submit that form to the instructor within 48 hours.
- (preferably) 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 final exam, the instructor and student will negotiate an extension for the final exam which will typically be written as soon as possible, but no later than the next offering of the course.

In the case of a missed assignment deadline or midterm test, the instructor will either a) 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 b) 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.

#### 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. Colin Ellard) is available for consultation and to mediate a resolution between the student and instructor. Dr. Ellard's contact information is as follows:

Email: [cellard@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:cellard@uwaterloo.ca)  
Ph 519-888- 4567 ext 36852

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.

#### Academic Integrity, Academic Offenses, Grievance, and Appeals:

*Academic Integrity:* in order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

*Discipline:* A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offenses, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offenses (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, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm>

*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,  
<http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm>

*Appeals:* A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline if a ground for an appeal can be established. Read Policy 72 - Student Appeals,  
<http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm>

*Academic Integrity website (Arts):*  
[http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic\\_responsibility.html](http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html)

*Academic Integrity Office (UW):* <http://uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/>

#### A Few Other Notes:

All students should activate their UW computer accounts each term. The accounts give students access to applications such as word processing, statistical and graphics packages, and electronic email as well as access to the Internet. For those who are not planning to use their UW email addresses, please do one of the following things:

- change your email address on QUEST to the one that you want posted on the University Directory, or
- on the UW account, arrange for the email from your UW account to be forwarded to your alternate email address.

Psychology majors should check the Psychology Undergraduate Web Site (<http://www.psychology.uwaterloo.ca/ugradprog/>) regularly for updates (e.g., psychology course offerings for F/W/S, volunteer and/or part-time paid research positions, application deadlines for scholarships, etc.)

## SCHEDULE OF TOPICS

| Class/Topic   | TUESDAYS: Required Readings and Reflections   | THURSDAYS: Required Readings and Reflections   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>WK 1</b></p> <p><b>Tues. Sept. 13</b></p> <p><b>&amp;</b></p> <p><b>Thurs. Sept. 15</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introductions and course overview (no required readings)</li> <li>- We will complete this week's notes/reflection assignments together in class based on an activity</li> <li>- Activity on Perception:</li> </ul> <p>"What you see depends on how you look" and the importance of investigating how science is "framed" by those presenting it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bargh experiments and videos</li> </ul>  | <p><i>Read Kazdin (2003) (p. 497-544)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ch. 17: Ethical Issues and Guidelines for Research (p.497)</li> <li>- How to identify and address potential "unknowns" in the early stages of interdisciplinary research (e.g., finding out what you <i>don't know</i> that you <i>need to know</i> in a new field)</li> <li>- Main sources of error in scientific inquiry and communication</li> <li>- Activities for generating ideas for group projects and presentations</li> <li>- Information on ethics approval for projects</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>WK 2</b></p> <p><b>Tues. Sept. 20</b></p> <p><b>&amp;</b></p> <p><b>Thurs. Sept. 22</b></p> | <p><i>Read John et al. (2010) (p. 3-56)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ch. 1: History of Modern Personality Theory and Research (p.3)</li> <li>- Ch. 2: Human Nature and Individual Differences: Evolution of Human Personality (p. 29)</li> <li>- Activities for generating ideas for group projects and presentations</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Describe one of the dominant paradigms in your current discipline and one from another discipline that you are less familiar with. What methods of analysis would you use to explore the validity of each one? What questions would you ask to find a bridge to integrate these paradigms – or forge new ones? (For example, if you are majoring in social psychology how would you attempt to better understand human nature from a biological/evolutionary perspective – and even integrate these different perspectives?)</p> | <p><i>Read Kazdin (2003) (p. 3 -54)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ch. 1: Introduction (p. 3) <i>*Optional</i></li> <li>- Ch. 2: Drawing Valid Inferences I: Internal and External and Validity (p.22)</li> </ul> <p>Project proposal writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussions and feedback on project proposals due next week</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Give an example of how the same research project could be altered to i) enhance internal validity over external validity, ii) vice versa, and possibly both together.</p> |
| <p><b>WK 3</b></p>  | <p><i>Read John et al. (2010) (p. 61-113)</i></p>   | <p><i>Read Kazdin (2003) (p. 55-110)</i></p>   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Tues. Sept. 27</b><br/>&amp;<br/><b>Thurs. Sept. 29</b></p>                    | <p>- Ch. 3: Psychoanalytic Approaches to Personality (p. 61)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> How has progress in neuroscience refuted and supported early theories of psychology? Describe at least two examples of each.</p>  | <p>- Ch. 3: Drawing Valid Inferences II: Construct and Statistical Conclusion Validity (p. 55)<br/>- Ch. 4: Sources of Artifact and Bias (p 82)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> What is the purpose of double- and triple-blind studies? If research cannot be conducted this way, how can the researchers address such potential problems? Give a couple of concrete examples.</p>   |
| <p><b>WK 4</b><br/><br/><b>Tues. Oct. 4</b><br/>&amp;<br/><b>Thurs. Oct. 6</b></p>   | <p><i>Read John et al. (2010) (p. 114 - 181)</i></p> <p>- Ch. 4: Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues (p. 114)<br/>- Ch. 5: The Five-Factor Theory of Personality (p. 159)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Test yourself with the Big Five Inventory Response Form (p. 157) BEFORE and AFTER reading both chapters. Which result more accurately reflects your personality? Explain why your responses did or did not change after reading the chapters.</p> | <p><i>Read Kazdin (2003) (p.110-183)</i></p> <p>- Ch. 5: Selection of the Research Problem and Design Research Ideas (p. 110)<br/>- Ch. 6: Experimental Research: Group Designs Subject Selection (p. 148)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> As you review chapters 5 &amp; 6, think about how you will address some of these issues in your own research project. Give at least two concrete examples for each chapter.</p>  |
| <p><b>WK 5</b><br/><br/><b>Tues. Oct. 11</b><br/>&amp;<br/><b>Thurs. Oct. 13</b></p> | <p><i>Read John et al. (2010) (p. 287 - 327)</i></p> <p>- Ch. 10: Behavioral Genetics and Personality: A New Look at the Integration of Nature and Nurture (p. 287)<br/>- Ch. 11: Toward a “Molecular Psychology” of Personality (p. 311)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Describe some mechanisms by which gene expression and a person’s environment interact to shape various aspects of personality (e.g., dopamine D4 receptor gene and traits related to novelty seeking).</p>   | <p><i>Read Kazdin (2003) (p.184-232)</i></p> <p>- Ch. 7: Control and Comparison Groups (p. 184)<br/>- Ch. 8: Assessing the Impact of the Experimental Manipulation Checking on the Experimental Manipulation (p. 214)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Considering our discussions on the influence of the fetal environment on brain development, discuss some potential problems involved in studies of monozygotic and dizygotic twins. (Hint: see Appendices in Maté (2008).</p> |
| <p><b>WK 6</b><br/><br/><b>Tues. Oct. 18</b><br/>&amp;<br/><b>Thurs. Oct. 20</b></p> | <p>In Class Research Review and Editing Sessions</p>   | <p><i>Read Kazdin (2003) (p.235-299)</i></p> <p>- Ch. 9: Observational Research: Case-Controlled and Cohort Designs (p. 235)<br/>- Ch. 10: The Case Study and Single-Case Research Designs (p. 265)</p>   |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <i>Reflection:</i> Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of both of these types of research designs.  |
| <b>WK 7</b><br><br><b>Tues. Oct. 25</b><br><b>&amp;</b><br><b>Thurs. Oct. 27</b> | <p>Read John et al. (2010) (p. 351-374; 518-541)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ch. 13: Parents' Role in Children's Personality Development: The Psychological Resource Principle (p. 351)</li> <li>- Ch. 20: Attachment Theory and Its Place in Contemporary Personality Theory and Research (p. 518)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Discuss the evolution of attachment theory and the contributions of neuroscience to understanding how interactions between parents and children affect brain and personality development.</p> | <p>Read Kazdin (2003) (p. 300-)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ch. 11: Evaluation of the Single Case in Clinical Work (p. 300)</li> <li>- Ch. 12: Qualitative Research Methods: An Overview (p. 328)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Discuss some ethical concerns involved in both types of research. How would you inform participants/clients of the potential impact of their involvement and minimize any iatrogenic effects of this type of research?</p> |
| <b>WK 8</b><br><br><b>Tues. Nov. 1</b><br><b>&amp;</b><br><b>Thurs. Nov. 3</b>   | <p>Read John et al. (2010) (p. 725 - 769)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ch. 29: Self-Regulatory Processes, Stress, and Coping (p. 725)</li> <li>- Ch. 30: Personality and Psychopathology (p. 743)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Discuss the interaction between personality and how a person learns to respond to their environment.</p>   | <p>Read Kazdin (2003) (p. 355-435)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ch. 13: Assessment Methods and Strategies (p. 355)</li> <li>- Ch. 14: Assessment and Evaluation of Interventions (p. 408)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Come prepared to discuss how you have designed your research project to collect and analyze your data.</p>  |
| <b>WK 9</b><br><br><b>Tues. Nov. 8</b><br><b>&amp;</b><br><b>Thurs. Nov. 10</b>  | <p>In Class Research Review and Editing Sessions</p>  | <p>Read Kazdin (2003) (p. 436-498)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ch. 15: Statistical Methods of Data Evaluation (p. 436)</li> <li>- Ch. 16: Interpretation of the Data (p. 471)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Come prepared to discuss how you have designed your research project to collect and analyze your data. *Bring sample data files if you have them.</p>  |
| <b>WK 10</b><br><br><b>Tues. Nov. 15</b><br><b>&amp;</b>                         | <p>Read Maté (2008) Parts I-II (p. 7-126):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Pt 1: Hellbound Train (p.7)</li> <li>-Pt 2: Physician, Heal Thyself (p. 101)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> How does Maté (2008) integrate the</p>   | <p>Read Maté (2008) Parts III- IV (p. 127-247):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pt 3: A Different State: The Addicted Brain (p. 127)</li> <li>- Pt 4: How the Addicted Brain Develops (p. 229)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reflection:</i> In response to one of Maté patients, who</p>  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Thurs. Nov. 17</b></p> <p><i>The Nature of Addiction: Causes, Consequences, and Consilience</i></p> | <p>sociocultural perspectives on drug addiction with scientific studies of brain and personality development? What questions do you have after reading the introduction and how might you attempt to answer them?</p>   | <p>confided that, “the first time I did heroin it felt like a warm soft hug,” Maté states in the book the following: “In that phrase she told her life story and summed up the psychological and chemical cravings of all substance-dependent addicts.” (p. 157) Discuss in detail what Maté’s argument is and how and why he integrates the science of addiction with personal biographies of addiction to frame his conceptualizations of human behavior</p> |
| <p><b>WK 11</b></p> <p><b>Tues. Nov. 22</b></p> <p><b>&amp;</b></p> <p><b>Thurs. Nov. 24</b></p>          | <p>Read Maté (2008) Parts V-VI (p. 213-328):</p> <p>-Pt 5: The Addiction Process and the Addicted Personality (p. 213)</p> <p>-Pt 6: Imagining a Humane Reality: Beyond the War on Drugs (p. 251)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Discuss Maté’s views on addiction and social policy: Why would you agree or disagree with that position? Taking the position of a politician, what additional scientific information would you require in order to make the most informed social policies? What is the next step?</p> | <p>Read Maté (2008) Parts VII &amp; Epilogue (p. 329-426):</p> <p>-Pt 7: The Ecology of Healing (p. 329)</p> <p>-Epilogue/Appendices (p. 399)</p> <p><i>Reflection:</i> Describe how you can use what you have learned from this book to guide your inquiries as a researcher.</p>   |
| <p><b>WK 12</b></p> <p><b>Tues. Nov. 29</b></p> <p><b>&amp;</b></p> <p><b>Thurs. Dec. 1</b></p>           | <p>Class Presentations</p> <p>*3-5 presentations to be scheduled at 15-20 min each</p>  | <p>Class Presentations</p> <p>*3-5 presentations to be scheduled at 15-20 min each</p> <p>Last Class!</p> <p>Looking Ahead....</p>   |
| <p><b>WK 13</b></p> <p><b>Tues. Dec. 6</b></p>  | <p>No Classes: Research Project Due (Hard-Copy Only)</p>  | <p>Drop Off: TBA</p>   |

## **Relevant Rules and Regulations**

### **Late Policy**

The penalty for late assignments handed in on the same day but AFTER the designated time period (i.e. during class) is 2%. After that, a 5% penalty is applied each day (including Saturday and Sunday).

### **Communication**

As per university regulations, all students are required to check their <uoguleph.ca> e-mail account regularly. E-mail is the official route of communication between the university (including your instructor) and its students. You are already enrolled in the course's portal, which can be accessed from the University's home page by clicking "CourseLink."

### **Incomplete Course Requirements**

When you find yourself unable to meet a course requirement because of illness or personal difficulties, please advise the course instructor in writing. Where possible, this should be done in advance of the missed work or event, but otherwise, as soon as possible. The instructor may request appropriate documentation. Such documentation will rarely be required for course components representing less than 10% of the course grade. Such documentation will be required for Academic Consideration for missed end-of-term work and missed final exams. For more information on regulations and procedures for Academic Consideration, please refer to the Undergraduate Calendar or the Psychology Department website.

### **Academic Misconduct**

The University of Waterloo takes a very serious view of Academic Misconduct, *and it is your responsibility as a student to be aware of and to abide by the University's policy*. Academic misconduct includes plagiarism, cheating on examinations, misrepresentation, and submitting the same material in two different courses without written permission. All submitted work is expected to have been done independently by the student. Anyone suspected of academic misconduct will have his or her case reviewed by the Associate Dean (i.e. it's out of your instructor's hands!) and may result in serious penalties, up to and including expulsion from the University. There are no warnings or second chances with respect to academic misconduct. To better understand your responsibilities regarding appropriate academic conduct, read the Undergraduate Calendar for a statement of Students' Academic Responsibilities; also read the full Academic Misconduct Policy. If you are ever concerned about inadvertently misrepresenting yourself, for example, when doing group assignments or quoting from texts, you are advised to make use of the resources available through the Learning Commons and to discuss the matter with your course instructor, TA, or academic counselor.

### **Drop Date**

The last date to drop one-semester Fall 2011 courses, without academic penalty, is Thursday November 3, 2011. For regulations and procedures for Dropping Courses, see the Undergraduate Calendar.

### Copies of Out-of-Class Assignments

Keep paper and/or other reliable back-up copies of all out-of-class assignments: you may be asked to resubmit work at any time. For more detailed information about these and other regulations, see Chapter VIII Undergraduate Degree Regulations and Procedures of the 2010-2011 University of Guelph Undergraduate Calendar

### Description of Grades

By now, you are probably familiar with the University's grading scheme:

|    |         |    |       |
|----|---------|----|-------|
| A+ | 90-100% | C  | 63-66 |
| A  | 85-89   | C- | 60-62 |
| A- | 80-84   | D  | 57-59 |
| B+ | 77-79   | D- | 50-52 |
| B  | 73-76   | F  | 0-49  |
| B- | 70-72   |    |       |

But how do you get an **A** in this course?

The purpose of this course is to expose students to ideas that will revolutionize interdisciplinary research; however, these ideas are increasingly complex and sophisticated and thus require a broader context within which to understand them. Thus, there will be a significant amount of reading and discussion required to analyze these ideas. Accordingly, students will be graded largely on preparation and participation. Students can achieve a B+ by reading and preparing notes for discussions that summarize the key points and relate to the assigned reflections. To receive an A+, students should extend their analysis to include connections to their own disciplines and other areas of study and a greater-world context, providing explicit examples in class. In addition, strong interdisciplinary research requires autonomy, initiative, and innovation; these criteria need to be reflected in the summative project to receive a B level grade. In general, grades advance or drop depending on both content and style; for an A-/A-/A+, the project must demonstrate exceptional thoughtfulness, reasoning, and presentation. "A" projects involve difficult and time-consuming work – and a tremendous investment in your education and development! A solid "B" is a mark of achievement which reflects critical reasoning and/or thorough research and solid writing skills.

As per Chapter VIII of the Undergraduate Calendar:

**80-100 (A) Excellent** An outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior grasp of the subject matter and an ability to go beyond the given material in a critical and constructive manner. The student demonstrates a high degree of creativity and/or logical thinking, a superior ability to organize, to analyse and to integrate ideas, and a thorough familiarity with the relevant literature and techniques.

**70-79 (B) Good** A more than adequate performance in which the student demonstrates a thorough grasp of the subject matter, and an ability to organize and examine the material in a critical and constructive manner. The student demonstrates a good understanding of the relevant issues and a familiarity with the relevant literature and techniques.

**60-69 (C) Satisfactory** An adequate performance in which the student demonstrates a generally Adequate grasp of the subject matter and a moderate ability to examine the material in a critical and constructive manner. The student displays an adequate understanding of the relevant issues, and a general familiarity with the relevant literature and techniques.

**50-59 (D) Poor** A barely adequate performance in which the student demonstrates a familiarity with the subject matter, but whose attempts to examine the material in a critical and constructive manner are only partially successful. The student displays some understanding of the relevant issues, and some familiarity with the relevant literature and techniques.

**0-49 (F) Fail** An inadequate performance.

## APPENDIX A

### **Seminar Notes/Reflections: 25% Weeks 2-9 Inclusive**

**NOTE: Students will receive general feedback between Weeks 5-6 and formal assessment after Week 10.**

#### **Content and Comprehension: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited writing skills, organization and interpretation of text; many grammatical and spelling errors.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Adequate writing skills, organization and interpretation of text; demonstrates that student has read the assigned readings; some grammatical and spelling errors.
- 7-8: More than adequate writing skills, organization and interpretation of text; demonstrates that student has read and understands the basic ideas in the assigned readings; summaries are concise and coherent; few grammatical and spelling errors.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior writing skills, organization, and interpretation of text; student has answered the reflection question with insight and/or provided additional information; few or no grammatical or spelling errors.

#### **Attendance and Answers: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited reflective and/or critical thinking skills; illegible.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some reflective and/or critical thinking skills; writing is legible.
- 7-8: More than adequate reflective and/or critical thinking skills; demonstrates that student paid attention during class and considered the ideas presented; writing is legible.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior reflective and / or critical thinking skills; demonstrates student is engaged with the ideas presented; writing is legible.

#### **Comments:**

## APPENDIX B

### **Seminar Participation and Professionalism: 25%**

#### **Attendance and Participation: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work; missed many seminars.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited preparation for seminars; lack of respect for Instructor, seminar leaders and peers; missed some seminars and did not make-up work.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some preparation for seminars; interacts with instructor, seminar leaders and peers in a respectful manner; listens and responds to ideas and offers own ideas; made up work from any missed seminars.
- 7-8: More than adequate preparation and participation; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with instructor, seminar leaders and peers; openly shares insights and encourages others to reciprocate; no missed seminars or made up work from all missed seminars.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior preparation and participation; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with instructor, seminar leaders and peers; consistently engages with others by respectfully offering and critiquing ideas; no missed seminars or made up work from all missed seminars.

#### **Comments:**

## APPENDIX C

### ARTICLE CRITIQUE: 10%

#### **Content and Comprehension: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; many grammatical and spelling errors.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Adequate writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates that student has read the assigned readings and applied the content and critical thinking principles to his/her work; some grammatical and spelling errors.
- 7-8: More than adequate writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates that student has read the assigned readings and applied the content and critical thinking principles to his/her work; student uses evidence to support arguments as taught during seminars and according to John et al. (2010), Kazdin (2003) and Mate (2008); few grammatical and spelling errors.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; student uses evidence to support arguments as taught during seminars and according to John et al. (2010), Kazdin (2003) and Mate (2008); student engages the reader with insight, critical arguments, and novel and/or unique perspective; almost no grammatical or spelling errors.

#### **Approach to Questions: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Topic is unacceptable.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited reflective and/or critical thinking skills; did not answer any of the assigned essay questions.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some reflective and/or critical thinking skills; answered some of the essay questions or partially answered questions; incomplete evidence and arguments presented.
- 7-8: More than adequate reflective and/or critical thinking skills; partially answered all of the essay questions; supportive evidence and clear arguments presented.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior reflective and / or critical thinking skills; thoroughly answered all of the essay questions; strong evidence and balanced arguments presented; student engages reader topic and various perspectives; student takes a risk focusing on controversial and/or less well known information/positions.

#### **Comments:**

## APPENDIX D

### RESEARCH PROJECT AND PRESENTATION: 40%

**NOTE: Students will also receive general feedback on drafts throughout the semester during peer editing sessions in seminars.**

#### **Project Proposal: Approved or Not Approved**

##### **Introduction and Choice of Topic: \_\_\_\_\_/10**

The proposed area of research is relevant to the study of psychology/neuroscience. The research is novel, with clear significance, and the corresponding research hypothesis is something that could be plausibly addressed through an appropriately designed study.

0-2: Topic is not acceptable.

3-4: Minimally acceptable.

5-6: Acceptable.

7-8: More than adequate.

9-10: Outstanding.

##### **Comments:**

##### **Content and Comprehension: \_\_\_\_\_/30**

The rationale for the study is based on logical conclusions drawn from the literature review. Introduction begins with the broad overview of the topic and narrows in on the literature related to the specifics of the research question, including the degree of integration and synthesis of ideas. The introduction should include a rationale and clearly and specific hypothesis.

0-6: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work.

7-12: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; many grammatical and spelling errors.

13-18: Acceptable. Adequate writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates that student has read the assigned readings and applied the content and critical thinking principles to his/her work; some grammatical and spelling errors.

19-24: More than adequate writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; demonstrates that student has read the assigned readings and applied the content and critical thinking principles to his/her work; student uses evidence to support arguments as taught during seminars and according to John et al. (2010), Kazdin (2003) and Mate (2008); few grammatical and spelling errors.

25-30: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior writing skills, organization, interpretation of primary and secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; student uses evidence to support arguments as taught during seminars and according to John et al. (2010), Kazdin (2003) and Mate (2008); student engages the reader with

insight, critical arguments, and novel and/or unique perspective; almost no grammatical or spelling errors.

**Comments:**

**Approach to Questions: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Topic is unacceptable.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited reflective and/or critical thinking skills; did not answer any of the assigned essay questions.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some reflective and/or critical thinking skills; answered some of the essay questions or partially answered questions; incomplete evidence and arguments presented.
- 7-8: More than adequate reflective and/or critical thinking skills; partially answered all of the essay questions; supportive evidence and clear arguments presented.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior reflective and/or critical thinking skills; thoroughly answered all of the essay questions; strong evidence and balanced arguments presented; student engages reader topic and various perspectives; student takes a risk focusing on controversial and/or less well known information/positions.

**Comments:**

**Content and Comprehension: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Topic not acceptable
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and/or secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; only one perspective covered; only one discipline addressed; unclear or incomplete reasoning for topic choice.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Adequate critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and/or secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; at least two perspectives covered; only one discipline addressed; demonstrates some principles learned throughout the course; cursory reasoning for topic choice.
- 7-8: More than adequate critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and/or secondary sources, and logical flow of ideas; at least three perspectives covered; at least two disciplines addressed; demonstrated application of content and critical thinking principles to group work; uses evidence to support ideas as taught during seminars and according to Browne and Keeley (2011); reasoning for topic choice is clear and relevant.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the group demonstrates superior critical thinking skills, organization, interpretation of primary and/or secondary sources, and logical flow

of ideas; three or more perspectives covered; two or more disciplines addressed; group uses evidence to support arguments as taught during seminars and according to Browne and Keeley (2011); group engages the audience with insight, critical arguments, and novel and/or unique perspective; the importance and relevance of the topic are clear and compelling; topic is meaningful and challenging.

**Approach to Project Topic: /10**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work. Topic is unacceptable.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited creativity and risk in approach and presentation; topic and presentation format do not complement each other; choice of topic too simplistic or obvious; no latitude for real discussion or debate; unprepared to present; unable to answer questions.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some creativity and risk in approach and presentation; topic and presentation format are congruent; choice of topic somewhat cursory but provides some opportunity for discussion and debate; prepared to present; minimal answers to questions.
- 7-8: More than adequate creativity and risk in approach and presentation; topic and presentation format complement each other; choice of topic is meaningful and relevant; well prepared to present; well informed answers to questions.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the group demonstrates superior creativity and risk in approach and presentation; topic and presentation format enhance each other; choice of topic is very significant compels the audience to re-evaluate their prior knowledge of the topic; more than well prepared to present; well informed and insightful answers to questions; thoroughly engages audience in topic and various perspectives; group takes a risk focusing on controversial and/or less well known information/positions.

**\*Peer Evaluation: /5**

- 0-2: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work; failed to contribute to project.
- 3-4: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited preparation for group work on project; lack of cooperation and collaboration with group members; missed some group meetings and did not make-up missed work.
- 5-6: Acceptable. Demonstrates some preparation for group work; interacts with group members in a cooperative, supportive, and collaborative manner; listens and responds to ideas and offers own ideas; made up any missed work.
- 7-8: More than adequate preparation and participation in group activities for project; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with group members that draw out peer strengths and support peer areas of learning (e.g., theatre student may share drama experience with non-theatre students for a re-enactment, whereas physics student may share principles of a simple experiment for a demonstration); openly shares insights and encourages others to reciprocate; equitable contributions to group work.
- 9-10: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior preparation and participation; demonstrates consistent and positive interactions with group members that both supports and challenges peers to work outside of their own zone of comfort in ways that lead to success (e.g., practicing public speaking with a shyer peer; sharing technical

skills in multimedia with peers rather than just working alone; demonstrating trust and respect in ways that encourages peers to share radically different ideas without fear of ridicule; etc...); consistently engages with others by respectfully offering and critiquing ideas; equitable contributions to group work.

**\*Within one week of your group's presentation, each group member is to provide a peer evaluation mark (out of 5) for each member, including yourself. All of the marks assigned to each individual – *including your self-evaluation mark* - will be averaged for a final mark (out of 5).**

**Comments:**

## RESEARCH PROJECT AND PRESENTATION: 40%

**NOTE: Students will also receive general feedback on drafts throughout the semester during peer editing sessions in seminars.**

**Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Introduction**

#### **Choice of topic /10**

The proposed area of research is relevant to the study of psychology/neuroscience. The research question is novel, with clear significance, and the corresponding research hypothesis is something that could be plausibly addressed through an appropriately designed study.

0-2: Topic is not acceptable

3-4: Minimally acceptable.

5-6: Acceptable.

7-8: More than adequate.

9-10 Outstanding.

#### **Comments**

#### **Logical Flow of the Paper /30**

The rationale for the study is based on logical conclusions drawn from the literature review. Introduction begins with a broad overview of the topic and narrows in on the literature related to the specifics of the research question, including the degree of integration and synthesis of ideas. The introduction should include a rationale and clearly stated and specific hypothesis.

0-6: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work

7-12: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited writing skill, organization and logical flow of ideas.

13-18: Acceptable. Adequate writing skills, organization and logical flow of ideas. Moderate ability to examine the material in a constructive manner. Adequate understanding of the relevant issues and methods.

19-24: More than adequate writing skill, organization, and logical flow of ideas and an ability to organize and examine the material in a constructive manner. Good understanding of the relevant issues and a familiarity of the appropriate literature and methods.

25-30 Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior writing skills, organization, and logical flow of ideas. Superior development and execution of ideas.

#### **Comments**

### **Methodology**

#### **Methods and procedure /15.**

Are the methods organized under appropriate headings (participants, materials or apparatus, procedure) and is the study replicable based on the information provided?

0-3: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work

4-6: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates familiarity with research methods appropriate to the study of the proposed aspect of cognitive neuroscience, some understanding of the relevant issues and techniques.

7-9: Acceptable. An adequate grasp of the research methods, and a moderate ability to examine the material in a constructive manner. Adequate understanding of the relevant issues and techniques.

10-12: More than adequate, a thorough grasp of the relevant research methods, and an ability to organize and examine the material in a constructive manner. Good understanding of the relevant issues and techniques.

13-15: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior grasp of the appropriate research methods, and an ability to critically address the outstanding question of research in a thorough and constructive manner.

#### **Comments**

### Statistical Analysis and Results / 15

Appropriate statistical procedures have been selected and statistics are organized and appropriately reported according to APA guidelines.

- 0-3: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work
- 4-6: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates familiarity with the statistical methods, some understanding of the relevant statistics to be reported.
- 7-9: Acceptable. An adequate grasp of the statistical methods and understanding of the statistics to be reported.
- 10-12: More than adequate, a thorough grasp of the statistical methods and a good understanding of the statistics to be reported
- 13-15: Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior grasp of the statistical methods and reporting techniques.

#### Comments

### Discussion / 20

The discussion begins with the hypothesis restated, and a brief non-statistical summary of the results, followed by a discussion of the findings. Results are evaluated within the context of the literature reviewed in the introduction and implications of the findings are reviewed. Finally, the importance/relevance of findings, conclusions and limitations and future directions are discussed.

- 0-5: Does not meet the minimum criteria for acceptable work
- 6-10: Minimally acceptable. Demonstrates limited writing skill, organization and interpretation of findings.
- 11-15: Acceptable. Adequate writing skills, organization and interpretation of findings. Moderate understanding of the literature and synthesis of ideas.
- 16-18: More than adequate writing skills, organization, and interpretation of findings, and an ability to organize and examine the material in a constructive manner. Good understanding of the relevant issues and a familiarity of the appropriate literature and synthesis of ideas.
- 19-20 Outstanding performance in which the student demonstrates superior writing skills, organization, and interpretation of findings. Superior development and execution of ideas.

#### Comments

### Clarity, Writing Style, APA format / 10

The extent to which APA style was adhered to throughout the proposal, including references, citations, figures, tables, and formatting of the paper eg, failure to use in text citations, reference page, improper use of quotations, title page does not include running head etc.

- 0-2: Not acceptable, many spelling, typo, or grammatical errors, or deviations from APA format.
- 3-6: Minimally written. Moderate degree of spelling, typo, or grammatical errors, or deviations from APA format.
- 7-8: Well written, few spelling, typo, or grammatical errors, or deviations from APA format.
- 9: Very well written, very few spelling, typo, or grammatical errors, or deviations from APA format.
- 10: Outstanding writing. Almost no spelling, typo, or grammatical errors, or deviations from APA format.

#### Comments:

**Grade: /100**