

Human Development and Family Science 760: Research Process Analysis

Professor: Claire M. Kamp Dush
 Office(s): 171A Campbell/58A Townshend
 Office Hours: by appointment
 Phone(s): 614-247-2126; 614-598-9693
 Email: kamp-dush.1@osu.edu

Winter, 2012
 Friday, 9:30 am to 11:48 am
 0038 Townshend Hall
[IPR](#) Conference Room
 2 hour group meeting, arranged

Course Description

Official Course Description: Overview of research methods and related conceptual issues relevant to study of human development and family science; creative approaches to research problems.

Course Goals	Learning Objectives
By the end of this course, students will be able to consume, interpret, and critique research across a range of disciplines and formats (i.e. grant applications, journal articles, newspapers).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the theory, research question, hypotheses, method, and results in scholarly research. 2. Translate research findings from academic jargon to language most could understand. 3. Determine the ideal research design for most research questions, and compare the actual research design to the ideal. 4. Compose thoughtful critiques of existing and proposed research. 5. Compare the interpretation of research across multiple outlets such as academic journals, grant applications, television news programs, newspaper articles, blogs, etc.
By the end of this course, students will have the beginnings of an interdisciplinary methodological toolkit for designing and carrying out research projects.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe a primary quantitative or qualitative data collection that addresses a research problem of interest to the student. 2. Describe a secondary quantitative or qualitative data analysis that addresses a research problem of interest to the student.
By the end of this course, students should be able to identify strengths and weaknesses in research, when a weakness might be a fatal flaw, when a strength might be innovative and paradigm shifting, and approximately where their own research lies on this continuum.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of a primary quantitative or qualitative data collection addressing a research problem of interest to the student. 2. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of a secondary quantitative or qualitative data collection addressing a research problem of interest to the student.

The goals of this course are to introduce students to the interdisciplinary research process in human development and family science and to develop or refine critical thinking, writing, and research skills. Within the broader curriculum, this course serves as a catalyst for students to research and design a research project in their own substantive

area. Ideally, this project would result in a thesis, grant application, or a research paper to be submitted for peer review.

These goals support our program and department goals of carrying out relevant basic and applied research that enriches the lives of individuals and families. The learning objectives support the departmental approach by emphasizing multi-method and multi-disciplinary skills.

Course Principles

- Critical thinking is a learnable skill
- Excellent writing is a learnable skill
- Becoming an expert in anything is a long-term process
- Both content-knowledge and skill are the foundation of expertise

Following these course principles, this class will have a heavy focus on critical thinking and writing and research skills. There is no assumption that you will be an expert in the research process by the end of the course. Rather, by the end you should have a basic understanding of some of the important issues in designing research, both in general and in your substantive area. Further, by the end of this course, you should have further refined your writing and research skill sets that will serve as the foundation of your future graduate career and professional life course.

Course Requirements

Prerequisite: An undergraduate research methods class. If you did not have this, please come see me.

Required textbook:

American Psychological Association (2009). [*Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*](#) (6th Edition, pp. 9 – 20). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Suggested textbooks:

I suggest you read a book on writing. Good writing is a skill that can (and should) be learned. Below are a few suggestions:

Clark, R. P. (2008) . [Writing tools: 50 essential strategies for every writer](#). Little, Brown and Company

Fogarty, M. (2008). [Grammar girl's quick and dirty tips for better writing](#). Holt Paperbacks.

Graff, G., & Birkenstein, C. (2010). [They say, I say: The moves that matter in academic writing](#). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

King, S. (2010). [On writing: A memoir of the craft](#). Scribner.

Zissner, W. (2006) [On writing well](#). Harper Perennial.

I also suggest that you read a book on time management, writing, and research strategies for getting things done. Academia, and graduate school, requires much self-discipline. These books will suggest ways to become more disciplined, or to balance your time.

Silvia, P. J. (2007). [How to write a lot: A practical guide to productive academic writing](#). American Psychological Association. Note: very quick, easy read.

Boice, R. (2000). [Advice for new faculty members](#). Allyn & Bacon. Note: dense, more difficult read, but good advice. Geared towards faculty, but would be useful to graduate students, particularly those who balance teaching and writing.

Technology Requirements:

This class requires a laptop for use in class. If you do not have a laptop available to you on a weekly basis to use in class, or if there is a week you anticipate not having a laptop, please talk to me.

Most all of the readings for this course are available through The Ohio State University Library's website, and this syllabus is hyperlinked in its electronic form. Thus, in order to access many of the materials for this course, you will need access to either an on-campus computer, or you need to learn how to access university materials from off-campus.

Tentative Schedule of Readings, Group Work, and Homework

Week 1: January 6th

An Introduction to Inquiry – or – What's really real?

Readings:

Content-Related:

Babbie, E. (2010). Human inquiry and science. In E. Babbie (Au.), *The practice of social research* (12th Edition, pp. 4-29). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Jose, A., O'Leary, K. D., & Moyer, A. (2010). Does premarital cohabitation predict subsequent marital stability and marital quality? A meta-analysis. [Journal of Marriage and Family, 72, 105-116](#).

Elwert, F. (2011). [Cohabitation, divorce, and the trial marriage hypothesis](#). Unpublished dissertation, Department of Sociology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Assignment	Learning Objective
1. Reflect on the following question. a. What is your perception of the "agreement reality" for the general public on whether or not	Goal 1, L.O. 2, 4

<p>couples should live together before marriage? What is the “agreement reality” for cohabitation and marital researchers (excluding Elwert)? Who would Elwert say is right? Who do you think is right?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Post your answer (less than 200 words total) into your CarmenWiki portfolio by 9 am on Friday, January 6. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. First, go to https://carmenwiki.osu.edu . b. Log in. Click on the “New” or “Global” tab. c. Scroll until you see: Winter 2012 HDFS 760: Research Process Analysis . Then, do two things. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. First, click the yellow star to the right of the link. That adds this page to your “Favourite” page, making it easier to navigate to the next time you log-in. ii. Click on the hyperlink (https://carmenwiki.osu.edu/display/hdfs760wi201211209/Home) to access the course wiki. d. Once you are inside the HDFS 760 wiki, scroll to your portfolio. Click on your portfolio. 3. Confirm that you can get onto OSU wireless from your laptop from an OSU wireless hotspot . Here is the coverage plan for the first and second floors of Campbell Hall. Virtually all of Thompson Library is a hotspot as well. 4. Bring your laptop to class. 	
--	--

Week 2: January 13th

Social Science Research Paradigms

Readings:

Content-Related:

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Evans, G. W. (2001). Developmental science in the 21st century: Emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs and empirical findings. [Social Development, 9, 115-125.](#)

Denscombe, M. (2009). Philosophy. In M. Denscombe (Au.), [Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice](#) (2nd edition, pp. 116-138). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Dishion, T. J., & Patterson, G. R. (1999). Model building in developmental psychopathology: A pragmatic approach to understanding and intervention. [Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28, 502-512.](#)

Skill-Related:

American Psychological Association (2009). Writing for the behavioral and social sciences. In American Psychological Association (Au.), *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th Edition, pp. 9 – 20). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Assignment	Learning Objective
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Answer the following questions in your portfolio – finish the answer at least 24 hours before your group is to meet. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review the literature in your substantive area of interest (I suggest you find a review piece). What seems to be the dominant research epistemology, ontology, and paradigm of the research area following Denscombe (2009)? b. Apply either Bronfenbrenner and Evans (2001) or Dishion & Patterson (1999) to your substantive area of interest. How would they extend this literature? c. Do the analytic approaches of the literature in your substantive area of interest appear to be in line with theory in that area? 2. Before your group meets, comment on the answers of each of your fellow group members. The comment can be a question, a suggestion, or an idea. 3. Discuss the questions, each group members' area of research and their answers to the questions, and the individual comments during your group meeting. 	<p>Goal 1, L.O. 1</p> <p>Goal 1, L.O. 1, 5</p> <p>Goal 1, L.O. 1, 5</p>

Week 3: January 20th***Moving from the Literature to a Research Question***

Readings:

Content-Related:

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2006). Reading for research. In L. Blaxter, C. Hughes, & M. Tight (Aus.), [*How to research*](#) (3rd Edition, pp. 99-131). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Denscombe, M. (2009). Purpose. In M. Denscombe (Au.), [*Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice*](#) (2nd edition, pp. 7-22). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Denscombe, M. (2009). Relevance. In M. Denscombe (Au.), [*Ground rules for social*](#)

<p>paper has moved the literature forward.</p> <p>d. Do you agree with the authors?</p> <p>e. How would you move this particular scholarly topic forward?</p> <p>3. Before your group meets, read and comment your fellow group members. The comment(s) can be a question, a suggestion, or an idea.</p> <p>4. Discuss the questions and comments as a group during your group time.</p>	<p>Goal 1, L.O. 4</p> <p>Goal 1, L.O. 4</p>
--	---

Week 4: January 27th

Research Design

Readings:

Content-Related:

Anderson Dannels, S. (2010). Research design. In G. Hancock & R. Mueller (Eds.), [*The reviewers guide to quantitative methods in the social sciences*](#) (pp. 343-355). New York, NY: Routledge.

Denscombe, M. (2009). Design. In M. Denscombe (Au.), [*Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice*](#) (2nd edition, pp. 99-115). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Peterson, C. (2009). Minimally sufficient research. [*Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4, 7-9.*](#)

Weissberg, R. P., & Greenberg, M. T. (1998). Prevention science and collaborative community action research: Combining the best from both perspectives. [*Journal of Mental Health, 7, 479-492.*](#)

Skill-Related:

American Psychological Association (2009). Manuscript structure and content. In American Psychological Association (Au.), *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th Edition, pp. 21 – 39). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Becker, H. S. (1983). Freshman english for graduate students: A memoir and two theories. [*The Sociological Quarterly, 24, 575-588.*](#)

Assignment	Learning Objective
1. Find a popular press (magazine or newspaper article, television program, blog post) piece relevant to your area of interest that cites at least one research study (i.e. peer-reviewed journal article or book). Find the cited	Goal 1, L.O. 3, 4

<p>study and read it. Briefly summarize the research question and research design of the study. Compare the conclusions of the study author with the conclusions of the popular press author. How accurate was the popular press article? What nuances were or were not included? Do you agree with the conclusions of the popular press author? Do you agree with the conclusions of the researchers? And, do you believe the researchers had the “ideal research design” to answer their question? If not, what changes would have made it more appropriate to answer the research question?</p> <p>Length: 750 to 1000 words. Due via the Carmen dropbox by 5 pm on Monday, January 31st.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Post a complete draft of your popular press assignment to your portfolio prior to your group meeting at least 12 hours before your group meeting. 3. List in your Carmen portfolio at least 5 common writing mistakes cited in the APA Manual, a website or blog on writing, or one of the other books in the syllabus on writing. 4. Before your group meets, arrange for each person in your group to be assigned one other student’s paper. Within 24 hours of your group meeting, read the student’s paper, making suggestions for changes. 5. After reading the paper, go back to your list of 5 common writing mistakes. Comment on your list, noting how many you found in the student paper you read. 6. During your group meeting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Read each student paper draft out loud, and edit the draft as a group. b. Discuss the 5 points each student identified as common writing mistakes, and how many of them you found in each other’s writing. c. If time, discuss the topic of your assignments. Were the research designs of the articles you read appropriate? What changes would you have made? How accurate were the popular press authors? 	<p>Goal 1, L.O. 4</p> <p>Goal 1, L.O. 3, 5</p>
---	--

Week 5: February 3rd
Measurement, Validity, and Reliability

Readings:

Content-Related:

Anderson, C. A., Lindsay, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (1999). Research in the psychological

- laboratory: Truth or triviality? [*Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 3-9.](#)
- Denscombe, M. (2009). Accuracy. In M. Denscombe (Au.), [*Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice*](#) (2nd edition, pp. 142-159). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gawronski, B., LeBel, E. P., & Peters, K. R. (2007). What do implicit measures tell us?: Scrutinizing the validity of three common assumptions. [*Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 181-193.](#)
- Kagan, J. (2009). Two is better than one. [*Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 22-23.](#)
- Lorenz, F. O., Melby, J. N., Conger, R. D., & Xu, X. (2007). The effects of context on the correspondence between observational ratings and questionnaire reports of hostile behavior: A multitrait, multimethod Approach. [*Journal of Family Psychology*, 21, 498-509.](#)
- Skill-Related:
 American Psychological Association (2009). Writing clearly and concisely. In American Psychological Association (Au.), *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th Edition, pp. 61 – 86). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Assignment	Learning Objective
1. Given your assignment for Week 7, your assignment for week 5 is to create a bulleted outline of your Week 7 assignment. Include each section, and subsection. Briefly summarize key points to be made in each section. This is due on Monday, February 6 th by 5 pm in the Carmen dropbox. 2. Answer the following questions in your Carmenwiki portfolio at least 12 hours before your group is to meet. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify your research question for the Week 7 assignment. b. Briefly describe your secondary data collection. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What are the threats to external validity? ii. What are the threats to internal validity? iii. What are the strengths of the approach? c. Briefly describe your primary data collection. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What are the threats to external validity? ii. What are the threats to internal validity? iii. What are the strengths of the approach? 	Goal 1, L.O. 1, 3, 4, 5, Goals 2 and 3 Goal 1, L.O. 1, 3, 4, 5, Goals 2 and 3

3. Prior to your group meeting, comment on each member's posting. Were you confused about any part of their post? What suggestions do you have for improvement? What did you like?	
--	--

Week 6: February 10th
Generalization and Sampling

Readings:

Content-Related:

Babbie, E. (2010). The logic of sampling. In E. Babbie (Au.), *The practice of social research* (12th Edition, pp. 188-227). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Coan, J. A., & Gottman, J. M. (2007). Sampling, experimental control, and generalizability in the study of marital process models. [*Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 73-80.](#)

Denscombe, M. (2009). Generalizations. In M. Denscombe (Au.), [*Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice*](#) (2nd edition, pp. 181-196). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Heyman, R. E., & Hunt, A. N. (2007). Replication in observational couples research: A commentary. [*Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 81-85.](#)

Kim, H. K., Capaldi, D. M., & Crosby, L. (2007). Generalizability of Gottman and colleagues' affective process models of couples' relationship outcomes. [*Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 55-72.](#)

Skill-Related:

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2009). Making good arguments: An overview. In W.C. Booth, G. G. Colomb, & J. M. Willaims (Aus)., [*Craft of research*](#) (3rd edition, pp. 108-119). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Assignment	Learning Objective
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optional: Turn in a rough draft of your paper for Week 7. This is due on Monday, February 13th by 5 pm in the Carmen dropbox. If you turn in a rough draft, you will receive feedback from me on your rough draft by 5 pm on Wednesday, February 15th. 2. Write the opening paragraph of your paper and post it in your Carmenwiki portfolio at least 12 hours before your group is to meet. 3. Read the opening paragraph of each member of your group. What is confusing? What do you like? How would 	Goals 2 and 3

<p>you revise it? Do you buy their opening argument? What would Booth, Colomb, and Williams (2009) suggest to improve it?</p> <p>4. Next, answer the following questions in your Carmenwiki portfolio before your group is to meet.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the central argument and findings of Kim, Capaldi, and Crosby (2007). Briefly describe each critique of the study (Heyman & Hunt, 2007; Coan & Gottman, 2007). Which critique do you agree with? Do you trust the original study's conclusions? <p>5. Discuss both the opening paragraphs and comments, as well as the Kim et al. (2007) article and critiques during your group meeting.</p>	<p>Goal 1, L.O. 2, 4</p>
--	--------------------------

Week 7: February 17th

Quantitative Analysis and Experimental Design: Examples and Issues

Readings:

Content-Related:

Correll, S. J., Bernard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? [*American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 1297-1338.](#)

D'Onofrio, B. M., Turkheimer, E., & Emery, R. E. (2006). A genetically informed study of the processes underlying the association between parental marital instability and offspring adjustment. [*Developmental Psychology*, 42, 486-499.](#)

Brody, G. H., Murry, V. M., Kogan, S.M., Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., Molgaard, V. et al (2006). The Strong African American Families Program: A cluster-randomized prevention trial of long-term effects and a mediational model. [*Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74, 356-366.](#)

Hygge, S., Evans, G. W., & Bullinger, M. (2002). A prospective study of some effects of aircraft noise on cognitive performance in schoolchildren. [*Psychological Science*, 13, 469-474.](#)

Johnson, D. (2005). Two-wave panel analysis: Comparing statistical methods for studying the effects of transitions. [*Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 1061-1075.](#)

Skill-Related:

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2009). Making claims. In W.C. Booth, G. G. Colomb, & J. M. Williams (Aus.), [*Craft of research*](#) (3rd edition, pp. 120-129). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- conducting integrative mixed methods research and data analyses. [*Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4, 342–360.](#)
- LaRossa, R. (2005). Grounded theory methods and qualitative family research. [*Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 837-857.](#)
- Stake, R. (2010). Qualitative research: How things work. In R. Stake (Au.), [*Qualitative research: Studying how things work*](#) (pp. 11-35). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Waller, M. R., & Swisher, R. (2006). Fathers' risk factors in fragile families: Implications for "healthy" relationships and father involvement. [*Social Problems*, 53, 392-420.](#)
- Skill-Related:
- Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2009). Assembling reasons and evidence. In W.C. Booth, G. G. Colomb, & J. M. Willaims (Aus.), [*Craft of research*](#) (3rd edition, pp. 130-138). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Matthews, S. H. (2005). Crafting qualitative research articles on marriages and families. [*Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 799–808.](#)

Assignment	Learning Objective
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optional: Turn in a rough draft of your paper for Week 9. This is due on Monday, February 27th by 5 pm in the Carmen dropbox. If you turn in a rough draft, you will receive feedback from me on your rough draft by 12 pm on Wednesday, February 29th. 2. Answer the following questions in your Carmenwiki portfolio before your group is to meet. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Describe a qualitative study that could address your research question using the readings from this week as a source. b. What population would you sample? How would you decide on the size of the sample? c. What questions would you ask? d. Using the readings from this week, how would you go about analyzing the data? What method would you use? e. What are one strength and weakness of this approach? f. What differences do you think you would find between the qualitative study you outlined here and the quantitative research study you will be 	<p>Goals 2 and 3</p> <p>Goal 2, L.O. 1</p> <p>Goal 3, L.O. 1</p>

conducting for your project? Could you use a mixed methods approach? Would that be useful? g. Discuss your answers during your group meeting.	
--	--

Week 9: March 2nd

Research Ethics and IRB's

Readings:

Content-Related:

Citro, C. F., Ilgen, D. R., & Marrett, C. B. (2003). Basic concepts. In C. F. Citro, D. R., Ilgen, & C. B. Marrett (Eds). [*Protecting participants and facilitating social and behavioral sciences research*](#) (pp. 23-57). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Deer, B. (2011). How the case against the MMR vaccine was fixed. [*British Medical Journal, 342*](#).

Denscombe, M. (2009). Ethics. In M. Denscombe (Au.), [*Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice*](#) (2nd edition, pp. 59-80). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Godlee, F., Smith, J., & Marcovitch, H. (2011). Wakefield's article linking MMR vaccine and autism was fraudulent. [*British Medical Journal, 342*](#).

Stake, R. (2010). Advocacy and ethics: Making things work better. In R. Stake (Au.), [*Qualitative research: Studying how things work*](#) (pp. 200-216). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Skill-Related:

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2009). Revising your organization and argument. In W.C. Booth, G. G. Colomb, & J. M. Willaims (Aus)., [*Craft of research*](#) (3rd edition, pp. 203-212). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Assignment	Learning Objective
1. Finish Part 2 of the Research Proposal Assignment. The length of this paper should be no more than 16 pages double spaced including title page, abstract, and all references (if using a figure, you may have an additional page). APA style required. Due IN CLASS on Friday, March 2 nd . You must bring THREE copies of the paper with you to class.	Goals 2 and 3
2. Prior to your group meeting, do the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Find a popular press article on an ethical research dilemma (please do not use the MMR issue that 	Goal 1, L.O. 2, 5

<p>we will discuss in class). Briefly summarize the article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What was the ethical violation? ii. What ethical standards were violated (refer to this week's readings)? iii. How was the dilemma discovered? iv. How was the dilemma resolved (or not)? v. What are the implications for future research based on the dilemma? <p>3. Discuss your posts at your group meeting.</p>	
--	--

Week 10: March 9th

Postscript on Statistical Significance

Readings:

Content-Related:

Cohen, J. (1994). The earth is round ($p < .05$). [*American Psychologist*, 49, 997-1003.](#)

Duncan, G. J. (2008). When to promote, and when to avoid, a population perspective. [*Demography*, 45, 763-784.](#)

Firebaugh, G. (2007). Replication datasets and favored-hypothesis bias: Comment on Jeremy Freese (2007) and Gary King (2007). [*Sociological Methods and Research*, 36, 200-209.](#)

Kirk, R. E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. [*Educational and psychological measurement*, 56, 746-759.](#)

Simmons, J.P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. [*Psychological Science*, 22, 1359-1366.](#)

Skill-Related:

American Psychological Association (2009). The publication process. In American Psychological Association (Au.), *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th Edition, pp. 225-244). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

White, L. (2005). Writes of passage: Writing an empirical journal article. [*Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 791—798.](#)

Assignment	Learning Objective
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finish Part 3 of the Research Proposal Assignment. Review two of your fellow students paper and give them feedback in form of a review. Due IN CLASS on Friday, March 9th. You must bring TWO copies of each review with you to class. 2. Prior to your group meeting, do the following: Reflect upon the readings from this week, and what you have learned this quarter. Write a 500 word reflection on the implications of the readings for this week on your research project that you designed for this class, as well as your research agenda. Paste the reflection into your Week 10 Portfolio. 3. Discuss your posts at your group meeting. 	<p>Goals 2 and 3</p> <p>Goal 1, L.O. 4</p>

Research Proposal Assignment Overview

Addresses both Goal 2, L.O. 1 and 2, and Goal 3, L.O. 1 and 2

Part 1 - Identify a research question of interest to you (grounded in the literature). Write an introduction section that describes why this research question is important and what it's answer will add to the relevant literature(s). Next, describe the counterfactual model. What are the limitations to implementing a counterfactual model for your research question. Next, describe two studies that would address this research question: 1) a study using secondary data and 2) a primary data collection. Each description should include variables that are identified and operationalized. Further, sampling, instrumentation, and procedures should be described. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each design? (due Week 7, a rough draft may be turned into the drop box by Monday of Week 7; if turned in, feedback will be given by Wednesday of Week 7). The length of this paper should be no more than 14 pages double spaced including title page, abstract, and all references. References are limited to 2 pages. Please follow all APA guidelines for this paper.

Part 2 - Develop a doable proposal for the research question you identified in Week 7 (due week 9, revised paper and response to comments due finals week). For most of you, that will mean develop the secondary data study you designed for the Week 7 paper into a full proposal. You must include an **introduction** (see description in the APA Manual, p. 27-28), **method section** (see description in the APA Manual, p. 29-32), and brief **discussion** (no more than a page or two at most; see description in the APA Manual, pp. 36). Because you will not have results, you cannot do the first part of the discussion. Rather, you can discuss the limitations of your research and potential alternative explanations (see the first full paragraph on pp. 36 of the APA manual), as well as speculate as to the importance of your findings (see the second and third full paragraphs on pp. 36 of the APA manual). This paper is due **IN CLASS**

on **Friday, March 2nd**. You must bring **THREE** copies of the paper with you to class. A rough draft may be turned into the drop box by 5 pm on Monday (February 27th) of Week 9; if turned in, feedback will be given by 12 pm on Wednesday of Week 9.

You are limited to 16 total pages; 1 title page, 1 abstract page, 11 pages of text, and 3 pages of references. If you would like to include a figure, you may have an additional page. Please follow all APA guidelines for this paper.

Part 3 - During class on Week 9 (Friday, March 2nd), each student will receive two other students' papers. You will trade papers with your fellow group members. You are required to read both papers and provide feedback in the form of a review. The review should be a numerated list of suggestions for improvement, and may also mention strengths of the paper. The reviews are due **IN CLASS** on Week 10 (Friday, March 9th). I will be grading you on the quality of your reviews, so you need to bring **TWO** copies of your review to class during Week 10, one for me, and the other for the student whose paper you reviewed.

Part 4 - Revise your Week 9 paper, incorporating the suggestions of each reviewer. As you revise your paper, create a "revision letter" in which you state how you addressed each of the concerns raised by the student reviewers. Both your final, revised paper and the revision letter are due the Wednesday of Finals Week (March 14th) by 5 pm, either in my mailbox or via the Carmen Dropbox.

In graduate school, there is one important rule of thumb I recommend to my students: make it count. You will do many assignments throughout your graduate school career. The smart student will try to find a way to make each one of them further them in their chosen field. HDFS is very diverse. Our faculty come from a variety of fields, including psychology, sociology, public health, couple and family therapy, speech science, behavioral genetics, among others. You should strive to get to know your field. Know the state of the art in research in your chosen area. Know who is writing what, where it is being published, and what its strengths and faults are. One way your progression towards becoming an expert in your field will occur is through making all assignments you do in graduate school coursework, when possible, relate to your chosen field of expertise. If you are interested in personality, and are doing a paper for a family course, do your paper on how personality comes into play in some kind of family relationship (the couple relationship, the parent-child relationship, the sibling relationship). If you are doing a paper for a child development course, do it on the development of personality across the life course. If you are taking a theory course, you should link relevant theories to personality research.

In this vein, the point of the proposal assignment is for you to identify a research question of interest to you that is grounded in the literature, ascertain the appropriate causal/counterfactual design, describe two studies to address the question and critique them, and finally, write up one of the studies into a doable proposal that when complete will (begin to) answer your research question. Note

that you are to identify a research question of interest to you. That means, it should be in your chosen field of interest, at least your current field of interest. You may still be identifying that area, and that is fine, but the point is, make these assignments count.

Grading Criteria:

The grading criteria for this course consist of three parts. You will be evaluated on your performance on:

1. Course and Wiki participation – 30% of your grade
2. Written assignments – 30% of your grade
3. Research Proposal (includes several parts) – 40% of your grade

Course and Wiki Participation and the written assignments will be graded as High Pass (A+), Pass (A), Marginal Pass (B), and No Pass (C). For written assignments only, grades of Marginal Pass and No Pass can be rewritten and turned in for a re-grade. I will give you a grade for your course and wiki participation each week by Wednesday for the previous week. For written assignments, I will grade them and give you feedback by class the following week. If you decide to rewrite a written assignment, it is due back by 5pm Wednesday of the week following the return of the graded assignment. Note: a grade of High Pass is rarely given.

The research proposal has multiple components, and your grade on the research proposal will include grades on individual components as well as an overall grade. Your research proposal will be graded on a scale of A+, A, AB, B, BC, Fail. You will have the opportunity to rewrite any part of the research proposal that receives less than a grade of “A”. Unless noted, I will grade parts of the research proposal and give you feedback by class the following week. If you decide to rewrite, it is due back by 5pm Wednesday of the week following the return of the graded assignment.

What successful students should expect to do in this course:

Be Responsible.

Successful students will attend each class, and be willing to participate in class discussions and engage in course material, even when these are irrelevant to their own research interests.

Successful students will follow both oral and written instructions. This syllabus is an organic document that may change, so be sure that you are clear at the end of class each week what your responsibilities are for the next week.

Successful students will make sure they are taking accurate notes and ask many questions before assignments are due.

It is the students’ responsibility to access readings. I have hyperlinked all readings, but I am unable to help you if the “ebrary” book you are trying to access already has

several users and you are unable to see the book. Please plan ahead, and do not put off your work until the last minute.

It is the students' responsibility to post on time to the CarmenWiki. Technical difficulties will arise, thus again, it is imperative that you do not push your work to the last minute.

Successful students look up information first so that they ask informed questions, rather than questions they already have the answer to or could easily have gotten from a google search.

Successful students will take full advantage of all of the resources available to them to do well in this class. Do the readings, including the "skill-related" readings, work hard and push yourself. Meet with me to get feedback on your ideas and progress. I am available most all day everyday; just send me an email.

Plan Ahead.

Successful students will plan ahead for their final project. Try to relate all of your assignments and CarmenWiki postings relate to your research area. Immerse yourself in your substantive area as you prepare your assignments for this class. Reading for this class while at the same time delving deeper into your research area should help you as you develop your thesis proposal, grant proposal, or publication that will truly further your career. Do not put these assignments off to the last minute. The rewriting process will be critical to your success in this course; and you can only rewrite and edit your work if you finish it at least a few hours before it is due.

Engage in Appropriate Classroom Conduct.

Successful students will behave respectfully toward me and their fellow classmates. They will arrive early to class and be set-up and ready to go at 9:30 am.

Successful students will turn off or silence their phone during class and put it somewhere that they cannot see it. We will have at least one long break where you can check your phone.

Successful students will be polite to me and their fellow classmates by not going on Facebook, Twitter, or email during class time. It will be tempting, because we are going to be on the internet during class, but I am going to ask that you resist the temptation.

Successful students will ask questions when they do not understand what is going on, but will avoid whispering and side conversations during class. I have hearing issues, so unnecessary background noise will make it hard for me to hear your fellow students.

Exhibit Courteous Wiki Behavior.

Please be courteous to your fellow students. Avoid sarcasm or rudeness. Re-read your comments, perhaps out loud, before you post them. Also, because assignment answers will be posted online, be very careful to avoid plagiarism. It might be advisable to avoid looking at your fellow students' answers before you post your own. More Wiki behavior advice is linked on the Week 1 Agenda.

Uphold High Standards of Academic Conduct. The Ohio State University Code of Student Conduct (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as "Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University, or subvert the educational process." Example of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the University's Code of Student Conduct is never considered an "excuse" for academic misconduct.

If I suspect that a student has committed academic misconduct in this course, I am obligated by University rules to report my suspicions to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. If COAM determines that you have violated the University's Code of Student Conduct (i.e., committed academic misconduct), the sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in this course and suspension or dismissal from the University. For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct). http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_cas.asp

The internet has made plagiarism very easy. I will utilize <http://www.google.com> to check for overlap of your work with published work on the internet. I will also examine your papers for overlap with the research articles you cite. If you are caught cheating/plagiarizing, that is considered academic misconduct, and the above statements apply. I have caught students plagiarizing each quarter I have taught at The Ohio State University. Please take this seriously.

Respect Diversity. The College of Education and Human Ecology affirms the importance and value of diversity in the student body. Our programs and curricula reflect our multicultural society and global economy and seek to provide opportunities for students to learn more about persons who are different from them. Discrimination against any individual based upon protected status, which is defined as age, color, disability, gender identity or expression, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, is prohibited.

Receive Assistance for Special Needs: Any student who feels s/he may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact the instructor privately to discuss specific needs. The Office of Disability Services is relied upon for assistance in verifying the need for accommodations and developing accommodation strategies. Please contact the Office for Disability Services at 614-292-3307 (V) or 614-292-0901 (TDD) in room 150 Pomerene Hall to coordinate reasonable accommodations; <http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/>. Students are

expected to follow Americans with Disabilities Act Guidelines for access to technology.

Discuss Problems and Work with the Professor to Address Them: According to University Policies, available from the Division of Student Affairs, if you have a problem with this class, “You should seek to resolve a grievance concerning a grade or academic practice by speaking first with the instructor or professor. Then, if necessary, with the department chairperson, college dean, and provost, in that order.” Specific procedures are outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-7-23, which is available from the Office of Student Life, 208 Ohio Union.