

<b>Clinical Research Seminar Psychology 259 - Spring 2004</b>
---

Meeting Place	Davie Hall 261
Meeting Time	Thursdays 12:30– 3:00
Office Hours:	By appointment
Instructor:	Marilyn Hartman, Ph.D.
Office:	Davie 256
Email:	hartman@email.unc.edu
Phone:	962-3987

### Objectives and Goals

The goal of this course is to help you develop skills needed for the design of a research project and for the writing and presentation of a proposal. We will consider a number of topics, including: (a) understanding and integrating a research literature; (b) designing a study; (c) incorporating ethical principles into the design and implementation of a research project; (d) improving scientific writing skills, based on understanding the writing process and development of techniques for writing and rewriting; (e) developing skills for supporting one another's writing; and (f) increasing competence in oral presentation of research ideas. By the end of the course you will have completed a proposal for a second-year research project or master's thesis and presented that proposal to the rest of the class. You will also have provided feedback to fellow students on excerpts from their proposals.

Your primary emphasis for this course should be the development and writing of your proposal.

**I ask all students to make a commitment to write at least 5 days a week, with a minimum of 15 minutes a day.** (We'll talk more about this in class.) Class meetings and additional reading assignments are intended to support this goal. We will meet most but not every week during the semester, and use our time together for discussion rather than the presentation of didactic material. We will start each class with a progress report from each of you and then move on to discuss specific topics, based on the readings, your own writing experiences and questions you have about your proposals. My hope is to create a supportive environment in the classroom, so that we can also deal with professional development issues that come up in the process of writing a research project. Thus, in addition to discussing the proposal itself, we will also tackle topics such as mentor-student relationships, peer support and feedback, ethical principles and dilemmas in doing research, intellectual ownership, etc. Suggestions of additional topics that you would like to discuss are welcome. Overall my role and that of your fellow students in our class meetings is to support you in the process of developing the proposal and learning to think of yourself as a researcher, writer, and public speaker. In addition to my presence in the classroom, I will be available for individual consultation throughout the semester.

Reading Assignments. Required readings are taken from the following sources.

1. Bolker, J. (1998). *Writing your dissertation in fifteen minutes a day*. New York: Henry Holt. [Bookstore]
2. Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.) (2000). *Guide to publishing in psychology journals*. New York: Cambridge. [Bookstore]
3. Anholt, R. R. H. (1994). *Dazzle 'em with style: The art of oral scientific presentation*. New York: W. H. Freeman. [Bookstore.]
4. American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed.)*. Washington, DC: Author.
5. Walters, R., & Kern, T. H. (1991). How to eschew weasel words. *Johns Hopkins Magazine*, 25-32. Available in the form of a PDF file.

6. Gopen, G.D., & Swan, J.A. (1990). The science of scientific writing. *American Scientist*, 78, 550-558. Available in the form of PDF files.

7. Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*. New York: Oxford University. Available in the form of PDF files.

8. Sales, B. D., & Folkman, S. (2000). *Ethics in research with human participants*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. [Bookstore or PDF files]

9. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. *Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board Manual*. <http://research.unc.edu/ors/irb/index.html>

### Additional Resources

Graduate School of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. *A guide to theses and dissertations*. <http://www.ais.unc.edu/sis/admissions/grad/TDGUIDE.PDF>

Reserve Readings. I have also placed a number of books on reserve in the Undergraduate Library. See attached bibliography. You may find them useful as additional resources for you as you develop your proposals.

### Written Assignments

1. **Work plan.** To create a work plan for yourself, start from wherever you are at the moment.

a. Consider the following: What have you done already and what do you still have to do? Break the process of completing the proposal into as many steps as possible, and describe each briefly. Include substeps. Consider also what you need to find out, what resources will be needed along the way, and what decisions still need to be made. How will you find out what you need to know, how will you get the resources you need, and how will you make the necessary decisions?

b. Now create deadlines for all the steps by trying to estimate the amount of time needed for each step or substep. This timeline will need to be revisited frequently, at least every other week, but should be as realistic as possible at any time point. Here are some suggested deadlines for completing the major steps in writing

the proposal (Note: you should have more steps than this in your work plan!):

- Draft of literature review – February 1
- Overview of study (goals, hypotheses and overall methodology) – February 15
- Draft including the revised literature review and study overview, plus a first draft of methods section – March 18
- Revision of study overview and methods – April 3
- Final proposal, including methods, power analysis, and planned data analysis – April 29

c. Create a writing schedule for yourself and add to your work plan. **Make a commitment to write at least 5 days a week, with a minimum of 15 minutes a day.** When will you work on the proposal? What days? What time of day? Be sure to take into account other obligations and time commitments that you expect to have during the semester, and your own style of writing.

d. In addition to submitting a copy of your work plan to me, give a copy to your advisor and discuss with him or her.

e. When you revise your work plan, revise the content of the steps and substeps as needed as well as adjusting the time line.

2. **Feedback to fellow students.** You will be asked to provide written feedback to 2 of your fellow students. Your comments should be 1-2 single-spaced, typed pages. I encourage you also to make comments in the margins of the student's paper. Bring your comments to class and *be prepared to read them* aloud. The comments should include at the beginning a short section of 'reader-based feedback' (see Elbow, 1998), perhaps one paragraph. The rest should be the more usual 'criterion-based feedback.'

**3. Draft of the proposal.** This refers to a draft that includes the literature review, study overview, and first draft of methods section. It is due March 18 at 5 PM. You may receive as much help from your advisor as you like, but do include a memo along with the draft describing how much and what type of feedback you did receive. (I do this to ensure that my evaluation of proposals is not affected by the amount of feedback that students are able to obtain from their advisors.)

**4. Proposal.** This refers to a full proposal that has undergone significant revisions and rewriting since March 18, based on feedback from fellow students and myself, and taking into consideration what you have learned about writing and rewriting from the reading assignments. Expect to complete several revisions between March 18 and the due date for the full proposal, April 29. Guidelines for getting feedback from your advisor are the same as for the earlier draft. Thus, please include a memo describing the feedback you received.

**5. Oral presentation.** Towards the end of the semester each of you will be expected to present your research proposal to the rest of the class. Using PowerPoint is *highly recommended*, even if you have never used it before. Incorporate tips from *Dazzle 'em with style: The art of oral scientific presentation*. The presentation should be timed to take approximately 20 minutes.

<u>Course Requirements</u>	<u>Evaluation</u>
Proposal draft	25%
Oral presentation of research plan	20%
Written critiques of others (2)	15%
Proposal	40%

### Assignments

1/8 Introduction to the course

1/15

1. Work plan and timeline for the semester. Submit one copy to me and one to your advisor.
2. Bring to class an empirical article you are reading for your literature review. Be prepared to describe and discuss how the authors' literature review is constructed to integrate the findings of multiple studies.
3. Bolker, J. (1998). Chapters 1 – 4 (pp. 3 - 62).
4. Kendall, P.C., Silk, J. S., & Chu, B. C. (2000). Writing an introduction (pp. 41-57). In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.).

1/22

1. Bolker, J. (1998): Chapters 5-6 (pp. 63-98); Chapter 8 (116-126)
2. Tesser, A. (2000). Theories and hypotheses (pp. 58-80). In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.).

1/29

1. Reis, H. T. (2000). Writing effectively about design (pp. 81-97). In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.).
2. Certificate demonstrating training in research ethics
3. AA-IRB online manual (especially sections I, II, IV, VII, IX, and X) and Guide to IRB Procedures
4. Sales, B. D., & Folkman, S. (2000):
  - a. Belmont Report (pp. 195-205)
  - b. APA Ethical principles (General principles and sections relevant to research: pp. 134-135, 153-157).
  - c. Chapters 2 -5 (pp. 13-57).
5. Be prepared to discuss ethical issues in your own research, as they relate to: (a) selection of topic and possible implications of the findings; (b) design and methodology of your study.

2/5 No class. **Write first!**

1. Revised work plan and timeline.
2. APA Publication Manual: Chapter 2
3. Walters & Kern (1991).

2/12

1. Gopen & Swan (1990).
2. Elbow, P. (1998): pp. 237-263.

Students 1-2: Email to the rest of the class a portion of the introduction or overview to your proposal on which you'd like feedback. The excerpt should comprise a minimum of 6 pages and a maximum of 10 pages. (If you submit more than 10 pages, indicate which section we should focus on.) Include also a paragraph describing the type of feedback that would be most helpful. Due by 1PM

2/19

1. Revised work plan and timeline.
2. Bring hard copy of submitted portion of proposal that you've reviewed. If applicable, bring hard copy of your feedback for students 1-2
3. Students 3-4: Email to the rest of the class a portion of the introduction or overview to your proposal on which you'd like feedback. The excerpt should comprise a minimum of 6 pages and a maximum of 10 pages. (If you submit more than 10 pages, indicate which section we should focus on.) Include also a paragraph describing the type of feedback that would be most helpful. Due by 1PM.

2/26

1. Bring hard copy of submitted portion of proposal that you've reviewed. If applicable, bring hard copy of your feedback for students 3-4.
2. Students 5-6: Email to the rest of the class a portion of the introduction or overview to your proposal on which you'd like feedback. The excerpt should comprise a minimum of 6 pages and a maximum of 10 pages. (If you submit more than 10 pages, indicate which section we should focus on.) Include also a paragraph describing the type of feedback that would be most helpful. Due by 1PM

3/4

1. Revised work plan and timeline.
2. Bring hard copy of submitted portion of proposal that you've reviewed. If applicable, bring hard copy of your feedback for students 5-6.

3/11 **Spring Break. Have a good one!**

3/18 No class meeting. **Proposal draft (electronic or hard copy) due by 5 PM**

3/25

1. Anholt, R. R. H. (1994).

4/1 No class. **WRITE FIRST!**

4/8 Oral Presentation of Research Proposals -- Students 1-3

1. APA Publication Manual: Read through Chapter 3 to check your understanding of punctuation, spelling, capitalization, etc. Most of it you should know already, but undoubtedly there will be a few tips you can pick up by taking the time to go through this material.

4/15 Oral Presentation of Research Proposals -- Students 4-6

4/22 No class. **WRITE FIRST!**

**\* Final proposal (electronic or hard copy) due on Thursday April 29 at 1 PM \***

#### READINGS AND RESOURCES ON RESERVE

- Barlow, D.H., & Hersen, M. (1984). *Single case experimental designs* (2nd ed.). New York: Pergamon. Provides extensive descriptions of a variety of single case designs and an excellent review of the methodology of single case research as it applies to clinical psychology.
- Ciminero, A., Calhoun, K.S., & Adams, H.E. (Eds.) (1986). *Handbook of behavioral assessment* (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley. Has review chapters for specific disorders as well as general chapters about the principles of behavioral assessment.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. An indispensable tool for planning and interpreting research.
- Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Rand McNally. The bible for quasi-experimental research.
- Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). Prentice-Hall. Good resource for design issues, especially ANOVA type designs.
- Maher, B.A. (1978). A reader's writer's and reviewer's guide to assessing research reports in clinical psychology. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 46, 835-838.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Robinson, J.P., Shaver, P.R., & Wrightsman, L.R. (Eds.) *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes, Vol.1*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. Very helpful compendium of reviews of common measures. Only Vol. 1 is available so far. You might check earlier editions (which were 1 volume books) if the type of measure you are seeking is not covered in this volume.
- Rosenthal, R. (1991). *Meta-analytic procedures for social research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Great how-to book for beginning meta-analytic researchers.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (Eds.) (1969). *Artifact in behavioral research*. Academic Press. The classic text on things that can obscure interpretation of your results.
- Webb, E.J. et al. (1981). *Nonreactive measures in the social sciences*. Rand McNally. An additional resource for assessment procedures to consider.