

RESEARCH COLLOQUIUM IN SOCIAL-PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: Kate A. Ratliff

Speaker Series: Fridays, 11.45-12.45, Psych 108

Discussion Series: Fridays, 1.15-2.45, Psych 0098

For All Social Area Graduate Students

All social area graduate students are required to attend the weekly speaker series. You will be responsible for introducing the speaker once per semester. If you are unable to be at brownbag, please let your advisor know ahead of time. If you are unable to introduce the speaker on your assigned day, you may switch with another student but please let Kate know that you have done so.

Speaker Series/One Credit Registration

If you are enrolled in the course for one credit hour, you must meet the requirements listed above. You must also ask at least three questions during the course of the semester.

Discussion Series/Three Credit Registration

If you are enrolled in the course for three credits, you must meet the requirements listed above. Additionally, you will also participate in the discussion portion of the course.

This semester, the discussion series will take the form of a “journal club” in which we read one recent paper from the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (JPSP)* and one recent paper from *Social Psychological and Personality Science (SPPS)*. Ideally, the two papers for the week should be on the same general topic, and the topic should change from week-to-week. Kate will choose the topic for the first week; after that, we will choose the following week’s papers at the end of the previous class.

The goals of this course are:

- To provide perspective and breadth on a range of topics in social psychology. Broad knowledge outside of your primary research area can help in many aspects of your academic life, such as in getting the most out of conferences, in being able to talk to colleagues in other research areas, and in finding unseen connections to your research.
- To highlight new and exciting findings and approaches in the study of social psychology.
- To help you practice being an academic, including: reading papers efficiently, learning effective strategies for scientific writing, asking questions in front of an audience, developing skills in critical thinking and research critique, and practice formulating research ideas. We will also focus in large part on the publication process and why and how articles end up in the “top” journals in the field.

The success of this course, and your learning, depends entirely on your preparation and participation. Thoughtful, interactive discussion based on a careful reading of the assigned papers is essential. At the end of this document you will find a rubric for critiquing quantitative research. You should complete the rubric for each article you read for this course. I will not collect the rubrics from you, so need only to jot notes for yourself, but you should be prepared to share your thoughts, ideas, and opinions on each section of the rubric and the paper more generally. I hope this is not necessary for a graduate-level course, but if it becomes clear that students are not doing the reading, I will turn the rubrics into a formal, graded assignment. Grades will be based on attendance and participation. Students who are auditing the course (i.e., sitting in without receiving credit) are expected to participate fully, as if you were taking the course for credit.

Students will uphold the University of Florida Honor Code in all aspects of this course. Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office, who will provide documentation to the student.

SPEAKER SCHEDULE

See https://docs.google.com/document/d/1InI9wu6rXEU_0Rp63_v_tewjW0xLdGI8e-TpfmpDtrs/edit for speaker and introduction schedule.

CRITIQUING AN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PAPER

<i>Background</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do the authors think the study is necessary? Do you agree? • Is this research question interesting and/or important?
<i>Hypotheses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the hypotheses clearly stated and testable? • What previous research are they based on? Are they grounded in theory? • Do the authors sufficiently justify their hypotheses?
<i>Sample</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do authors discuss power and a data collection stopping rule? Are they sufficient? • How generalizable is the sample? Who is left out? Does that matter for this research?
<i>Method/ Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the IVs and DVs? • How are they operationalized and measured? • Are the measures valid and reliable? • Are there ways the method and/or procedure could be improved?
<i>Data Analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the analyses appropriate for the data collected? • Could different analyses have been used?
<i>Results/ Discussion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the results consistent with the hypothesis? • What are the implications and real-world applications of this research? • What would be a logical extension of this work that was not mentioned? • Does the discussion section do a good job situating this work in the bigger-picture?
<i>Writing/ Publication</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the paper generally well-written? What is good about the writing? What could be improved? • Do the authors provide sufficient information throughout? What is missing? • Why do you think the authors chose this journal as an outlet for this work?