9704 Research Methods [2019-2020]

Fall: Tuesdays, 9–12 (3102)    Winter: Mondays, 9–12 (2102)

First Meeting: Sept. 10

Professor: Matt Thomson
Phone: (519) 661 4279

Offcie: Room 3357
Email: mthomson@ivey.uwo.ca (best way to contact me)

The schedule may be juggled (e.g. to accommodate changes to guests’ availability etc...)

“...data analysis alone does not enable researchers to achieve their main goal, namely, to answer questions. To reach that goal, researchers must concentrate on their design: it must be as sound as possible, and it must be appropriate for the questions they want answered...
Though there are numerous techniques of data analysis, no techniques, regardless of its elegance, sophistication, and power can save the research when the design is poor, improper, confounded, or misguided. As we have stated, and will state again, sound inferences and generalizations from a piece of research are a function of design and not statistical analysis...”
(Keppel & Zedeck, 1991, pg. 12)

This course will introduce different ways of conducting research. The focus is on methodological and philosophy of science issues – it is not a statistics class. It will help you develop skills to conduct and evaluate research. By the end of the course, you will have some appreciation of the research process. But, this course will not make you an expert and it only marks the beginning of your methodological training.

Evaluation: Performance will be assessed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critiques</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December paper</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam - Poster</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final average in this class will likely be in the 80% to 85% range, though there is no policy specifying it cannot be higher or lower. 90%+ = A+ (= truly exceptional); 80-90% = A (doing just fine); 70-80% = B (“we should talk”).

Materials:

(1) A. F. Chalmers, What Is This Thing Called Science? (3rd edition please)
(3) Sudhir Venkatesh, Gang Leader for a Day (any paperback version is fine)
(4) Ben Goldacre, Bad Science (get most recent version please)
(5) Various readings (articles, book chapters) available on a network folder
PDFs of the remaining readings (i.e. excluding assigned books) can be found at:

*Network > biz-info > phd > shared > Research Methods Course*

**Contribution:** The course is a seminar, a format that requires you to speak. If you have not carefully prepared the readings for the week, it’s better not to talk. To paraphrase Bausell (1994, p. 18), I will not accept intellectual bullshitting and neither should you. I evaluate your contribution daily on the basis of the quality and quantity of your contributions. Do all the readings carefully. Be thoughtful. Make well-substantiated and logical arguments. Be critical. Take risks. Listen. There are three ways to contribute:

1. Ask questions, answer questions, respond to comments, wonder aloud, provoke discussion etc… regularly during classes.

You will also do two types of presentations:

2. **Formal Presentation of a paper:** you present a research paper that I assign *as if it were your own* (i.e. you are one of its authors). When you are done the presentation, other students will challenge you, ask questions etc… (i.e. offer their own critique) of ‘your’ paper. Use powerpoint as if it’s a normal talk at a conference. Plan for a 15 minute presentation. Your job will be to get through the presentation and effectively respond to comments etc… I have assigned each of you an article to present on the reading list.

3. **Reading Presentation:** You present the important content of an assigned reading. You have to make the determination of what is important*. Take as much time as you need but I’ll rarely let you go over 15 minutes. If you need less time to do an effective job, take less time. Your job is to teach the content in whatever manner you think will be most clear and effective (but no powerpoint, no handouts; you stand at the whiteboard and employ a single piece of paper to help you remember content) making sure to pull out of the assigned reading key insights, theories, ideas, facts etc… You goal is to help the class reach a superior understanding of the topics and ideas in a given reading. These are labelled **RP1-RP10** in the reading list.

   
   *this means you may have to ignore content. It is better to be deep than broad, to focus on a few important things in a thorough manner than cover many things in a cursory manner.

This means that some days, you may have to do both a Formal Presentation of a paper AND present a reading. It will pay for you to be organized. Everyone must hand in the assigned critique (below) except the one or two students doing a Formal Presentation of that paper on that day (they are free to hand one in if they like, but I’m not expecting it).

**Critiquing:** This is an individual assignment. Throughout the year, I will assign articles for which you write a critique (see *How to Write a Critique* below). All students will also write a critique of the Venkatesh book (which counts as two critiques). You may throw out your two worst critique grades of the year. If you hand in a critique late or miss one, you get 0% on it, but that presumably would be one of the two you would opt to throw out.

In addition to addressing some of the issues outlined in the *How to Write a Critique* content outlined below, each critique must include two excellent questions that are explicitly listed at the end of the critique. The idea is that you will have a chance to read aloud these questions to the presenter of the article you are critiquing and that person, in turn, will respond to you. These questions must provide challenges regarding conceptualization, methodologies etc… of the underlying paper being critiqued. Easy questions or ‘questions of clarification and elaboration’ are strongly discouraged – the point is to (a) demonstrate an advanced understanding of the underlying paper and to (b) challenge the presenter. Under no conditions should these questions be shared with the presenter in advance – what fun would that be?!

So for each critique, you must (a) upload the critique (that includes the questions you’ll ask in class) to the Turn It In site (more below), AND (b) bring to class a copy of the two questions you intend to ask.
Deadline: upload your critique no later than the start of class in which we discuss the related paper. Don’t leave it too close - I will not accept late papers and whatever the time stamp on Turn It In says, that’s the time stamp I’m using.

Your critique of the Venkatesh book may be 3 pages long. All others may not exceed 2 pages.

Formatting: typed, single spaced, 1-inch margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman. Please make sure your name appears prominently somewhere on the critique.

Also, at various times during the year, I may ask for a version of your critique that is anonymized – this is so I can distribute a version to the class without giving away your identity (so other students can learn from your work).

December Paper: Write a paper on a management topic that interests you. The paper must be de novo (e.g. independent of other current or past coursework or workplace efforts). You may use an idea given to you by a professor at Ivey, or even work with that person to develop your ideas, but you must be the ‘primary’ on the paper (e.g. first author) and be the major force driving the ideas and paper forward. Though you may work with a professor on the conceptualizing of the paper, it is not permissible to have them read or provide feedback on a draft of the manuscript prior to handing it in and it is not permissible to use any form of copy editor or assistance in writing the paper. It must represent your own work.

Make it a small enough idea that you can get it done, but a big enough one that if you collected data on it, you could see yourself presenting it next year at a conference. The papers you submit should be aimed at a quality that would generate interest from reviewers at good journals in your field. Do not propose a meta-analysis or conceptual paper. The paper must be hypothesis driven (present no less than two and no more than four hypotheses) and it must demonstrate a good grasp of the literature; it must attempt to make an explicit and significant contribution; it must be logical, persuasive and put theory front and centre. The paper includes everything you would typically see in a top journal article up to (but not including) the “Study 1” section. That is:

- Introduction section (e.g. Position paper. Why is it important? What is the contribution? What is the general approach of the paper? What is the paper’s goal?). This section must include a succinct and precise representation of your research question.
- Literature Review: Derived from and supports your research question. This section should include hypotheses generation.
- Figures, tables etc… You must include an explicit theoretical model. That is, there must be a theoretical figure, a picture of how you conceptualize the relationships among your core variables.
- References: must be accurate and complete.

Due: 5 pm, Tuesday Dec. 17, 2019. Submit via Turn It In but also email me a PDF copy as a backup. I am limiting you to 10 pages of text (not including references, tables and figures, abstract/title page). The title page should include the title, authorship and abstract. It is vital that you keep a good length/contribution ratio. You must develop your ideas logically and clearly. I value depth over breadth in this endeavour. Please make a PDF copy of the paper and email it to me (CC’ing yourself in the same email) by the deadline. You are free to hand the paper in early but you are only permitted to hand it in once (I tend to grade these as I receive them).

Text Formatting: typed, 1.5 spaced, 1-inch margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman. For other formatting issues (e.g. references, tables/figures…), adopt the style used by a top research journal in your respective field.

Final Exam – Poster: Your final exam will be in the form of a poster presented at the annual Faculty Retreat (schedule to be determined but it is tentatively end of April). Many students present the updated version of their December paper while others present other research they have been working on since starting at Ivey, but the same rules apply – it must be original research (e.g. independent of other current or past coursework or workplace efforts). It must be in the form of a high-quality poster presented at any top conference, including explicit statement of research question(s), moderately detailed description of studies/methods, clear summary of
results and contributions etc... It has to be able to ‘stand on its own’ (that is, be clear and comprehensive without your having to explain it. Imagine you are at a conference; for every one person you talk to about your poster, many others will look at it and not be able to talk to you). You should make yourself familiar with the expectations of a poster as well as talk to senior students about their formatting ideas. I will seek input from all faculty about their impression of the posters (though I alone remain responsible for grading). It will also cost something in the neighborhood of $60 to have the poster printed (Western University has the facilities to do it).

Here is the hard part. **You must present actual data.** You have ~8 months (from September to the presentation date) to obtain ethics approval (if necessary - see NOTE below), conduct a study and analyze the data. Remember, the research idea must be de novo (not building on Master’s data or previous workplace efforts etc…). It does not have to be an enormous study, but it must be tight, defensible, thoughtful etc...

Keep in mind that it will take about a month to have your ethics/IRB application approved (if you are using human subject data). It will take time to collect and analyze the data. You should start moving with the paper/presentation components of this course early. One reasonable goal you should expect of yourself is to submit this paper to one of your area’s major conferences. You will be in much better shape if you submit your ethics application by early December.

**NOTE:** If your study involves human-subjects, you will have to obtain ethics approval (i.e. see Western’s office of Human Research Ethics for details). To do this, you’ll have to be sponsored by a professor and have your actual study designed (e.g. know how you plan to recruit, what measures you’ll collect, etc... It is very specific). It also takes at least a month to get approval.

**Course Rules:**

- I will not accept late papers or assignments except by prior written arrangement or unless I receive what I judge to be unambiguous evidence of extenuating circumstances in which case it is at my discretion how to handle grading. Otherwise, late papers, assignments etc… will earn an automatic grade of zero. Assignments that exceed page limits will be treated as late (i.e. 0%).

- I expect you to attend all classes and I expect you to be on time. If you plan to be absent or late, email me ahead of time. If you miss 5 or more classes, you may not do the final exam. In any event, if you miss a class, you are responsible for completing the assignment and readings on time.

- Pay attention to the quality of your writing/arguments (well organized and articulated; specific and clear meanings; perfect formatting etc…). COMMUNICATE IN SUCH A MANNER THAT YOU CANNOT POSSIBLY BE MISUNDERSTOOD. If you can’t communicate your amazing ideas, they’re bad ideas. I tend to be hard on poorly written assignments.

- No Wikipedia. You are a doctoral student now.

- I use Turn It In.com for all written assignments. Sometime in the beginning of the semester, you’ll receive an email to register at this site. Please do so and submit all your course work to me through it. However, here is some official language on the matter: “All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism-detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com(https://www.turnitin.com).” See also https://www.lib.uwo.ca/tutorials/plagiarism/ and https://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf.

**Academic integrity:** Plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty will be dealt with consistent with the official policies of the university. This concept applies with equal force to all assignments and is considered a major Scholastic Offence. I want to be very clear: If I find you to be cheating, plagiarizing, working together when you are not permitted to etc…, I will do everything in my power to have you removed from the class, the program and the university. I will be holding you, as a PHD student, to a high standard of integrity and professional conduct. If you have concerns, queries etc…, talk to me immediately. Here is some language that
the university requires: “Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site: http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf

Mental Health: As part of a successful graduate student experience at Western, we encourage students to make their health and wellness a priority. Western provides several on campus health-related services to help you achieve optimum health and engage in healthy living while pursuing your graduate degree. For example, to support physical activity, all students, as part of their registration, receive membership in Western’s Campus Recreation Centre. Numerous cultural events are offered throughout the year. Please check out the Faculty of Music web page http://www.music.uwo.ca/ and our own Mcintosh Gallery http://www.mcintoshgallery.ca/. Information regarding health- and wellness-related services available to students may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/

Students seeking help regarding mental health concerns are advised to speak to someone they feel comfortable confiding in, such as their faculty supervisor, their program director (graduate chair), or other relevant administrators in their unit. Campus mental health resources may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/resources.html

To help you learn more about mental health, Western has developed an interactive mental health learning module, found here: http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/module.html. This module is 30 minutes in length and provides participants with a basic understanding of mental health issues and of available campus and community resources. Topics include stress, anxiety, depression, suicide and eating disorders. After successful completion of the module, participants receive a certificate confirming their participation.

How to Write a Critique

Summarize briefly – in your own words, not cut and paste from the abstract for example – and then in detail assess the reading. You cannot do an effective job at critiquing an article if you have not read the other assigned readings for a session. Here are some guidelines: 1 (things to think about when preparing critiques). You won’t have room to talk about all these things in any given critique, but this is a good set of questions etc… to get you focused. Remember, only focus on important aspects of the paper.

1. Briefly summarize the question the author is trying to answer. Is this question interesting and important? Why or why not? In evaluating the importance of the question, you should consider whether the author’s review of the literature suggests a logical need for this research. Some issues you might want to think about are: Is this research the first empirical test of an important theoretical prediction? Does it extend existing theory? Does it test competing theoretical predictions? Does it remedy important flaws in past empirical research?

2. Briefly describe the model the author uses to answer the research question. What are the key concepts in the model and what are the relationships between those concepts? Try to be as specific as possible in describing the model (e.g., do not say “this paper tests a transactions costs theory of the employment relationship,” rather say that “this paper examines the idea that the firm specificity of employees’ skills affects the mechanisms a firm uses to govern the employment relationship”.). Your summary of the model should be brief; it should indicate that you understand that author’s model without describing it in detail. If you are able, you may wish to comment on how well the model fits with existing literature in the area. How well does the model represent what we already know about the author’s research question?

3. Discuss the appropriateness of the author’s methodology. Does the methodology appear to be able to answer the author’s research question? Some issues to consider are: Is the sample appropriate (e.g., if the author wants to study factors that affect the death of firms, does the sample include both firms that died and

1 I have pulled most of this content from Prof. Jay Anand’s (Ohio State University) syllabus on Research Methods.
comparable firms that did not die?) Are the measures reasonable representations of the constructs in the author’s model (e.g., in the study just described, how does the author measure organizational death? Is this measure consistent with the author’s theoretical description of the construct?).

4. Include some evaluation of the appropriateness of the statistical tests. Are the tests reasonable, given the author’s research question? Does the author explore alternative explanations for the results and test them where possible? How well does the author explain anomalous or unexpected results? Are the author’s explanations for these results tested, where possible? Be careful not to get bogged down in detail. Do not criticize the statistical tests unless you can offer some reasonable explanation for why the test is inappropriate or for why an alternative test would be more appropriate. For example, do not say “the author should have used a regression analysis instead of comparing means across organizations” unless you can explain why a simple comparison of means is not appropriate and how a regression analysis would have improved the author’s results.

5. Evaluate the author’s conclusions. Do the conclusions address the author’s research question? Are the conclusions consistent with the results? Are there any untested alternative explanations for the author’s results? If these alternative explanations cannot be tested in this research, does the author suggest ways in which these explanations might be tested in future research? Does the author discuss the limitations of the research and describe ways of remedying those limitations in future research?

6. Provide suggestions for improvement (this can be done in conjunction with each of the items listed above or as a separate section of the critique). For each major criticism of the work, suggest ways in which the work could be improved. For example, if you feel that the research question is not important, suggest a related, but more important, research question. If you believe that the sample is flawed, suggest a more appropriate, but still reasonable sample. You should refrain from making suggestions that are correct theoretically but infeasible practically. For example, you could criticize most research by saying “the author should have selected a random sample of organizations.” While this is true in theory, it is typically impossible in practice and thus is not a very useful criticism. Your suggestions for improvement should focus on practical, reasonable steps that the author could take to improve the research. If you are one of the fortunate few who reviews a study that, like Mary Poppins, is “practically perfect in every way,” you should have several ideas for expanding the research.

7. It is much better to focus your critique on ideas, concepts, contributions, constructs, measurement, arguments, interpretations, hypotheses, evidence, conclusions, etc… It’s tempting (because it’s easy) to focus on surface things like writing style, writing quality, diction, spelling, organization but that’s not going to push your brain very hard. If these cursory things are a [devastatingly major issue, note them BRIEFLY (one sentence) and move on.

Use the following to figure out your critiques (see reading list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your First Name</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Reading Presented by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>RP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoorsana</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>RP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murat</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>RP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>RP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuzanna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>RP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naryoung</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>RP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>RP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramin</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>RP8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
READING LIST:

Session 1: Bad Science (Sept. 10)

Session 2: Writing and Reviewing (Sept. 17)
- Cochrane (2005), “Writing Tips for Ph.D. Students” RP1

Critique 1 Due: (A) and (B) – that is everyone – write a critique of Golder and Tellis (1993) “Pioneer Advantage: Marketing Logic or Marketing Legend”

Note: critique your article by applying the ideas advanced in the other papers and in light of the day’s topic. I don’t expect you to be a marketing expert.

Session 3: Ethics (Sept. 24)
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 4 RP5

Critique 2 Due:
(A) Milgram (1969) “Obedience to Authority”, Chapters 1, 2 and 14 (formal presentation by: Ali)
(B) Haney et al. (1973), “A Study of Prisoners and Guards…” (formal presentation by: Ramin)

Note: your critiques of either Haney et al. or Milgram should be based on applying the principles laid out in the Tri-Council Statement. That is, before you write a critique, you need to read the material for the class.

Session 4: Graduate School (Oct. 1)

Critique 3 Due:
(A) Williamson and Cable (2003) “Predicting Early Career Research Productivity: The Case of Management Faculty” (formal presentation by: Annie)
(B) Long et al. (1998) “Research Productivity of Graduates in Management: Effects of Academic Origin and Academic Affiliation” (formal presentation by: Hoorsana)

Session 5: Ideas and Writing (Oct. 8)

Critique 4 Due:
(B) Stremersch, Stefan, Isabel Verniers and Peter C. Verhoef (2007), “The Quest for Citations: Drivers of Article Impact” (formal presentation by: Ryan)

Session 6: Scientific Method (Oct. 15)
- Chalmers, Chapter 1 RP8

- Chalmers, Chapter 5 RP1
- Chalmers, Chapter 6 RP2
- Chalmers, Chapter 7 RP3
- Kerlinger (1973) “Science and the Scientific Approach” (note this is PDF contains three chapters as below)
  o Chapter 1: Science and the Scientific Approach RP10
  o Chapter 2: Problems and Hypotheses RP1
  o Chapter 3: Constructs, Variables, and Definitions RP2
- Flexner, 1939 RP4

**Session 7: Theory** (Oct. 22)
- Chalmers, Chapter 8 RP5
- Chalmers, Chapter 9 RP6

**Critique 5 Due:**
(A) Ghaseimagz et al. (2012), “A Study of the Relationship between Teachers and Principals’ Spiritual Leadership, Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction and Productivity” *(formal presentation by: Zuzanna)*
(B) Ring and van de Ven (1992), “Structuring Cooperation Relationships between Organizations” *(formal presentation by: Naryoung)*

**Session 8: Grounded Theory/Humanistic Inquiry** (Oct. 29)
- Chalmers, Chapter 2 RP3
- Chalmers, Chapter 4 RP4

**Critique 6 Due:**
(B) Schouten and McAlexander (1995) “Subcultures of Consumption: An Ethnography of the New Bikers”

**Session 9: Qualitative Summary** (Nov. 12)
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 8 RP2
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 9 RP3
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 17 RP4

**Critique 7 Due:** (A) and (B) Venkatesh, *Gang Leader for a Day* (all students must write a critique of this book)

**Session 10: Nadine de Gannes on Qual/Integration?** (Nov. 19) Please note this sessions runs 8:30 to 10:30.

**Session 11: Models I³ (Nov. 26)**

**Session 12: Models II³ (Dec. 3)**

*December Paper Due: 5 pm, Tuesday Dec. 17, 2019. Submit via Turn It In but also email me a PDF copy as a backup.*

**Session 13: Scale Development, Measurement** (Jan. 6)
- Churchill (1979) “A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs” RP5
- Thomson et al. (2005), “The Ties That Bind…” RP1
- Larsen and Bong, 2016, “A Tool for Addressing Construct Identity…” (skip appendix) RP2
Critique 8 Due: (A) and (B): Everyone write a critique of: Bennett and Robinson (2000) “Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance”

Session 14: Self-Report Measures (Jan. 13)
- Podsakoff et al. (2003) “The Mismeasure of Man(agement) and its Implications for Leadership Research” RP4
- Schwarz (1999) “Self Reports: How the Questions Shape the Answers” RP6
- Schwarz (2003), “Self-Reports in Consumer Research…” RP8


Session 16: Natural & Quasi-experiments (Guest: Adam Fremeth) (Jan. 27)

Session 17: Surveys I (Feb. 3)
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 3 RP1
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 12 RP2
- Dillman et al, “From Questions to a Questionnaire” RP3

Session 18: Surveys II (Feb. 10)
- Fowler (1992), “How Unclear Terms Affect Survey Data” RP8
- Blair et al. (1977), “How to Ask Questions about Drinking and Sex…” RP1
- Bishop et al. (1986), “Opinions on Fictitious Issues…” RP4

Session 19: Surveys III (March 2).
- Heine et al (2002), “What’s Wrong with Cross-Cultural Comparisons…” RP1

Session 20: Validity, Reliability and Generalizability (March 9)
- Bachrach et al. (2001) “Attributions of the “Causes” of Group Performance as an Alternative Explanation of the Relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Performance” RP4
- Peter (1979) “Reliability: A Review of Psychometric Basics and Recent Marketing Practices” (ignore marketing practices section) RP8

Session 21: Experiments (March 16)
- Chalmers, Chapter 3 RP2
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 2 RP3
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 5 RP4
- Bickman and Rog, Chapter 6 RP5

3 You will receive instructions on how to prepare for this session in advance.
• Greenwald (1976) “Within-Subjects Designs: To Use or Not To Use?” RP8
• Prentice and Miller (1992) “When Small Effects are Impressive” RP1
• Meyvis and Van Osselaer, “Increasing the Power of Your Study…” RP2

Session 22: Mediation, Moderation etc… (March 23)
• Krishna, “A Clearer Spotlight on Spotlight…” RP3
• Spiller et al, “Spotlights, Floodlights and the Magic Number Zero…” RP4
• Zhao, Lynch and Chen “Reconsidering Baron and Kenny…” RP5
• Carlson and Wu, “The Illusion of Statistical Control…” RP6
• Spector and Brannick, “Methodological Urban Legends…” RP8

Session 23: Biases etc. (March 30)
• Greenberg (1987) “The College Sophomore as Guinea Pig: Setting the Record Straight” RP1
• Sawyer (1975) “Demand Artifacts in Laboratory Experiments in Consumer Research” RP4
• Weber and Cook (1972) “Subject Effects in Laboratory Research” RP5

Session 24: Controversies in Research (April 6)
• Simmons et al. (2011), “False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis Allows Presenting Anything as Significant” RP6
• Vandenberg, Robert J. (2011), “The Revolution with a Solution: All is Not Quiet on the Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends Front” RP8
• Lehrer, Jonah (2010), “The Truth Wears Off” RP1
• Simonsohn (2012), “Just Post It: The Lesson from Two Cases of Fabricated Data Detected by Statistics Alone” RP2

Session 24: People’s Choice (RP1 – RP7 → all students prepare) Each student bring in a copy of what he or she views as an important RM-related paper that we have not covered in this class. During Session 24, each student will present (~15 minutes) their chosen paper, explaining its significance etc...

Final exam (i.e. Posters) – April 20. Details TBD.