

COURSE #630:685: Experimental Methods

Spring 2018

Newark, 1 WP, Room 402

Fridays, 1:00pm – 4:00pm

Dr. Kristina Durante

1 Washington Park, Room 978

kdurante@business.rutgers.edu

Office Hours: by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is about taking an idea and turning it into a published scientific paper. Although the course will impart research skills in design and methodology, its aim is to provide a framework students will carry with them throughout their career as they guide a project from idea to paper.

The course will focus on how to take your research ideas and turn them into properly designed studies that can form the basis for high-quality, high-impact scientific papers. The class will give students a solid understanding of study design (i.e., how to make the right choices when testing an idea) and implementation (i.e., how to carry out those choices).

The course will consist of readings, discussion, in-class exercises, a journal review, a research study (carried out from start to finish), and 2 short presentations.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The course will cover the following topics.

Primary:

- ✓ How to determine which *methods and empirical findings* best support those ideas
- ✓ Navigating data analysis decisions, including emerging ethical challenges in data collection, analysis, and reporting
- ✓ Distinct “methodological paradigms for publishing high-quality research” (e.g., bridging disciplines, challenging assumptions, combining moderators and mediators, venturing into the real world).
- ✓ A toolkit to turn an idea into a testable hypothesis that becomes a research paper.

Secondary:

- ✓ Action strategies for discovering high-quality ideas
- ✓ Crucial role of theory in framing hypotheses
- ✓ Tips for writing and revising

COURSE MATERIALS

- (1) Book 1: *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, by Shadish, Cook, & Campbell
- (2) Book 2: *How to Publish High-Quality Research* by Jeff Joireman and Paul A. M. Van Lange
- (3) Additional readings will be posted on Blackboard

Check Blackboard (blackboard.rutgers.edu) and your official Rutgers email account regularly.

LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This course is designed to help students develop skills and knowledge in the following area(s): idea generation, research design and implementation, interpreting data, and crafting a scientific journal article.

Students develop these skills and knowledge through the following course activities and assignments:

Reflections/Assignments

For each class (as indicated), you will turn in either a “Reflection” or a home assignment. Reflections are like journal entries for reflecting and thinking more deeply about the readings and papers assigned for class. For each reflection you can do any one or all of the following: offer a short critique of the papers you read, suggest an additional experiment for each paper you read, discuss which study from a paper is the weakest and what you might replace the study with, and/or suggest a research idea related to the class topic and how you would test it.

Each reflection must be at least 1/2 page in length and can be as long as you want. **Reflections will be discussed in class and must be turned in electronically right before the start of each class.** Because reflections are like journal entries, you will get credit for turning them in and you will receive feedback in class, but they will NOT be graded.

In some instances, I will guide you to a particular paper to critique for your reflection. In other instances, you can choose among the papers you will read which to critique. Instructions will be provided with the readings for each week.

Journal Article Review

You will be given a manuscript submitted to or recently published in a major marketing journal. Your task is to write a review, using the reviewer guidelines provided by me and the *Journal of Consumer Research* (See “Reviewing for JCR” under the Reviewer Tab at <http://ejcr.org>). Given the focus of this seminar, the review should center on methodological and statistical issues in the journal article. Comments regarding theory development are not necessary, unless they impinge on the adequacy of the methodology.

Research Project

Each student will submit an 8-12 page final research paper (written in either JCR or APA format). Because the most value comes from doing not simply reading about and imagining what

can be done, you will take an idea to the finish line in an actual study that you design and carry out. To that end, the research project in this class will be a paper based on a research idea you present to the class. You will design an experiment to test and collect data on this idea. The paper itself should include a clear presentation and motivation of the research question and your proposed contribution, a concise mention of key findings from the literature, well-articulated hypothesis, a clear explication of your method, results, and an interpretation of the results, including limitations of the method used and future directions for the research. The paper should reflect reading (beyond what is included in this syllabus) in your selected area. The paper should have a clear explication of the methods and analysis plan.

Presentations

Each student will make two presentations in class – (1) a proposal for their idea and research design and (2) a presentation of the final results.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

I do NOT tolerate cheating. Students are responsible for understanding the RU Academic Integrity Policy (http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/files/documents/AI_Policy_2013.pdf). I will strongly enforce this Policy and pursue *all* violations. On all examinations and assignments, students must sign the RU Honor Pledge, which states, “On my honor, I have neither received nor given any unauthorized assistance on this examination or assignment.” [I will screen all written assignments through *SafeAssign* or *Turnitin*, plagiarism detection services that compare the work against a large database of past work.] Don’t let cheating destroy your hard-earned opportunity to learn. See business.rutgers.edu/ai for more details.

ATTENDANCE AND PREPARATION POLICY

- Expect me to attend all class sessions. I expect the same of you. If I am to be absent, my department chair or I will send you notice via email and Blackboard as far in advance as possible. If you are to be absent, report your absence in advance at <https://sims.rutgers.edu/ssra/>. If your absence is due to religious observance, a Rutgers-approved activity, illness, or family emergency/death and you seek makeup work, also send me an email with full details and supporting

 - For weather emergencies, consult the campus home page. If the campus is open, class will be held.

 - Expect me to arrive on time for each class session. I expect the same of you. [If you are going to be tardy, then please let me know ahead of time.

 - Expect me to remain for the entirety of each class session. I expect the same of you. [If you are going to leave early, then please let me know ahead of time.

 - Expect me to prepare properly for each class session. I expect the same of you. Complete all background reading and assignments. You cannot learn if you are not prepared. The minimum expectation is that for each 3-hour class session, you have prepared by studying for at least twice as many hours.

 - Expect me to participate fully in each class session. I expect the same of you. Stay focused and involved. You cannot learn if you are not paying attention.
-

CLASSROOM CONDUCT

No talking with classmates during class time unless instructed to do so.

No cell phones—turn them on silent and put them away.

No sleeping

No signing attendance sheet for other students

Violation of these rules will not be tolerated and will result in point deductions from your final grade.

GRADING POLICY

Course grades are determined as follows:

(1) Reflections (journal entries)	5%
(2) Participation	25%
(3) Journal Article Review	20%
(4) Final Research Project	30%
(5) 2 Research Presentations	20% (10% each)

Extra credit: None expected at this time.

Pregrading & regrading: There will be no pregrading. I will answer questions about assignments but will not do any special grading ahead of time. If you request a regrade, please keep in mind that your grade may not change. Also, while there is a chance that I will notice something that will cause your grade to go up, there is a chance that I will notice something that will cause your grade to go down.

Grade grubbing: Your final grade is not subject to negotiation. If you feel I have made an error, submit your written argument to me within one week of receiving your final grade. Clarify the precise error I made and provide all due supporting documentation. If I have made an error, I will gladly correct it. But I will adjust grades only if I have made an error. I cannot and will not adjust grades based on consequences, such as hurt pride, lost scholarships, lost tuition reimbursement, lost job opportunities, or dismissals. Do not ask me to do so. It is dishonest to attempt to influence faculty in an effort to obtain a grade that you did not earn, and it will not work.

TENTATIVE CLASS SCHEDULE

Experimental Methods COURSE #630:685, Spring 2018 Fridays 1:00pm to 4:00pm

Week 1, January 19th: Foundations of High-Quality Research

Background Reading:

The Importance of Stupidity in Scientific Research by Martin Schwartz, *Journal of Cell Science*

Week 2, January 26th: Idea Generation and Research Methods

Background Reading:

Quickly skim the following articles to become acquainted with different methods of consumer behavior research: qualitative research, correlational (survey) research, experimental research, and quasi-experimental research.

Qualitative Research: Susan Fournier (1988), "Consumers and their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (March), 343-74.

Survey Research: C. Whan Park, Deborah J. MacInnis, Joseph Priester, Andreas B. Eisingerich, and Dawn Iacobucci (2010), "Brand Attachment and Brand Attitude Strength: Conceptual and Empirical Differentiation of Two Critical Brand Equity Drivers," *Journal of Marketing*, 74(November), 1-17.

Experimental Research: Hill, Sarah E., Christopher D. Rodeheffer, Vladas Griskevicius, Kristina M. Durante, and Andrew E. White (2012), "Boosting Beauty in an Economic Decline: Mating, Spending, and the Lipstick Effect," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103 (2), 275-291.

Quasi-experimental Research: Klein, J. and Dawar, N. (2004), "Corporate Social Responsibility and Consumers' Attributions and Brand Evaluations in a Product-Harm Crisis," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 21, 203-217.

Thoroughly read the following:

Discovering High Quality Ideas: The Many Roads to Rome, Chapter 1: *How to Publish High-Quality Research* by Jeff Joireman and Paul A. M. Van Lange

Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, Chapter 1 (pp. 1-18), Chapter 2 (pp. 33-42).

Susan T. Fiske (2004), Mind the Gap: In Praise of Informal Sources of Formal Theory, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*

In-Class Assignment:

To begin our discussion of validity issues, we are going to examine a manuscript that went through the review process at a major marketing journal, the *Journal of Consumer Research*. I have posted the originally submitted manuscript (“Manuscript Round 1”) and the first set of reviews (“Reviews Round 1”) on Blackboard. Then, identify three points made by the reviewers and associate editor that relate to methods issues. Then, for each issue you have identified, classify it as pertaining to one of four categories: internal validity issue, external validity issue, construct validity issue, or statistical conclusion validity issue. Explain why it belongs to this category. [This is *not* a written assignment]

Week 3, February 2nd: Internal Validity

Background Reading:

Shadish, Cook, and Campbell, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, Chapter 2 (pp. 53-62), Chapter 8 (pp. 246-256).

Joireman and Van Lange, *Developing and Testing Theories*, Chapter 2

For In-Class Discussion

Listed below are two articles that are posted on Bb. For each article, evaluate the extent to which the research rules out threats to internal validity. In doing so, identify aspects of the methods that helped ruled out threats to internal validity—and identify aspects of the methods that were less positive and contributed to a threat to internal validity being present. Which of the two articles scores better on internal validity?

1. Gino, F., Norton, M.I., and D. Ariely (2010), “The Counterfeit Self: The Deceptive Costs of Faking It,” *Psychological Science*, 21, 712-720.
2. Hieke, S. (2010), “Effects of Counterfeits on the Image of Luxury Brands: An Empirical Study from the Customer Perspective,” *Journal of Brand Management*, 18, 159-173.

Home Assignment:

To continue our discussion of validity issues, I am posting one of my manuscripts in its “first version” form on Bb. Please read the manuscript and DO NOT become tempted to read the final version of the paper. I want you to take the role of reviewer of this paper and identify methods issues, particularly as they relate to internal and external validity. Then, I would like you to come up with at least two ideas for how the authors can repair these methods issues. For example, how might you design a new study the authors can run to overcome the issues you see? What would

the authors need to consider in order to continue to position the paper (i.e., frame the paper) in the way that they have? Please write out the feedback and turn it in to me as a reflection. You can email me your feedback before class.

Week 4: Construct Validity and Statistical Conclusion Validity

We will discuss issues related to construct validity, including construct validity of the cause (independent variables) and construct validity of the effect (dependent variables).

Background Reading:

Shadish, Cook, and Campbell, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, Chapter 3 (pp. 64-82).

Feldman, J. M. and Lynch, J. C. (1988), "Self-Generated Validity and Other Effects of Measurement on Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 421-435.

Schwarz, Norbert (1999), "Self-Reports: How the Questions Shape the Answers," *American Psychologist*, 54, 93-105.

Schwarz, N., Clore, G. L. (2016). Evaluating psychological research requires more than attention to the N: A comment on Simonsohn's (2015) "small telescopes." *Psychological Science*, 27, 1407–1409. (skim)

For in Class Discussion:

Listed below are two articles that are posted on Bb. For each article, evaluate the extent to which the research rules out threats to construct validity. In doing so, identify aspects of the methods that helped rule out threats to construct validity—and identify aspects of the methods that were less positive.

1. Regan, D. T. and R. Fazio (1977), "On the Consistency between Attitudes and Behavior: Look to the Method of Attitude Formation," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13, 28-45.
2. Smith, R. E. and W. R. Swinyard (1983), "Attitude-Behavior Consistency: The Impact of Product Trial Versus Advertising," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20 (August), 257-67.

Home Assignment:

For your reflection/homework, submit to me an original research question and design for how to test it (one study). This will form the basis of an in-class discussion on study design. You do not need to go into lengthy detail. Just a half a page and no more than one page double-spaced.

Week 5: SCP, NO CLASS

Week 6: Statistical Overview: What Tests to Run

Background Reading:

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 36(4), 717-731.

Spiller, S. A., Fitzsimons, G. J., Lynch Jr, J. G., & McClelland, G. H. (2013). Spotlights, floodlights, and the magic number zero: Simple effects tests in moderated regression. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50(2), 277-288.

Additional Readings (skim):

Shadish, Cook, and Campbell, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, Chapter 2 (pp. 42-53).

Simmons, J. P., L. D. Nelson, and U. Simonsohn (2011), "False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis that Allows Presenting Anything as Significant," *Psychological Science*, 20, 1-8.

Tom Meyvis, Stijn M J Van Osselaer (2018). Increasing the Power of Your Study by Increasing the Effect Size, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Volume 44, Issue 5, Pages 1157–1173.

Home Assignment:

In addition to the reading, please visit Hayes' website and look around:

<http://afhayes.com/index.html> There is valuable information on the various types of mediation analysis.

Week 7: External Validity and Journal Reviewing

This week we will be finishing discussion of external validity and preparing to complete our journal review during class in Week 8.

Background Reading:

Fiske, Donald W. and Louis Fogg (1990), "But the Reviewers are Making Different Criticisms of My Paper!" *American Psychologist*, 45, 591-598.

Holbrook, Morris (1986), "A Note on Sadomasochism in the Review Process: I Hate When That Happens," *Journal of Marketing*, July, 104-108.

How to Review a Paper, by Bob Cialdini

In-Class Discussion Part 1:

Listed below are two articles that are posted on Bb. For each article, evaluate the research on the basis of external validity. Specifically, identify aspects of the method that are (1) helpful in establishing external validity; and (2) detrimental in terms of establishing external validity. Overall, which of the two papers would score better in terms of external validity?

1. Pires, C. and L. Agante (2011), "Encouraging Children to Eat More Healthy: The Influence of Packaging," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 10, 161-168.
2. Miller, E.G., Seiders, K., Kenny, M., and M.E. Walsh (2011), "Children's Use of On-Package Nutritional Claim Information," *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 10, 122-32.

In Class Discussion Part 2:

In the second half of class we will continue to discuss your research ideas.

Week 8: In Class Journal Review

Week 9: SPRING BREAK, NO CLASS

Week 10: IRB Protocol and Paradigm Shifts, Challenging Assumptions, Testing Competing Theories

We will go through the process of submitting an IRB application, including Exempt Form, Questionnaire, Cover Letter, and Procedure. This tutorial will serve as the starting point for obtaining IRB approval for your data collection if you do not already have IRB approval. We will also talk about how to obtain IRB certification if you do not already have it.

Week 11: No Class – Meme Symposium

Week 12: Survey Design I

We will discuss special topics in consumer research methods related to survey design. I have compiled a list of topics and readings for this purpose. Please read the first three papers below. We will discuss these papers (under Reliability and Cross Cultural Research) along with going over your individual survey design.

For Week 13, I will be asking if you have an idea for another topic, so we can discuss whether it's a good fit for discussion.

Reliability:

Bergvist and Rossiter (2007), "The Predictive Validity of Multiple-Item Versus Single-Item Measures of the Same Constructs," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 44 (May), 175-184.

Cross Cultural Differences:

Lalwani, A. K., Shavitt, S., and Johnson, T. (2006), "What is the Relation Between Cultural Orientation and Socially Desirable Responding," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 165-178.

Schwarz, N. (2003), "Self-Reports in Consumer Research: The Challenge of Comparing Cohorts and Cultures," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (March), 588-594.

Week 13: Survey Design II

We will continue our discussion of special topics in consumer research methods related to survey design. Please read the papers below. We will discuss these papers and continue to go over your individual survey design.

Demand Artifacts:

Darley, W. K., & Lim, J. (1993). Assessing demand artifacts in consumer research: An alternative perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 489-493.

Shimp, T. A., Hyatt, E. M., & Snyder, D. J. (1993). A critique of Darley and Lim's "alternative perspective." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 496-501.

Socially Desirable Reporting:

Mick, David G. (1996), "Are Studies of Dark Side Variables Confounded by Socially Desirable Responding: The Case of Materialism," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 23, 106-119.

Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. K., and Fong, G. T. (2006), Establishing a Causal Chain: Why Experiments are More Often Effective than Mediational Analyses in Examining Psychological Processes, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (December), 1173-1182.

Week 14: How To Write a Paper and Responding to Reviewer Comments

Bem, Daryl J. (2003), "Writing the Empirical Journal Article," in J.M. Darley, M.P. Zanna, and H.L. Roediger III (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Practical Guide for the Beginning Social Scientist*, 2nd Edition, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Peracchio, Laura and Jennifer Edison Escalas (2008), "Tell Me a Story: Crafting and Publishing Research in Consumer Psychology," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 18, 197-204.

Zigerell, L. J. (2013), “Rookie Mistakes: Preemptive Comments on Graduate Student Empirical Research Manuscripts”

Do Mothers Spend More on Daughters - Reviews and Durante Response to Reviewers

Spending on Girls - Reviews and Durante Response to Reviewers

Week 15: Data Blitz—Presentation of Final Projects

SUPPORT SERVICES

If you need accommodation for a *disability*, obtain a Letter of Accommodation from the Office of Disability Services. The Office of Disability Services at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, provides student-centered and student-inclusive programming in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments of 2008, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1998, and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination. <https://ods.rutgers.edu>

If you are a military *veteran* or are on active military duty, you can obtain support through the Office of Veteran and Military Programs and Services. <http://veterans.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of *mental health* services, please use our readily available services. Rutgers University-Newark Counseling Center: <http://counseling.newark.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of *physical health* services, please use our readily available services. Rutgers Health Services – Newark: <http://health.newark.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of *legal* services, please use our readily available services: <http://rusls.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of additional *academic assistance*, please use our readily available services. Rutgers University-Newark Learning Center: <http://www.ncas.rutgers.edu/rlc>
Rutgers University-Newark Writing Center: <http://www.ncas.rutgers.edu/writingcenter>