

SYLLABUS
EDUCATION/PSYCHOLOGY 7670
Literature Reviews
Spring 2018

Instructor: Karl R. White (Phone: 797-3013; E-mail: karl.white@usu.edu)
Office: Emma Eccles Jones Early Childhood Education and Research Center #302
(Secretary is Sherry Johnson in #335, 797-3589; sherry.johnson@usu.edu)
Class Time: Mondays, 4:30 – 6:20 PM, EEJ ECERC #162
Credit: 2 credit hours
Prerequisites: PSY/EDUC 6600 or equivalent
Office Hours: By appointment

Course Overview

This course is designed to help students write a literature review that is appropriate for a dissertation or thesis proposal. The course will emphasize skills for writing the Problem Statement and conducting and writing the Review of Literature. Even though the Procedures section is an important part of the dissertation or thesis proposal, it will **not** be dealt with extensively in this class. Other courses that deal specifically with the appropriate design, analysis, and interpretation issues that the student will use for his or her research should be taken prior to this course. Substantial time will be devoted to critiquing previously written Literature Reviews as a way of helping the student understand the differences between a well-written and a poorly-written literature review.

Reading assignments will be given each week, and students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss the material. Class discussion will supplement the reading material, and students will have a variety of practical hands-on experiences. A 20-25 page Literature Review will be submitted at the end of the course.

Schedule of Activities

The course will include outside reading assignments, homework, and class discussion. The various reading and homework assignments are summarized briefly below. For each reading, a class member will be assigned (the week prior to when the article will be discussed) to prepare a written one page summary (with copies for other class members) of the most important content of the reading.

Academic Honesty

Students are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty. Cheating, falsification of information, or plagiarism will not be tolerated. Standards of the University concerning academic honesty are described in the Student Policy Handbook, Article V, Section 3, paragraphs a, b, and c. It is particularly important to emphasize that the written paper for the course must be the student's own work. Plagiarism (i.e., using the work of someone else as your own) or cheating will result in a failing grade in the course. If you have any questions about how much collaborative work is permissible for any part of the class, speak with the instructor.

Evaluation

Course evaluation procedures have been designed as a means of judging the degree to which students have mastered the course content. Points resulting from these activities will be used to determine the student's final grade according to the following:

| | | | |
|----|---------|----|--------------|
| A | 94-100% | C | 73-76% |
| A- | 90-93% | C- | 70-72% |
| B+ | 87-89% | D+ | 67-69% |
| B | 83-86% | D | 63-66% |
| B- | 80-82% | D- | 60-62% |
| C+ | 77-79% | F | 59% or below |

Possible

| Activity | Points | Description and Rationale |
|----------------------|------------|---|
| 1. Literature Review | 100 | Each student will submit a literature review at the end of the semester. This review will contain the elements required for a thesis or dissertation in the College of Education at USU. The review <u>cannot</u> exceed 25 typed, double-spaced pages. Additional instructions for this activity will be given during class. |
| 2. Other Assignments | 165 | The schedule of class activities lists a number of homework assignments which will be explained during class. Each of these is due at the beginning of class on the due date. |
| TOTAL POINTS | 265 | |

If a student has a disability that will likely require accommodations by the instructor, the student must contact the instructor and document the disability through the Disability Resource Center. In cooperation with Disability Resources, course material may be provided in alternative formats such as large print, audio, diskette, or braille.

Class Assignments and Activities for 7670, Spring 2018

| Week/Date | Class Discussion | Homework Assignments for Next Class Period | Points |
|--|---|---|--------|
| #1 | January 8 Problem Statements Threats to Internal Validity Critical Attributes of Good Integrative Reviews | Internal Validity exercises | 10 |
| | | One question your research will answer | 5 |
| | | Problem Statement 1 st draft | 10 |
| | | | |
| January 15 NO CLASSES – Campus closed for Human Rights Day | | | |
| #2 | January 22 Research Questions Internal Validity Exercises Problem Statements | Published Lit Review Critique #1 (Bronfenbrenner) | 10 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| #3 | January 29 Readings #1(Glass '76) and #2 (Glass '77) Published Lit Review Critique #1 (Bronfenbrenner) | Orange Juice and IQ Analysis | 20 |
| | | Literature Review Critique #1 (Service Learning) | 10 |
| | | | |
| #4 | February 5 Reading #3 (White et al) Literature Review Critique #1 (Service Learning) Orange Juice and IQ Analysis | Summary of Previous Reviews on your Topic | 5 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| #5 | February 12 Reading #4 (Slavin) Developing a Coding System | Meta-Analysis Coding Exercise | 10 |
| | | | |
| February 19 Campus closed for President's Day- Class will be held February 20th | | | |
| #6 | February 20 (Monday Schedule) Meta-Analysis Coding Exercise Computation of Effect Sizes | Published Lit Review Critique #2 (Gold et al) | 10 |
| | | Outline of Finding and Conclusions from Previous Reviews on your Topic | 5 |
| | | | |
| #7 | February 26 Reading #5 (Rosenthal & DiMatteo) Published Lit Review #2 (Gold et al Ginkgo Biloba) | Literature Review Critique #2 | 10 |
| | | Coding Sheet and Revised Questions for your Lit Review | 10 |
| | | | |
| Spring Break from March 5-9: NO USU CLASSES | | | |
| #8 | March 12 Reading #6 (Light & Pillemer) Literature Review Critique #2 (Eating Disorders) | Article Critique #1(Textbooks) | 10 |
| | | | |
| March 19 No Class | | | |
| #9 | March 26 Readings #7 (Boote & Beile) and #8 (Wachter) Article Critique #1(textbooks) | Article Critique #2 (Public/private schools) | 10 |
| | | | |
| #10 | April 2 Reading #9 (Moher et al) Article Critique #2 (public/private schools) | Literature Review Critique #3 (Adjunct questions) | 10 |
| | | | |
| #11 | April 9 Literature Review Critique #3 (Adjunct Questions) Reading #10 (Coyne et al) | Published Lit Review Critique #3 (Taylor - Hooking Mortality) | 10 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| #12 | April 16 Readings #11 (Tuft) & 12 (Wainer) Published Lit Review Critique #3 (Taylor - Hooking Mortality) | Literature Review Critique #4 (Attractive Children) | 10 |
| | | Published Lit Review #4 (Parachutes) | |
| | | | |
| #13 | April 23 Literature Review Critique #4 (Attractive Children) Submit Literature Review (due April 30th) | | 100 |
| | | | |

EDUC/PSYCH 7670: Readings

Readings for the course are listed below. Readings and other handouts are available on Canvas.

- 1) Glass, GV. (1976). Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research. Educational Researcher, 5(10), 3-8.
- 2) Glass, GV. (1977). Integrating findings: The meta-analysis of research. Review of Research in Education, 5, 351-379.
- 3) White, KR., Bush, DW., Casto, GC. (1986). Learning from reviews of early intervention. The Journal of Special Education, 19(4), 417-428.
- 4) Slavin, RE. (1986). Best-evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional reviews. Educational Researcher. 15(9), 5-11.
- 5) Rosenthal R and DiMatteo MR. (2001). Meta-analysis: Recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. Annual Review of Psychology 52, 59-82.
- 6) Light, RJ., & Pillemer, D. (1982). Numbers and narrative: Combining their strengths in research reviews. Harvard Educational Review, 52, 1-26.
- 7) Boote, DN., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. Educational Researcher, 34(6), 3-15.
- 8) Wachter, KW. (1988). Disturbed by meta-analysis? Science, 241, 1407-1408.
- 9) Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, and PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. Annals of Internal Medicine, 151(4), 264-269.
- 10) Coyne JC, Thombs BD, and Hagedoorn M. (2010). Ain't necessarily so: Review and critique of recent meta-analyses of behavioral medicine interventions in health psychology. Health Psychology, 29(2), 107-116.
- 11) Tufte, ER. (1997). Visual and statistical thinking: Displays of evidence for making decisions. Graphics Press, Cheshire, CT.
- 12) Wainer H. (1992) Understanding graphs and tables. Educational Researcher. 21(2), 14-23

For each of the above readings, a class member will be assigned (the week prior to when the article will be discussed) to prepare a written one page summary (with copies for other class members) of the most important content of the article.

- Problem Statement (25 points possible)
 - syllogistic/logical/concise
 - convincing
 - advance organizer of proposed study
- Hypotheses/Research Questions/Objectives (10 points possible)
 - specific/well defined/testable
 - clear and concise
- Review of Literature (40 points possible)
 - support assertions made in problem statement
 - demonstrate awareness of major research in area
 - critical analysis of previous research
 - show how proposed work will extend, replicate, or improve
 - rationale/support for methodology chosen
- Procedures (15 points possible)
 - based on review of literature
 - logically organized
 - complete explanation of what will be done
 - appropriate analysis procedures
- Quality Control (10 points possible)
 - neatly typed and proofread
 - consistency with guidelines
 - general quality of writing (logical, concise, clear, etc.)

TOTAL (100 points possible)

Form for Rating Internal Validity of Conclusions from Research Articles

Author/Year

I. Author's Major Conclusions(s)

II. Threats to Internal Validity

Mortality _____

History _____

Instrumentation _____

Testing _____

Selection _____

Regression _____

Maturation _____

0 = not a plausible threat to the study's internal validity

1 = potential minor problem in attributing the observed effect to the treatment; by itself not likely to account substantial portion of observed results

2 = plausible alternative explanation which by itself could account for substantial amount of the observed results

3 = by itself could explain most or all of the observed results

II. Rating of Internal Validity for each Conclusion (1 = high, 5 = low)

