

**SYLLABUS
EDUCATION/PSYCHOLOGY 7670**

**Literature Reviews
Spring 2007**

Instructor: Karl R. White (Phone: 797-3013; E-mail: karl.white@usu.edu)

Office: Education Building, Room 430
(Secretary is Sherry Johnson in Room 432B)

Class Time: Mondays, 4:30 - 5:20 p.m., Education Building 487C

Credit: 2 credit hours

Prerequisites: PSY/EDUC 6600 or equivalent

Office Hours: Tuesdays and Thursdays - 8:30 - 10:00 a.m.

Course Overview

This course is designed to help students in doctoral programs 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 proposal, it will not be dealt with extensively in this class. Other courses which deal specifically with the appropriate design, analysis, and interpretation issues which 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 what differentiates between a well-written and poorly-written literature review.

Substantial reading assignments will be given each week, and students will be 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 written Review of Literature 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.

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 be grounds for 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 outline:

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

Activity	Possible Points	Description and Rationale
1. Literature Review	100	Each student will prepare a literature review to be handed in 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 Homework Assignments	110	The schedule of class activities lists a number of homework assignments which will be explained in more detail during class. Each of these are due at the beginning of class.
TOTAL POINTS		210

If a student has a disability that will likely require some 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 2007

Week/Date	Class Discussion	Homework Assignments for Next Week	Points
#1 January 8	Guidelines for Dissertation Proposals Problem Statements	Internal Validity exercises Topic of your Dissertation Proposal	5 5
January 15	NO CLASSES – Campus closed for Human Rights Day		
#2 January 22	Readings #1 and #2 Critical Attributes of Good Integrative Reviews Proposal Topics	Article Critique #1	10
#3 January 29	Article Critique #1	Literature Review Critique #1	10
#4 February 5	Reading #3 Literature Review Critique #1	Literature Review Critique #2	5
#5 February 12	Reading #4 Developing a Coding System	Code Meta-Analysis Articles	10
February 19	NO CLASSES – Campus closed for President's Day		
#6 February 20 (Monday Schedule)	Coding of Meta-Analysis Articles Computing Effect Sizes		
#7 February 26	Literature Review Critique #2		
#8 March 5	Reading #5 Discuss Problem Statements	Article Critique #2	10
#9 March 12	SPRING BREAK		
#10 March 19	Readings #6 and #7 Article Critique #2	Coding Sheet and Outline of Review Findings and Conclusions	5 + 5
#11 March 26	Readings #8 and #9	Literature Review Critique #3	10
#12 April 2	Literature Review Critique #3		
#13 April 9	Reading #10	Literature Review Critique #4	10
#14 April 16	Literature Review Critique #4	Article Critique #3	10
#15 April 23	Article Critique #3	Submit Literature Review (due April 30th)	100

EDUC/PSYCH 7670
Readings – Spring 2007

Readings and other handouts for the course are available from the library's Electronic Reserve. To access the Electronic Reserve, go to the web address, eres.usu.edu (do not use www at the beginning), click on "Electronic Reserves and Reserves Pages." You can look up the course either by the department (which is Psychology) or by the instructor (which is White). The course is Psy 7670 and the password is research (lower case). Materials posted on the electronic reserve can be viewed online or printed.

Reviewing Research

- 1) Glass, Gene V. (1976). Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research. Educational Researcher, 5(10), 3-8. (6 pp.)
- 2) Glass, Gene V. (1977). Integrating findings: The meta-analysis of research. Review of Research in Education, 5, 351-379. (29 pp.)
- 3) White, Karl R., Bush, David W., Casto, Glendon C. (1985-86). Learning from reviews of early intervention. The Journal of Special Education, 19(4), 417-428. (12 pp.)
- 4) Slavin, Robert E. (1986). Best-evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional reviews. Educational Researcher. (7 pp.)
- 5) Bangert-Drowns, Robert L. (1986). Review of developments in meta-analytic method. Psychological Bulletin, 99(3), 388-399. (12 pp.)
- 6) Light, R. J., & Pillemer, D. (1982). Numbers and narrative: Combining their strengths in research reviews. Harvard Educational Review, 52, 1-26. (27 pp.)
- 7) Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. Educational Researcher, 34(6), 3-15. (13 pp.)
- 8) Wachter, Kenneth W. (1988). Disturbed by meta-analysis? Science, 241, 1407-1408. (2 pp.)
- 9) Abrami, Philip C., Cohen, Peter A., & d'Apollonia, Sylvia (1988). Implementation problems in meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 58(2), 151-179. (29 pp.)
- 10) Tufte, Edward R. (1997). Visual and statistical thinking: Displays of evidence for making decisions. Graphics Press, Cheshire, CT.

RATING SHEET FOR 7670 PROPOSALS

Problem Statement (25)

- syllogistic/logical/concise
- convincing
- advance organizer of proposed study

Hypotheses/Research Questions/Objectives (10)

- specific/well defined/testable
- clear and concise

Review of Literature (40)

- 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)

- based on review of literature
- logically organized
- complete explanation of what will be done
- appropriate analysis procedures

Quality Control (10)

- neatly typed and proofread
- consistency with guidelines
- general quality of writing (logical, concise, clear, etc.)

TOTAL (100)

Form for Research Article Critiques

Name/Date

Author/Year

I. Threats to Internal Validity

	_____	0 =	not a plausible threat to the study's internal validity
History	_____	1 =	potential minor problem in attributing the observed effect to the treatment; by itself not likely to account
Mortality	_____		substantial portion of observed results
Instrumentation	_____	2 =	plausible alternative explanation which by itself could account for substantial amount of the observed results
Testing	_____		
Selection	_____	3 =	by itself could explain most or all of the observed results
Regression	_____		
Maturation	_____		

II. General Rating of Validity (1 = high, to 5 = low)

III. Author's Major Conclusions(s)

IV. Your Major Conclusions(s)
