PSYC3052: Advanced Social Psychology
Course Outline (2018-9 Autumn Semester)

Lecture: Wednesday 12:30 – 14:20; CPD 3.01, Section 1B

Contact details

Instructor: Gilad Feldman
Office: The Jockey Club Tower 6.22 Office
Hours: Wednesday, 15:30-16:30 (email first)
Email: gfeldman@hku.hk

Tutor: Boley Cheng
Office: The Jockey Club Tower 6.18 Office
Hours: Tuesdays, 2:30-3:30pm
Email: boleyc@hku.hk

Course Objectives

The purpose of this course is for students to gain an in-depth understanding of the recent developments in psychological science through the lens of social psychology.

After taking this course, students will:

1. Understand the recent developments in psychological science and the so-called “replication/reproducibility crisis”.
2. Discuss and analyze the ongoing crisis, addressing both challenges and possible ways to improve.
3. Experience and lead, hands-on, high-quality academic research using the most recent methodological advances in psychological science conducting a pre-registered replication and extension of a classic study in social cognition / judgment and decision-making.
   a. In-depth analysis of a published academic article
   b. Assessment of experimental scientific methods and evidence (effect-size, confidence-intervals, power, and p-values)
   c. Pre-registration plan
   d. Data analysis
   e. Pre-registered replication report (as an academic submission)
4. Articulate process and findings, both orally and in writing, with discussion of evidence and its implications for the academic field and in everyday life.
Learning Outcomes

1. Achieve an in-depth understanding of challenges and potential remedies to the ongoing crisis.
2. Contemplate, analyze, and discuss academic articles on advanced topics regarding recent developments in psychological science.
3. Critical mindset and advanced skills in interpreting and communicating research reports;
4. Understand and conduct a pre-registered replication and extension of simple classic experiments in judgment and decision-making.
5. Write research articles and communicate research findings in presentations.
6. Coordinate and cooperate with other students to achieve common academic goals and successfully conclude academic projects.
7. Write high-quality publishable research articles and communicate research findings in presentations.

Reasons why you should NOT take this course

1. If you dislike or are skeptical about psychology, you may not like this class.
2. If you're looking for an easy course. Be warned, this is a very demanding course, and we will work under very strict criteria of establishing scientific evidence requiring high-level of scientific understanding and thinking.
3. If you think psychology is a "soft science" or "intuitive" and/or that psychology classes are "easy classes", then you're in for a surprise. This will require a scientific mind and adhering to the most up-to-date scientific standards.
4. If you do not care about academic research or are hesitant or reluctant to conduct academic research. This is an advanced research undergraduate course that aims to introduce you to the scientific understanding of social psychology, and this will involve conducting a state-of-the-art research project. We will provide you with resources and examples, and aid you in the project, but it will depend on your ability to do research to get an in-depth understanding of the human mind from a critical academic perspective.
5. If you prefer passive learning, if you do not like self-study, or if you expect learning to originate only from the instructor. I will guide you, provide support and assistant, but learning in this course is student focused and student driven. It will depend on your conducting self-study and pushing yourself to master needed skills, fully engage in academic thinking, and do the required work.
6. If you need high structure and do not tolerate uncertainty. There will be uncertainty in this course, and things will not always be clear upfront. It will be up to you to raise questions, seek help, and overcome difficulties as they arise. I will do whatever I can to support you, but I am joining you in this journey with no certainty of how this journey will turn out or what the outcome will be.
7. If you dislike quantitative research and have an aversion to statistics. Academic research in psychology requires basic understanding of statistics and I will assume that you have mastered the basics of statistics and are capable of mastering further needed skills given guidance.

**Things to consider about the course**

To give you a heads-up, for you to determine if there's a fit and to address any possible future misunderstandings - this is a very demanding research-focused course requiring in-depth readings on judgment and decision making in the domain of social psychology with a very comprehensive academic research course project.

**Assessment Components**

1. Individual projects: 50%
   a. Qualtrics survey: 5%
   b. Article analysis: 5%
   c. Pre-registration: 10%
   d. Data analysis: 10%
   e. Final report: 20%
2. Pair final project presentations: 10%
3. Peer review: 10%
   a. Pre-registration + Qualtrics: 5%
   b. Final report: 5%
4. Thought piece: 10%
5. Facilitator group: 20%
   a. Class presentation + discussion: 10%
   b. Final group report: 10%
## Tentative Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Tasks due end of week (Sunday 11:59pm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/09</td>
<td>Introduction lecture #1 Science under crisis - understanding the crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/09</td>
<td>Introduction lecture #2 Addressing the crisis, intro to pre-registered replications</td>
<td>Register for HKU Qualtrics account <a href="http://hkupsysch.qualtrics.com">hkupsysch.qualtrics.com</a></td>
<td>Complete quiz on the syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19/09</td>
<td>Understanding the ongoing science crisis</td>
<td>T1 Qualtrics survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26/09</td>
<td>Why is this happening?</td>
<td>T2 Article analysis</td>
<td>Deadline 30/09 11:59pm: Qualtrics survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>03/10</td>
<td>Replications and pre-registrations</td>
<td>T3 Pre-registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Pre-registered replications: Case studies #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 07/10 11:59pm: Article analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17/10</td>
<td>Reading week</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 21/10 11:59pm: Pre-registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24/10</td>
<td>Pre-registered replications: Case studies #2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 28/10 11:59pm: Peer review of pre-registration (includes article analysis and Qualtrics survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31/10</td>
<td>“New statistics”: Effects and power</td>
<td>T4 Data analysis</td>
<td>Deadline 04/11 11:59pm: Revised pre-registration (includes article analysis and Qualtrics survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>07/11</td>
<td>Open science &amp; future of science</td>
<td>T5 Writing APA style replication reports</td>
<td>(Students receive data collection results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14/11</td>
<td>Recommendations to improve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 18/11 11:59pm: Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21/11</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 25/11 11:59pm: Submission of final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>28/11</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 02/12 11:59pm: Submission of peer review on final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>05/12</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 09/12 11:59pm: Submission of revised final report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course readings

Readings overview
The readings for this course are important readings about the ongoing science crisis. All students need to go over the required readings for the course. In each session you will be asked to read the mandatory papers and provide and analysis and commentary.

Please note:

1. Mandatory readings are sometimes long, and therefore require only brief reading. There is no need or expectations for you to read and understand those in-depth, only enough for you to understand what is discussed and have an informed opinion to share your thoughts in a thought piece.

2. The optional readings are only meant for the facilitator group. For the rest of the class that are not in the facilitator group the readings are 100% optional, there is no need or expectations for students to read the optional readings unless they really want to.

Class presentations and discussions
The first two classes during the add-drop period will be demonstrations by the course instructor. Beginning from week #3, each class will consist of two parts. The first part is a class discussion of the weekly readings, led by a student facilitator group, and the second part is given by the instructor to offer the broader perspective on the readings and cover topics that would aid students in their course project.

Facilitator group
Students will be randomly assigned into six discussion groups at the beginning of the semester (4+ students). Each group will be in charge of guiding the discussion in class #3, #4, #5, #8, #9, and #10.

The group will begin with a 10 minutes presentation of the ~4 readings. The class will then split to 4 groups led by members of the group. The 4 groups will discuss the weekly readings for 20 minutes and will aim to summarize key challenges and practical implications for conducting psychological science based on a weekly assigned task by the instructor. The facilitators will then be asked by the instructor to briefly summarize their group’s discussion to the class.

The group will submit a report of the discussions in class, with a summary of the key challenges and recommendations for practical implications. The presentation and the reports should be submitted one week following the class presentation, will be shared with the entire classes, and will be graded.

Thought piece on class readings
Students are required to read all the main readings, and are suggested to briefly read atleast one of the optional readings.

For each class, students will write a thought piece (2 paragraphs max, no longer than 1 double space page) on their reactions to the readings on each of the selected topics (see page 1). Students will summarize the main keypoints in one paragraph with a second paragraph summarizing the student’s practical recommendations based on the readings.
Using lists and bullet-points instead of paragraphs is acceptable and even encouraged, as long as they’re clear.

The primary purpose of these assignments is to prepare students for class discussion, and so late thought pieces will NOT be marked. Short and precise arguments/summaries are expected, and long answers that exceed paragraph/page limit will not be read.

All students will work on a collaborative Google Doc summarizing all the readings and class activity. The Google Doc will also be used for you to share your thought piece with the other students.

Please make sure that your comment appears on the Google Doc on **Tuesday 5:00pm (the day before class)** and bring a copy to class (no need to submit a hard copy, only make sure you have a copy of your thoughts to share with your discussion group).

Please write your name and student ID next to your commentary on the Google Doc.

My preference for thought pieces:

1. Use simple language, minimize use of jargon. Aim: Your parents should be able to understand this submission.
2. Don’t just summarize… reflect.
3. Don’t accept as is, doubt it. It's okay to challenge the readings…
5. Think of the implications. What does it all mean?

**Weeks #6 and #7: Case studies**

In week 6 and week 7 we’ll do something a bit different and take a closer look at a published replication attempt of a classic finding in social psychology.

Please submit the softcopy of thought pieces TO MOODLE on **Tuesday 5:00pm (the day before class)** and bring a copy to class (no need to submit a hard copy, only make sure you have a copy of your thoughts to share with your discussion group).

Instead of a regular thought piece, you will conduct a hands-on analysis of the replication attempt and reflect on the quality of the replication. To do that, you will read both the original article and the target article, if there are more than one study replicated then choose one of the replicated studies/experiments, and then answer the following in Brandt etal's Replication Recipe for that specific study/experiment:

1. It was important to replicate this effect because: (one paragraph max)
2. The similarities/differences of the experimental design between of the original article and the replication (very brief and in a table)
   a. The similarities/differences in the instructions are:
   b. The similarities/differences in the measures are:
   c. The similarities/differences in the stimuli are:
   d. The similarities/differences in the procedure are:
   e. The similarities/differences in the location (e.g., lab vs. online; alone vs. in groups) are:
f. The similarities/differences in remuneration are:
g. The similarities/differences between participant populations are:
3. The similarities/differences in the results of the original article and the replication
   (very brief and in a table)
   a. The effect size of the original effect is:
   b. The confidence interval of the original effect is:
   c. The effect size of the replication is:
   d. The confidence interval of the replication effect size is:
4. Conclusion: The replication effect size [is / is not] (choose one) significantly different
   from the original effect size?
5. I judge the replication to be a(n) [success / informative failure to replicate / practical
   failure to replicate / inconclusive] (choose one) because: (one paragraph max)

In addition, please
6. Provide constructive realistic recommendations to improve on this replication even
   further. (one paragraph max)
7. Reflect on what you learned from this replication attempt for your own pre-registered
   replication project? (one paragraph max)
Class #3: Understanding the science crisis: Seminal papers

Mandatory readings


Optional readings


Class #4: Why is this happening?

Mandatory readings


Optional readings


Class #5: Replications and pre-registrations

Mandatory readings


Optional readings

Class #6: Case Study 1 - Gervais & Norenzayan 2012
(Please note: No facilitator group for this session)

**Mandatory readings**


**Optional readings**

3. What the replicators had to say about the process of trying to conduct and publish the replication. Introduction to the New Statistics blog: Another disappointing replication result, but with as happy an ending as can be…
5. How the failed replication was covered in the media. NY Mag: Religious Belief and Analytical Thinking Don’t Necessarily Cancel Each Other Out

Class #7: Case Study 2 - Hart & Albarracín 2011
(Please note: No facilitator group for this session)

**Mandatory readings**

3. Why Scientists Shouldn’t Replicate Their Own Work, Neuroskeptic

**Optional readings**

6. Coverage: Replication Effort Finds No Evidence That Grammatical Aspect Affects Perceived Intent (APS)
Class #8: “New statistics”: Effects and power

Mandatory readings


Optional readings


Class #9: Open science & the future of science

Mandatory readings


Optional readings

Class #10: Recommendations to improve

Mandatory readings


Optional readings

Individual projects: Pre-registered replications

Note: Materials for the projects will be shared on Dropbox, see: https://tinyurl.com/hku2018dropbox

The pre-registered replication project course manual: https://docs.google.com/document/d/11CA_Q1Gxe2AsS9nsu34SDILVXPwjAiSu3Hm09VGHfPo/edit?usp=sharing

Students will conduct pre-registered replication and extension of classic findings in judgment and decision-making. Students will be randomly assigned an experiment in a classic article and will follow a structured procedure to attempt a replication with a simple extension.

Each classic article will be the target replication article for two students, who will work independently on the same article without any information-sharing or collaboration. This method will be used to educate students about different perspectives on conducting replication and analysis of the same article, and the two students will peer review one another's work, for both the pre-registration (with analysis and Qualtrics survey), and the final report, and will use the process to improve on their own work. The idea is not to have identical outputs, but for each of the students to do the best they can on their own and then compare their own approach to that by the other student.

The students will be responsible for designing a replication Qualtrics survey, analyzing the article, writing the pre-registration plan, conducting the data analysis, writing a final report, and presenting their findings.

The instructor will conduct the data collection for the students online using Amazon Mechanical Turk, and will provide the students with the finalized dataset for analysis.

Project process outline
What is an "extension" to a replication?

Projects are expected to extend the classic replications by adding 1 simple extension to the replication studies to add additional insights that go beyond the original article.

This must involve one of the following types of extensions:

1. **Additional dependent variables (DV)**: The added dependent variables will be either about evaluations/attributions/judgments regarding the scenarios/vignettes presented or present participants with a choice related to the presented scenario.

2. **Additional well-known and validated individual difference scale** at the beginning of the survey (e.g., belief in free will, Rakos et al., 2008) as predictors of the effect (independent variables; IV).
   There should be a clear reasonable theoretical reason to expect a link between the suggested individual differences as an IV and the effects tested as the DV.

3. **Additional condition(s)** that make slight changes to the scenario presented: The added conditions are anticipated to pose no harm to participants going beyond the replication materials.
   For example, adding a control/neutral condition to a replication in which the original experimental design did not include a control/neutral conditions. Please note that this type of extension significantly increases required sample size and so should aim for minimum added conditions.

Important: Added extensions must pose **no harm** to participants going beyond the replication materials.

Sharing and open science

One of the core elements of good science is openness, transparency, and community. By opening up our research in terms of process, materials, data, analysis, and conclusions, and by sharing our thought process with others in the scientific community, we are promoting learning and cooperation and we increase the chances of conducting high-quality research. Some researchers, and possibly students, may feel reluctant to share their outputs, either because they feel shy, lack confidence, or are possessive of their own materials. In our projects, I ask that you join me in overcoming this mentality in the name of science and learning. By opening up and sharing what we do, we can help each other learn and maximize the potential of our projects.

You will be asked to share with others everything that you do. First, with your fellow students, and finally with the rest of the academic community. The TAs and instructor will do their best to work together with you to result in the highest quality outputs.

Academic journal submission and coauthorship

Our goal with this project is to share our insights with the academic community. The formalized way of doing that is summarizing the findings in a manuscript, publishing this as a pre-print, and submitting that as coauthored work to a journal for peer-review. We will aim your projects to become a journal submission to publicize the results of your hard-work. Unless there are unexpected issues, the plan is for all of the student work in this course to be submitted as an academic manuscript, meaning that - by default - you will be coauthors, as determined by the instructors based on level of contribution. You may decide not to join as coauthors or not to have your work included in a journal submission, but in such a case you
are requested to communicate that to the instructor early on and indicate this clearly on your reports.

Meaning, that by taking this course and taking part in this project you agree to have your work shared with the academic community and to be a coauthor on a submission based on your work. If you wish to withdraw from that, then please indicate clearly in your pre-registration submissions, that you do not want to be a coauthor in a journal article submission based on your work or do not wish for your projects to be included in a journal submission.

**Pair final project presentations**

Each two students working to replicate the same target article will present together at the end of the course. They will integrate insights from their independent projects to give an overall analysis on the replicability of the target article.

Each pair (/3) will have no more than 10 minutes, **strictly observed with a timer** (I will stop you when time is up, regardless of whether you're done or not). There will be no time for questions from the audience, but I will either comment, ask a question, or add something. Both students need to have equal time, I strongly recommend you rehearse this and make sure timing and flow is right, and that no one person is over-dominant or unheard.

The presentation should include:

1. Very brief overview of the original article main hypothesis, experimental design of the main effect of interest, and findings regarding the main hypothesis. Do try and make this visually attractive and interesting, this is your one change to explain your article to your audience (suggested time - 2 min)
2. You should briefly mention the calculated effect-size (with confidence intervals), power-analysis, and adjustments made to the experimental design to fit our replication using MTurk. It should mention whether the calculations were the same or different between the students. (suggested time - 1 min)
3. Presentation of your initial data-analysis results. Figures are generally better than stats. I especially like violin plots with boxplots and data jiggered dots (see descriptives in JAMOVI library), or at very least plots with confidence interval errors bars. (suggested time - 3 min)
4. Summary of comparison between original results in target article and your data on (1) effect-size and confidence intervals, (2) direction of findings, (3) NHST p-values of the main test for the main hypothesis. (suggested time - 1 min)
5. Conclusion: successful/failed/inconclusive replication, why? (suggested time - 1 min)
6. Main challenges and takeaways from the process, things specific about your project that you learned about the original article, pre-registrations and replications process. (suggested time - 2 min)

Additional things to note:

1. This should be a no bla-bla presentation. This needs to be very concise, straight and to the point. There is no time for stories or long explanations. Focus on the bottom line and what's really important, no need for little details, you'll have plenty of space for details in your reports.
2. Anything that you present should include both students' analyses together. If there are differences between the two - the differences should be highlighted clearly.
3. Assume your audience knows nothing about your article and only little statistics. Explain things as if you're talking to laypersons. Avoid jargon as much as possible. Clarity is key.
4. Aim for high-level summary slides with little text. Attractive visual displays are far better than text. Do not place text and read off from your slides. Do not assume audience reads your slides while you talk about something else.
5. Save time. There is NO need to present and/or discuss things you have in common with the rest of the class (replication crisis, sample size, importance of pre-registered replications, what is MTurk, etc.)

Peer review

Student pairs conducting a replication and extension of the same target article will review each other’s work on two time-points, once after submission of the pre-registration, and once for the final report. Peer review will follow academic standards for providing positive constructive feedback on ways to improve, and each of the peer reviews will be graded.

Guidelines:

1. This is NOT a competition, this is joint effort, help each other (and science!) do better. Provide meaningful feedback that would help your colleague achieve full potential.
2. Be constructive. Vague and criticizing comments are not welcome.
3. Always remain positive and supportive.
4. Be clear and comprehensive.
5. When possible: Give them a hand.
6. Yes, you can copy-paste examples/screens from your own work, BUT clearly mark it as your addition. These will need to be changed by the reviewed student.

Data analysis

The data analysis report is the results section of the final report. Data analysis should be done independently without coordination. It is an important part of the scientific process. This is meant so that when you present together you can compare what you did and figure out what went wrong and needs to be corrected. This process needs to be shared transparently.

The data analysis report needs to look like a results section of an APA article. It needs to report the results addressing all the data analysis plan points in the pre-registration following all that you analyzed in the article analysis. Please make sure you follow APA style guidelines for table format and results reporting.

Keep in mind that soon after you're expected to present these results to the entire class in a presentation. Figures should be APA style clear and presentable to audiences so that others who do not know your projects would be able to take a quick look at your figures and understand your data.
Why are we doing pre-registered replications in this course?

If you're not sure you understand the point of conducting pre-registered replication in undergraduate classes, then I suggest a few readings on the topic.

- Teaching Replication in Psychology: A Guide for Teachers and Students (OSF project)
- Collaborative Replications and Education Project (CREP)
**Tutorial participation**

Tutorials are meant to aid students in their projects. The tutor will give a hands-on demonstration of technical aspects required for a successful completion of the course project.

Students who wish to take advantage of the tutorials are expected to be punctual. If you arrive late, please be polite and respect the others and the tutor by not coming in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Qualtrics survey</td>
<td>Tutorial on how to setup an experiment on Qualtrics using the class-provided template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Article analysis</td>
<td>Tutorial on how to calculate the effect-size, and conduct a power analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pre-registration</td>
<td>Tutorial on writing pre-registrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Tutorial on how to conduct data-analysis of data using Jamovi (jamovi.org). Covering: Descriptives, plotting, T-tests, One-way ANOVA with contrasts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Writing APA style replication reports</td>
<td>Tutorial going on how to write the final pre-registered replication reports, writing manuscripts in APA style. Will go over guidelines and examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grading details

Article analysis report grading

1. **10% comprehensiveness**: All items in the guidelines have been addressed, following the guidelines for article analysis structure.
2. **10% comprehension**: Understood and analyzed the right things (for example, not confusing p-values for confidence intervals, etc.).
3. **30% transparency, open-science, and clarity**:
   a. Regardless of accuracy, included enough information to make it clear to potential reviewers where values are from and how analysis was conducted.
   b. In-depth information about tools, screen captures, GPower protocols, references to (/copy-paste from) text in the articles, explanations of what the conclusions mean, etc.
   c. The criteria: I should be able to give this as is to another student and the other student will be able to understand what was done, how, and why.
   d. 10% of the 30%: adherence to the replication recipe, addressing replication recipe items
4. **50% accuracy/effort/accuracy**:
   a. Reporting from the article of the method and the results (20% of the 50%)
   b. Effect-size calculations and power-analyses (30% of the 50%)

Facilitator group

Class presentation + discussion: 10%

The class presentation should not be more than 10min and should cover the 4 readings. Since the other students have read at least the two main readings, the aim is not to explain the readings from zero, but to provide a very brief summary of the readings to remind the students, and initiate a discussion. Also, try and provide at least one slide/section that combines and links all the readings together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main task</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group effort</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively lead sub-group discussions</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate group summary to the class</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final group report: 10%

The final report should include the presentation given to class and an integration of the group discussions into one report. Both will be shared with the rest of the class.

The format of the report should follow the rubric provided for the class discussion and should sufficiently elaborate on each point with no more than one paragraph.
The report will be graded based on the following criteria (overall 10%):
1. Understanding (3%): Should reflect an in-depth understanding of the topic of discussion.
2. Integration (3%): Ability to synthesize all the group discussions into a single comprehensive summary.
3. Clarity and simplicity (4%): We are dealing with complicated issues, and the main challenge is to communicate these effectively. Aim for the simplest language possible, so that non-academic audiences (e.g., your parents) would be able to understand your report. This is the biggest most important challenge in this task.

Finally, your report will include a section that will not be shared with others.
1. One paragraph will include self-reflection about the group discussion process, what have you learned as a group regarding leading a discussion about these topics.
2. One optional paragraph will include your recommendations to me on how to improve group discussions in future classes/courses. Try and keep this as constructive as possible.

**Due date:** One week following class presentation.

**Page limit:** No longer than 5 pages (double space, 12font), please. Short and concise is strongly encouraged.

Please note: No more than one paragraph per each point. No need to elaborate further, can integrate several points into one paragraph if clear.
Example: using the class #2 example it will be: 1+5+3+3+3 (the rubric from group discussion) and 1+1 (self-reflection and feedback to me) = 17 paragraphs max.
General guidelines

Assignment submission
All assignments will be done with Google Docs. To be clear, all work should be conducted on the Google Doc from the very beginning (rather than imported at the end from a Microsoft Word document). This is to allow automatic backup, versioning, and direct access by instructor, tutors, and group members.

Submit by creating an edit link, adding the link to your document, exporting the document to a Word file and submitting the file on Moodle. Feedback by the instructor will be given directly on the Google Doc.

IMPORTANT: Make sure that the Google Doc has permissions of "anyone with the link can edit".

Assessment feedback and consulting
All written assignments will be marked and returned to students within 3 weeks after submission. Students are welcome to consult the instructor and the tutors anytime during the semester.

Moodle guest account
The Moodle will serve as the course website.
Guest account:
Username: psyc3052_1b_2018_guest
Password: Psyc3052!
Policies

Contacting the instructor
I try and make the syllabus very comprehensive, to address any possible issues, so it is very likely that most of your questions are answered in either the syllabus or the various documents in the Moodle.

Still, if there's something not on the syllabus, feel free to contact me. Before you do, please read "How to Email Your Professor (without being annoying AF)", and use this suggested template (fill in all the areas with numbers):

To: gfeldman@hku.hk (Please do not email instructor in any other emails)
From: myname@student.hku.hk
Subject: PSYC3052 - [full name 1] - [write clear topic title 2]

Dear Fili,

My name is [Enter your full name 3] and I am a student in your PSYC3052 Advanced Social Psychology course. My TA is [Enter TA name 4].

This is the question I have or the help I need [write the question/problem you're facing 5].
I’ve looked in the syllabus and the Moodle and at my notes from class and online and I asked someone else from the class [this is to confirm that you did the minimum required before contacting instructor 6], and I think This Is The Answer [write what you think is the answer 7], but I’m still not sure.

This is the action I would like you to take or the request I have [write your request 8].

Thank you/Best regards [polite sign off 9],
[write your full name again here with LAST NAME IN CAPITAL LETTERS 10]
Requests for reference letters
Please see my policy on reference letters based on undergraduate course work in the following link: http://wiki.mgto.org/doku.php/requesting_a_reference_letter_from_me

English is the official language
The official language of instruction and communication is English. To ensure that everyone feels included, both instructor and students, please refrain from speaking any other language in the classroom. Please address the instructor or the tutors only in English, in and outside of the classroom.

Academic honesty
Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. Any student who engages in any form of academic dishonesty (e.g., cheating on exams, plagiarism, interfering with grading) will receive a grade of F in this course and will be reported to the Department/Faculty Office/University Disciplinary Committee for further disciplinary action. There will be no exceptions. If you are not sure what constitutes the academic offense of plagiarism, checkout the webpage at http://www.hku.hk/plagiarism

Plagiarism
A softcopy is required for all written assignments. The softcopy will be checked for plagiarism against a database of articles, books, webpages, and essays submitted by students at HKU and other universities. No credit will be given for an assignment that contains plagiarized materials. Further penalties will be applied. These penalties include a zero mark for participation in course tutorials and a zero mark for the course. Plagiarism will also be reported to your Faculty for further disciplinary action.

Feedback Policy
Students can expect to receive feedback within three weeks after submitting written assignments and taking each exam.

Late assignments
Late assignments will be penalized by 10% of the score for each day following deadline (including Saturday and Sunday). A day late starts one second following submission date/time.

Department seminars
In response to a comment from the review panel on students’ feedback last year that students would like to know more about cutting edge, contemporary research while psychology’s capstone courses (i.e. advanced lab courses) have limited space and very competitive, it’s then discussed at the Departmental Teaching and Learning Committee and reported at the Departmental Meeting that students enrolled in the capstone courses, from the academic year of 2018/19, are required to attend the Seminars in compulsory manner.