PSYC3052A/B: Advanced Social Psychology
Course Outline (2020-21 Autumn Semester)

Important: All lectures in this semester are recorded and will be shared publicly online.

Lectures:
● Section 3052B: Tuesday 16:30 - 18:20; Remote ZOOM (if not remote-CPD-LG.07)
● Section 3052A: Wednesday 12:30 – 14:20; Remote ZOOM (if not remote-CPD-3.28)

[you're also welcome to visit PSYC2071 Remote ZOOM Thursday 13:30 – 15:20 | Syllabus]

Tutorials:
● Monday 10:30-12:20 (TBD)
● Thursday 10:30-12:20 (TBD)

Please ask all course/syllabus related questions on our Slack (channel: #questionsaboutcourse). We will answer it all there for all to see and learn. Please only email us when there are personal issues that relate only to you.

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

Tutor: Kristy CHOW
Office: Jockey Club Tower 6.18
Hours: TBD

Supporting tutor: Siu Kit YEUNG
Office: Jockey Club Tower 6.41
Hours: TBD

Supporting tutor: Qinyu XIAO
Office: Jockey Club Tower 6.41
Hours: TBD

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 “credibility revolution” following the so-called “replication/reproducibility crisis”.
2. Gain an academic overview of main research themes in social-psychology.
3. Summarize, analyze, reflect, and apply classic experiments and findings in social-psychology.
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.

5. 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-psychology.
   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. Registered Report Stage 1 (as an academic submission)

**Learning Outcomes**

1. Understanding and implementing open-science.

2. Achieve an in-depth understanding of challenges and potential remedies to the ongoing science crisis.

3. Gain knowledge and reflect on academic findings in social-psychology.

4. Gain overall broad understanding of several research streams in social-psychology.

5. Develop ability to contemplate and analyze social-psychology academic research.

6. Exercise critical mindset and basic skills in interpreting and communicating research reports.

7. Understand and conduct a pre-registered replication and extension of simple classic experiments in social-psychology.

8. Coordinate and cooperate with other students to achieve common academic goals and successfully conclude academic projects.

9. 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 state-of-the-art research projects. 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 assistance, but learning in this course is student focused and student driven. It will depend on you 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.

8. If you do not believe in scientific openness and transparency. We will live by the principles of open-science.

**Things to consider about the course**

1. 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 social psychology with a very comprehensive academic research course project.**

2. Everything we do in this course, everything (reports, presentations, class notes, etc.), will be shared not only to your TA and instructor, but also to all your classmates, and the entire world. **Everything we do will be shared with the academic community on the Open-Science Framework.**

3. If you took other courses about judgment and decision making (e.g., CCST9027 "Science of Irrational Thinking"), you may find some of the course context repeating some of the themes and experiments covered. Since this is an advanced class, we aim to build on and extend beyond that course, but some content is likely to overlap. If you did take that course, please inform our TA.

4. If you took my previous courses about social psychology (e.g., PSYC2020 "Fundamentals of Social Psychology"), you may find some of the course context repeating some of the themes and experiments covered. Since this is an advanced class, we aim to build on and extend beyond that course, but some content is likely to overlap. If you took that class with another instructor, no worries, overlap is likely going to be minimal. If you did take that course, please inform our TA.

You are invited to browse all materials, by both instructor and students, shared on the Open Science Framework from courses in previous years: [http://mgto.org/teaching-courses/](http://mgto.org/teaching-courses/)
Teaching Philosophy

Why am I teaching this way?

See the following references:


Why are we doing replications and extensions Registered Reports 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)
- Listen to the student’s perspective: Open Science Talk podcast session on student's perspective on Open Science – and specifically replication studies. With Kristoffer Klevjer.

About replications

- Nosek, B. A., & Errington, T. M. (2020). What is replication?. *PLOS Biology*, 18(3), e3000691. [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000691](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000691)

If you wish to see me explain this in depth, then there are recorded video lectures about me explaining open science and what we are doing at University of Hong Kong, see my webpage about Open Science.
Structure

Students will form groups (2 students) and two groups will form a team (overall, 4 students). This team will work together on the following:

1. **Registered Replication Report (RRR):** Read, analyze, summarize, and present a RRR (list below).
2. **Replication and extension Registered Report Stage 1:** Teams of 2 groups will work on a replication and extension Registered Report Stage 1 science project. Each of the two groups will work separately and independently to complete a project (see “projects” below for info), and the two groups will peer-review one another and present together. The separate work is important so that the two teams can then check each other to find possible flaws, help each other improve, and suggest different extensions.
3. **Primer/opinion piece:** Write a manuscript aimed to discuss an open/meta science issue and/or a guide to help improve psychological science.

Assessment Components

1. **RRR assessment (team score) 25%**
   a. RRR peer-review (2 reviews): 5% each = 10%
   b. RRR group report: 10%
   c. RRR class presentation: 5%
2. **Replication and extensions projects: (group score) 50%**
   a. Introduction including target article analysis (effects + power) + Qualtrics survey design: 20%
   b. Replication and extensions peer review (1 review): 10%
   c. Replication and extensions Registered Report Stage 1 report: 20%
3. **Improving psychological science: Guide/opinion piece manuscript (team score) 25%**
   a. Guide/opinion piece peer review (2 reviews): 5% each = 10%
   b. Guide/opinion piece report 10%
   c. Guide/opinion piece presentation 5%
### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Tasks due end of week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01-02/09</td>
<td>Introduction lecture #1 Science under crisis - understanding the crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signup for HKU Qualtrics account: <a href="https://hku.qualtrics.com/">https://hku.qualtrics.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>08-09/09</td>
<td>Introduction lecture #2 Course outline Reasons for crisis + Stats intro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 13/09 11:59pm: <strong>MANDATORY for course enrollment</strong>: Complete quiz on the syllabus and open-science lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15-16/09</td>
<td>Introduction lecture #3: Registered Reports Assessing science</td>
<td>T1 Science assessment task</td>
<td>Deadline 20/9 11:59:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22-23/09</td>
<td>Improving psychological science</td>
<td>T2 Effect size and power analysis</td>
<td>Deadline 27/9 11:59: RRR Assessment report submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Books: Science Fictions 7 Deadly Sins of Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29-30/09</td>
<td>Making sense of the world</td>
<td>T3 Research design: Replications and extensions</td>
<td>Deadline 4/10 11:59: RRR Assessment peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Books: The power of bad Thinking fast and slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06-07/10</td>
<td>Factfulness: Why we might be wrong about the world</td>
<td>T4 Qualtrics survey best practices</td>
<td>Deadline 11/10 11:59pm: RRR Assessment final submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Books: Factfulness Enlightenment now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13-14/10</td>
<td>Reading week No class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 18/10 11:59pm: Mid term team/group evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20-21/10</td>
<td>Human nature</td>
<td>T5 Data analysis plan JAMOVI/R + Simulating data</td>
<td>Deadline 25/10 11:59pm: Replication + Extension Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Books:</td>
<td>Assignments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27-28/10</td>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>The righteous mind</td>
<td>T6 (open tutorial TBD) Deadline 1/11 23:59pm:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>03-04/11</td>
<td>Unethicality</td>
<td>Honest truth about dishonesty</td>
<td>Deadline 8/11 23:59pm Replication + Extension Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-11/11</td>
<td>Mind</td>
<td>The mind club Mindwise</td>
<td>Deadline 15/11 23:59pm Replication + Extension Part 2 peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in PRETEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17-18/11</td>
<td>Happiness/Empathy/Humanization</td>
<td>The power of human</td>
<td>Deadline 22/11 23:59pm Opinion piece submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24-25/11</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 29/11 11:59pm: Opinion piece peer review submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02/12</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 06/12 11:59pm: End of term team/group evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9/12</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline 13/12 11:59pm: Replication + Extension Part 2 final submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion piece final submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaboration and resources

Collaborative course summary
All students will work on a collaborative Google Doc summarizing all the readings and class activity: https://mgto.org/psyc30522020coursesummary

Communication and help
We have a slack channel: https://hku2020psyc3052.slack.com
Click on this invite link to join the course Slack channel.
You can use this Slack workspace to discuss topics with other students, and ask TA and instructor questions about the projects/tasks. Emails should be reserved to personal issues only. This way, all students can see all help provided to all others, and can help one another do better.

Course materials
Course materials are shared on the Open Science Framework.

Class structure
The aim is that each class will consist of two parts:
1. Open science topic
2. [5 minutes break]
3. Social psychology topic
Group projects: Replications and extensions

Stage 1 Registered Report

Important resources/links for your projects:

1. Cloud drive: Materials for the projects
2. Collaborative guide: Pre-registered replication project
3. Collaborative guide: R/JAMOVI/JASP
4. Collaborative guide: Designing extensions guide
5. Collaborative guide: Effect size, confidence intervals, and power analyses guide.
6. Collaborative guide: Peer review
7. Collaborative guide: Qualtrics
8. HKU mass replication project webpage
9. Updating the academic community about our replication projects (ResearchGate)

Students will conduct replication and extension Stage 1 Registered Report of classic findings in social psychology or 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 groups of two students (henceforth: team. Please note: group = 2 students, team = 2 groups). Each group will work independently on the same article without any information-sharing or collaboration with the other group in the team. This method will be used to educate students about different perspectives on conducting replication and analysis of the same article. The two groups will peer review one another's work, 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 on randomly generated dataset, writing a Registered Reports Stage 1, and presenting their projects.
Project process outline

Adding extensions to replication
Groups are expected to design extensions on the replications (bonus points awarded). How? see Collaborative guide: Designing extensions guide for more detail.

Sharing and open science
The core elements of good science are 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.
All your work will be shared with others. 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 academic manuscripts, 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 must 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 the public, and to be a coauthor on a submission based on your work. If you wish to withdraw from that, then please indicate clearly in ALL your 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.

Can student reports really be published? Yes! Please visit our main page to see the status of publishing the reports from previous years. At the end, we hope that all students’ work will end up in academic journals. Even for those that will not, they will be shared as preprints and will have citable DOIs. You could and should be proud of this work, and add those to your list of academic achievements.

Analyses

It is strongly recommended that you use R/Rmarkdown for all your effect-size calculations and data analyses. R is the future of stats, and is an important skill for you have in the job market will be beneficial for you in the job market beyond academia.

If you don’t know R, that could be a bit challenging, so it is strongly recommended that instead you use JAMOVI, which looks a bit like SPSS, much more powerful than SPSS, and is open-source/free and runs on R.

Our TA tutorials will focus on JAMOVI.

See our JAMOVI collaborative guide with lots of guides/videos/resources.

Why choose R:

- **SPSS is dying. It’s time to change.**
- **Popularity of Data Science Software** (a bit outdated, from 2015, but the trend became even stronger in recent years)
- **The Impressive Growth of R**

Resources:

- **JAMOVI / JASP/ R collaborative guide**
- **Effect size and CIs calculations / power analyses collaborative guide**
- **JAMOVI workshop & resources cloud folder**
- **R/Rmarkdown workshop & resources cloud folder**
Team final project presentations

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

Each team 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. All students should 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. 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 chance to explain your article to your audience.
   (suggested time - 3 min)
2. Brief review of the literature following the target article. What impact has it had? Were there replications? meta-analyses? etc.
   (suggested time - 1 min)
3. Briefly cover the technical aspects of the replication: calculated effect-size (with confidence intervals), power-analysis, and adjustments made to the experimental design to fit our replication using online samples (MTurk/Prolific). It should mention whether the calculations were the same or different between the students.
   (suggested time - 3 min)
4. Briefly cover the extension you designed. What are you adding? why? what insights do you hope to get?
   (suggested time - 2 min)
5. Main challenges and takeaways from the process, things specific about your project that you learned about the original article, pre-registrations and replication process.
   (suggested time - 1 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 groups’ 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 the 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.)

Presentation materials used should be submitted on Moodle after the presentation, in PPT/PPTX format. PDF format is unacceptable unless preapproved by TA/instructor.

Students will vote on the best presentation in each class (voting is identified, not anonymous), and presenters of the 2 best presentations will receive a 10% bonus on their presentation grade.

Peer review

Groups conducting a replication and extension of the same target article will review each other’s work. See our peer review template/guide for these reviews.

Teams will review reports from two other teams for RRR assessment and opinion piece. Templates will be provided during the semester.

Peer review will follow academic standards for providing positive constructive feedback on ways to improve, and each of the peer reviews will be graded.
Replication Targets 2020-1

Please note: All PDFs with instructions and highlights about what to do are posted on a cloud folder.


  - Study: Use Study 1 as base and add the additional scales from Study 2
  - Design: Correlational (also examining gender differences)
  - Summary: Values and expectancies for wealth and money are negatively associated with adjustment and well-being when they are more central to an individual than other self-relevant values and expectancies.
  - Citations: 2893
  - Tutor: Qinyu Xiao


  - Study: Combine Study 1 with Study 4, random order
  - Design: Study 1 experimental 2 conditions; Study 4 experimental 2x3
  - Summary: Experiences make people happier than material possessions
  - Citations: 1226
  - Tutor: Siu Kit Yeung


  - Study: Studies 1 and 2, random order
  - Design: Study 1 and Study 2 are two conditions (between)
  - Summary: Evaluation of experiences tends to be less comparative than that of material possessions
  - Citations: 400
  - Tutor: Siu Kit Yeung


  - Study: Combine Studies 3a, 3b, 3c, and 5, random order.
  - Design: Study 3a/3b/3c are one-sample comparison. Study 5 is 2 conditions between.
  - Summary: Experiences tend to be more closely associated with the self than possessions, therefore leading to more happiness.
  - Citations: 337
  - Tutor: Qinyu Xiao

Study: Use Study 1 as base, but add measures from Studies 2 and 3.
Design: Correlational, we’re not doing the experimental inducement.
Summary: Loneliness is associated with perceived agency in various targets.
Citations: 585
Note: As extensions, I suggest adding other measures of agency, such as free will belief scales and combining with measures in this study.
Tutor: Qinyu Xiao


Study: Study 1 (combine Q from both samples), Study 2, random order
Design: Study 1 correlational, Study 2 2 conditions
Summary: People commonly anthropomorphize nonhuman agents, imbuing everything from computers to pets to gods with humanlike capacities and mental experiences. People anthropomorphize, in part, to satisfy effectance motivation—the basic and chronic motivation to attain mastery of one’s environment.
Citations: 383
Tutor: Qinyu Xiao


Study: Combine Study 1 and Study 2, random order
Design: Study 1 is 2 conditions (between) x 5 offenses (within), Study 2 is 2x2x2 mixed design
Summary: People reacted more strongly (in terms of punishment assigned and negative emotions felt) to acts of betrayal than to identical bad acts that do not violate a duty or promise to protect.
Citations: 239
Tutor: Qinyu Xiao

Helping

Study: Combine Study 1 and Study 3, random order
Design: Study 1 is 2 conditions (close/distant; between design). Study 3 is 2 x 2 (between)
Summary: Recipient’s evaluation of a helper’s intentions and the recipient’s own attitudes about future interactions with the helper depend partly on the recipient’s perceptions of how the helper decided to assist: on the basis of affect, of role, or of cost-benefit calculation
Citations: 202
Tutor: Kristy Chow
Gratitude

Study: Study 2
Design: Study 2 is 3x2x2 conditions (mixed).
Summary: Gratitude and indebtedness are distinct emotional states. Increasing expectations of return communicated with a gift by a benefactor, indebtedness should increase but gratitude should decrease.
Citations: 363
Tutor: Kristy Chow


Study: Combine Study 1 and Study 2, random order
Design: Study 1 3 conditions (some/most/base, between), Study 2 is 2x2 (manipulated) x 2 (gender, measured)
Summary: People are more willing to express attitudes that could be viewed as prejudiced when their past behavior has established their credentials as non-prejudiced persons.
Citations: 1090
Tutor: Qinyu Xiao


Study: Combine Study 1a/b, Study 2, Study 4, random order
Design: Various, fairly simplified
Summary: Although people believe that learning more about others leads to greater liking, more information about others leads, on average, to less liking.
Citations: 272
Tutor: Kristy Chow
Team Project: Registered Replication Report assessment

Students will work in teams of 4 to work on a Registered Replication Report (RRR). This will include a presentation, and a team report analyzing the replication.

Replication assessment report

Please use our template for your replication assessment reports for your reports. For your group/teams, please make a copy of the template Google Doc, and work on that.

General description of the task (details in the template link above):
A team will assess the quality of a classic article and then the replication we conducted at HKU in the previous semesters. This will involve a hands-on analysis of the replication and reflect on the quality of the target article and the replication. To do that, you will need:

1. The original article
2. The replication article
3. The replication pre-registration, data, and code

Your report and presentation shall cover the following topics (this is for overview purpose only, see details in the template):

1. What is the effect/phenomenon
2. Why was it important to replicate?
3. Why would it replicate?
4. Why wouldn’t it replicate?
5. Quality of the target original article.
6. Quality of the pre-registration.
7. Quality of the replication report.
8. Did it replicate? how do you know?
9. If results differ - which of the two do you find more convincing? why?
10. What can be improved? Provide constructive realistic recommendations to improve on this replication even further.
11. Lessons learned for your own replication. Reflect on what you learned from this replication attempt for your own pre-registered replication projects?

Indicators used to assess the quality of both target article and the replication:

1. Clarity
2. Transparency and open-science
3. Reproducibility
4. Methods rigor
5. Design (does it fit the hypotheses?)
6. Power (calculate power)

Page limit: No longer than 30 pages (1.5 space, 11font). Preferences for summary/comparison tables and figures over text. Short and concise is strongly encouraged, but this should not come at the expense of comprehensiveness. The limits are set only for the main assessment component of “[Replication article/project]: Replication assessment”. No limit on appendices, intro pages, abstracts, and other added information.
Projects list

Assignment to projects will be done by end of the add/drop period and finalizing course student list.

For published and “under review” links and materials, visit: https://mgto.org/pre-registered-replications/#preprints

PSYC3052 (5 for PSYC3052A + 6 projects for PSYC3052B)

1. Agency and self-other asymmetries in perceived bias and shortcomings: Replications of the Bias Blind Spot and extensions linking to free will beliefs [Preprint]
2. Revisiting the Folk Concept of Intentionality: Replications and extensions of Malle and Knobe (1997) [Preprint]
3. Risky therefore not beneficial: Replication and extension of Finucane et al. (2000)'s Affect Heuristic experiment [Preprint]
4. Revisiting Disjunction Effect: Replication and extension of Tversky and Shafir (1992) comparing between and within subject designs. [Preprint]
5. Retrospective and prospective Hindsight Bias: Replications and extensions of Fischhoff (1975) and Slovic and Fischhoff (1977) [Preprint]
6. Accentuation and compatibility: Replication and extensions of Shafir (1993) to rethink Choosing versus Rejecting paradigms [Preprint]
7. Revisiting "Money Illusion": Replication and extension of Shafir et al. (1997) [Preprint]
Team Project: Primer/Review/Opinion piece

To help the scientific community improve current practices of psychological science, teams will work together to produce a manuscript that will either guide readers in improving on a certain topic or practice, or write a review opinion piece debating a particular practice.

Teams will be randomly assigned to a topic, and will follow a provided template for a manuscript on the assigned primer/review/opinion piece

Examples:
1. Fully open peer review: For and against.
2. Standardizing manuscript limitations section: Guide for writing useful limitations section.
3. Deviations from pre-registration: Need, existing solutions, suggested template, and guide for implementation. (sidetone: based on our experience in mass replication project).
4. Mass replication projects: Single paper for every replication or all in one paper?
5. Replications: Should original authors be involved? if so - how?

More details will be provided later in the semester.

Participation and contribution

Syllabus quiz
Completing the syllabus quiz is mandatory for this course. Not completing the quiz will mean no points for participation and contribution.

Tutorial plan and participation

Tutorial participation is optional but highly recommended since it’s likely to provide you with important training to help you with your replication projects, which are the largest component in this course.

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.

See course schedule for planned tutorials.
Grading details

Replication and extension Registered Report

1. Article analysis (30%)
2. Qualtrics / Survey design (40%)
   1. Design (20%)
      i. Matches with the article.
      ii. Randomization done correctly.
      iii. Correct order of screens.
      iv. Reasonable question type selection.
      v. Right use of question or choice randomization.
      vi. Includes validations/forced answers where needed.
      vii. Use of skip logic/display logic/recoding where needed.
      viii. etc.
   2. Overall survey design/flow, clarify and engagement (10%):
      i. Follows the Qualtrics replication guide guidelines.
      ii. Clear instructions and sufficient explanation in engaging the participants (e.g., participants know what to do and what is expected of them).
      iii. Meaningful variable naming (that will be easy to understand when analyzing)
      iv. Meaningful values coding (check values assigned to each possible answers, easier in the WORD export)
      v. Use of features to maximize survey responsiveness and high-quality responding

3. Data analysis on random dataset (30%)
   1. Analyses
      i. Analyses appropriate and match design
   2. Writeup
      i. Clear, structured,
      ii. Adherence to template and APA style
      iii. Clarity comprehensiveness
Pre-registration 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%)

Team class in-class experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team effort</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with class/students</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team class RRR presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team effort</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of analysis</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Team final project presentations grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>0 marks (Fail)</th>
<th>8 points (Poor)</th>
<th>17 points (Good)</th>
<th>25 points (Excellent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong> (areas = high level)</td>
<td>Bad structure. Did not follow outline at all, most areas not covered. Presentation is very disorganized; little flow; vague; difficult to understand.</td>
<td>Minimal structure. Mostly not follow outline, and much areas left uncovered. Presentation is confusing and disorganized in a number of places, disconnected or choppy; take some effort to follow.</td>
<td>Good structure. Generally followed outline, covered most areas. Presentation flows smoothly with occasional confusion or rough patches between ideas.</td>
<td>Excellent structure. Followed outline strictly, and covered all areas. Presentation is smooth, polished and organized; flows well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong> (components = low level)</td>
<td>Does not reflect understanding of project aim/ideas; Points not clear; irrelevant information; listeners gain nothing/little. Did not cover or mistaken on most of the needed components.</td>
<td>Reflect minimum understanding of project aim/ideas; Information is confusing in places; too much or too little information; listeners gain a few insights. Missed or inaccurate on many of the components.</td>
<td>Reflect decent understanding of project aim/ideas; Sufficient information; many good points made; some areas lacking; listeners gain adequate insight. Covered most components well.</td>
<td>Reflects excellent understanding of project aim/ideas; Abundance of material; points clearly made; evidence supports; listeners gain good insights. Excellent cover of components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simplicity, conciseness, delivery, use of communication Aids</strong></td>
<td>Overcomplicated, not concise and unclear No figures or visual aids (tables). Overuse of jargon. Lay audience cannot follow or understand. Communication aids poorly prepared or nonexistent.</td>
<td>Not simple, clear, or concise enough. Minimal use of figures or visual aids (tables). Use of jargon. Communication aids marginally prepared; do not support presentation well.</td>
<td>Fairly simple, clear, and concise. Good use of figures and visual aids (tables, etc.). Professional communication aids, but not varied; may use too many or too few.</td>
<td>Clear, simple, and concise. Appropriate, varied, and professional communication aids. Excellent use of visual aids rather than text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair delivery</strong></td>
<td>No pair effort/coordination. Presenters are uncomfortable; pace is rushed; style is distracting and annoying 'noticeable use of filler words (uhhs, likes, umms) or pauses.</td>
<td>Minimal pair effort/coordination Presenters are somewhat uncomfortable or nervous; noticeable use of filler words (uhhs, likes, umms) or pauses.</td>
<td>Good pair effort/coordination Presenters are general comfortable; somewhat polished; minor problems.</td>
<td>Excellent pair effort/coordination Presenters are comfortable; presentation flows smoothly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Score**: 100

---

Evaluators are instructed to:

1. Avoid outcome bias. Ignore results. Whether the replication “worked” or not should not be a factor.
2. Clarity is key. Would a stranger to the project be able to understand the presentation and the findings?
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 public viewing with commenting permissions, and check that you can access the document even in incognito mode when you are not logged in. Please also make sure that the instructor has full editing permissions (giladfel@gmail.com).

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_1a_2020_guest / psyc3052_1b_2020_guest
Password: Psyc!3052 (case sensitive; same password for both guest accounts)
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, please post your questions on Slack. I'll answer your questions there. If you have personal issues not related to course/projects, feel free to contact me/TA directly.

Before you do, please read "How to Email Your Professor (without being annoying)", and use this suggested template (fill in all the areas with numbers):

To: gfeldman@hku.hk / [TA email] (Please do not email instructor in any other emails)
From: myname@student.hku.hk
Subject: PSYC3052-2020: [full name 1] - [write clear topic title 2]

Dear [Fili / TA name],

My name is [Enter your full name 3] and I am a student in your PSYC3052 Advanced Social Psychology course. The project I am working on is [Enter project name 5]

This is the question I have or the help I need:
[write the question/problem you're facing 6].
I’ve looked at the syllabus and the Moodle/Slack 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 7], and I think [This Is The Answer] [write what you think is the answer 8], but I am still not sure.

This is the action I would like you to take or the request I have:
[write your request 9].

Thank you/Best regards [polite sign off 10],
[write your full name again here with LAST NAME IN CAPITAL LETTERS 11]
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](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](http://www.hku.hk/plagiarism) and check the new website and new Policy on Student Plagiarism in Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Curricula.

**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.
To be clear: For components that are submitted in stages (such as pre-registration) this policy applies for each of the stages and will influence the score of the last stage. Meaning, submitting late to stage 1 of the pre-registration will affect the score of the final pre-registration per the policy above.
Incomplete assignment submissions

Students are responsible to verify their submissions and make sure these are accurate and complete in accordance with submission instructions. We simply cannot afford the time to run after students to seek out materials. Incomplete assignments may not be checked at all and grade will be penalized by up to 20% of the score if TA follows up on submission to obtain further details. Response to TA requests on incomplete submissions is expected within 1 calendar day, or assignment will not be accepted.

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.