

Printer-friendly version

#ubcpsyc325  
PSYC 325 with Dr. Rawn  
Psychology of Self in Social Media

Please hand in ONE of your three paper copies. Ensure your name is on it. Then sit with your working group. Thanks!

Syllabus: <http://blogs.ubc.ca/psychsocialmedia>

Meetings: Tuesday & Thursday 11-12:20, BUCH A201



# Agenda

1. Paper copies: Hand in one for me [use this as attendance], one for each of your reviewers
2. Review grading of Impact Project
3. Receive copies of the feedback form, and we'll review it together. Changes? Clarifications?
  - *Your comments will be graded by our TAs (10% of your grade).*
  - *Some examples of excellent peer comments on proposals*
  - *While we work out who you are to provide feedback to, start using the feedback form with your own paper. Practice objectivity, honesty, and helpfulness.*
4. Identify who is providing you with feedback, and who you are to provide feedback to. Exchange papers as needed.
5. **By Thursday March 24**, submit a copy of the feedback you are creating for others **to me and to the person** whose work you are reviewing
  - Interested in exceeding expectations? Submit a thorough self-review too.

# Impact Project Grading

- Worth 40%
- 25% paper grade (average of the peer- and self-ratings you receive, combined with TA grade adjustment if needed)
- 15% quality of peer and self reviews for proposals (5%), ***quality of written comments on 2 people's draft papers (10%)*** (TA graded)
- Evaluate all working group's final papers using primarily a numerical rubric (*so we maintain inter-rater reliability*)

# Examples of excellent peer comments on proposals...

## Overall

- (Writing) Y provided examples for some of the questions she would ask participants (such as...). It helped to understand more about her project and her goals. This makes it easier for a reader to visualize the experiment and helps to ground the theories in easy-to-understand language.
- (Proposal content) A particular strength of this project is that it connects to the different aspects of the self, which we have been talking about in class. G is considering how the social actor, autobiographical actor, or motivated agent act on people's engagement in social media when it concerns social media movements. This is good because the readings and discussions we have had in class about the aspects of the self can be tied in to his project work. To strengthen this advantage, I think he should see if there are certain key words he can identify for each aspect of the self, because it is a rather subjective task to identify which aspect of self someone is displaying. Similar to the reading about extraversion and self-presentation having certain key words, maybe he could code a few words that people who are presenting as a motivated agent use more often than as an autobiographical actor, for example.

# Examples of excellent peer comments on proposals...

## Specificity

- (Writing) M's proposal was well-written and one of the strengths was the thorough descriptions about her method. For example, M explained that her intention for this research project is to 'find out which is the best social media platform for promoting (topic)' and then operationally defined this by stating, "I will define "best promotion" as whichever platform results in the most clicks on the link to my blog." After reading her proposal, I was able to imagine her process and methods based on the detailed information she provided.

# Examples of excellent peer comments on proposals...

## Justifying why it's a strength/weakness

- (Proposal content) One specific strength of the project is that the criterion variable of self-esteem appears to have a solid operational definition. This measurement has good face validity, and is well-connected to the greater theme of the project. One way to improve it further would be to find previous research that also uses and supports the chosen operational definition.

# Examples of excellent peer comments on proposals...

## Suggestions for further implementation/future ideas

- (Proposal content) One limitation of the project is the difficulty of measuring how often a story is shared by men or women. As the project progresses, it will likely become difficult to count the amount of shares by each gender. One way to remedy this would be to limit the project to shares on Facebook, since it is easier to identify gender on this platform than on Twitter. In addition, it could be useful to choose news stories that have not been shared more than about 200 times, so that data collection will be less time-consuming and difficult.

# Examples of excellent peer comments on proposals...

## Pointing out the importance of the strength/weakness

- This project is strongly rooted in past research, while still filling a gap in the literature. It addresses a question that has not been investigated in an online context, but it still closely resembles questions investigated offline. This will allow the results to be compared to very similar past research in offline contexts. So, conclusions can be drawn from the results themselves and also from comparisons of these results to past research. This could be improved by conforming the methodology (specifically, what words indicate emotion expression) very closely to the methodology of past studies, to make the data even more comparable because the variables will have similar operational definitions.