



ECPS6001: Psychology Empirical Project Research Proposal

Assessment Component 1: Research proposal (1,000 words) worth 10% of the overall module mark for the Psychology Empirical Project. The proposal form will be marked in line with the Level Six Grading Rubric. The boxes below will expand as you type.

Student Name and University ID number:	Joe Bloggs (123456)
Proposed Supervisor's name:	<i>Only complete this if you have already been in contact with a potential supervisor who has agreed to supervise you in principle.</i> Dr Jane Smith

Psychology Research Area (tick all that apply)

Key boxes not ticked

Social Psychology	Developmental Psychology	Biological Psychology	Forensic Psychology
Health Psychology	Individual Differences	Educational Psychology	Political Psychology
Cognitive Psychology ✓	Clinical Psychology	Counselling Psychology	Occupational Psychology
Other: indicate briefly (not included in word count)			

Proposed Study Design (tick all that apply)

Key boxes not ticked

Quantitative	Experimental ✓	Applied (with UWTSD students)	Online Questionnaire Survey
Qualitative	Quasi Experimental	Focus Groups	Online
Mixed Methods	Applied (with external organisation)	Interviews	Lab-based study
If Applied, and involving an external organisation, please indicate your plans for gaining appropriate approvals from the organisation: (not included in the word count)		Other study design: indicate briefly (not included in word count)	

Suggested Research Title/Area: (between 10-15 words and must reflect the essence of your proposed research question, study design and study population and should be more specific than a broad topic area).

Pain and attention bias – a quantitative study

Missing info on target participants and specific type of study design

Background: 250 words
Why is your study important? What theory and empirical research evidence supports your research question? (Please provide a rationale for your study including a brief review of relevant psychological literature and theory and a minimum of five references).

Asmundson, Kuperos, and Norton (1997)

Kahneman (1973) said that “various messages are filtered in a given situation, allowing the individual to pick and choose which information to focus on based upon how relevant or significant that information is to the individual and to filter out less relevant information”.

Researchers found that to understand the meaning of what is referred to as “attention” itself and how it relates to those with chronic pain.

The cocktail party problem says on auditory info with regard to selective attention, the theory still stands and focuses on the concept of an individual telling the difference between two different pieces of auditory info.

Schoth, Nunes and Liossi (2012) found a link between the two variables, but there is contention as to what direction the results point toward.

Commented [KW1]: Needs to cover the designated word count and citations must follow APA formatting conventions

Commented [KW2]: A citation without any accompanying information doesn't tell us anything.

Commented [KW3]: Including quotes does not enable the marker to judge your knowledge and understanding. There are also page numbers missing.

Commented [KW4]: Any arguments must be backed up with citations and sentences must be checked to ensure they make sense. It also needs to be clear why a particular reference is relevant to your study.

Commented [KW5]: Any theories/models must be appropriately cited and again sentences must make sense and link with other information discussed.

Commented [KW6]: Write out words in full

Commented [KW7]: Need to explain the literature for the reader to understand. This section also needs to end with a clear link back to the specific focus of the study.

Please state the main research question(s) or hypotheses(s): (100 words max)

For this study I want to try and find out whether people in more pain are better or worse at looking at things on a computer.

I expect to find that people in more pain will perform worse and the hypothesis is that there will be a significant difference in scores between the two groups.

Commented [KW8]: Avoid use of first person.

Commented [KW9]: Better/worse at what? What specific task/activity?

Commented [KW10]: What are “things”?

Commented [KW11]: Than who? And on what criteria?

Commented [KW12]: Scores on what?

Commented [KW13]: What groups? Generally, a poorly worded hypothesis.

Methodological Details (500 words)

Please summarise the key methodological approach: (you can include copies of proposed study materials as appendices if you wish). You must include details of the following:

- *Participants:* Who will your participants be, how will you access and recruit them, and how many are needed?
- *Design:* Using appropriate terminology clearly define key elements of your design (IVs, DVs, Qual approach, expt. manipulations etc). How do you plan to analyse your main data?
- *Materials:* What are the main measures, scales, experimental tools or other materials required for your study?
- *Procedure:* How will you carry out the study – define briefly what will happen to a participant in your study from the point of consent to the study debrief.

Participants:

Forty participants from Psychology and Counselling over the age of 18. They will be put into two groups – pain and no pain.

Design:

The study is quantitative and will have an IV (pain, no pain) and a DV (correct response).

Data will be inputted to SPSS for analysis.

Materials:

Complete a pain scale and a computer task

Procedure:

Participants fill in the questionnaire then complete the computer task in the SA1 labs.

Commented [KW14]: Why 40? No sample size calculation or link to previous research to support this. Requires justification.

How will they be recruited? EMS? Any specific courses with P&C or open to all? If so, how will others be approached recruited?

How will the groupings be achieved? Rationale? Numbers?

Commented [KW15]: Too basic/lacking detail – what design specifically? Experimental, within/between? Clear operational definition of IV group split required. Correct response on what? Continuous/categorical data?

Commented [KW16]: This doesn't tell us anything. The specific analyses to answer the research questions should be documented – e.g., 2x3 mixed ANOVA. Ensure to explain what each analysis you plan to conduct will explore.

Commented [KW17]: Too basic/lacking detail. Which pain scale? Provide reference. Is it validated? What are the psychometric properties? How does it measure pain? Self-report, and what are the categories/cut-offs? What is the task, what are participants required to do? How arduous/sensitive is it?

Commented [KW18]: How – what is involved. Need to explain in a step-by-step manner what the participant is expected to do.

Key Ethical considerations (150 words)

In this section you are required to briefly outline any specific ethical considerations for your project. All projects will be expected to adhere to the BPS code of human research ethics, and you will need to submit a full ethics form which will document your specific processes for informed consent, debriefing, and data protection. Here you need to briefly note additional or specific key ethical considerations for your particular project e.g. potential for distress or discomfort, any deception, research with vulnerable populations or sensitive topic areas, and briefly outline how you expect to manage these risks within your project.

There are no real ethical concerns as it will be in the labs and they only have a questionnaire and computer task to do, and will be given a consent and debrief.

Commented [KW19]: Never say there are no ethical concerns. Always reference the BPS ethics and specifically consider HOW these will be adhered given the specific design and procedure of your study. What additional aspects above and beyond the standard ethical considerations should be included?