

**ApEc 8902 Graduate Seminar: PhD Program
Fall 2007**

Instructor: Professor Elizabeth (“Liz”) Davis
Email: edavis@umn.edu
Office Location: 317E Classroom Office Building
Telephone: 612-625-3772
Office Hours: By appointment. *Email is the best way to set up an appointment.*

Instructor: Professor Gerard McCullough
Email: gmccullo@umn.edu
Office Location: 248c Classroom Office Building
Telephone: 612-624-2210
Office Hours: By appointment. *Email is the best way to set up an appointment.*

Course Description: Writing, critiquing and oral presentation skills for Ph.D. students. Topics include: research project development and design, components of a research project, writing and reviewing the work of others, presentations, and research ethics.

Course Objective: Develop professional knowledge and skills in conducting research and in presenting research results. Develop and present a research proposal that could be the basis for a dissertation.

Class Meetings: Fridays, 12:00-12:50, 230 Classroom Office Building. Class may run late on some days in order to give all students a chance to present. Please let us know if this presents a problem for you.

Required text and readings: We will read extensively from *Research Methodology in Applied Economics* by Don Ethridge (second edition). Copies of all readings are on reserve in Waite Library. Some readings are also available online.

Course requirements:

The following assignments must be completed by all students in the course

1. Prepare a written research proposal and a seminar presentation of your research proposal. Components of the research proposal are due each week as noted in the course outline.
2. Prepare a written review of another student’s research proposal and seminar presentation.
3. Complete the readings prior to class and prepare for and participate in class discussion.
4. Prepare revisions to the written research proposal based on feedback from fellow students and instructors.

Grading:

This course is graded S-N only. The university has established the following grading standards:

S: Achievement is satisfactory, which is equivalent to a C- or better.

N: Represents failure (or no credit) and signifies that the work was either (1) completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit, or (2) was not completed and there was no agreement between the instructor and the student that the student would be awarded an I (“incomplete”).

Incompletes are only granted after the student and instructors have agreed upon a timetable (in a written contract) for the completion of all coursework.

What does an incomplete mean? All students will receive feedback from the instructors on their proposal. You should expect to make revisions to your proposal based on this feedback. If extensive revisions are needed, or if the instructors feel that the student has not made sufficient progress in developing their proposal, a grade of incomplete may be given. In this case, the student will be required to turn in a revised proposal (usually before the end of the following semester) in order to receive a satisfactory grade.

Academic Dishonesty: "The College of Liberal Arts defines scholastic dishonesty broadly as any act by a student that misrepresents the student's own academic work or that compromises the academic work of another. Examples include cheating on assignments or exams, plagiarizing (misrepresenting as one's own anything done by another), unauthorized collaboration on assignments or exams, or sabotaging another student's work." If you have any concerns or questions about what constitutes scholastic dishonesty or plagiarism, please talk with us. Academic dishonesty in any portion of the academic work for a course shall be grounds for awarding a grade of N for the entire course and may face additional sanctions from the University.

Disabilities: Students with disabilities that affect their ability to participate fully in class or to meet all course requirements are encouraged to contact the university Office of Disability Services so that appropriate accommodations can be arranged.

Sexual Harassment: University policy prohibits sexual harassment as defined in the December 1998 policy statement, available at the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. Questions or concerns about sexual harassment should be directed to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, located in 419 Morrill Hall.

**ApEc 8902 Graduate Seminar
COURSE OUTLINE AND TOPICS**

Readings should be done in advance of class. Assignments are due at the beginning of class.

Date	Topic	Readings and Writing Assignments
Sept. 7	Organizational meeting	
Sept. 14	Planning the Research	Skim Ethridge chapters 1-2. Read Ethridge, Ch. 5 Writing Assignment Due: Statement of topic and name of advisor
Sept. 21	Research Problem and Objectives	Read Ethridge, Ch. 6 Skim McCloskey, <i>Economical Writing</i>
Sept. 28	Literature Review	Read Ethridge, Ch. 7 Writing Assignment Due: Research problem and objectives
Oct. 5	The Conceptual Framework	Read Ethridge, Ch. 8 Writing Assignment Due: Literature review
Oct.12	Methods and Procedures	Read Ethridge, Ch. 9 Writing Assignment Due: Conceptual framework
Oct. 19	Reporting the Research	Read Ethridge, Ch. 10 Writing Assignment Due: Methods and procedures
Oct. 26	Writing and authorship	Skim McCloskey, <i>Economical Writing</i> Read M.A. Fine and L.A. Kurdek. 1993. “Reflections on Determining Authorship Credit and Authorship Order on Faculty-Student Collaborations.” <i>American Psychologist</i> 48 (11, November): 1141-1147. Writing Assignment Due: Revised research problem and objectives
Nov. 2	Research ethics	Read National Academy of Sciences. <i>On Being a Scientist: Responsible Conduct in Research</i> , 2 nd edition (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1995). Online at http://www.nap.edu/readingroom/books/obas/
Nov. 9	Research proposal presentation	Complete proposal due
Nov.16	Research proposal presentation	
Nov. 30	Research proposal presentation	
Dec.7	Research proposal presentation	

Suggestions for additional readings:

D. McCloskey. 2000. *Economical Writing*.

Good advice on professional writing for economists. Highly recommended.

D. McCloskey. 1996. The Standard Error of Regressions. *Journal of Economic Literature* XXXIV (March 1996): 97-114.

Warns economists of the risks of relying too heavily on tests of statistical significance instead of considering the economic or practical significance of results and the power of the statistical test.

D. Hamermesh. 1992. The Young Economists Guide to Professional Etiquette. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 6 (1, winter): 169-179.

Suggestions for new assistant professors on how to increase their visibility and likelihood of professional success.

D. Hamermesh. 1994. Facts and Myths about Refereeing. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8 (1, winter): 153-163.

Data on the length of time for refereeing, characteristics of referees, and strategies for getting published.

Research ethics and human subjects topics

University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board website

<http://www.research.umn.edu/irb/guide/>

University of Minnesota Graduate school – list of ethics codes for different organizations

<http://www.grad.umn.edu/ethics/codes.html>

Ethics guidelines for statisticians

<http://www.amstat.org/profession/index.cfm?fuseaction=ethicalstatistics>

Michigan State Graduate School publications on research ethics

<http://www.msu.edu/user/gradschl/integrity.htm>

Onlineethics.org at Case Western Reserve University

<http://onlineethics.org>