

Eastern Kentucky University

Encompass

SWK 340: Social Work Research Methods OER Collection

2021

SWK 340: Exercise 5. Abstract for the Research Proposal

Erin Stevenson

Follow this and additional works at: https://encompass.eku.edu/oer_swk340



Part of the **Social Work Commons**

Exercise 5. Writing an Abstract for the Research Proposal

Purpose: This assignment focuses on the skill required to write a succinct abstract for a research proposal.

Instructions: Academic papers include an abstract and keywords to summarize the research problem, question, hypothesis, methods, and results of a study. This helps readers to know at a glance if the information is relevant to their search topic. Journals often have a specific word count required for an abstract, usually around 150-250 words.

For this exercise, write the abstract section of your research proposal. You do not have any results at this point in the process since you are writing a proposal for research. Instead of results, talk about what new information your study would offer the field of social work if it was to be funded and you could actually conduct the study.

Submit your abstract through the assignment link on blackboard by the due date in the course schedule. Include a title page.

Format: The abstract is on its own page after the title page. It is written as one paragraph and is not indented in APA format. Review the [APA guide for abstract and keywords](#). The abstract should be 250 words or less and include 1-2 sentences for each of these topics in your paper:

- Key aspects of the literature
- Research problem, question and hypothesis
- Brief description of study design and sample
- Implications of your study for social work

Keywords are listed under the abstract paragraph and are indented. The title “*Keywords*” is italicized and indented. You should list 3-4 words that represent the main topic in your paper and would be good search terms for readers.

Here are two good examples of research paper abstracts for you. You can go to the [APA format sample papers](#) to view the source of each abstract if you are interested in more information

Abstract Example 1

Learning experiences that connect students to communities and provide them with opportunities to reflect and apply theories to real-world challenges can promote a value orientation toward social justice. This study uses a mixed methods design to investigate students' value orientation toward social justice in an undergraduate community psychology course and the extent to which community engagement contributes to this orientation among a cross-sectional undergraduate sample of racially diverse students at a minority-serving institution. The analysis of outcomes collected across three different course offerings revealed that students enrolled in the course possessed a more favorable orientation toward social justice ($Mdn = 150.00$) and that the course had subtle effects in improving this orientation ($Mdn = 152.32$, $Z = -1.73$, $p = .08$, $r = -.22$). An analysis of students' value orientation across each course offering revealed a significant between-course effect, $H(2) = 5.86$, $p = .05$. Students enrolled in courses with an emphasis on completing the community engagement assignment in a group demonstrated a more positive value orientation. Qualitative findings further explicate how the course increased students' awareness of social inequalities and, for some, their social justice behaviors.

Keywords: social justice, undergraduates, community psychology, value orientation

Source: Mixed methods professional paper template: Adapted from "‘I Am a Change Agent’: A Mixed Methods Analysis of Students’ Social Justice Value Orientation in an Undergraduate Community Psychology Course," by D. X. Henderson, A. T. Majors, and M. Wright, 2019, *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*. Advance online publication. (<https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000171>). Copyright 2019 by the American Psychological Association.

Abstract Example 2

What role does deliberation play in susceptibility to political misinformation and “fake news”?

The Motivated System 2 Reasoning (MS2R) account posits that deliberation causes people to fall for fake news because reasoning facilitates identity-protective cognition and is therefore used to rationalize content that is consistent with one’s political ideology. The classical account of reasoning instead posits that people ineffectively discern between true and false news headlines when they fail to deliberate (and instead rely on intuition). To distinguish between these competing accounts, we investigated the causal effect of reasoning on media truth discernment using a two-response paradigm. Participants ($N = 1,635$ Mechanical Turkers) were presented with a series of headlines. For each paradigm, participants were first asked to give an initial, intuitive response under time pressure and concurrent working memory load. They were then given an opportunity to rethink their response with no constraints, thereby permitting more deliberation. We also compared these responses to a (deliberative) one-response baseline condition where participants made a single choice with no constraints. Consistent with the classical account, we found that deliberation corrected intuitive mistakes: Participants believed false headlines (but not true headlines) more in initial responses than in either final responses or the unconstrained one-response baseline. In contrast—and inconsistent with the MS2R account—we found that political polarization was equivalent across responses. Our data suggest that, in the context of fake news, deliberation facilitates accurate belief formation and not partisan bias.

Keywords: fake news, misinformation, dual-process theory, two-response paradigm

Source: Quantitative professional paper template: Adapted from “Fake News, Fast and Slow: Deliberation Reduces Belief in False (but Not True) News Headlines,” by B. Bago, D. G. Rand, and G. Pennycook, 2020, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 149(8), pp. 1608–1613 (<https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000729>). Copyright 2019 by the American Psychological Association.