Evaluating methods

PSYC 11: Laboratory in Psychological Science

Jeremy Manning
jeremy@dartmouth.edu

What makes a "good" methods section?

- It resulted in the intended outcome

- People following the instructions understood what they were doing

- The procedure was not overly complex or time consuming

What data do we have?

- Original drawings and instructions

- Reproduced drawings (images)

- Lists of assumptions made about each set of instructions

- Ratings of how closely instructions were followed

- Evaluations of quality of instructions

What might we want do with our data?

- Understand something about how effective different instructions were

- Learn about potential differences between how we **think** our instructions will be perceived vs. how they **are** perceived

- Understand what it's like to follow instructions, including the role of assumptions

Original vs. reproduced drawings

Group A original

Reproductions of group A's drawing

Assumptions data

- Instructions that require making more assumptions **could** be more ambiguous

  - If the end product is still "correct" those ambiguities might not matter much

  - More complex instructions (e.g., more steps, more to do per step, etc.) might require making more assumptions, but they also might convey more information

Ratings and evaluations

- When you rated or evaluated, which criteria did you use? What specific components of the instructions (or products) were you considering?

- What can evaluations of your **own** group's instructions tell you?

- What can evaluations from **other** groups tell you?

Sample analyses