

A stylized, minimalist illustration in the background shows two figures. On the left, a person is shown in profile, facing right, with their mouth open as if speaking. On the right, another person is shown from the chest up, facing left, with their hands clasped near their face in a listening posture. The figures are rendered in light beige and grey tones against a pale blue background. A large, light orange triangle is positioned behind the main title text.

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



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

