

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 forward with a neutral expression. 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

April 12, 2024

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

