



Lecture 02: Asking good questions and gathering evidence

Being Scientific

Dr. Gordon Wright 

g.wright@gold.ac.uk

October 9, 2023



Attendance QR Code [HERE](#)



Key topics today

- The week ahead
- The research process you are beginning
- Effect sizes
- Lab preview - Literature, and making it your friend



The week ahead

This week (week 2) you have your Personality Essay Tutorial

“Insert info”

title

Deadline 10am Friday x

Feedback on/by x



Perennial CHIP topics

I want to briefly draw your attention to the third (final) piece of coursework for this module, the so-called ‘CHIP Learning Log’

The earlier we flag topics and introduce little glimmers of content, the easier that will be.



1 - What is Science?



An amazing opportunity to consider this critical question while you do your Mini-Dissertation

Here is a thought-provoking initial overview - Open Educational Resource

Diener, E. (2022). Why science?. In R. Biswas-Diener & E. Diener (Eds), *Noba textbook series: Psychology*. Champaign, IL: DEF publishers. <http://noba.to/qu4abpzy>



2 - Artificial Intelligence - Promise or Peril?



Last year, this was a fairly philosophical question

This year, you are probably using AI on a daily or weekly basis. I don't need to give you 1980's movie references to show you how we thought computers were going to take over the world and enslave the human race, we can just look out the window!



CHIP topic approval process

Lectures identified with CHIP in the title e.g. weeks 16-20 [They change yearly!]

I am open to other topics, but they must fit the following brief, and be agreed in the Forum.

- A concept or debate within Psychology
- A historical issue or controversy
- A methodology or approach and its promises or limitations
- A distinctive or divisive topic
- A modern innovation or applied challenge


<https://www2.open.ac.uk/openlearn/CHIPS/>



**I can't make bricks without
clay!**



A psychologist? A scientist?





In this instance, Sherlock is talking about the need for data prior to solving a case. You can't do science without data.



Scientists base their ‘claims’ on EVIDENCE

Theory
e.g., “There
is only one
general kind
of
intelligence”



Personality and
Individual Differences

Research
e.g., Do children
with better spatial
skills also have
better reading
skills?

Are people good at
painting also good
at maths?



Evidence quality = claim quality!



**“We should
spend more
money on
advertising!”**



**“How many people see
these adverts?”**
**“Do people buy things
they see online?”**
**“How does this compare
to other kinds of
advertising?”**



It starts with a hypothesis

You've already been introduced to the idea of a hypothesis in stats last year.

“Coffee will improve memory scores”

(Experimental Hypothesis)



“Coffee will have no effect on memory scores”

(Null Hypothesis)





recap on hypotheses

However, two ways we can think about what a hypothesis is:

A hypothesis is a prediction about what will happen in a study

e.g., “Memory scores will be higher in the group that gets coffee”


Or a hypothesis is a claim about how the world is

e.g., “Caffeine improves the strength of our memories”



The research process


The research process



Chapter 1: Types of research and inferring causality

Chapter 2: Aims and hypotheses in research

ON THE READING LIST AND AVAILABLE ONLINE



**Research Methods in
Psychology**

Howitt, Dennis


Publisher: Pearson Education



The simplicity of an experiment

Experiments

- The word *experiment* has a very specific meaning in science
- Involves manipulating a variable to see the effect on another variable
- A way of testing claims about cause and effect





Operationalisation

Operationalisation is a key process in designing a research study. This involves translating general claims about cause and effect into specific variables that we can measure and manipulate.

“Caffeine improves the strength of our memories”

Cause: Caffeine

Effect: Memory strength

“Memory scores will be higher in the group that gets coffee”

Independent variable: Coffee


Dependent variable: Memory scores



The challenge of operationalisation


Operationalisation = Translating general claims into specific IVs and DVs

e.g.,





A toy example





Extraneous variables

Assumption of an experiment is that variability in the DV depends on manipulation of the IV.

However, we must also consider the influence of **extraneous variables** – factors we don't manipulate, but which also affect what we measure





Usually...

Most **extraneous variables** just add noise to your measurements i.e. they add variability to your dependent variables that is separate from your manipulation

e.g., if time of test affects memory, and this randomly varies between groups, will make it harder to detect effect of manipulation






but occasionally...


you hear of ‘confounds’ or **‘confounding variables’**

A confounding variable is an extraneous variable that systematically varies with one of your independent variables. These are rare, but nothing can save the experiment.

Extraneous (but not Confound)




Confound





An impossible interpretation

If things are **confounded**, and we see this pattern of results....



It could be....

Drinking **coffee**...

Independent variable

...leads to **higher recall** in a memory test

Dependent variable

Or it could be....

Being **tested in the morning**...

Confounding variable

...leads to **higher recall** in a memory test

Dependent variable


Confounds make results impossible to interpret!



Manipulations almost always introduce potential confounds

Could be:


- Caffeine?
 - Drinking something warm?
 - Drinking anything?
 - Holding a mug?
 - Brief social interaction with the experimenter?
 - ???





Experimental skill + careful thought + piloting + randomness!


Good manipulation = fewest possible confounds





The importance of operationalising your variables well

Good operationalisation is key to good study design.



If operationalisation from broad question to specific details is bad, the study can't answer the question we are interested in



Reading along

I highly recommend reading along with the general topics we cover in the first few weeks.

Research Methods in Psychology by Dennis Howitt and Duncan Cramer is excellent. Chapter 2 in that book (right at the top of the module reading list and [here](#)) deals with Hypotheses and aims of research, essentially what we cover this week, and Chapter 1 deals with the basics and golden rules of research design and designing good experiments.



**Another interpretation of “I
can’t make bricks without
clay!”**



Garbage in, Garbage out

Last year someone selected a ‘target paper’ for their Critical Proposal [next week’s lecture topic] from a Sociology Journal - it presented a ‘thought experiment’.

No data, no methodology, no participants, no actual experiment.

How do you think they did?



The literature you read will drive the quality of your output

- This applies to the study you design for your Mini-Dissertation
- This applies to your Module Essays
- This applies to your Critical Proposal
- It is NOT a question of QUANTITY
- It is very much a question of QUALITY
- It is a function of QUALITY and QUANTITY



Lab 2 is about Literature Search and Management



Effect Sizes



A measure of the Effect (MOTE)

Effect sizes represent the magnitude of a relationship between variables, for example between a Manipulation and the Dependent Variable.

It's like the 'strength' of your pill, or intervention, or manipulation.

Do not run an experiment that is designed to fail - you must believe a manipulation will have an 'Effect'

If the manipulation works, then there will be an Effect

The Effect Size is just how big that visible effect was.



Let's imagine the simplest example possible

An independent t-test. Working Memory Capacity.

I have a magic pill to increase working memory capacity.

7 ± 2 is the Miller Law. Let's read this as normal mean working memory capacity for a group of humans is mean 7 units with a standard deviation of 2 units.

Let's say my pill was tried on a group of humans, and when we measured their mean working memory capacity it was 11 units with a standard deviation of 2 units. Wowsers!

That's an effect size of $d=2$. Simply put, Cohen's d is always presented in units equivalent to 1 standard deviation. So 11 is 2 SDs higher than 7.

Calculating Effect Sizes (shinyapps.io)

