Methods & Analysis in Behavioural Science (PS923)

PS923 Assignment 1

Feedback for 5637058

Mark: 68%

Grade: B

Feedback on your submission

Task 1 75

It was good to find (and correct) the typos in the data.

It was good to fit the linear models and report your findings. It was good to report the statistics, including R-squared values. It was good to include the R-squared value for the overall model; it would have been good to also report R-squared results for the WTP & Usefulness models, which arguably plays into the question of whether the two groups predict expectations equally. It was very good to use the interaction term of Stranger ~ Task * Participant to identify whether the Task had a significant effect on the slope. (It would have been good to have checked the assumptions of homogeneity and normality of the data too, though this is a fairly minor point.)

Very minor point: When reporting a *p*-value, the convention now is to not report the leading 0 (e.g., write "*p* = .04", rather than "*p* = 0.04"), as the value must be between 0 and 1.

There was generally good effort with putting the results into context and you did a good job qualifying your conclusions. It might've been good to focus a bit more on the interaction between participant ratings and type of task -- reporting the regression slopes for both conditions, and as noted the r^2 values, and interpreting those. But overall, you did a very nice job writing this up.

The figure was good. It would be good to also include confidence intervals, to help readers interpret things visually, though it was good to include data points.

The code for each task was well laid out and suitably commented. For future assignments, it might be helpful to include a bit more detail on the type of analysis you're running and briefly explaining why, just to make it easier for you and others to follow your code in the future.

Task 2 60

It was good to have identified (and dealt with) the duplicate rows in the data and comment on this in section 2.

It was good to use ANOVA and also have some follow-up contrasts analysis. It would have been good to also do the 3-way ANOVA (type of rank - comparative versus objective, rank level - low, medium, high, and type of valuer - under or postgrad), which was significant and could have helped to guide the subsequent analysis and interpretation of the other values. The best way to follow-up on the 3-way interaction would have been to split the data into 2 subsets (e.g., according to valuer, for example) and run separate 2-way ANOVAs in each subset. Because you collapsed across valuers, you correctly found the main effect of rank level, but missed the valuer and type of rank interaction.

The figure is neatly produced. It's good to have labelled things nicely and included the units. As a key question was whether there's a difference between objective and comparative ranking types, it would arguably have been slightly better to split the panels by undergrad/postgrad, to be able to contrast the objective vs comparative data across these samples. It was good to show the distribution of data with box plots.

There was generally good effort with putting the results into context, though again, it would've been good to examine the relationship between the three variables in more detail, running follow up contrasts and interpreting those (which would've changed your interpretation.

The code for each task was well laid out and generally well commented, though there were fewer comments towards the end when you report follow up contrasts. It may be useful to include those, so it makes it easier for you and others to follow in the future.

OVERALL (T1 + T2 ; overall mark for this assignment: 68)

Good work. The write-ups are good and the code is clear. You understand what you're doing and will be well-set for the final assignment and future modules. For future assignments remember to take into account all variables (like the three variables in Section 2) and run appropriate statistics based on them and the research question, following up with contrasts and interpretation as needed. But overall, well done.