

Week 3 Lecture - Claims & Validity

Undergraduate Research Methods in Psychology

Quinton Quagliano, M.S., C.S.P

Department of Psychology

Table of Contents				
	erview 1 Lesson Overview			
2 Var 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4	iables2Definition2Scales of Measurement2Measured vs. Manipulated Variables2Constructs to Operational Variables3			
3 The 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5	2 3 Types of Claims 3 Definition			
4 Ass 4.1 4.2 4.3	4.1.1 Construct Validity 6 4.1.2 External Validity 6 4.1.3 Statistical Validity 6 4.1.4 Internal Validity 7			

1 Overview

1.1 Lesson Overview

•	Up until now, we have mostly focused of		and philo-
	sophical parts of why we conduct resea	ırch	
•	Now, we are going to start to put more moving parts of a study		names to the many
•	This is going to include talking about value are going to over	ariables, claims, and va the remainder of the se	

2 Variables

2.1	Defi	MIT.	\sim 10
_			
			\mathbf{v}

Some	that can va	that can vary, with at least 2 levels/values		
- Contras	st this with a	, which does not vary at all		
	e important in both the chesis-data cycle	and the data stages of the		
Variables (all of a		context of the study) are core, critical parts an important role in the validity of the results		
2.2 Scales of	f Measurement			
Likely a review fro	m statistics course			
 Every variab 	le has some	of how it is measured:		
between ead	io/Continuous: A variable h ch level/value, arranged in <i>k</i> le: Age, height in centimeter	nown order.		
•	variable has a <i>known</i> order. le: Place in a foot race, Clas	distances between each level/value, ss rank		
from one an – Examp	/Discrete: A variable's leve other, arbitrary (no) arrange le: Experimental group vs. C	ment of order Control group		
2.3 Measure	d vs. Manipulated Vari	ables		
	or <i>directly</i> caused	neasurement of something that is not by the experimenter (but may be the result		
Often, of is simpExamp	g an experimenter did). due to ethical or y impossible to directly char le: SAT score, hair color, cla			
	by an experimente	er		
ExampSome variate		n intervention or control group, depending on the setup of the study.		

2.4 Constructs to Operational Variables

•	Construct/Conceptual/L some			Abstract v Innot be ex					_
	- However, these u	sually <i>are</i> on.	the c	concepts	we a	ctually	care	to	draw
	- Example: Depressio	n, Academic	achie	vement/ap	otitude)			
•	Operational/Measured V	/ariables: C sense	oncret	e variable	s as m	neasure	d throu	ıgh s	some
	- This is what we can	directly			in th	e study			
	 Example: PHQ-9, te 	st score			_				
•	In most research, we		th	ne construc	ct to so	me dire	ct mea	sure	ment
	tool. However, the focus of the	that it purpo	rts to r	measure.					
	 Example: when I associated a student has representative of. 	-		-		-			
•	Generally, when we talk ab and when we are ta var						s, we	dis	; scuss
•	Side note: The gap betwee area that deals with we will be discussing should be the content of th	ortly. This are	va ea of s	alidity, which tudy deals	ch is d	lifferent	from th	ne va	alidity
3	The 3 Types of C	laims							
3.1	Definition								
•	A claim , simply, is any between two or more object.	ects.		for some id	dea, in	teraction	n, or re	latio	nship
•	Claims can be derived from of knowledge we discussed – But remember the	ed previously	y	•			, and	pric	 oritize
•	Claims come in 3 flavors:	frequency,			,	and cau	ısal		

 All three have varying 	to be valid, which more strict re-
quirements moving from frequency ->	association -> causal
 Good evidence of any claim is a 	of the scale of measure-
ment and the design of the study	
3.2 Frequency Claims	
 A frequency claim is one that deals with th 	e rate, percent, or
of a certain characteristic or phenomenon.	
Hint: a sign is of	ftentimes a dead giveaway for this type
of claim - but keep in mind that a "claim see a percent.	" is not necessarily made every time you
 Example: "roughly 25% of college stu upcoming assessment" 	idents report feeling stressed about an
 These claims are usually only made upon son 	ne single observed and
variable or measurement, and often describ	
 Example: 20 of 50 students like the di 	-
liking the food, 50 said no to the same	•
These claims are dea ment	ling with a categorical scale of measure-
Stats sidebar: testing for claims of freq	uency are normally done with tests such
χ^2 or Fisher's exact tests	defley are normally done with tests such
represented by pie ch	narts or bar charts
3.3 Association Claims	
 An association claim is made regarding 	or more variables,
attempting to describe or quantify the relation	onship between them, without explaining
which one might the o	other
 Hint: look for words like "correlate", "pr 	edict", "associated with", and/or "covary"
to identify these claims	
 Example: I think that people who are n 	
An association between two variables can expression between two variables can expression and the second secon	either be described as positive, negative,
or non-existent/zero:	le increases, so does the other
	·
 Negative -> as one variable increases, 	
 Non-existent/zero -> both variables do 	not consistently
 Variables in this claim usually have to be at least 	
commonly continuous in nature. In most ca only be or measured.	•

	 Stats sidebar: testing for these claims is relation test (e.g., Pearson's r, Spearman (e.g., linear - OLS, curvlinear) 	-	
•	Graphically represented by	(one variable o	on x-axis, other on
	y-axis)	<u> </u>	
3.4	Causal Claims		
•	Similar to an association claim, with the added on which of two or more		
	 This claim requires the most all three claim types. Whereas a claim of descriptive, a causal claim is more inferent. Example: I think eating more carbs makes. 	association or fre	
•		•	additional criteria:
	 The two variables are correlated (valid 		_ claim) _
	 One variable clearly came before the other 	(precedence)
	 The relationship or change cannot be factor/confound (internal validity - more or 	this later)	by some other
•	For solid causal claims, acceptable design (but we will cover that later a	•	t (and maybe only)
•	In causal claims, we are most likely to encounter	observed	data
	as our outcome, and some form ofvariable.	·	nental/manipulated
	 Stats sidebar: because of the scale of musually thinking about some sort of t tost or 		
	usually thinking about some sort of t-test or between tow or more groups.		to test means
	3 p		
3.5	Claims Are Not Always Research		
	Claims can appear in personal experience, apprintuition; just because a claim is made, does not - Example: "I swear this happens to me ever [insert reason here]" - What types of claims are those two above If a claim is made, ask yourself, "what is the Hopefully an empirical article!	mean that they are ery day", "This all h	

This will be covered further in-depth in PSY-350

sizes, and

4 Assessing Claims with 4 Types of Validity

7 7		/I ~ \ A A
4	UNHI	., I — V/V
4.1	Overv	V I C V V

 Alongside the theory-hypothesis-data framework we discussed early in the semeste and the reading strategy I offered for empirical articles - these 4
will make up the backbone on how you approach critiquing scientific claims.
4.1.1 Construct Validity
Construct validity is all about how well the variables under study are nanipulated, and measured. This is often closely related to the operational measures one chooses to capture the latent/constructions.
 Faults in validity imply a failure to properly represent th constructs under study, and will lead to a disconnect between the study and th under study
We will discuss more about "good" measurement in week 5
4.1.2 External Validity
• External validity, also sometimes called , is all abou
how well the claims and results of a study/hypothesis apply to the broade and other contexts. This tends to be primarily determined be
how tightly controlled a study is (more control = less generalizable to daily life) an how individuals were for a study (more on this in week 7).
 Faults in external validity lead to in how well a claim can b extrapolated and abstracted outside the context of a study.
 Example: Is a tightly-controlled clinical study on mice in a lab cage readily applicabl to the average person in their daily life? No!
4.1.3 Statistical Validity

• Statistical Validity is all about whether the , p-values, effect

methods support the hypothesis in question.

 Helpful questions to ask: Did the authors state an α level in the methods? Did the paper report adequate statistical information to assess significance? (e.g., p-values, intervals, effect sizes - ideally all 3) Did the authors themselves actually rectly? Was the analysis enough sample) Failures in this type of validity the conclusions made in the discussion, which comes from the results. 				
4.1.4 Internal Validity				
 Internal validity is most closely related to how well confounds are 				
for and noted in a study. Researchers may use a combination of controls (which we will discuss in this class) and statistical controls (which are more				
relevant to PSY-350).				
• Failure to properly address these will result in on the actual causation/association mechanism between two or more variables.				
 This tends be be one of the validities to fully meet, and one that many people fail to account for in intuition and personal experience. This is where the famous phrase comes from: "Correlation does not equal" - because people fail to account for all the necessary 3 components for causal claims. 				
4.2 Claim Types and Validity				
In my opinion, the validities don't necessarily need a tailor-made application to each type of claim. The one exception is that internal validity is not really applicable to claims, and only very little to association claims.				
4.3 How to Prioritize Certain Validities				
• As we have discussed before, no study can be so well-made that it satisfies all validities and answers all questions about a . Instead, it is				
our goal to balance and our available resources to create a				
reasonably good study that provides evidence for a part of a broader question.				

	- This is importar		we create research (research assess existing research (research
)!	
•	propose 4 areas to co	onsider when choosing how	to prioritize:
	Type of	to be made (fre	equency, association, causal) - see
	previous sections	for discussions on those.	
	- Practicality: time,	resources, funding	
	- Ethics: sampling	method, interventions,	of populations
	- Impact: how impo	ortant and	are our findings
• B	ut, there is no one pa	anacea or perfect solution t	o balance these all - we often do
re	esearch understandin	g the natural	of our work.