

Week 13 Lecture - Quasi-experiments & Small-n Designs

Undergraduate Research Methods in Psychology

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

Department of Psychology

Table of Contents	
	2
2 Chapter Overview 2.1 Chapter Overview .	.
3.2 Internal Validity3.3 Priorities of Validity .3.4 With Correlational Stud	2
4.2 Core Characteristics4.3 Types4.4 Balancing Priorities in4.5 Disadvantages of Sma	6

1 Learning Objectives

1.1 Textbook Objectives

- Articulate how quasi-experiments differ from true experiments.
- Use the design and results of quasi-experiments to evaluate the support they provide for causal claims.
- Explain the major differences between small-N designs and large-N designs.
- Use the design and results of small-N experiments to evaluate the support they provide for causal claims.

1.2 Professor's Objectives

 Understand the natural limitations and appropriate situations for quasi-experiments and small-n designs

2 Chapter Overview

2.1 Chapter Overview

 For practical and difficult to investigate caus 	reasons, we ma sal relationships with experim	ay find our hypotheses to be ents and large-scale studies
 But, we may still want to e and/or still present results 	establish among small groups of indivi	validity in our relationships iduals
experimental and small-n	•	ve call
 You can think of thes 	e as the	designs for when we have
especially limited res	ources or difficulty in manipul	ating a variable

3 Quasi-Experiments

- Unlike with _____ experiments, like we've discussed so far, quasiexperiments do not have full control of the IV
 - E.g., assignment to different classrooms or different school programs by administrators, not researchers

•	Because we lack control, it is better to refer to these as quasi	ariables.
3.1	Types	
Non-	-equivalent Control Group Posttest-only Design	
•	Similar to our previous groups posttest-only design, this design will have a control group and a treatment group, both measured on an outcome	gn
•	However, they are still only tested the "intervention" occurs	
•	In the "Quasi" version, the researchers have the ability to radiomly assign who goes in the experimental or control groups	ın-
Non-	-equivalent Control Group Pretest/Posttest Design	
•	Largely an of above, this follow the same procedures as to previous design, but now includes measurements before and after the intervention	
Inter	rupted Time-series Design	
•	This is when we are some variable for a period of time, a then it's measurement is "interrupted" by some clear event	nd
Non-	-equivalent Control Group Interrupted Time Series Design	
•	A of the time series and non-equivalent control group desig where we have both comparison groups and also a historical event that interrupt some variable measured over time.	
3.2	Internal Validity	
•	Just like with true experiments, these designs are similarly affected by threats internal validity	to
	– E.g.,, selection, order, attrition, etc.	
•	We can still make to control for these possibilities, <i>but</i> we show the cautious on how the "quasi-" part of these studies are cause for concern	ıld

Thankfully, the counterparts!	for many of thes	se are similar to their non-quasi
Selection Effects		
 Recall that a selection ef condition of the IV. 	ffect occurs if there is	variability in one
 This can be especially lack of random assignment 		unt for, because of the general prevent these effects normally
Solution:Carefully monitor groups		differences between
 Use a pretest/postt trends over time 	est design to see different _	points and
- Compare	groups on demo	graphic characteristics
- Plan a	-list design, where	treatment times are staggered
 Similar to above, but this the Solution: Same as above 	s is when there is some syst _time as the change in condi _	ematic variation that occurs at ition.
Maturation Effects		
	l" maturation effects, we can using a pretest/posttest desi	account for this by observing gn.
History Effect		
 First thing to consider is one 	whether a history effect caus 	se systematic variability in only
Solution: Still using comparis	son groups and pretest/postte	est!

Regression to the Mean	
Surprise, surprise, this is still the same	as discussed before
 Solution: Still using comparison groups and pretest/posttest! 	
Attrition	
Be mindful to check for attrition effects across conditions.	variables and IV
Testing & Instrumentation	
 Largely, just ensure construct validity and use parallel effects. 	forms to prevent practice
Observer Bias, Demand Characteristics, & Placebo Effects	5
Observe bias is only present if we use	measures
•characteristics will be minimized if punaware of what "condition" they are in	articipants are blinded and
Placebo are only a concern when we receiving an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when we receive an inert treatment, and can be nullified with a concern when the concern when th	
3.3 Priorities of Validity	
Real-world Opportunity	
 Sometimes, societal change presents an interesting que wouldn't otherwise be possible on such a 	estion for researchers, that
External Validity	
 In some ways, these types of studies are more participants in a more natural environment, enhancing ex But still watch out for sampling! 	and observe atternal validity.

C+	h	1	^	c
Cι		ш		3

•	This is often due to our group of interest being naturally small, or an extreme time to each participant.
•	The of small-n studies are often more concerned on individualized impact, which is a departure from the traditional probabilistic goals of most quantitative research.
4.2	Core Characteristics
•	Each person is treated as an individual, rather than with others.
•	Data is not(i.e., turned into a mean or median)
	Designs are used to closely monitor timing andto interventions. Often used in therapeutic or care settings
	Types Small-n designs all share a relatively small sample size, but have different ————— ble-baseline
•	This is when a person or few people are held at a for sufficient time to observe an unchanging status on some outcome variable.
•	This baseline period is then followed-up with someor change, and more measurements
Mult	tiple-baseline Design
•	This design requires people, and necessitates staggering the timing of the intervention across the participants, to see if the timing alone is explanatory in the change.
•	It also helps in observing whether multiple participants see the sameo behavior change

Reve	ersal	Design	1
	,, 04.	-00.9.	•

 This is when a nati baseline, and then a 	urally undesirable to reduce	is allowed to occur at ett.
Then, after sometime behavior is analyzed.	e, the treatment is removed, a d.	and theof the
Single-n		
This is a general cat over usually a	egory term that captures any period of tim	study that looks at only one person e.
<u> </u>	the study.	for this person may be gathered
This may sometimes	s be called a	study.
4.4 Balancing Prio	rities in Small-n	
	aturally very limited in their abi le, due to the uniqueness of t	
•	to be useful in examining and annot be replicated - and som	describing or ne implication may inform directions
4.5 Disadvantages	of Small-n	
Without comparison	groups, we often open oursel	ves up to numerous internal validity
– E.g.,	 threats, regression	on threats, etc.
 External validity will specific to individual 	tend to be naturally	as the cases are so
•	can hardly be considered	of many people!
4.6 Assessing Vali	dity in Small-n	
Internal validity can multiple baseline an		, especially in the case of
multiple baseline an – Like with any c was	<u> </u>	to internal validity is whether there bunds.

 External validity is relatively 	weak, but may be	more with further,
larger studies.		
And not all	need to generalize	!
– E.g., a clinician worki	ng with only a few clients with	a specific problem
 Construct validity is assessed 	ed just like any study - with the u	ise of bias
tools and observations.		
I.e., look at the	statistics for	tools, as well as authors'
explanations and ratio	onale	
 Statistical validity tends to 	often be more so graphical tha	` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` `
most	statistics require large groups	s).
 E.g., our trusty friend, 	plots!	