

Week 6 Lecture - Surveys & Observational Design

Undergraduate Research Methods in Psychology

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

Department of Psychology

| Table of Contents | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1 Chapter Overview 1.1 Overview | |
| 2 Construct Validity in Survey Designs a | and Self-reports 2 |
| 2.1 Overview | • |
| 2.2 Question Formats | |
| 2.3 "Good" Questions | |
| - | 4 |
| 9 - | 4 |
| | 4 |
| _ | 4 |
| 2.4 Getting Accurate Responses | |
| • | |
| 2.4.2 Fence Sitting | |
| 2.4.3 Socially Desirable Respondi | ng / Faking Good 6 |
| 2.5 Other Confounds in Surveys | 6 |
| | |
| 3 Construct Validity in Behavioral Obser | |
| 3.1 Overview | |
| 3.2 Claims on Observational Data | |
| 3.3 Reliability and Validity in Observatio | |
| | |
| | |
| • | |
| 3.3.4 Ethics in Observation | |

Chapter Overview

| - | - | | | • |
|---|---|------|--------------------------------|---|
| 7 | 1 | / 11 | /erv | 1011 |
| | | | \prime \sim ι \sim | $\mathbf{I} \leftarrow \mathbf{V} \mathbf{V}$ |
| - | | | | |

| Observational design is when we don't at any variables, we just take measureme i.e., just lots of measured variables, no | ents of individuals in their natural disposition, |
|--|---|
| claims (though ca | for more macro-level studies that look by tend to be most effective in assessing an be appropriate for association and causal |
| claims as well) | |
| survey) | erywhere: ically even the election itself, is effectively a on certain topics |
| Interest in a certain commercial pr | • |
| 2.1 OverviewSurveys, Polls, and observational de | ey Designs and Self-reports signs mean the same thing, and describe a athered from a certain sample via a self-report |
| This design has plenty of email, phone, advertisements, etc measurements done | , such as being done via the mail, which change the construct validity of the |
| 2.2 Question Formats | |
| Question types range from | to most restrictive, with different |
| types having varying | to use. |
| Open-ended questions are those that all | |
| | I to one format. While capturing the "most" are difficult to transform into quantitative |
| | uld say they should not be transformed at all |

| This is the most common type of where the goal is to often capture the full, Note: In this class, we will be almost entir which is that which uses experiences to numbers. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|---|--|
| Forced-choice questions are those that responding to a question or prompt is a specifi For example, any | respondents to only ed number of wayschoice or true-false assessment is |
| forced choice. - Think about how forced-choice naturally sharing the full breadth of their experience. | participants in |
| Likert scale is ordinal scale question that asks a or questions with 5 answ Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree | |
| A question that is similar in structure but has than those 5 should be referred to as a Likert- | or less options type scale |
| Semantic Differential is a format that asks a with a "rating" between two "star" system for rating satisfaction. | respondent to respond to a prompt or adjectives. Ex. This could be a |
| Question formats do not inherently however they will have an impact on the type of type, and Semantic will all | or add to construct validity, of analysis one can use. Likert, Likert-Il produce ordinal data. Forced choice |
| is likely to be And open-e - Be mindful of how you will perform analysis tool! | ended is a whole other thing entirely s before making a survey or self report |
| 2.3 "Good" Questions | |
| Question writing can have a large impact on the validity of a question - writing good questions is | |
| While there are many ways for a question to go are especially and danger | |

| 2.3.1 Leading Question |
|------------------------|
|------------------------|

| • | questions are when a question is worded or designed in such |
|-------|--|
| | a way that is likely to respondents towards a certain answer or outcome. This can be accidental, or intentional. |
| 4 | In general, avoid using terms that are in nature - like "awful", "bad", "dangerous", etc. If your questions is likely to play up the emotion of your participant, it is possibly a leading question. |
| 2.3.2 | Double-barreled Questions |
| | This occurs when a question is actually two questions into one. The problem is that this might cause confusion in capturing the real opinions or feelings of an individual. |
| | A good way to this mistake is if you see an "and" anywhere in the question - tread cautiously |
| 2.3.3 | Negative Wording |
| • | Negative wording is when a question is worded in such a manner that confounds the of a question. — Ex. "Do you not agree with…" |
| | Not only can this be difficult to properly analyze in a study, it can also be generally very to participants and produce inaccurate responses. |
| | Wherever possible, avoid "not", "nor", "neither" and other negative words in surveys. Sometimes, these sorts of issues can be rectified by a question up, similar to procedures for double-barreled questions. |
| | If a question is split up to be both a negative and positive version, one can use a correlation $ \text{and Cronbach's } \alpha \text{ to ensure that same-direction } $ questions correlate well with one another (and if they don't - we have a problem) |
| 2.3.4 | Question Order |

2.3.

• This is a complicated issue and can be hard to fully prevent problems with. Identifying this issue is sometimes best investigated through a pilot study, which occurs the primary study, and is usually meant to ensure that a measure is sound before rolling out to the "real sample".

| To catch a question of the measure, with a different order of question different groups. Then are similar or not. If they differ, there is some | the answers of the groups to see if they | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| "Solving" this issue often involves a good, | understanding of the | | |
| literature and some away to delicate questions. | s to why participants may react a certain | | |
| 2.4 Getting Accurate Responses | | | |
| Surveys are, effectively, always a introspection on the part of the responde and place in the ability experiences. | -report - they require an nt. In a lot of research, we must trust ity of a person to report on their internal | | |
| However, for a variety of reasons, we must which are when a participant follows a may not be particularly informative. In the responding by the particular parti | of responses which | | |
| Response sets generally occur more scales | in Likert or Likert-type | | |
| 2.4.1 Acquiescence / Yea-saying | | | |
| This occurs when a participant carelessly selects the most positive (e.g., Strongly Agree) or yes throughout a measure | | | |
| When a respondent is yea-saying, it makes that represents their | s it incredibly difficult to discern whether opinions/disposition. | | |
| We may try to use reverse-coded question "I feel happy most of the time" "I feel sad most of the time" | is to detect this - Ex: | | |
| 2.4.2 Fence Sitting | | | |
| This is when a person keeps choosing the | or neutral option | | |

| • | This can be resolved by the inclusiveness of the quality self-report to force choosing | | the middle option, but this also limits also choose to use a forced-choice es. | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|
| 2.4.3 | Socially Desirable Resp | onding / Faking G | ood | |
| • | This is when one takes a respond in a way that seen embarrassment or shame – Ex., On a personality s | ns | trend where they intentionally try to to most people, maybe due to n overly-altruistic manner | |
| • | We may also be concerned with faking bad/malingering, which is especially true in or neuropsychological settings | | | |
| • | We can help limit these sets would be absurd for <i>anyone</i> know results are from collateral reports as we | to be <i>that</i> good or . Finally, | al questions that bad. We can also ensure participants, we may also get converging evidence | |
| 2.5 | Other Confounds in | Surveys | | |
| • | We may often run into other in general related to people | | ems with our self reports and surveys accurately | |
| • | why they made a choice. T | here may be a nur | e options intuitively, and may not know mber of underlying cognitive reasons f people don't know it! | |
| • | not be quite accurate. Just | nore distant memo because someone essarily mean that | t it is accurate. The best way we can | |
| 3 | Construct Validity | in Behavior | al Observations | |
| 3.1 | Overview | | | |
| • | Observational measures at causal claims. Observational | | to frequency, association, and ve a sense of "objectiveness", as they | |

| | are notreport feelings. | on the ability of a person to | accurately introspect and | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| • | Think about the historical move namicism to behaviorism - just data as the "superior" type of | st like those early behaviorists | and psychody- s, some see observational | |
| • | However, just like with self-repositions validity of these observations | | of the construct | |
| 3.2 | Claims on Observatio | nal Data | | |
| • | Observational data is all about about looking at what a person is defined about the looking at looking at which is defined about the looking at lookin | what a participant is doing. | 9 | |
| • | For some cases, it might be behavior to tie back to a cons | | to just measure a | |
| 3.3 | Reliability and Validity | / in Observation Data | | |
| • | Construct validity in observa | ational data can be confound bserver effects, and reactivity | | |
| 3.3.1 | Observer Bias | | | |
| • | Depending on the circumstances, observers may be biased to "see" a certain in participants due to some preconceived notions or beliefs | | | |
| • | This is why it is important to hamay be observing and to ha consistent process (double-c – It is common to use cod is to be | ave rigorous training that hel | is! - but what type) | |
| • | Blinded studies may also be | called | studies. | |
| 3.3.2 | Observer Effects | | | |
| Observer effects are when participants act un-natural in response to the or perspectives of the researchers. Participants may readily | | | | |

| act a certain way to appear "go stiff or modify actions as they w | | careful or | |
|--|---|---------------------|--|
| Still of modify actions as they w | aton now experiments react. | | |
| Participants may also be uninte as well! | entionally reacting to the behaviors | of the observers | |
| • The same solutions can help, es | enecially blinding the | , because | |
| • | | , Decause | |
| they won't be unconsciously sw | ayed by their knowledge. | | |
| 3.3.3 Reactivity | | | |
| • | ar to Observer effects, but hinge server causing behavior changes ir | | |
| Three solutions to minimize reactive behaviors Find some way to be "unobtrusive" in observation, whether viewing from afar or outside the | | | |
| Allow a subject to | to having you there | and let any initial | |
| reactivity die out | | , | |
| Measure | regulte of the behavior and the | a aubicat thamaalf | |
| | results of the behavior once the | e subject themsell | |
| is gone - but this is still obs | servational | | |
| | | | |
| 3.3.4 Ethics in Observation | | | |
| need to be approached in a | for research, observation technan ethical and sensible manner elling participants how and why the | r, with informed | |
| Some deception, such as watching through a one-way mirror may be | | | |
| (if allowed by the IRB), as long as it has good, scientific rationale. | | | |
| | | | |