

What We Will Cover in This Section

- Overview.
- Basic requirements.
- Between subjects designs.
- Within subjects designs.
- Factorial designs.
- Pre-experimental designs.
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Basic Requirements, Review

- Two or more groups.
- Participants randomly assigned to treatment conditions.
- One or more treatment conditions.
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|  | Basic Design |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Independent <br> Vreatment <br> Groups | Dependent <br> Variable |
| Group 1 | Treatment (s) <br> controlled by the <br> experimenter | Measurement(s) <br> made after the <br> treatments are <br> applied. |
| Group 2 |  |  |
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Treatment Groups

## Experimental Group

Group that gets some level of the treatment being studied. $\qquad$
Control Group
Group in the study that does not get the experimental treatment.

## Comparison Group

Group in the study that gets some alternative level of the experimental treatment.

Characteristics of Good Treatments

- Valid.
- Reliable.
- Strength
- Multiple levels.
- Right levels.
- Right strength.
- Salient.
- Multiple stimuli.
$\qquad$
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Field Research Example

- In 1984 Pittsburgh National Bank had a problem with their tuition reimbursement program.
- They were paying tuition and fees for employees seeking bachelors degrees.
- Approximately $45 \%$ of the people did not want to work in the field in which they majored.
- The bank was prepared to scrap the program.
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| Evaluation Design |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Independent Variable | Dependent Variable |
| Experimental Group | 342 people who attended workshop | Job posting Applications 70\% Promotions: 12\% Salary/grade change: $91 \%$ |
| Control Group | 450 people who did not attend the workshop. | Job posting Applications 23\% <br> Promotions: 3\% <br> Salary/grade change: 66\% |


$\qquad$

Basic Elements

- Two or more treatment conditions. $\qquad$
- Subjects exposed to only one treatment condition and one treatment level.
$\qquad$
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Randomized Post-test Only Control Group

|  | Independent <br> Variable | Dependent <br> Variable |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{ss}_{1}$ | Treatment 1 | Measure |
| $\mathrm{ss}_{2}$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{ss}_{3}$ | Measure |  |
| $\mathrm{ss}_{4}$ | Treatment 2 | Ms |
| $\mathrm{ss}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{Ss}_{6}$ |  |


| Randomized Pre-test Post-test Control Group |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre-test | Independent Variable | Post-test |
| SS $\mathrm{SS}_{2}$ $\mathrm{SS}_{3}$ | Measure A | Treatment 1 | Measure A |
| SS $\mathrm{SS}_{5}$ SS | Measure A | Treatment 2 | Measure A |
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| Matched Random Assignment |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Independent Variable | Post-test |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{SS}_{1 \mathrm{~A}} \\ & \mathrm{SS}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \\ & \mathrm{SS}_{3 \mathrm{C}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Treatment 1 | Measure A |
| SS 4A $S S_{5 B}$ $S_{56}$ | Treatment 2 | Measure A |



| Within Subjects Design |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Independent Variable | Post-test |
| SS $\mathrm{SS}_{2}$ $\mathrm{ss}_{3}$ | Treatment 1 | Measure A |
| $\mathrm{SS}_{1}$ $\mathrm{SS}_{2}$ $\mathrm{SS}_{3}$ | Treatment 2 | Measure A |
| $\mathrm{SS}_{1}$ $\mathrm{SS}_{2}$ $\mathrm{SS}_{3}$ | Treatment 2 | Measure A |


| Example |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Independent <br> Variable   <br> $\mathrm{ss}_{1}$ <br> $\mathrm{Ss}_{2}$ <br> $\mathrm{Ss}_{3}$ Milk Chocolate Post-test <br> $\mathrm{ss}_{1}$ <br> $\mathrm{Ss}_{2}$ <br> $\mathrm{ss}_{3}$ German Chocolate Preference <br> $\mathrm{Ss}_{1}$ <br> $\mathrm{Ss}_{2}$ <br> $\mathrm{Ss}_{3}$ Dark Chocolate Preference |  |  |



## Benefits and Issues

Benefits.

1. Fewer participants.
2. Reduce subject variability.

Order effects.

1. Practice effect.
2. Fatigue effect.
3. Carryover effect.
4. Sensitization effect (demand characteristics).
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## Counterbalancing

- Varying the order of the presentation of the independent variable. $\qquad$
- Full counterbalancing.
- Issue here is the number of possibilities is N!.
- Randomized blocks. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
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Counterbalancing

|  | Trial 1 | Trial 2 | Trial 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S1 | Milk <br> Chocolate | German <br> Chocolate | Dark <br> Chocolate |
| S2 | Dark <br> Chocolate | Milk <br> Chocolate | German <br> Chocolate |
| S3 | German <br> Chocolate | Dark <br> Chocolate | Milk <br> Chocolate |

$\qquad$
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Multiple Variable (Factorial) Designs
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Factorial Design

> A design in which participants are exposed to two or more treatments.

| Main Effect |
| :---: |
| The influence that one variable alone |
| has independently of the other |
| variables. |
| Interaction |
| The influence that two or more |
| variables together have on the |
| dependent variable over and above |
| their main effects. |


$\qquad$

Uses of Factorial Designs

1. Testing for moderator effects.
2. Are there order effects.
3. Controlling extraneous variables. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


Ex Post Facto Approach

|  | Independent <br> Variable | Dependent <br> Variable |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Group 1 | Groups divided <br> based on some <br> pre-existing <br> Group 2 | Measurement(s) <br> made after the <br> assignment to <br> groups. |

$\qquad$
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Example

An experimenter wanted to see if more women than men were whistle blowers in industry. The researcher looked though fifty business journals and magazines and tabulated the gender of the whistle blowers for the past ten years. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Benefits and Issues

## Benefits.

1. May be the only way to study some influences.
2. May be OK for preliminary research.

Issues.

1. Ss not randomly assigned to treatment conditions.
2. If a person is unusual on one characteristic he may be unusual on others.
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## Threats to Internal Validity

1．History．
2．Maturation．
3．Testing．
4．Instrument Decay．
5．Statistical Regression．
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## 1．History

Any event that occurs between the first and second dependent measures $\qquad$ that is not manipulated by the experimenter．


| Treatment | Delay | Post－test |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\qquad$ － $\qquad$

2．Testing
Participation in the pre－test may cause changes in the person． $\qquad$
－Reactivity
－Memory

| Pre－test | Treatment | Post－test |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Treatment | Post－test |
| Pre－test | Delay | Post－test |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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## 3. Maturation

Changes in the individual over time that are not associated with the independent variable.

| Treatment | Delay | Post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Placebo | Delay | Post-test |

$\qquad$
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## 4. Instrument Decay

Changes in the measuring instrument over time. $\qquad$

- Observer gets bored.
- Test becomes obsolete. $\qquad$
- Machine wears out.

| Pre-test | Treatment | Post-test |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Treatment | Post-test |
|  |  |  | $\qquad$

$\qquad$
 $\qquad$
5. Statistical Regression

Occurs when participants are placed into groups based on extreme scores. $\qquad$ Extreme scores tend to move(regress) toward the mean.

| Pre-test | Treatment | Post-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-test | Delay | Post-test |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

-


Benefits and Issues

Benefits.
Issues.

1. OK for preliminary research.
2. Compared to whom?

| One-group Pre-test Post-test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre-test | Independent <br> Variable | Post-test |
| Group | Measure <br> A | Treatment 1 | Measure <br> A |

What problems are there with this design?

| Benefits and Issues |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Benefits. <br> 1. OK for preliminary research. | Issues. <br> 1. History. <br> 2. Maturation. <br> 3. Testing. <br> 4. Instrument decay. |
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| Non-equivalent Control Group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Independent <br> Variable | Dependent <br> Variable |  |
| Group A | Treatment 1 | Measure |
| Group $X$ | Treatment 2 | Measure |
| What problems are there with this design? |  |  |
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Benefits and Issues

## Benefits.

1. May be the only alternative in field experimentation.

Issues.

1. Treatment difference is CONFOUNDED by group difference.
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## Thought Problem \#1

Patty Kayke decided to evaluate the effects of low-level sound tone on the sleeping behavior of dogs. She took a group of dogs and through a set of hidden speakers played a 200 Hz sound to the dogs at 20 decibels. She then evaluated their sleeping behavior.

1. What kind of design is this?
2. Is this a good or bad design? Why?
3. How could this study be improved?
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Thought Problem \#2
Justa Minnit decided to evaluate the effect of taking one long versus several short breaks on the learning level of his class. Justa took the Tuesday class and had them take one 15 minute break. For the Wednesday class Justa have the students three 5 minute breaks. Justa then gave both classes the same quiz to measure learning.

1. What kind of design is this?
2. Is this a good or bad design? Why?
3. How could this study be improved?
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## Thought Problem \#3

Pickup N. Dropoff wanted to evaluate the influence of Jolt on the driving habits. Dropoff had a group

1. What kind of of people drink 12 oz of Jolt, then assessed their ability to drive through a set of traffic cones. Dropoff then waited an hour and had the people drive through the cones again. He evaluated the differences number of cones hit.
design is this?
design is this?
2. Is this a good or bad design? Why?
3. How could this study be improved?
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## Thought Problem \#4

Petal D. Stamen was interested in the influence that flowers would have on women's affection toward men. Petal sent a dozen roses to a random sample of women then asked them to fill out a well researched affection survey.

1. What kind of design is this?
2. Is this a good or bad design? Why?
3. How could this study be improved?
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