

SEVENTH EDITION

Introduction to
**BEHAVIORAL
RESEARCH METHODS**



Mark R. Leary



Pearson

Introduction to Behavioral Research Methods

Seventh Edition

Mark R. Leary
Duke University

VP, Product Development: *Dickson Musslewhite*
Director, Content Strategy and Development:
Sharon Geary
Editor in Chief: *Ashley Dodge*
Managing Editor: *Sutapa Mukherjee*
Sponsoring Editor: *Priya Christopher*
Content Manager: *Carly Czech*
Editorial Assistant: *Anna Austin*
Editorial Project Manager: *Aphrodite Knoop,*
iEnergizer Aptara®, Ltd.
Development Editor: *Leslie Lahr,*
iEnergizer Aptara®, Ltd.
Instructional Designer: *Namita Hiwale,*
iEnergizer Aptara®, Ltd.
Asset Development Team: *LearningMate*
Solutions, Ltd.
VP, Director of Marketing: *Maggie Moylan*

Director, Project Management Services: *Etain O'Dea*
Project Team Lead: *Vamanan Namboodiri*
Project Manager: *Purnima Narayanan*
Director of Field Marketing: *Jonathan Cottrell*
Senior Marketing Coordinator: *Susan Osterlitz*
Operations Manager: *Mary Fischer*
Operations Specialist: *Mary Ann Gloriande*
Associate Director of Design: *Blair Brown*
Interior Design: *Kathryn Foot*
Cover Design: *Lumina Datamatics, Inc.*
Cover Art: *Fotolia / agsandrew*
Digital Studio Project Manager: *Elissa Senra-Sargent*
Digital Studio Team Lead: *Peggy Bliss*
Full-Service Project Management and Composition:
Jogender Taneja, iEnergizer Aptara®, Ltd.
Printer/Binder: *RRD-Owensville*
Cover Printer: *Phoenix Color*

Acknowledgements of third party content appear on pages 347–348, which constitute an extension of this copyright page.

Copyright © 2017, 2012, 2008 by Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliates. All Rights Reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This publication is protected by copyright, and permission should be obtained from the publisher prior to any prohibited reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise. For information regarding permissions, request forms and the appropriate contacts within the Pearson Education Global Rights & Permissions department, please visit www.pearsoned.com/permissions/.

PEARSON, ALWAYS LEARNING, and REVEL are exclusive trademarks owned by Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliates, in the U.S., and/or other countries.

Unless otherwise indicated herein, any third-party trademarks that may appear in this work are the property of their respective owners and any references to third-party trademarks, logos or other trade dress are for demonstrative or descriptive purposes only. Such references are not intended to imply any sponsorship, endorsement, authorization, or promotion of Pearson's products by the owners of such marks, or any relationship between the owner and Pearson Education, Inc. or its affiliates, authors, licensees or distributors.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Leary, Mark R.

Title: Introduction to behavioral research methods/Mark R. Leary, Duke University.

Description: Seventh Edition. | Hoboken : Pearson, 2016. | Revised edition of the author's | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016022200 | ISBN 9780134414409 | ISBN 0134414403

Subjects: LCSH: Psychology—Research—Methodology.

Classification: LCC BF76.5 .L39 2016 | DDC 150.72/1—dc23 LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016022200>

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



ISBN-13: 978-0-13-441440-9
ISBN-10: 0-13-441440-3

Brief Contents

1	Research in the Behavioral Sciences	1	9	Basic Issues in Experimental Research	146
2	Behavioral Variability and Research	26	10	Experimental Design	170
3	The Measurement of Behavior	40	11	Analyzing Experimental Data	186
4	Approaches to Psychological Measurement	58	12	Statistical Analyses	200
5	Selecting Research Participants	81	13	Quasi-Experimental Designs	222
6	Descriptive Research	97	14	Single-Case Research	239
7	Correlational Research	114	15	Ethical Issues in Behavioral Research	253
8	Advanced Correlational Strategies	131	16	Scientific Writing	274

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Preface	xi		
About the Author	xv		
1 Research in the Behavioral Sciences	1		
1.1: The Beginnings of Behavioral Research	2		
Contributors to Behavioral Research: Wilhelm Wundt and the Founding of Scientific Psychology	2		
1.2: Goals of Behavioral Research	3		
1.2.1: Describing Behavior	4		
1.2.2: Predicting Behavior	4		
1.2.3: Explaining Behavior	4		
1.3: Behavioral Science and Common Sense	4		
1.4: The Value of Research to the Student	5		
1.5: The Scientific Approach	6		
1.5.1: Systematic Empiricism	6		
1.5.2: Public Verification	6		
1.5.3: Solvable Problems	7		
In Depth: Science and Pseudoscience	7		
1.6: Detecting and Explaining Phenomena	7		
1.6.1: Theories	8		
1.6.2: Models	9		
1.7: Research Hypotheses	9		
1.7.1: Deduction and Induction	9		
1.7.2: Testing Theories	10		
1.8: Conceptual and Operational Definitions	11		
Developing Your Research Skills: Getting Ideas for Research	12		
1.9: Scientific Progress	13		
1.9.1: Proof and Disproof in Science	13		
1.9.2: Replication	14		
In Depth: Solutions to the Replication Problem	15		
1.9.3: The Scientific Filter	16		
Developing Your Research Skills: Resisting Personal Biases	18		
1.10: Strategies of Behavioral Research	19		
1.10.1: Descriptive Research	19		
1.10.2: Correlational Research	19		
1.10.3: Experimental Research	19		
1.10.4: Quasi-Experimental Research	20		
1.10.5: Review of Behavioral Research Strategies	20		
1.11: Domains of Behavioral Science	21		
1.12: Behavioral Research on Nonhuman Animals	21		
Behavioral Research Case Study: Chimpanzees Select the Best Collaborators	22		
1.13: Decisions, Decisions, Decisions	23		
Summary: Research in the Behavioral Sciences	24		
Key Terms	25		
2 Behavioral Variability and Research	26		
2.1: Variability and the Research Process	27		
2.1.1: The Goals of Behavioral Science	27		
2.1.2: Research Questions	27		
2.1.3: Research Design	28		
2.1.4: Measurement of Behavior	28		
2.1.5: Statistical Analyses	28		
2.2: Variance	29		
2.2.1: A Conceptual Explanation of Variance	29		
2.2.2: A Statistical Explanation of Variance	30		
Developing Your Research Skills: Statistical Notation	31		
2.3: Systematic and Error Variance	32		
2.3.1: Systematic Variance	32		
Examples of Systematic Variance: Temperature and Aggression	32		
2.3.2: Error Variance	33		
2.3.3: Distinguishing Systematic from Error Variance	34		
2.4: Assessing the Strength of Relationships	34		
2.4.1: Effect Size	35		
2.4.2: Small Effect Sizes Can Be Important	35		
In Depth: Effect Sizes in Psychology, Medicine, and Baseball	36		
2.5: Systematic Variance Across Studies	36		
2.5.1: Meta-Analysis	37		
Psychological Effects of Punishment on Children	37		
Behavioral Research Case Study: Meta-Analyses of Gender Differences in Math Ability	37		
2.6: The Quest for Systematic Variance	38		
Summary: Behavioral Variability and Research	38		
Key Terms	39		
3 The Measurement of Behavior	40		
3.1: Types of Measures	41		
Behavioral Research Case Study: Converging Operations in Measurement	41		
3.2: Scales of Measurement	42		
3.2.1: Importance of Scales of Measurement	43		
In Depth: Scales, Scales, and Scales	43		

3.3: Assessing the Reliability of a Measure	43	4.4: Developing Items	69
3.3.1: Measurement Error	44	4.4.1: Single-Item and Multi-Item Measures	70
3.3.2: Reliability as Systematic Variance	46	4.4.2: Writing Items	70
3.3.3: Types of Reliability	46	4.4.3: Response Formats	71
Behavioral Research Case Study: Interitem Reliability and the Construction of Multi-Item Measures	49	In Depth: Choosing Response Options	73
In Depth: Reflective Versus Formative Measures	49	In Depth: Asking for More Than Participants Can Report	74
3.3.4: Increasing the Reliability of Measures	50	4.5: Biases in Self-Report Measurement	74
3.4: Assessing the Validity of a Measure	51	4.5.1: The Social Desirability Response Bias	74
3.4.1: Types of Validity	51	4.5.2: Acquiescence and Nay-Saying Response Styles	74
Behavioral Research Case Study: Construct Validity	52	Developing Your Research Skills: Anti-Arab Attitudes in the Wake of 9/11	75
Behavioral Research Case Study: Criterion-Related Validity	54	4.6: Archival Data	76
3.5: Fairness and Bias in Measurement	54	Behavioral Research Case Study: Predicting Greatness	77
In Depth: The Reliability and Validity of College Admission Exams	55	4.7: Content Analysis	77
Summary: The Measurement of Behavior	56	4.7.1: Steps in Content Analysis	77
Key Terms	57	Behavioral Research Case Study: What Makes People Boring?	78
4 Approaches to Psychological Measurement	58	Summary: Approaches to Psychological Measurement	79
4.1: Observational Approaches	59	Key Terms	80
4.1.1: Naturalistic Versus Contrived Settings	59	5 Selecting Research Participants	81
4.1.2: Disguised Versus Nondisguised Observation	60	5.1: A Common Misconception About Sampling	81
Behavioral Research Case Study: Disguised Observation in Laboratory Settings	61	5.1.1: Probability Versus Nonprobability Samples	82
4.1.3: Behavioral Recording	61	5.2: Probability Samples	82
4.1.4: Increasing the Reliability of Observational Methods	63	5.2.1: The Error of Estimation	83
Behavioral Research Case Study: Predicting Divorce from Observing Husbands and Wives	64	5.2.2: Simple Random Sampling	83
4.2: Physiological and Neuroscience Approaches	64	In Depth: Random Telephone Surveys	84
4.2.1: Measures of Neural Electrical Activity	65	5.2.3: Systematic Sampling	85
4.2.2: Neuroimaging	65	5.2.4: Stratified Random Sampling	86
Behavioral Research Case Study: Judging Other People's Trustworthiness	65	5.2.5: Cluster Sampling	86
4.2.3: Measures of Autonomic Nervous System Activity	65	In Depth: The Debate Over Sampling for the U.S. Census	87
4.2.4: Blood and Saliva Assays	66	5.2.6: A Review of Types of Probability Sampling	88
4.2.5: Precise Measurement of Overt Reactions	66	5.2.7: The Problem of Nonresponse	89
4.3: Questionnaires and Interviews	66	5.2.8: Factors Contributing to Nonresponse	89
4.3.1: Questionnaires	66	5.2.9: Misgeneralization	90
4.3.2: Sources for Existing Measures	67	5.3: Nonprobability Samples	90
4.3.3: Experience Sampling Methods	67	5.3.1: Convenience Sampling	91
4.3.4: Interviews	68	In Depth: College Students as Research Participants	91
Behavioral Research Case Study: An Interview Study of Runaway Adolescents	69	5.3.2: Quota Sampling	92
4.3.5: Advantages of Questionnaires Versus Interviews	69	5.3.3: Purposive Sampling	92
		Behavioral Research Case Study: Sampling and Sex Surveys	92
		5.4: How Many Participants?	93
		5.4.1: Sample Size and Error of Estimation	93
		5.4.2: Power	94

In Depth: Most Behavioral Studies Are Underpowered	94	7.6: Factors That Distort Correlation Coefficients	123
Summary: Selecting Research Participants	95	7.6.1: Restricted Range	123
Key Terms	96	7.6.2: Outliers	125
6 Descriptive Research	97	7.6.3: Reliability of Measures	125
6.1: Types of Descriptive Research	97	7.7: Correlation and Causality	126
6.1.1: Survey Research	97	Behavioral Research Case Study: Correlates of Satisfying Relationships	127
Behavioral Research Case Study: Cross-Sectional Survey Design	98	7.8: Testing Causal Possibilities	127
In Depth: Conducting Surveys on the Internet	100	7.8.1: Partial Correlation	128
6.1.2: Demographic Research	100	Behavioral Research Case Study: Partial Correlation	128
Behavioral Research Case Study: Demographic Research	100	7.9: Other Indices of Correlation	129
6.1.3: Epidemiological Research	101	Summary: Correlational Research	130
Behavioral Research Case Study: Why Do More Men Than Women Die Prematurely?	101	Key Terms	130
6.2: Describing and Presenting Data	102	8 Advanced Correlational Strategies	131
6.3: Frequency Distributions	103	8.1: Linear Regression	131
6.3.1: Simple Frequency Distributions	103	8.1.1: Linear Relationships	132
6.3.2: Grouped Frequency Distributions	103	8.2: Multiple Regression	133
6.3.3: Frequency Histograms and Polygons	103	8.2.1: Standard Multiple Regression	133
6.4: Measures of Central Tendency	105	Behavioral Research Case Study: Standard Multiple Regression Analysis	133
6.4.1: Presenting Means in Tables and Graphs	105	8.2.2: Stepwise Multiple Regression	134
6.4.2: Confidence Intervals	106	Behavioral Research Case Study: Predictors of Blushing	135
Developing Your Research Skills: How to Lie with Statistics	107	8.2.3: Hierarchical Multiple Regression	135
6.5: Measures of Variability	108	Behavioral Research Case Study: Personal and Interpersonal Antecedents of Peer Victimization	136
6.5.1: Normal Distributions	109	8.2.4: Multiple Correlation	136
6.5.2: Skewed Distributions	110	8.3: Assessing Directionality	137
6.6: The z-Score	111	8.3.1: Cross-Lagged Panel Design	137
Developing Your Research Skills: A Descriptive Study of Pathological Video-Game Use	111	8.3.2: Structural Equations Modeling	138
Summary: Descriptive Research	112	Behavioral Research Case Study: Partner Attractiveness and Intention to Practice Safe Sex	139
Key Terms	113	8.4: Nested Data and Multilevel Modeling	140
7 Correlational Research	114	Behavioral Research Case Study: Birth Order and Intelligence	141
7.1: The Relationship Between Two or More Variables	114	8.5: Factor Analysis	142
7.1.1: The Correlation Coefficient	115	8.5.1: An Intuitive Approach	142
7.2: A Graphical Representation of Correlations	116	8.5.2: Basics of Factor Analysis	142
7.2.1: Curvilinear Relationships	117	8.5.3: Uses of Factor Analysis	143
7.2.2: Interpreting Correlation Coefficients	118	Behavioral Research Case Study: The Five-Factor Model of Personality	143
7.3: The Coefficient of Determination	118	Summary: Advanced Correlational Strategies	144
7.3.1: Correlation and Systematic Variance	119	Key Terms	145
7.4: Calculating the Pearson Correlation Coefficient	119	9 Basic Issues in Experimental Research	146
7.4.1: The Formula for Calculating r	120	9.1: The Use of Experimental Designs	147
Contributors to Behavioral Research: The Invention of Correlation	120	9.2: Manipulating the Independent Variable	147
7.5: Statistical Significance of r	121	9.2.1: Independent Variables	148
7.5.1: Testing the Statistical Significance of Correlation Coefficients	122	9.2.2: Types of Independent Variables	148

Behavioral Research Case Study: Emotional Contagion	149	10.2.2: Higher-Order Factorial Designs	175
9.2.3: Dependent Variables	151	10.2.3: Assigning Participants to Conditions	177
Developing Your Research Skills: Identifying Independent and Dependent Variables	151	10.3: Main Effects and Interactions	178
9.3: Assigning Participants to Conditions	152	10.3.1: Main Effects	178
9.3.1: Simple Random Assignment	152	10.3.2: Interactions	179
9.3.2: Matched Random Assignment	152	Developing Your Research Skills: Graphing Interactions	180
9.3.3: Repeated Measures Designs	153	10.3.3: Three-Way Factorial Designs	180
Behavioral Research Case Study: A Within-Subjects Design	154	10.4: Combining Independent and Participant Variables	181
Behavioral Research Case Study: Carryover Effects in Cognitive Psychology	155	10.4.1: Uses of Mixed/Expericorr Designs	181
9.4: Experimental Control	155	10.4.2: Classifying Participants into Groups	182
9.4.1: Systematic Variance Revisited	156	Behavioral Research Case Study: Narcissism and the Appeal of Scarce Products	183
9.4.2: Error (Within-Groups) Variance	156	10.4.3: Cautions in Interpreting Results of Mixed/Expericorr Designs	184
9.4.3: Three Components of Total Variance	157	Summary: Experimental Design	184
9.5: Eliminating Confounds	158	Key Terms	185
9.5.1: Internal Validity	158	11 Analyzing Experimental Data	186
Developing Your Research Skills: Can You Find the Confound?	158	11.1: An Intuitive Approach to Analysis	186
9.5.2: Threats to Internal Validity	159	11.1.1: Error Variance Can Cause Differences Between Means	187
9.6: Experimenter Expectancies, Demand Characteristics, and Placebo Effects	162	11.2: Significance Testing	188
9.6.1: Experimenter Expectancy Effects	162	11.2.1: The Null Hypothesis	188
9.6.2: Demand Characteristics	162	11.2.2: Type I and Type II Errors	189
9.6.3: Placebo Effects	163	11.2.3: Power	190
Behavioral Research Case Study: The Kind of Placebo Matters	163	11.2.4: Comparing Type I and Type II Errors	191
9.7: Error Variance	164	11.2.5: Problems with Null Hypothesis Testing	191
9.7.1: Sources of Error Variance	164	In Depth: Reporting p-Values	192
9.7.2: Concluding Remarks on Error Variance	165	11.3: Effect Size	192
In Depth: The Shortcomings of Experimentation	166	11.3.1: Cohen's d	193
9.8: External Validity	166	11.3.2: The Odds Ratio	193
In Depth: But It's Not Real Life	167	11.3.3: Determining the Effect Size Indicator	193
9.9: Web-Based Experimental Research	167	Behavioral Research Case Study: Taking Class Notes	194
Summary: Basic Issues in Experimental Research	168	11.4: Confidence Intervals	194
Key Terms	169	11.4.1: Confidence Intervals for Means	195
10 Experimental Design	170	11.4.2: Confidence Intervals for Differences Between Means	196
10.1: One-Way Designs	171	In Depth: Confidence Intervals and Standard Errors	197
10.1.1: Assigning Participants to Conditions	171	Behavioral Research Case Study: Scarcity and the Exclusion of Ambiguous Group Members	197
Developing Your Research Skills: Design Your Own Experiments	171	Summary: Analyzing Experimental Data	198
10.1.2: Posttest-Only Designs	172	Key Terms	199
10.1.3: Pretest-Posttest Designs	172	12 Statistical Analyses	200
10.1.4: Posttest-Only Versus Pretest-Posttest Designs	172	12.1: Analysis of Two-Group Experiments Using the t -Test	201
10.2: Factorial Designs	174	Contributors to Behavioral Research: W. S. Gosset and Statistics in the Brewery	201
10.2.1: Two-Way Factorial Designs	175	12.1.1: Conducting a t -Test	201
		Developing Your Research Skills: Computational Example of a t-Test	203

12.1.2: Designing and Analyzing Two-Group Experiments	204	13.2: Time Series Designs	227
12.1.3: Back to the Doodles Experiment	205	13.2.1: Simple Interrupted Time Series Design	228
12.1.4: Directional and Nondirectional Hypotheses	205	Behavioral Research Case Study: The Effects of No-Fault Divorce	228
12.2: Conducting Multiple Tests Inflates Type I Error	205	13.2.2: Interrupted Time Series with a Reversal	229
12.2.1: The Bonferroni Adjustment	206	13.2.3: Control Group Interrupted Time Series Design	230
12.3: The Rationale behind ANOVA	207	Behavioral Research Case Study: Traffic Fatalities After 9/11	230
12.4: How ANOVA Works	207	13.3: Comparative Time Series Design	231
12.4.1: Total Sum of Squares	207	Behavioral Research Case Study: Comparative Time Series Design	231
12.4.2: Sum of Squares Within-Groups	207	13.4: Longitudinal Designs	232
12.4.3: Sum of Squares Between-Groups	208	Behavioral Research Case Study: The Stability of Personality in Infancy and Childhood	233
12.4.4: The <i>F</i> -Test	209	13.5: Cross-Sequential Cohort Designs	233
12.4.5: Extension of ANOVA to Factorial Designs	209	13.6: Program Evaluation	234
Contributors to Behavioral Research: Fisher, Experimental Design, and the Analysis of Variance	211	Developing Your Research Skills: Broken Experiments	235
12.5: Follow-Up Tests to ANOVA	211	Contributors to Behavioral Research: Donald Campbell and Quasi-Experimentation	235
12.5.1: Main Effects for Independent Variables with More than Two Levels	211	13.7: Evaluating Quasi-Experimental Designs	235
12.5.2: Interactions	212	13.7.1: Threats to Internal Validity	236
Behavioral Research Case Study: Liking People Who Eat More than We Do	213	13.7.2: Increasing Confidence in Quasi-Experimental Results	237
12.5.3: Interpreting Main Effects and Interactions	213	Summary: Quasi-Experimental Designs	238
Developing Your Research Skills: Cultural Differences in Reactions to Social Support	215	Key Terms	238
12.6: Analyses of Within-Subjects Designs	216	14 Single-Case Research	239
12.7: Multivariate Analysis of Variance	216	Contributors to Behavioral Research: Single-Case Researchers	240
12.7.1: Conceptually Related Dependent Variables	217	14.1: Single-Case Experimental Designs	240
12.7.2: Inflation of Type I Error	217	14.1.1: Criticisms of Group Designs and Analyses	241
12.7.3: How MANOVA Works	217	In Depth: How Group Designs Misled Us About Learning Curves	242
Behavioral Research Case Study: An Example of MANOVA	218	14.2: Basic Single-Case Experimental Designs	243
12.8: Experimental and Nonexperimental Uses of <i>t</i> -Tests, ANOVA, and MANOVA	218	14.2.1: ABA Designs	243
In Depth: Computerized Analyses	219	14.2.2: Multiple-I Designs	244
Summary: Statistical Analyses	220	14.2.3: Multiple Baseline Designs	245
Key Terms	220	14.2.4: Data from Single-Participant Designs	245
13 Quasi-Experimental Designs	222	14.2.5: Uses of Single-Case Experimental Designs	247
In Depth: The Internal Validity Continuum	223	Behavioral Research Case Study: Treatment of Stuttering	247
13.1: Pretest–Posttest Designs	223	14.2.6: Critique of Single-Participant Designs	248
13.1.1: Why Not to Use the One-Group Pretest–Posttest Design	223	14.3: Case Study Research	248
13.1.2: Nonequivalent Control Group Design	224	14.3.1: Uses of the Case Study Method	249
Behavioral Research Case Study: Perceived Responsibility and Well-Being Among the Elderly	225	14.3.2: Limitations of the Case Study Approach	250
Behavioral Research Case Study: Motivational Climate in Youth Sports	226	Behavioral Research Case Study: A Case Study of a Case Study	250
13.1.3: Ensuring Similarity in Nonequivalent Control Designs	227	Summary: Single-Case Research	251
		Key Terms	252

15 Ethical Issues in Behavioral Research	253	16 Scientific Writing	274
15.1: Approaches to Ethical Decisions	254	16.1: How Scientific Findings Are Disseminated	274
In Depth: What Is Your Ethical Ideology?	255	16.1.1: Journal Publication	275
15.2: Basic Ethical Guidelines	255	16.1.2: Presentations at Professional Meetings	276
15.2.1: Potential Benefits	255	16.1.3: Personal Contact	276
15.2.2: Potential Costs	256	In Depth: Peer Review, the Media, and the Internet	276
15.2.3: The Institutional Review Board	256	16.2: Elements of Good Scientific Writing	277
15.3: The Principle of Informed Consent	256	16.2.1: Organization	277
15.3.1: Obtaining Informed Consent	257	16.2.2: Clarity	277
15.3.2: Problems with Obtaining Informed Consent	257	16.2.3: Conciseness	278
Developing Your Research Skills: Elements of an Informed Consent Form	258	Developing Your Research Skills: What's Wrong with These Sentences?	278
15.4: Invasion of Privacy	258	16.2.4: Proofreading and Rewriting	280
Developing Your Research Skills: What Constitutes Invasion of Privacy?	258	16.3: Avoiding Biased Language	280
15.5: Coercion to Participate	259	16.3.1: Gender-Neutral Language	280
15.6: Physical and Mental Stress	259	In Depth: Does Gender-Inclusive Language Really Matter?	281
In Depth: Do Studies of Sensitive Topics Exceed Minimal Risk?	260	16.3.2: Other Language Pitfalls	282
15.7: Deception	260	16.4: Parts of a Manuscript	282
15.7.1: Objections to Deception	261	16.4.1: Title Page	282
15.8: Confidentiality	261	16.4.2: Abstract	283
Behavioral Research Case Study: The Milgram Experiments	262	16.4.3: Introduction	283
15.9: Debriefing	263	16.4.4: Method	284
15.10: Common Courtesy	264	16.4.5: Results	284
15.11: Vulnerable Populations	264	16.4.6: Discussion	285
In Depth: Internet Research Ethics	265	16.5: Citing and Referencing Previous Research	285
Developing Your Research Skills: Ethical Decisions	265	16.5.1: Citations in the Text	285
15.12: Ethical Principles in Research with Nonhuman Animals	266	Improving Your Research Skills: Write About Behavior and Research, Not About Authors	286
In Depth: Behavioral Research and Animal Rights	267	16.5.2: The Reference List	286
15.13: Scientific Misconduct	267	In Depth: Electronic Sources and Locator Information	288
15.13.1: Fabrication, Falsification, and Plagiarism	267	16.6: Other Aspects of APA Style	288
15.13.2: Questionable Research Practices	268	16.6.1: Headings, Spacing, Pagination, and Numbers	289
15.13.3: Unethical Behavior	268	In Depth: Who Deserves the Credit?	290
15.14: Ethical Issues in Analyzing Data and Reporting Results	269	16.7: Writing a Research Proposal	290
15.14.1: Analyzing Data	269	16.8: Using <i>PsycINFO</i>	291
15.14.2: Reporting Results	270	16.9: Sample Manuscript	292
15.14.3: An Ethical Guidepost	270	Summary: Scientific Writing	316
15.15: Suppression of Scientific Inquiry and Research Findings	270	Key Terms	316
In Depth: Should Scientists Consider the Ethical Implications of Controversial Findings?	271	Statistical Tables	317
15.16: A Final Note on Ethical Abuses	272	Computational Formulas for ANOVA	322
Summary: Ethical Issues in Behavioral Research	272	Choosing the Appropriate Statistical Analysis	327
Key Terms	273	Glossary	329
		References	339
		Credits	347
		Index	349

Preface

Regardless of how good a particular class is, the students' enthusiasm for the course material is rarely as great as the professor's. No matter how interesting the material, how motivated the students, or how skillful the instructor, those who take a course are seldom as enthralled with the content as those who teach it. We've all taken courses in which an animated, nearly zealous professor faced a classroom of only mildly interested students.

In departments founded on the principles of behavioral science—psychology, neuroscience, communication, human development, education, marketing, social work, and the like—this discrepancy in student and faculty interest is perhaps most pronounced in courses that deal with research design and analysis. On the one hand, faculty members who teach courses in research methods are usually quite enthused about research. Many have contributed to the research literature in their own areas of expertise, and some are highly regarded researchers within their fields. On the other hand, despite these instructors' best efforts to bring the course alive, many students dread taking research methods courses. They expect that these courses will be dry and difficult and wonder why such courses are required as part of their curriculum. Thus, the enthusiastic, involved instructor is often confronted by a class of disinterested students, some of whom may begrudge the fact that they must study research methods at all.

In many ways, these attitudes are understandable. After all, students who choose to study psychology, education, human development, and other areas that rely on behavioral research rarely do so because they are enamored with research. In fact, many of them are initially surprised by the degree to which their courses are built around the results of scientific studies. (I certainly was.) Rather, such students either plan to enter a profession in which knowledge of behavior is relevant (such as professional psychology, social work, teaching, counseling, marketing, or public relations) or are intrinsically interested in the subject matter. Most students eventually come to appreciate the value of research to behavioral science, the helping professions, and society, although some continue to regard it as an unnecessary curricular diversion. For some students, being required to take courses in methodology and statistics nudges out other courses in which they are more interested.

In addition, the concepts, principles, analyses, and ways of thinking central to the study of research methods

are new to most students and, thus, require a bit of extra effort to comprehend and learn. Not only that, but the topics covered in research methods courses, on the whole, seem inherently less interesting than those covered in most other courses in psychology and related fields. Wouldn't most of us rather be sitting in a class in developmental psychology, neuroscience, social psychology, memory, or human sexuality than one about research methods?

I wrote *Introduction to Behavioral Research Methods* because, as a teacher and as a researcher, I wanted a text that would help counteract students' natural tendencies to dislike and shy away from research—a text that would make research methodology as understandable, palatable, useful, and interesting for my students as it was for me. Thus, my primary goal was to write a text that is *readable*. Students should be able to understand most of the material in a text such as this without the course instructor having to serve as an interpreter. Enhancing comprehensibility can be achieved in two ways. The less preferred way is simply to dilute the material by omitting complex topics and by presenting material in a simplified, “dumbed-down” fashion. The alternative that I chose is to present the material, no matter how complex, with sufficient elaboration, explanation, and examples to render it understandable. The feedback I've received about the six previous editions gives me the sense that I have succeeded in my goal to create a rigorous yet readable introduction to behavioral research methods.

A second goal was to integrate the various topics to a greater extent than is done in most research methods texts, using the concept of variability as a unifying theme. From the development of a research idea, through measurement issues, to research design and analysis, the entire research process is an attempt to understand variability in behavior. Because the concept of variability is woven throughout the research process, I've used it as a framework to provide coherence to the various topics. Having taught research methods courses centered on the theme of variability for over 30 years, I can attest that students find the unifying theme very useful.

Third, I tried to write a text that is interesting—one that presents ideas in an engaging fashion and uses provocative examples of real and hypothetical research. This edition has even more examples of real research and intriguing controversies in behavioral science than previous editions. Far from being icing on the cake, these features help to enliven the research enterprise. Research

methods are essentially tools, and learning about tools is enhanced when students can see the variety of fascinating studies that behavioral researchers have built with them.

Courses in research methods differ widely in the degree to which statistics are incorporated into the course. My own view is that students' understanding of research methodology is enhanced by familiarity with basic statistical principles. Without an elementary grasp of statistical concepts, students find it very difficult to understand the research articles they read. Although this text is decidedly focused on research methodology and design, I've sprinkled essential statistical topics throughout. My goal is to help students understand statistics conceptually without asking them to actually complete the calculations. With a better understanding of basic statistical concepts, students will not only be prepared to read published studies, but they should also be able to design better research studies themselves. Knowing that instructors differ in the degree to which they incorporate statistics into their methods courses, I have made it easy for individual instructors to choose whether students will deal with the calculational aspects of the analyses that appear. For the most part, statistical calculations are confined to a couple of within-chapter boxes, Chapter 12, and the Computational Formulas for ANOVA section in the endmatter. These sections may easily be omitted if the instructor prefers.

Instructors who have used previous editions of the text will find that the statistical material in Chapters 11 and 12 has been rearranged. Behavioral science is in flux regarding the preferred approaches to statistical analysis as the long-standing emphasis on null hypothesis significance testing is being supplemented, if not supplanted, by an emphasis on confidence intervals and effect sizes. In my view, students need to understand all common approaches to analyses that they will encounter in published research, so Chapter 11 provides a conceptual overview of both traditional and "new" approaches to statistical inference, while Chapter 12 dives more deeply into analyses such as *t*-tests and analysis of variance. Other than moving some topics in these chapters, those who are familiar with the previous edition will find the organization of the text mostly unchanged.

As a teacher, researcher, and author, I know that there will always be some discrepancy between professors' and students' attitudes toward research methods, but I believe that the new edition of *Introduction to Behavioral Research Methods* helps to narrow the gap.

New to This Edition

- Replication research is discussed in greater detail, along with the use of registered replication reports.

- The difference between reflective and formative measures is covered to dispel the erroneous belief that all multi-item scales must have high interitem reliability.
- Additional material on the use of telephone surveys and internet-based research has been added in light of the explosion in cell phone usage and Web-based studies.
- Attention is given to shortcomings of traditional null hypothesis significance testing and to alternative approaches to statistical inference involving confidence intervals and effect sizes.
- The two chapters on basic statistical analyses have been reorganized so that conceptual issues in statistical inference appear in Chapter 11 and the details of analyses such as *t*-tests and analysis of variance appear in Chapter 12, providing greater flexibility in how fundamental statistical issues are covered.
- The problems of deductive disclosure and computer security have been added to the discussion of data confidentiality.
- The section on scientific misconduct has been expanded given egregious cases of fraud since the previous edition.
- A new section on "Ethical Issues in Analyzing Data and Reporting Results" has been added that addresses cleaning data, overanalyzing data, selective reporting, and post hoc theorizing.

REVEL™

Educational technology designed for the way today's students read, think, and learn

When students are engaged deeply, they learn more effectively and perform better in their courses. This simple fact inspired the creation of REVEL: an immersive learning experience designed for the way today's students read, think, and learn. Built in collaboration with educators and students nationwide, REVEL is the newest, fully digital way to deliver respected Pearson content.

REVEL enlivens course content with media interactives and assessments — integrated directly within the authors' narrative — that provide opportunities for students to read about and practice course material in tandem. This immersive educational technology boosts student engagement, which leads to better understanding of concepts and improved performance throughout the course.

Learn more about REVEL: www.pearsonhighered.com/revel

Available Instructor Resources

The following resources are available for instructors. These can be downloaded at <http://www.pearsonhighered.com/irc>. Login required.

- **PowerPoint**—provides a core template of the content covered throughout the text. Can easily be added to customize for your classroom.
- **Instructor's Manual**—includes an outline of the chapter in the text, a list of key terms, ideas for course enhancement (including handouts that can be copied and given to students), and questions for review and application.
- **Test Bank**—includes additional questions beyond the REVEL in multiple choice and open-ended formats.
- **MyTest**—an electronic format of the Test Bank to customize in-class tests or quizzes. Visit: <http://www.pearsonhighered.com/mytest>.

This page intentionally left blank

About the Author

Mark R. Leary (Ph.D., University of Florida, 1980) is Garonzik Family Professor of Psychology and Neuroscience at Duke University and Director of the Interdisciplinary Behavioral Research Center. Prior to moving to Duke in 2006, Dr. Leary taught at Denison University, the University of Texas at Austin, and Wake Forest University, where he was department chair.

Dr. Leary's research and writing has centered on social motivation and emotion, with an emphasis on people's concerns with interpersonal evaluation and the negative effects of excessive self-focused thought. He has published 12 books and more than 200 scholarly articles and chapters on topics such as self-presentation, self-attention, social emotions (such as social anxiety, embarrassment, and hurt feelings), interpersonal rejection, and self-esteem. His books include: *Social Anxiety*, *Interpersonal Rejection*, *The Social Psychology of Emotional and Behavioral Problems*, *Self-Presentation*, *Introduction to Behavioral Research Methods*, *Handbook of Self and Identity*, *Handbook of Hypo-egoic Phenomena*, and *The Curse of the Self*.

In addition to serving on the editorial boards of numerous journals, Dr. Leary was founding editor of *Self and Identity*, editor of *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, and President of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, the Association for Psychological Science, and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. He was the recipient of the 2011 Lifetime Career Award from the International Society for Self and Identity and the recipient of the 2015 Scientific Impact Award from the Society for Experimental Social Psychology.



This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 1

Research in the Behavioral Sciences



Learning Objectives

- 1.1 Recall the early history of behavioral research
- 1.2 Summarize the three primary goals of behavioral research
- 1.3 Discuss ways in which the findings of behavioral research do and do not coincide with common sense
- 1.4 Name four benefits of understanding research methods for students
- 1.5 Summarize the three criteria that must be met to consider an investigation scientific
- 1.6 Explain the difference between theories and models
- 1.7 Compare deduction and induction as ways to develop research hypotheses
- 1.8 Contrast conceptual and operational definitions
- 1.9 Explain how scientific progress occurs
- 1.10 Distinguish among the four broad strategies of behavioral research
- 1.11 List specialties that comprise behavioral research
- 1.12 Explain how animal research has contributed to knowledge about thought, behavior, and emotion
- 1.13 List the decisions that researchers must make when they conduct behavioral research

Stop for a moment and imagine, as vividly as you can, a scientist at work. Let your imagination fill in as many details as possible regarding this scene.

- What does the imagined scientist look like?
- Where is the person working?
- What is the scientist doing?

When I asked a group of undergraduate students to imagine a scientist and tell me what they imagined, I found their answers to be quite intriguing.

First, virtually every student said that their imagined scientist was male. This in itself is interesting given that a high percentage of scientists are, of course, women.

Second, most of the students reported that they imagined that the scientist was wearing a white lab coat and working in some kind of laboratory. The details regarding this laboratory differed from student to student, but the lab always contained technical scientific equipment of one kind or another. Some students imagined a chemist, surrounded

by substances in test tubes and beakers. Other students thought of a biologist peering into a microscope. Still others conjured up a physicist working with sophisticated electronic equipment. One or two students imagined an astronomer peering through a telescope, and a few even imagined a “mad scientist” creating monsters in a shadowy dungeon lit by torches. Most interesting to me was the fact that although these students were members of a psychology class (in fact, most were psychology majors), not one of them thought of any kind of a *behavioral scientist* when I asked them to imagine a scientist.

Their responses were probably typical of what most people would say if asked to imagine a scientist. For most people, the prototypical scientist is a man wearing a white lab coat working in a laboratory filled with technical equipment. Most people do not think of psychologists and other behavioral researchers as scientists in the same way they think of physicists, chemists, and biologists as scientists.

Instead, people tend to think of psychologists primarily in their roles as mental health professionals. If I had asked you to imagine a psychologist, you probably would have thought of a counselor talking with a client about his or her problems. You probably would not have imagined a behavioral researcher, such as a developmental psychologist studying how children learn numbers, a physiological psychologist studying startle responses, a social psychologist conducting an experiment on aggression, a political psychologist measuring voters' attitudes, or an organizational psychologist interviewing employees at an automobile assembly plant.

Psychology, however, is not only a profession that promotes human welfare through counseling, psychotherapy, education, and other activities but also a scientific discipline that studies behavior and mental processes. Just as biologists study living organisms and astronomers study the stars, behavioral scientists conduct research involving behavior and mental processes.

1.1: The Beginnings of Behavioral Research

1.1 Recall the early history of behavioral research

People have asked questions about the causes of behavior throughout written history. Aristotle (384–322 BCE) is sometimes credited as being the first individual to systematically address basic questions about the nature of human beings and why they behave as they do, and within Western culture this claim may be true. However, more ancient writings from India, including the *Upanishads* and the teachings of Gautama Buddha (563–483 BCE), offer equally sophisticated psychological insights into human thought, emotion, and behavior.

For over two millennia, however, the approach to answering questions about human behavior was entirely speculative. People would simply concoct explanations of behavior based on everyday observation, creative insight, or religious doctrine. For many centuries, people who wrote about behavior tended to be philosophers or theologians, and their approach was not scientific. Even so, many of these early insights into behavior were, of course, quite accurate.

And yet many of these explanations of behavior were also completely wrong. These early thinkers should not be faulted for having made mistakes, for even modern researchers sometimes draw incorrect conclusions. Unlike behavioral scientists today, however, these early “psychologists” (to use the term loosely) did not rely on scientific research to answer questions about behavior. As a result, they had no way to test the validity of their explanations and, thus, no way to discover whether or not their ideas and interpretations were accurate.

Scientific psychology (and behavioral science more broadly) was born during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Through the influence of early researchers such as Wilhelm Wundt, William James, John Watson, G. Stanley Hall, and others, people began to realize that basic questions about behavior could be addressed using many of the same approaches that were used in more established sciences, such as biology, chemistry, and physics.

Today, more than 100 years later, the work of a few creative scientists has blossomed into a very large enterprise, involving hundreds of thousands of researchers around the world who devote part or all of their working lives to the scientific study of behavior. These include not only research psychologists but also researchers in other disciplines such as education, social work, family studies, communication, management, health and exercise science, public policy, marketing, and a number of medical fields (such as nursing, neurology, psychiatry, and geriatrics). What researchers in all of these areas of behavioral science have in common is that they apply scientific methodologies to the study of behavior, thought, and emotion.

Contributors to Behavioral Research

Wilhelm Wundt and the Founding of Scientific Psychology

Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920) was the first research psychologist. Most of those before him who were interested in behavior identified themselves primarily as philosophers, theologians, biologists, physicians, or physiologists. Wundt, on the other hand, was the first to view himself as a research psychologist.

Wundt began studying medicine but switched to physiology after working with Johannes Müller, the leading physiologist of the time. Although his early research was in physiology rather than psychology, Wundt soon became interested in applying the methods of physiology to the study of psychology. In 1874, Wundt published a landmark text, *Principles of Physiological Psychology*, in which he boldly stated his plan to “mark out a new domain of science.”

In 1875, Wundt established one of the first two psychology laboratories in the world at the University of Leipzig. Although it has been customary to cite 1879 as the year in which his lab was founded, Wundt was actually given laboratory space by the university for his laboratory equipment in 1875 (Watson, 1978). William James established a laboratory at Harvard University at about the same time, thus establishing the first psychological laboratory in the United States (Bringmann, 1979).

Beyond establishing the Leipzig laboratory, Wundt made many other contributions to behavioral science. He founded a scientific journal in 1881 for the publication of research in experimental psychology—the first journal to devote more

space to psychology than to philosophy. (At the time, psychology was viewed as an area in the study of philosophy.) He also conducted research on a variety of psychological processes, including sensation, perception, reaction time, attention, emotion, and introspection. Importantly, he also trained many students who went on to make their own contributions to early psychology: G. Stanley Hall (who started the American Psychological Association and is considered the founder of child psychology), Lightner Witmer (who established the first psychological clinic), Edward Titchener (who brought Wundt's ideas to the United States), and Hugo Munsterberg (a pioneer in applied psychology). Also among Wundt's students was James McKeen Cattell, who, in addition to conducting early research on mental tests, was the first college professor to integrate the study of experimental methods into the undergraduate psychology curriculum (Watson, 1978). In part, you have Cattell to thank for the importance that colleges and universities place on courses in research methods.

1.2: Goals of Behavioral Research

1.2 Summarize the three primary goals of behavioral research

Psychology and the other behavioral sciences are thriving as never before. Theoretical and methodological advances have led to important discoveries that have not only enhanced our understanding of behavior but also improved the quality of human life. Each year, behavioral researchers publish the results of tens of thousands of studies, each of which adds incrementally to what we know about the behavior of human beings and other animals.

Some researchers distinguish between two primary types of research that differ with respect to the researcher's primary goal. *Basic research* is conducted to understand psychological processes without regard for whether or not the knowledge is immediately applicable. The primary goal of basic research is to increase our knowledge. This is not to say that basic researchers aren't interested in the applicability of their findings. They usually are. In fact, the results of basic research are usually quite useful, often in ways that were not anticipated by the researchers themselves. For example, basic research involving brain function has led to the development of drugs that control symptoms of mental illness, and basic research on cognitive development in children has led to educational innovations in schools. However, the immediate goal of basic research is to understand a psychological phenomenon rather than to solve a particular problem.

In contrast, the goal of *applied research* is to find solutions for particular problems rather than to enhance general

knowledge about psychological processes. For example, industrial-organizational psychologists are often hired by businesses to study and solve problems related to employee morale, satisfaction, and productivity. Similarly, community psychologists are sometimes asked to investigate social problems such as racial tension, littering, and violence in a particular city, and researchers in human development and social work study problems such as child abuse and teenage pregnancy. These applied researchers use scientific approaches to understand and solve some problem of immediate concern (such as employee morale, prejudice, or child abuse). Other applied researchers conduct *evaluation research* (also called *program evaluation*), using behavioral research methods to assess the effects of social or institutional programs on behavior. When new programs are implemented—such as when new educational programs are introduced into the schools, new laws are passed, or new employee policies are implemented in a business organization—program evaluators are sometimes asked to determine whether the new program is effective in achieving its intended purpose. If so, the evaluator often tries to figure out precisely why the program works; if not, the evaluator tries to uncover why the program was unsuccessful.

Although the distinction between basic and applied research is sometimes useful, we must keep in mind that the primary difference between them lies in the researcher's purpose in conducting the research and not in the nature of the research itself. In fact, it is often difficult to know whether a particular study should be classified as basic or applied simply from looking at the design of the study.

Furthermore, the basic–applied distinction overlooks the intimate connection between research that is conducted to advance knowledge and research that is conducted to solve problems. Much basic research is immediately applicable, and much applied research provides information that enhances our basic knowledge. Furthermore, because applied research often requires an understanding of what people do and why, basic research provides the foundation on which much applied research rests. In return, applied research often provides important ideas and new questions for basic researchers. In the process of trying to solve particular problems, new questions and insights arise. Thus, although researchers may approach a particular study with one of these goals in mind, behavioral science as a whole benefits from the integration of both basic and applied research.

Whether behavioral researchers are conducting basic or applied research, they generally do so with one of three goals in mind—description, prediction, or explanation. That is, they design their research with the intent of describing behavior, predicting behavior, or explaining behavior. Basic researchers stop once they have adequately described, predicted, or explained the phenomenon of interest; applied researchers typically go one step further to offer suggestions and solutions based on their findings.

1.2.1: Describing Behavior

Some behavioral research focuses primarily on describing patterns of behavior, thought, or emotion. Survey researchers, for example, conduct large studies of randomly selected respondents to determine what people think, feel, and do. You are undoubtedly familiar with public opinion polls, such as those that dominate the news during elections and that describe people's attitudes and preferences for candidates. Some research in clinical psychology and psychiatry investigates the prevalence of certain psychological disorders. Marketing researchers conduct descriptive research to study consumers' preferences and buying practices. Other examples of descriptive studies include research in developmental psychology that describes age-related changes in behavior and studies from industrial psychology that describe the behavior of effective managers.

1.2.2: Predicting Behavior

Many behavioral researchers are interested in predicting people's behavior. For example, personnel psychologists try to predict employees' job performance from employment tests and interviews. Similarly, educational psychologists develop ways to predict academic performance from scores on standardized tests in order to identify students who might have learning difficulties in school. Likewise, some forensic psychologists are interested in understanding variables that predict which criminals are likely to be dangerous if released from prison. Developing ways to predict job performance, school grades, or violent tendencies requires considerable research. The tests to be used (such as employment or achievement tests) must be administered, analyzed, and refined to meet certain statistical criteria. Then data are collected and analyzed to identify the best predictors of the target behavior. Prediction equations are calculated and validated on other samples of participants to verify that they predict the behavior successfully. All along the way, the scientific prediction of behavior involves behavioral research methods.

1.2.3: Explaining Behavior

Most researchers regard explanation as the most important goal of scientific research. Although description and prediction are quite important, scientists usually do not feel that they really understand something until they can explain it. We may be able to describe patterns of violence among prisoners who are released from prison and even identify variables that allow us to predict, within limits, which prisoners are likely to be violent once released. However, until we can *explain* why certain prisoners are violent and others are not, the picture is not complete. As we'll discuss later in this chapter, an important part of any science involves developing and testing theories that explain the phenomena of interest.

WRITING PROMPT

Description, Prediction, and Explanation

We have seen that the goals of behavioral research are to describe, predict, and explain behavior. Consider a psychological phenomenon (such as procrastination, drunk driving, etc.) that seems interesting or important to you. List three questions about this topic that involve (1) describing something about the phenomenon, (2) predicting the phenomenon, and (3) explaining the phenomenon.

▶ The response entered here will appear in the performance dashboard and can be viewed by your instructor.

Submit

1.3: Behavioral Science and Common Sense

1.3 Discuss ways in which the findings of behavioral research do and do not coincide with common sense

Unlike research in the physical and natural sciences, research in the behavioral sciences often deals with topics that are familiar to most people. For example, although few of us would claim to have personal knowledge of subatomic particles, cellular structure, or chloroplasts, we all have a great deal of experience with memory, prejudice, sleep, and emotion. Because they have personal experience with many of the topics of behavioral science, people sometimes maintain that the findings of behavioral science are mostly common sense—things that we all knew already.

In some instances, this is undoubtedly true. It would be a strange science indeed whose findings contradicted everything that laypeople believed about behavior, thought, and emotion. Even so, the fact that a large percentage of the population believes something is no proof of its accuracy. After all, most people once believed that the sun revolved around the Earth, that flies generated spontaneously from decaying meat, and that epilepsy was brought about by demonic possession—all formerly “commonsense” beliefs that were disconfirmed through scientific investigation.

Likewise, behavioral scientists have discredited many widely held beliefs about behavior, including the following:

- Parents should not respond too quickly to a crying infant because doing so will make the baby spoiled and difficult (in reality, greater parental responsiveness actually leads to less demanding babies).
- Geniuses are more likely to be crazy or strange than people of average intelligence (on the contrary, exceptionally intelligent people tend to be more emotionally and socially adjusted).

- Paying people a great deal of money to do a job increases their motivation to do it (actually, high rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation).
- Most differences between men and women are purely biological (only in the past 50 years have we begun to understand fully the profound effects of socialization on gender-related behavior).

Only through scientific investigation can we test popular beliefs to see which ones are accurate and which ones are myths.

To look at another side of the issue, common sense can interfere with scientific progress. Scientists' own commonsense assumptions about the world can blind them to alternative ways of thinking about the topics they study. Some of the greatest advances in the physical sciences have occurred when people realized that their commonsense notions about the world needed to be abandoned. The Newtonian revolution in physics, for example, was the "result of realizing that commonsense notions about change, forces, motion, and the nature of space needed to be replaced if we were to uncover the real laws of motion" (Rosenberg, 1995, p. 15).

Social and behavioral scientists often rely on commonsense notions regarding behavior, thought, and emotion. When these notions are correct, they guide us in fruitful directions, but when they are wrong, they prevent us from understanding how psychological processes actually operate. Scientists are, after all, just ordinary people who, like everyone else, are subject to biases that are influenced by culture and personal experience. However, scientists have a special obligation to question their commonsense assumptions and to try to minimize the impact of those assumptions on their work.

1.4: The Value of Research to the Student

1.4 Name four benefits of understanding research methods for students

The usefulness of research for understanding behavior and improving the quality of life is rather apparent, but it may be less obvious that a firm grasp of basic research methodology has benefits for a student such as yourself. After all, most students who take courses in research methods have no intention of becoming researchers. Understandably, such students may wonder how studying research benefits them.

A background in research has at least four important benefits:

First, knowledge about research methods allows people to understand research that is relevant to their professions. Many professionals who deal with people—not only

psychologists but also those in social work, nursing, education, management, medicine, public relations, coaching, public policy, advertising, and the ministry—must keep up with advances in their fields. For example, people who become counselors and therapists are obligated to stay abreast of the research literature that deals with therapy and related topics. Similarly, teachers need to stay informed about recent research that might help improve their teaching. In business, many decisions that executives and managers make in the workplace must be based on the outcomes of research studies. However, most of this information is published in professional research journals, and, as you may have learned from experience, journal articles can be nearly incomprehensible unless the reader knows something about research methodology and statistics. Thus, a background in research provides you with knowledge and skills that may be useful in professional life.

Related to this outcome is a second: A knowledge of research methodology makes one a more intelligent and effective "research consumer" in everyday life. Increasingly, we are asked to make everyday decisions on the basis of scientific research findings. When we try to decide which new car to buy, how much we should exercise, which weight-loss program to select, whether to enter our children in public versus private schools, whether to get a flu shot, or whether we should follow the latest fad to improve our happiness or prolong our life, we are often confronted with research findings that argue one way or the other. Similarly, when people serve on juries, they often must consider scientific evidence presented by experts. Unfortunately, studies show that most adults do not understand the scientific process well enough to weigh such evidence intelligently and fairly. Less than half of American adults in a random nationwide survey understood the most basic requirement of a good experimental design, and only a third could explain "what it means to study something scientifically" (National Science Board, 2002). Without such knowledge, people are unprepared to spot shoddy studies, questionable statistics, and unjustified conclusions in the research they read or hear about. People who have a basic knowledge of research design and analyses are in a better position to evaluate the scientific evidence they encounter in everyday life than those without such knowledge.

A third outcome of research training involves the development of critical thinking. Scientists are a critical lot, always asking questions, considering alternative explanations, insisting on hard evidence, refining their methods, and critiquing their own and others' conclusions. Many people have found that a critical, scientific approach to solving problems is useful in their everyday lives.

A fourth benefit of learning about and becoming involved in research is that it helps one become an authority not only on research methodology but also on particular topics. In the process of reading about previous studies,

wrestling with issues involving research strategy, collecting data, and interpreting the results, researchers grow increasingly familiar with their topics. For this reason, faculty members at many colleges and universities urge their students to become involved in research, such as class projects, independent research projects, or a faculty member's research. This is also one reason why many colleges and universities insist that their faculty maintain ongoing research programs. By remaining active as researchers, professors engage in an ongoing learning process that keeps them at the forefront of their fields.

Many years ago, science fiction writer H. G. Wells predicted that "Statistical thinking will one day be as necessary for efficient citizenship as the ability to read and write." Although we are not at the point where the ability to think like a scientist and statistician is as important as reading or writing, knowledge of research methods and statistics is becoming increasingly important for successful living.

1.5: The Scientific Approach

1.5 Summarize the three criteria that must be met to consider an investigation scientific

I noted earlier that most people have greater difficulty thinking of psychology and other behavioral sciences as science than regarding chemistry, biology, physics, or astronomy as science. In part, this is because many people misunderstand what science is. Most people appreciate that scientific knowledge is somehow special, but they judge whether a discipline is scientific on the basis of the topics it studies. Research involving molecules, chromosomes, and sunspots seems more scientific to most people than research involving emotions, memories, or social interactions, for example.

Whether an area of study is scientific has little to do with the topics it studies, however. Rather, science is defined in terms of the approaches used to study the topic. Specifically, three criteria must be met for an investigation to be considered scientific: systematic empiricism, public verification, and solvability (Stanovich, 1996).

1.5.1: Systematic Empiricism

Empiricism refers to the practice of relying on observation to draw conclusions about the world.

The story is told about two scientists who saw a flock of sheep standing in a field. Gesturing toward the sheep, one scientist said, "Look, all of those sheep have just been shorn." The other scientist narrowed his eyes in thought, then replied, "Well, on the side facing us anyway." Scientists insist that conclusions be based on what can be objectively observed and not on assumptions, hunches, unfounded

beliefs, or the products of people's imaginations. Although most people today would agree that the best way to find out about something is to observe it directly, this was not always the case. Until the late sixteenth century, experts relied more heavily on reason, intuition, and religious doctrine than on observation to answer questions.

But observation alone does not make something a science. After all, everyone draws conclusions about human nature from observing people in everyday life. Scientific observation is *systematic*. Scientists structure their observations in systematic ways so that they can use them to draw valid conclusions about the nature of the world. For example, a behavioral researcher who is interested in the effects of exercise on stress is not likely simply to chat with people who exercise about how much stress they feel. Rather, the researcher would design a carefully controlled study in which people are assigned randomly to different exercise programs and then measure their stress using reliable and valid techniques. Data obtained through systematic empiricism allow researchers to draw much more confident conclusions than they can draw from casual observation alone.

1.5.2: Public Verification

The second criterion for scientific investigation is that the methods and results be available for *public verification*. In other words, research must be conducted in such a way that the findings of one researcher can be observed, verified, and replicated by others.

There are two reasons for this.

First, the requirement of public verification ensures that the phenomena scientists study are real and observable and not one person's fabrications. Scientists disregard claims that cannot be verified by others. For example, a person's claim that he or she was kidnapped by Bigfoot makes interesting reading, but it is not scientific if it cannot be verified.

Second, public verification makes science self-correcting. When research is open to public scrutiny, errors in methodology and interpretation can be discovered and corrected by other researchers. The findings obtained from scientific research are not always correct, but the requirement of public verification increases the likelihood that errors and incorrect conclusions will be detected and corrected.

Public verification requires that researchers report their methods and their findings to the scientific community, usually in the form of journal articles or presentations of papers at professional meetings. In this way, the methods, results, and conclusions of a study can be examined and possibly challenged by others. As long as researchers report their methods in detail, other researchers can attempt to repeat, or replicate, the research. Replication not only catches errors but also allows researchers to build on and extend the work of others.

1.5.3: Solvable Problems

The third criterion for scientific investigation is that science deals only with *solvable problems*. Scientists can investigate only those questions that are answerable given current knowledge and research techniques.

This criterion means that many questions fall outside the realm of scientific investigation. For example, the question “Are there angels?” is not scientific: No one has yet devised a way of studying angels that is empirical, systematic, and publicly verifiable. This does not necessarily imply that angels do not exist or that the question is unimportant. It simply means that this question is beyond the scope of scientific investigation.

In Depth

Science and Pseudoscience

The results of scientific investigations are not always correct, but because researchers abide by the criteria of systematic empiricism, public verification, and solvable problems, scientific findings are the most trustworthy source of knowledge that we have. Unfortunately, not all research findings that appear to be scientific actually are, but people sometimes have trouble telling the difference. The term *pseudoscience* refers to claims of evidence that masquerade as science but in fact violate the basic criteria of scientific investigation that we just discussed (Radner & Radner, 1982).

NONSYSTEMATIC AND NONEMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

As we have seen, scientists rely on systematic observation. Pseudoscientific evidence, however, is often not based on observation, and when it is, the data are not collected in a systematic fashion that allows valid conclusions to be drawn. Instead, the evidence is based on myths, untested beliefs, anecdotes about people’s personal experiences, the opinions of self-proclaimed “experts,” or the results of poorly designed studies that do not meet minimum scientific standards. For example, von Daniken (1970) used biblical references to “chariots of fire” in *Chariots of the Gods?* as evidence for ancient spacecrafts. However, because biblical evidence of past events is neither systematic nor verifiable, it cannot be considered scientific. This is not to say that such evidence is necessarily inaccurate; it is simply not permissible in scientific investigation because its veracity cannot be determined conclusively. Similarly, pseudoscientists often rely on people’s beliefs rather than on observation or accepted scientific fact to bolster their arguments. Scientists wait for the empirical evidence to come in rather than basing their conclusions on what others think might be the case.

When pseudoscience does rely on observed evidence, it tends to use data that are biased to support its case.

Example

For example, those who believe that people can see the future point to specific episodes in which people seemed to know in advance that something was going to happen. A popular

tabloid once invited its readers to send in their predictions of what would happen during the next year. When the 1,500 submissions were opened a year later, one contestant was correct in all five of her predictions. The tabloid called this a “stunning display of psychic ability.” Was it? Isn’t it just as likely that, out of 1,500 entries, one person would, just by chance, make correct predictions?

Scientific logic requires that the misses be considered evidence along with the hits. Pseudoscientific logic, on the other hand, is satisfied with a single (perhaps random) occurrence. Unlike the extrasensory perception (ESP) survey conducted by the tabloid, scientific studies of ESP test whether people can predict future events at better than chance levels.

NO PUBLIC VERIFICATION

Much pseudoscience is based on individuals’ reports of what they have experienced—reports that are essentially unverifiable. If Mr. Smith claims to have been abducted by aliens, how do we know whether he is telling the truth? If Ms. Brown says she “knew” beforehand that her uncle had been hurt in an accident, who’s to refute her? Of course, Mr. Smith and Ms. Brown might be telling the truth. On the other hand, they might be playing a prank, mentally disturbed, trying to cash in on the publicity, or sincerely confused. Regardless, because their claims are unverifiable, they cannot be used as scientific evidence.

Furthermore, when pseudoscientific claims appear to be based on research studies, one usually finds that the research was not published in scientific journals. In fact, it is often hard to find a report of the study anywhere, and when a report can be located, on the Web, for example, it has usually not been peer-reviewed by other scientists. You should be very suspicious of the results of any research that has not been submitted to other experts for review.

UNSOLVABLE QUESTIONS AND IRREFUTABLE HYPOTHESES

Pseudoscientific beliefs are often stated in such a way that they can never be tested. Those who believe in ESP, for example, sometimes argue that ESP cannot be tested empirically because the conditions necessary for the occurrence of ESP are compromised under controlled laboratory conditions. Similarly, some advocates of creationism claim that the Earth is much younger than it appears from geological evidence. When the Earth was created in the relatively recent past, they argue, God put fossils and geological formations in the rocks that only make it appear to be millions of years old. In both these examples, the claims are untestable and, thus, pseudoscientific.

1.6: Detecting and Explaining Phenomena

1.6 Explain the difference between theories and models

Scientists are in the business of doing two distinct things (Haig, 2002; Herschel, 1987; Proctor & Capaldi, 2001).

First, they are in the business of discovering and documenting new phenomena, patterns, and relationships. Historically, analyses of the scientific method have neglected this crucial aspect of scientific investigation. Most descriptions of how scientists go about their work have assumed that all research involves testing theoretical explanations of phenomena.

Many philosophers and scientists now question this narrow view of science. In many instances, it is not reasonable for a researcher to propose a hypothesis before conducting a study because no viable theory yet exists and the researcher does not have enough information about the phenomenon to develop one (Kerr, 1998). Being forced to test hypotheses prematurely—before a coherent, viable theory exists—may lead to poorly conceived studies that test half-baked ideas. In the early stages of investigating a particular phenomenon, it may be better to design studies to detect and describe patterns and relationships before testing hypotheses about them. After all, without identifying and describing phenomena that need to be understood, neither theory-building nor future research can proceed in an efficient manner. Typically, research questions evolve from vague and poorly structured ideas to a point at which formal theories may be offered. Conducting research in the “context of discovery” (Herschel, 1987) allows researchers to collect data that describe phenomena, uncover patterns, and identify questions that need to be addressed.

Scientists’ second job is to develop and evaluate explanations of the phenomena they see. Once they identify phenomena to be explained and have collected sufficient information about them, they develop theories to explain the patterns they observe and then conduct research to test those theories. When you hear the word *theory*, you probably think of theories such as Darwin’s theory of evolution or Einstein’s theory of relativity. However, nothing in the concept of theory requires that it be as grand or all-encompassing as evolution or relativity. Most theories, whether in psychology or in other sciences, are much less ambitious, attempting to explain only a small and circumscribed range of phenomena.

1.6.1: Theories

A *theory* is a set of propositions that attempts to explain the relationships among a set of concepts. For example, Fiedler’s (1967) contingency theory of leadership specifies the conditions in which certain kinds of leaders will be more effective in group settings. Some leaders are predominantly task-oriented; they keep the group focused on its purpose, discourage socializing, and demand that the members participate. Other leaders are predominantly relationship-oriented; these leaders are concerned primarily with fostering positive relations among group members and with group satisfaction. The contingency theory

proposes three factors that determine whether a task-oriented or relationship-oriented leader will be more effective in a particular situation: the quality of the relationship between the leader and group members, the degree to which the group’s task is structured, and the leader’s power within the group. In fact, the theory specifies quite precisely the conditions under which certain leaders are more effective than others. The contingency theory of leadership fits our definition of a theory because it attempts to explain the relationships among a set of concepts (the concepts of leadership effectiveness, task versus interpersonal leaders, leader–member relations, task structure, and leader power).

Occasionally, people use the word *theory* in everyday language to refer to hunches or unsubstantiated ideas. For example, in the debate on whether to teach creationism or intelligent design as an alternative to evolution in public schools, creationists dismiss evolution because it’s “only a theory.” This use of the term *theory* is very misleading. Scientific theories are not wild guesses or unsupported hunches. On the contrary, theories are accepted as valid only to the extent that they are supported by empirical findings. Science insists that theories be consistent with the facts as they are currently known. Theories that are not supported by data are usually discarded or replaced by other theories.

Theory construction is a creative exercise, and ideas for theories can come from almost anywhere. Sometimes, researchers immerse themselves in the research literature and purposefully work toward developing a theory. In other instances, researchers construct theories to explain patterns they observe in data they have collected. Other theories have been developed on the basis of case studies or everyday observation. Sometimes, a scientist does not agree with another researcher’s explanation of a phenomenon and sets out to develop a better theory to explain it. At other times, a scientist may get a fully developed theoretical insight when he or she is not even working on research. Researchers are not constrained in terms of where they get their theoretical ideas, and there is no single way to develop a theory.

However, even though ideas for theories can come from anywhere, a good theory must meet several criteria (Fiske, 2004).

What are the characteristics of a good theory in psychology?

Specifically, a good theory in psychology:

- proposes causal relationships, explaining how one or more variables cause or lead to particular cognitive, emotional, behavioral, or physiological responses;
- is coherent in the sense of being clear, straightforward, logical, and consistent;

- is parsimonious, using as few concepts and processes as possible to explain the target phenomenon;
- generates testable hypotheses that are able to be disconfirmed through research;
- stimulates other researchers to conduct research to test the theory; and
- solves an existing theoretical question.

1.6.2: Models

Closely related to theories are models. In fact, researchers occasionally use the terms *theory* and *model* interchangeably, but we can make a distinction between them. Whereas a theory specifies both how and why concepts are related, a *model* describes only how they are related. We may have a model that describes how variables are related (such as specifying that X leads to Y, which then leads to Z) without having a theory that explains why these effects occur. Put differently, a model tries to *describe* the hypothesized relationships among variables, whereas a theory tries to *explain* those relationships.

For example, the assortative mating model postulates that people tend to select mates who are similar to themselves. This model has received overwhelming support from numerous research studies showing that for nearly every variable that has been examined—such as age, ethnicity, race, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and physical attractiveness—people tend to pair up with others who resemble them (Botwin, Buss, & Shackelford, 1997; Little, Burt, & Perrett, 2006). However, this model does not explain *why* assortative mating occurs. Various theories have been proposed to explain this effect. For example, one theory suggests that people tend to form relationships with people who live close to them, and we tend to live near those who are similar to us, and another theory proposes that interactions with people who are similar to us are generally more rewarding and less conflicted than those with people who are dissimilar.

1.7: Research Hypotheses

1.7 Compare deduction and induction as ways to develop research hypotheses

On the whole, scientists are a skeptical bunch, and they are not inclined to accept theories and models that have not been supported by empirical research. Thus, a great deal of their time is spent testing theories and models to determine their usefulness in explaining and predicting behavior. Although theoretical ideas may come from anywhere, scientists are very constrained in the procedures they use to test their theories.

People can usually find reasons for almost anything *after* it happens. In fact, we sometimes find it equally easy to explain completely opposite occurrences. Consider Jim

and Marie, a married couple I know. If I hear in 5 years that Jim and Marie are happily married, I'll probably be able to look back and find clear-cut reasons why their relationship worked out so well. If, on the other hand, I learn in 5 years that they're getting divorced, I'll be able to recall indications that all was not well even from the beginning. As the saying goes, hindsight is 20/20. Nearly everything makes sense after it happens.

The ease with which we can retrospectively explain even opposite occurrences leads scientists to be skeptical of *post hoc explanations*—explanations that are made after the fact. In light of this, a theory's ability to explain occurrences in a post hoc fashion provides little evidence of its accuracy or usefulness. If scientists have no preconceptions about what should happen in a study, they can often explain whatever pattern of results they obtain in a post hoc fashion (Kerr, 1998). Of course, if a theory can't explain a particular finding, we can conclude that the theory is weak, but researchers can often explain findings post hoc that they would not have predicted in advance of conducting the study.

More informative is the degree to which a theory can successfully *predict* what will happen. To provide a convincing test of a theory, researchers make specific research hypotheses *a priori*—before collecting the data. By making specific predictions about what will occur in a study, researchers avoid the pitfalls associated with purely post hoc explanations. Theories that accurately predict what will happen in a research study are regarded much more positively than those that can only explain the findings afterward.

The process of testing theories is an indirect one. Theories themselves are not tested directly. The propositions in a theory are usually too broad and complex to be tested directly in a particular study. Rather, when researchers set about to test a theory, they do so indirectly by testing one or more hypotheses that are derived from the theory.

1.7.1: Deduction and Induction

Deriving hypotheses from a theory involves *deduction*, a process of reasoning from a general proposition (the theory) to specific implications of that proposition (the hypotheses). When deriving a hypothesis, the researcher asks, If the theory is true, what would we expect to observe? For example, one hypothesis that can be derived (or deduced) from the contingency model of leadership is that relationship-oriented leaders will be more effective when the group's task is moderately structured rather than unstructured. If we do an experiment to test the validity of this hypothesis, we are testing part, but only part, of the contingency theory of leadership.

You can think of a *hypothesis* as an if-then statement of the general form, "If *a*, then *b*." Based on the theory, the researcher hypothesizes that *if* certain conditions occur, *then*