




Describe the study you read. Bring this to group: you and your partner will flesh out each other's analyses. *Think critically*; what should the researchers have done differently?

Think of at least one alternate hypothesis. What else may be going on in the procedures, the setting, the participants etc. that may really account for the results? Is there a confound?

Participant Recruitment	Participant Assignment	Experimental Procedures	Experimental Treatment or Manipulation	Results
Sample 	Group A →	Procedure A →	Treatment →	Outcome
	Group B →	Procedure A →	Control →	Outcome
Sample representative of population? Why / why not?	Participants assigned to groups? ... Self-selection or other bias?	Equality of procedures across groups? Experimental controls?	Independent & Dependent variables? Confounds?	How strong were the differences between groups?

Alternate hypothesis? Confound?