

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX  
PSYCHOLOGY

# **Ethics, Philosophy and Methods (EPM)**

**Masters Module** (301C8: 15 credits)

**Autumn Term/Teaching Block 1 (2017-18)**

**Module Convenor: Michael Morgan**

## Ethics, Philosophy & Methods (EPM) - Essentials

### Autumn Term/Teaching Block 1: Weeks 1-10

	Week	Format	Time	Place	Title
<b>Qualitative Methods</b>  John Drury <a href="mailto:j.drury@sussex.ac.uk">j.drury@sussex.ac.uk</a> Tel 2514	1	2-hour lecture			Introducing qualitative methods
	2	2-hour lecture			Analysis
	3	2-hour lecture			Evaluating qualitative research
Assessment: 33% weighting: 1000-word essay. See Sussex Direct for submission date in week 5					
<b>Ethics and Governance</b>  Michael Morgan <a href="mailto:m.j.morgan@sussex.ac.uk">m.j.morgan@sussex.ac.uk</a> Pev 1, 1C6: Tel 7202	4	2-hour lecture			An introduction to human research ethics in Psychology
	5	2-hour lecture			The BPS Code of ethics & research governance
	6	2-hour lecture			Working with vulnerable groups of participants
Assessment: 33% weighting: 1000-word essay. See Sussex Direct for submission date in week 8					
<b>Philosophy of Science</b>  Zoltan Dienes <a href="mailto:Z.Dienes@sussex.ac.uk">Z.Dienes@sussex.ac.uk</a> Tel 7335	7	2-hour lecture			Popper
	8	2-hour lecture			Lakatos/Neyman-Pearson
	9	2-hour lecture			Bayes
	10	2-hour lecture			Assessment guidance
Assessment: 33% weighting: Unseen (MCQ) exam. See Sussex Direct for exam date.					

## **Module Overview**

This module will consider the conceptual foundations of psychological research and is divided into three key elements (referred to in this document as “mini-modules”):

1) **Qualitative methods.** These are becoming increasingly important in psychology and related disciplines (e.g., biology, medicine, sociology). Nevertheless, heated debates continue to rage about their essential qualities (if any) and “quality” (if any). In this part of the module we will examine all aspects of qualitative research, from (claimed) philosophical underpinnings, through method selection, project planning, ethical considerations, data collection, data analysis, and the production, assessment, and presentation of results, though to the scientific, practical, ethical, and theoretical benefits of the end product(s). Particular attention will be given to the prospects of developing qualitative methods that are complementary to quantitative ones.

2) **Ethics and Research Governance.** During this part of the module students will learn about the ethical principles and guidelines relating to research in psychology, in particular the BPS code of conduct and how it applies to research studies, and the UK frameworks for research governance. The ethical issues involved in using non-human animals in psychological research will also be addressed.

3) **Philosophy of Science.** This part of the module explores different approaches to what it means for psychology to be scientific and why it matters. Half of the material considers classic philosophy of science as represented in the views of Popper and Lakatos and how they apply to psychology. The remaining material considers the foundations of statistical inference, comparing the conceptual basis of orthodox (Neyman Pearson) statistics with that of Bayesian statistics. The aim is to clear up popular misconceptions in interpreting statistics, not to teach any particular statistical technique.

## Assessment

There are three assessments for this module, one each for each of the “mini-modules” below.

- See **Sussex Direct** for deadlines for each assessment on your assessment timetable <https://direct.sussex.ac.uk>
- **Make sure that you familiarise yourself with how to avoid accusations of academic misconduct**, including plagiarism, collusion, and personation. The Study Skills at Sussex (S3) website provides help with this. <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/s3/index.php?id=33>

Masters and MRes students taking PG year modules will usually be asked to submit assessments electronically where assessments are text-based, for example, an essay. Your Sussex Direct webpages and module handbook will give all assessment details. Feedback for all e-submission assessments will also be provided electronically.

Please refer to the frequently asked questions available on the following webpage for further information:

[www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/examsandassessment/esubmission](http://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/examsandassessment/esubmission)

### Submission deadlines and late penalties

Information on the following can be found at the link below:

- Submitting your work
- Missing a deadline
- Late penalties
- Plagiarism and Collusion - Academic Misconduct
- Exceptional circumstances
- Exams
- Help with managing your studies and competing your work
- Assessment Criteria

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/psychology/internal/students/examinationsandassessment>

### Student Feedback

You will be able to provide feedback. Details will be confirmed during the module. We want the module be as good as it possibly can be so all and any feedback is gratefully received.

### APA writing style

To familiarise yourself with APA writing style see [Study Success at Sussex \(S3\)](http://www.sussex.ac.uk/study/success) and: <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

# Qualitative Methods 'Mini-Module'

## Mini-Module Leader: John Drury

**Teaching:** Lectures in Weeks 1-3.

**Reading:** The core readings are the following:

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. London: Sage.

Howitt, D. (2013). [\*Introduction to qualitative methods in psychology\*](#) (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). Harlow, UK: Pearson

Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (3rd edn.). Maidenhead: McGraw Hill/Open University Press.

Other recommended books are given in an annotated bibliography below, as are some useful articles.

**Assessment:** A single 1000-word essay. See above for general assessment details. See below for titles.

### Qualitative Methods – Essay Titles

Below are some titles you may use for your 1000-word essay for the Qualitative Methods 'mini-module' assessment. You may use another title if you first get emailed permission for it from John.

- Is qualitative research necessary? Is quantitative research sufficient?
- To what extent are qualitative and quantitative modes of enquiry compatible in psychology?
- How may the quality of qualitative research in psychology best be assessed?
- Explain how one piece of qualitative research made a significant contribution to psychological knowledge. What are the implications for improving future qualitative research?
- To what extent is generalisability a necessary and sufficient condition of scientific research in psychology? Is there a place for idiographic research?
- To what extent does subjectivity preclude the possibility of qualitative research in psychology being scientific?
- In psychology, is qualitative research a precursor to science?

- To what extent is qualitative research necessary and sufficient within psychology?
- Can qualitative research contribute to the establishment and improvement of a body of useful psychological knowledge?
- To what extent should qualitative researchers in psychology strive for objectivity?
- Should anything be done about the inevitability of researcher interpretation within qualitative research?

### Qualitative Methods – Books and book chapters

None of the readings included in this document are ‘essential.’ Please read as widely and deeply as possible to answer the questions you have for each topic (whilst ensuring that you meet the Learning Outcomes).

Billig, M. (1988). Methodology and scholarship in understanding ideological explanation. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods* (pp. 199-215). London: Sage.

Breakwell, G. M., Smith, J. A., & Wright, D. B. (2012) (Eds.). *Research methods in psychology* (4th ed., pp. 367-390). London: Sage.

Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). London: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. (Third edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds) (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). London: Sage.

Edley, N. (2001). Analysing masculinity: Interpretative repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.) *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 189-228). London: Sage/Open University.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (2001). The discourse of New Labour: Critical discourse analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.) *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 229-266). London: Sage/Open University.

- Gillies, V. (1999). An analysis of the discursive positions of women smokers: Implications for practical interventions. In C. Willig (Ed.), *Applied discourse analysis: Social and psychological interventions* (pp. 66-86). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Gould, S. J. (1998). The median is not the message. In T. Greenhalgh & B. Hurwitz (Eds.), *Narrative based medicine: Dialogue and discourse in clinical practice* (pp. 29-33). London: BMJ Books.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (Eds.) (2002). *Handbook of interview research: Context & method* (pp. 801-814). London: Sage.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (2nd edn.) London: Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book* (Second Edition). London: Sage.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (Eds.) (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion*. London: Sage
- Nightingale, D. J., & Cromby, J. (Eds.) (1999). *Social constructionist psychology: A critical analysis of theory and practice*. Buckingham: Open University.  
<http://www.mheducation.co.uk/openup/chapters/033520192X.pdf>
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J. (2003). Discourse analysis. In M. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp. 607-624). London: Sage.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research: A resource for users of social research methods in applied settings* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Silverman, D. (2004). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). London: Sage.

- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing Grounded Theory*. London: Sage.
- Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Wiggins, S. (2016). *Discursive psychology: theory, method and applications*. London: Sage.
- Willig, C. (1999). Beyond appearances: A critical realist approach to social constructionist work. In D. J. Nightingale & J. Cromby (Eds.), *Social constructionist psychology: A critical analysis of theory and practice* (pp. 37-51). Buckingham: Open University Press.  
<http://www.mheducation.co.uk/openup/chapters/033520192X.pdf>

### Qualitative Methods – Selected Articles

As said above, none of the readings included in this 'mini-module' are 'essential.' Please read as widely and deeply as possible to answer the questions you have for each topic (whilst ensuring that you meet the Learning Outcomes).

- Abrahamsson, K. H., Berggren, U., Hallberg, L., & Carlsson, S. G. (2002). Dental phobic patients' view of dental anxiety and experiences in dental care: a qualitative study. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 16 (2), 188-196.
- Antaki, C., Billig, M., Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (2002). [Discourse analysis means doing analysis: A critique of six analytic shortcomings](#). *Discourse Analysis Online*, 1
- Armstrong, D., Gosling, A., Weinman, J., & Marteau, T. (1997). The place of inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: an empirical study. *Sociology*, 31, 597-606.
- Babchuk, W. A. (1996). Glaser or Strauss? Grounded theory and adult education. Winning graduate paper presented at Midwest Research to Practice Conference.  
<http://web.archive.org/web/20060315133436/www.iupui.edu/~adulsted/mwr2p/prior/gradpr96.htm>
- Barbour, R. S. (2001). Checklists for improving rigour in qualitative research: a case of the tail wagging the dog? *British Medical Journal*, 322, 1115-1117.
- Barbour, R. S. (2003). The newfound credibility of qualitative research? Tales of technical essentialism and co-option. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13, 1019-1027.



- Black, N. (1996). Why we need observational studies to evaluate the effectiveness of health care. *British Medical Journal*, 312, 1215-1218.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Britten N. (1995). Qualitative interviews in medical research. *British Medical Journal*, 311, 251-253.  
Very basic, no-frills overview of interviewing from a relatively 'positivist' (i.e., the truth is out there) stance.
- Brodcki, J. M., & Wearden, A. J. (2006). A critical evaluation of the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in health psychology. *Psychology and Health*, 21, 87-108.
- Charmaz, K. (1990). 'Discovering' chronic illness: using grounded theory, *Social Science & Medicine*, 30, 1161-1172.
- Chenail, R. J. (1995). Presenting qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report*, 2.  
<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/presenting.html>  
Plenty to think about in a brief, well-written paper.
- Collins, P. (1998). 'Negotiating Selves: Reflections on 'Unstructured' Interviewing.' *Sociological Research Online*, 3,  
<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/3/3/2.html>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13, 3-21.
- Drury, J., & Stott, C. (2001). Bias as a research strategy in participant observation: The case of intergroup conflict. *Field Methods*, 13, 47-67
- Elliot, R., Fischer, C. T., & Rennie, D. L. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 215-229.
- Elliot, R., Fischer, C. T., & Rennie, D. L. (2000). Also against methodolatry. A reply to Reicher. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 39, 7-10.
- Gillies, V., & Willig, C. (1997). 'You get the nicotine and that in your blood': Constructions of addiction and control in women's accounts of cigarette smoking. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 285-301.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Research*, 8, 597-607.  
<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf>
- Green, J., & Britten, N. (1998). Qualitative research and evidence based medicine. *British Medical Journal*, 316, 1230-1232.

Greenhalgh, T., & Taylor, R. (1997). How to read a paper: Papers that go beyond numbers (qualitative research). *British Medical Journal*, 315, 740-743.

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough?: An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18, 59-82.

Haig, B. (1995). Grounded theory as scientific method. *Philosophy of Education*. Online at <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~pms/cj355/readings/Haig%20Grounded%20Theory%20as%20Scientific%20Method.pdf>

Hall, W. A., & Callery, P. (2001). Enhancing the rigor of grounded theory: incorporating reflexivity and relationality. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11, 257- .

Hallberg, L., R-M. (2006). The 'core category' of grounded theory: making constant comparisons. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Health and Well-Being*, 1, 141-148.

Hammersley-Potter debate:

Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: Methods or paradigms? *Discourse & Society*, 14, 751-781.

Potter, J. (2003). Discursive psychology: Between method and paradigm. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 783-794.

Hammersley, M. (2003). Doing the fine thing: A rejoinder to Jonathan Potter. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 795-798.

Potter, J. (2003). Practical scepticism. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 799-801.

Hammersley, M. (2003). The impracticality of scepticism: A further response to Potter. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 803-804.

Hayward, C., & Madill, A. (2003). The meaning of organ donation: Muslims of Pakistani origin and white English nationals living in North England. *Social Science & Medicine*, 57, 389-401.

Heath, H., & Cowley, S. (2004). Developing a grounded theory approach: A comparison of Glaser and Strauss. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 41, 141-150.

Hein, S. F., & Austin, W. J. (2001). Empirical and hermeneutic approaches to phenomenological research in psychology: A comparison. *Psychological Methods*, 6, 3-17.

Hixon, J. G., & Swann, W. B. Jr. (1993). When does introspection bear fruit? Self-reflection, self-insight, and interpersonal choices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 35-43.

- Holloway, I., & Todres, L. 2003: The status of method: flexibility, consistency and coherence. *Qualitative Research*, 3, 345-357.
- Jack, D. C. (1999). Ways of listening to depressed women in qualitative research: Interview techniques and analyses. *Canadian Psychology*, 40, 91-101.
- Jones, R. (1995). Why do qualitative research? *British Medical Journal*, 311, 2.
- Jussim, L. (1991). Social perception and social reality: A reflection-construction model. *Psychological Review*, 98 (1), 54-73.
- Kearney, M. H. (2001). Enduring love: a grounded formal theory of women's experience of domestic violence. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 24, 270-282.
- Kelle, U. (2005). "Emergence" vs. "forcing" of empirical data? A crucial problem of "grounded theory" reconsidered. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [On-line Journal], 6 (2), Art. 27.
- Kumar, S., & Gantley, M. (1999). Tensions between policy makers and general practitioners in implementing new genetics: Grounded theory interview study. *British Medical Journal*, 319, 1410-1413.
- Kumar, S., Little, P., & Britten, N. (2003). Why do general practitioners prescribe antibiotics for sore throats? Grounded theory interview study. *British Medical Journal*, 326, 138-141.
- Legewie, H., & Schervier-Legewie, B. (2004). Research is hard work, it's always a bit of suffering. Therefore on the other side research should be fun. Anselm Strauss in conversation with Heiner Legewie and Barbara Schervier-Legewie. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [On-line Journal], 5 (3), Art. 22. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/562>
- Lerner, R. M., & Tolan, P. H. (2016). On the qualitative transformation of developmental science: The contributions of qualitative methods. *Qualitative Psychology*, 3(1), 120.
- Lester, S. (1999). An introduction to phenomenological research. <http://www.sld.demon.co.uk/resmethy.pdf>
- Lopez, V. A., & Emmer, E. T. (2002). Influences of beliefs and values on male adolescents' decision to commit violent offenses. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 28-40.

- Madill, A., Jordan, A., & Shirley, C. (2000). Objectivity and reliability in qualitative analysis: Realist, contextualist and radical constructionist epistemologies. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91, 1-20.
- Mays, N. & Pope, C. (1995). Qualitative research: Rigour and qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 311, 109-112.  
Lots of good points, clearly made, plus checklist (not the same as the 2000 one).
- Mays, N. & Pope, C. (2000). Assessing quality in qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 320, 50-52.
- Milne, D. (2001). Research quality in higher education and the NHS: Differing values. *The Psychologist*, 11, 638-639
- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 1 (2), Article 2.
- Murphy, E., Dingwall, R., Greatbatch, D., Parker, S., & Watson, P. (1998). Qualitative research methods in health technology assessment: A review of the literature. *Health Technology Assessment*, 2 (16).  
<http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta/volume-2/issue-16>
- Peel, E., Parry, O., Douglas, M., & Lawton, J. (2006). "It's no skin off my nose": Why people take part in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 16, 1335-1349.
- Pope, C. & Mays, N. (1995). Reaching the parts other methods cannot reach: an introduction to qualitative methods in health and health service research. *British Medical Journal*, 311, 42-45.
- Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2000). Analysing qualitative data. *British Medical Journal*, 320, 114-116.  
<http://bmj.bmjournals.com/cgi/ijlink?linkType=FULL&journalCode=bmj&resid=320/7227/114>
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2, 281-307.
- Reicher, S. (2000). Against methodolatry: some comments on Elliott, Fischer, and Rennie. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 39(1), 1-6.
- Rennie, D. L. (1994). Clients' deference in psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 427-437.

- Richards, H. M., & Emslie, C. (2000). The "doctor" or the "girl from the University"? Considering the influence of professional roles on qualitative interviewing. *Family Practice*, 17, 71-75.
- Salmon, P. (2003). How do we recognise good research? *The Psychologist*, 16, 24-27.
- Schraw, G., Wadkins, T., & Olafson, L. (2007). Doing the things we do: a grounded theory of academic procrastination. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99, 12-25.
- Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54, 93-105.
- Smith, J. A. (1999). Towards a relational self: Social engagement during pregnancy and psychological preparation for motherhood. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 409-426.
- Smith, J. A., & Eatough, V. (2012). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In G. M. Breakwell, J. A. Smith, & D. B. Wright (Eds.) (2006). *Research methods in psychology* (4th ed., pp. 439-459) London: Sage.
- Speller, V., Learmouth, A., & Harrison, D. (1997). The search for evidence of effective health promotion. *British Medical Journal*, 315, 361-363.
- Spencer, L., Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Dillon, L. (2003). *Quality in qualitative evaluation: A framework for assessing research evidence*. National Centre for Social Research. Cabinet Office report.  
[http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/a\\_quality\\_framework\\_tcm6-38740.pdf](http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/a_quality_framework_tcm6-38740.pdf)
- Starks, H., & Brown Trinidad, S. (2007). Choose your method: a comparison of phenomenology, discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(10), 1372-1780.
- Stephenson, J., & Imrie, J. (1998). Why do we need randomised controlled trials to assess behavioural interventions? *British Medical Journal*, 316, 611-613.
- Stokoe, L. (2016). [How to talk so people listen](#). *The Psychologist*, July
- Taylor, S. (2001). Evaluating and applying discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.) *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 311-330). London: Sage/Open University.
- Thomas, G., & James, D. (2006). Re-inventing grounded theory: some questions about theory, ground and discovery. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32 (6), 767-795.

- Timlin-Scalera, R. M., Ponterotto, J. G., Blumberg, F. C., & Jackson, M. A. (2003). A grounded theory study of help-seeking behaviors among White male high school students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 339-350.
- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research: a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 1-9.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851.
- Walker, D., & Myrick, F. (2006). Grounded theory: an exploration of process and procedure. *Qualitative Health Research*, 16, 547-559.

# **Ethics and Research Governance ‘Mini-Module’**

**Mini-Module Leader: Michael Morgan**

## **Section Overview**

### **Structure, Aims and Objectives**

This short component of the module is concerned with the general topic of research governance; primarily ethical considerations in carrying out psychological research but also addressing issues around risk assessment and other components of research governance. The ethical issues involved in using non-human animals in psychological research will also be addressed. Some knowledge in this area is essential to anyone who plans a career that involves a research component in psychology. However the issues have a very much broader relevance than this. Almost all professions – especially those that involve offering services to individuals – will have ethical codes that depend, to some extent, on shared philosophical principles and moral codes.

### **Pre-Requisites**

There are no formal prerequisites.

### **Contact Information**

Organiser: Michael Morgan

Location: Pevensey 1, 1C6

Telephone: internal x7202, external; 01273 877202

E-mail: [m.j.morgan@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:m.j.morgan@sussex.ac.uk)

## Teaching and Learning

**Teaching Sessions.** There are three timetabled teaching sessions, in Weeks 4-6, for this module. Each session will involve a mix of lectures by the convener and some interactive discussion. The Chair of our Research Ethics Committee (REC) will also give a short presentation during the second session. The third session will be in two parts. In the first part I shall discuss the ethical issues that arise when using non-human animals in psychological research and I will finish with an informal session to help you with the module assessment.

**Independent study.** The teaching sessions for this module will provide a background to ethics and research governance but you will be expected to carry out a significant amount of private study both prior to and following the teaching sessions.

Following the teaching sessions you will need to complete the assessment. This will involve careful reading of the University of Sussex framework for Research Governance, the 2014 version of the BPS Code of Human Research Ethics and the human research ethics application procedure and online forms used by the University of Sussex. You will also need to examine other issues that arise in Research Governance, primarily relating to health and safety.

**Office Hours.** I have office hours at 1.00-2.00 pm on Mondays and Thursdays. You may use these office hours (without appointment) to discuss or ask about anything that relates to this module.

**Study Direct.** You are encouraged to access module materials and use the module forum in Study Direct. This is the best way to share ideas amongst your fellow students and ask questions about the module. All of the module reading is provided on the website and is not repeated here. <https://direct.sussex.ac.uk>

**School of Psychology webpage.** ALL PGT student applications for projects considered “low risk” must be submitted online. Applications will first be authorised by the Student’s Supervisor or Course Convenor, and then reviewed by the Psychology School Research Ethics Officer (SREO): Dr Michael Morgan. Applications must be submitted through the online ethical review application system via Sussex Direct. See the Research Governance website for more details:

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/staff/research/spg/researchgovernance/apply>

## Books and Reading

There is no module text for this module, but you are encouraged to read all relevant material that is available online such as the 2014 BPS code of human research ethics: [http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/code\\_of\\_human\\_research\\_ethics.pdf](http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/code_of_human_research_ethics.pdf)



## **Assessment**

*The Task.* A single 1000-word essay: "Critically evaluate the extent to which the ethics approval process for conducting human psychological research at the University of Sussex complies with the guidelines in the 2014 BPS Code of Human Research Ethics in Psychology".

### **Submission deadlines and late penalties**

Submission deadlines should be shown on your timetable and in Sussex Direct.

Information on the following can be found at the link below:

- Submitting your work
- Missing a deadline
- Late penalties
- Plagiarism and Collusion - Academic Misconduct
- Exceptional circumstances
- Exams
- Help with managing your studies and competing your work
- Assessment Criteria

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/psychology/internal/students/examinationsandassessment>

## **Session Overview**

Week 4	An introduction to research ethics in Psychology
Week 5	BPS code of ethics and research governance framework at Sussex
Week 6	Working with vulnerable groups of participants. Guidance on the ethics approval process.

# Philosophy of Science 'Mini-Module'

## Mini-Module Leader: Zoltan Dienes

### Section Overview

**Summary:** This section of the module explores different approaches to what it means for psychology to be 'scientific' and why it matters. It considers classic philosophy of science as represented in the views of Popper and Lakatos and how it applies to psychology. It also considers the foundations of statistical inference, comparing the conceptual basis of orthodox (Neyman Pearson) statistics with that of Bayesian statistics. This part of the course aims to clear up popular misconceptions in interpreting statistics, so that you can conduct and evaluate research in a way useful for your development in whichever branch of psychology you are specialising in (clinical, cognitive, etc).

This is the schematic time table. You should rely on Sussex Direct for complete information on dates and times.

WEEK	Lecture
7	Popper/Lakatos
8	Orthodox statistics
9	Bayesian statistics
10	Assessment guidance

**Assessment:** Assessment will consist of a one-hour 20-question multiple choice exam in the first assessment. After the third lecture you will be ready to try the sample exam, whose answers we will go over in the fourth lecture.

A variety of assessment modes are used to develop and test different types of knowledge, skills and aptitudes. The assessment modes have been approved to test the course and module learning outcomes. Written submissions usually form an integral part of assessment at all levels. Written submissions include essays, reports, logs etc as appropriate to the module and the skills that you are being expected to develop. Examinations usually focus more on your ability to use your knowledge of the subject, rather than simply testing your memory for facts. Feedback is provided to support you in future assessments.

Unseen examinations are typically used to assess your level of knowledge and/or understanding of the discipline without the support of textbooks, notes or internet resources, unless these have been specifically permitted by the examination rubric. For students registered with the Student Support Unit an alternative mode may be approved as a Reasonable adjustment with the Student Support Unit.

However, when, in accordance with the academic judgement of the School, where an unseen exam has been approved for a module to assess competence standards, learning outcomes and any accreditation requirements, an alternative mode may not be approved as a Reasonable Adjustment for a student registered with the Student Support Unit. If you have any concerns, please discuss these with the Student Support Unit, who will liaise with the school.

## Readings by topic:

### KARL POPPER

#### Essential reading.

Dienes, Z. (2008). *Understanding Psychology as a Science: An Introduction to Scientific and Statistical Inference*. Palgrave Macmillan, chapter 1.

#### Background reading:

Popper, K. (1963). *Conjectures and refutations*. Routledge. Chapter 1.

Popper, K. (1994). *The myth of the framework: In defence of science and rationality*. Routledge. Especially Chapters 1, 2 and 3

Magee, B. (1997). *Popper*. Fontana.

Chambers, C. (2017). *The Seven Deadly Sins of Psychology: A Manifesto for Reforming the Culture of Scientific Practice*. Princeton University Press. Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Waldman, I. D. (Eds) (2017). *Psychological Science Under Scrutiny: Recent Challenges and Proposed Remedies*. Wiley. Chapter 1.

### IMRE LAKATOS

#### Essential reading.

Dienes, Z. (2008). *Understanding Psychology as a Science: An Introduction to Scientific and Statistical Inference*. Palgrave Macmillan, chapter 2.

#### Background reading:

A 20-minute talk by Lakatos:

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/lakatos/scienceAndPseudoscience.htm>

printed as the introduction to Lakatos, I. (1978). *The methodology of scientific research programmes: Philosophical papers, vol 1*. Cambridge University Press.

Lakatos, I. and Feyerabend, P. (1999). *For and against method*. University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1.

Larvor, B. (1998). *Lakatos: An introduction*. Routledge.

### NEYMAN-PEARSON

#### Essential reading.

Dienes, Z. (2008). *Understanding Psychology as a Science: An Introduction to Scientific and Statistical Inference*. Palgrave Macmillan, chapter 3.

**Background reading:**

Finch, S., & Cumming, G. (2009). Putting research in context: Understanding confidence intervals from one or more studies. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*: <http://jpepsy.oxfordjournals.org/content/34/9/903.full>

Good talk by Cumming:

<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/ockhamsrazor/stories/2011/3333636.htm>

First part of this paper explains using confidence intervals:

Dienes, Z. (2014). Using Bayes to get the most out of non-significant results. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5: 781. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00781

Wasserstein, R. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2016). The ASA's statement on p-values: context, process, and purpose. *Am Stat*, 70(2), 129-133.  
See especially the supplement by Greenland et al.

Matthews, R., Wasserstein, R., & Spiegelhalter, D. (2017). The ASA's p-value statement, one year on. *Significance*, 14(2), 38-41.

If you are staying in research this book is worth getting:

Cumming, G. (2011). *Understanding The New Statistics: Effect Sizes, Confidence Intervals, and Meta-Analysis*. Routledge.

## **BAYESIAN INFERENCE**

**Essential reading.**

Dienes, Z. (2008). *Understanding Psychology as a Science: An Introduction to Scientific and Statistical Inference*. Palgrave Macmillan, chapter 4.

Dienes, Z. (2011). Bayesian versus Orthodox statistics: Which side are you on? *Perspectives on Psychological Sciences*, 6(3), 274-290.

Dienes, Z. & McLatchie, N. (2017). Four reasons to prefer Bayesian over orthodox statistical analyses. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, doi:10.3758/s13423-017-1266-z  
Accompanying talk: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JzKmRciFRew&t=44s>

**Background reading:**

Dienes, Z., Coulton, S., & Heather, N. (in press). Using Bayes Factors To Evaluate Evidence For No Effect: Examples From The SIPS Project. *Addiction*,  
Available at: [http://www.lifesci.sussex.ac.uk/home/Zoltan\\_Dienes/publications.html](http://www.lifesci.sussex.ac.uk/home/Zoltan_Dienes/publications.html)

Dienes, Z. (2014). Using Bayes to get the most out of non-significant results. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5: 781. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00781

Dienes, Z. (2016). How Bayes factors change scientific practice. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 72, 78-89.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Waldman, I. D. (2017). *Psychology Science under Scrutiny*. Wiley. Chapter 8.

If you are staying in research this book is worth getting:

Baguley, T. (2012). *Serious Stats: A guide to advanced statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Palgrave Macmillan. See Chapter 11 for Bayes - Challenging, but a gold mine if you have above average statistical understanding for a graduate psychologist.