Bem (2011) critique

Ignoring the Introduction, we move onto Experiment 1 (pages 408-409):
- Immediate description of the method in vague terms, which leads me to wonder why he's assigning this to 'precognition' instead of 'chance'
- Does the fact that it's erotica stimuli really matter?
- They were told that it's an experiment on ESP (social desirability bias)
- There are thirty-six total trials: 12 erotic, 12 negative picture, 12 neutral. Doesn't give much chance to account for individual noise. If you flipped a coin twelve times, you might find a pattern where you get heads more often than tails, but does that mean it has any meaning?
  - Justifies small trial count by saying we need a lot of neutral items that are nonarousing. But doesn't mean you can't increase the trial count overall?
- This is Experiment 1, yet he refers to how Experiment 5 led to unexpected results, so they changed the methodology (i.e., added pictures for men/women differences). Isn't that confusing in terms of the overall story?
- The picture wasn't shown, and its left/right position not determined, until after a button response, and that's why it's precognition? Why isn't it still random?
- Chance is 50%; the average is 53.1%. This is not a particularly 'big' effect.
- See the footnotes: 'all significance levels are based on one-tailed tests'
- Nonparametric tests because of different distribution assumptions underlying t tests: not sure what he's getting at here?
- Explanation of binomial tests even suggests it's only more significant than a 'coin toss' in his own analogy.
- Stop at Individual Differences – no need to keep reading on; this is just a demonstration of how to critically read an article, taking into account perspectives like 'all models are wrong, but some are useful'