

Instructions for Paper IV: Study Two Method, Results, Discussion (Worth 30 Points)

First M. Last

Florida International University

Purpose of Paper IV: Study Two Method, Results, and Discussion

1). Psychological Purpose

The psychological purpose behind Paper IV is to make sure you can summarize what you did in your second study, how you did it, and what you found. This is similar to Paper II, but you will include information related to your second independent variable in Paper IV.

For the results section in Paper IV, you will provide information about your participants, materials, and procedure. Your participant section goes first, and it includes descriptive statistics about your sample. This is a new sample of participants, so you CANNOT use Paper II for this information. Your materials and procedure sections include information about what you did and how you did it (I already uploaded the Qualtrics Survey and Study Two Class Data on Canvas, located at Data & Survey folder under Modules).

You will also write a new Results section focusing on a 2 X 2 factorial design here.

Your Discussion section for Paper IV will be a short summary of what you found in that study.

2). APA Formatting Purpose

The second purpose of Paper IV is to again teach you proper American Psychological Association (APA) formatting for Method and results

3). Writing Purpose

Paper IV is intended to help you figure out how to update a Method, Results and Discussion section using a 2 X 2 factorial design.

NOTE: There is a 60% maximum plagiarism limit on this paper. However, this **DOES NOT** mean that you can directly plagiarize 60% of your paper. These 60% similarity is set for our standardization—everyone is writing on the same topic, using almost same references, and using the same instruction & checklist as an example. In addition, I will check all the similarity reports in your paper. **Copying and pasting (plagiarism) is NOT ok even with a tiny percent. Furthermore, you will get an auto 0 if more than 60% overlapping.**

Method

Keep in mind that Study Two is different from Study One. It may use some of the same materials, but your descriptions in the Method section should be specific to your Study Two idea. If you reuse some of the same variables, please refer to study one, but if the elements are new make sure to FULLY describe them. The results themselves will be *completely* different, as now that section will consider two independent variables, and your brief discussion will similarly be new. Below are some of the points to cover in this paper. I will highlight in purple the new components you should pay attention to for this paper.

1. Title Page: I expect the following format (2 point)—1 page
 - a. Same with Paper III Title Page
2. Method Section: I expect the following format (10 points) —min 1.5 pages
 - a. Write **Method** at the front of this section, make it bold, and center it.
 - b. The participants section comes next. The word **Participants** is bolded and left justified. In this section ...
 - i. Tell me who your participants were (college students, family members, friends) and how many there were. *Make sure this is for your NEW SAMPLE. This sample will differ from Paper II, so you will have to provide all new demographic data.*
 - ii. Provide frequencies and descriptive statistics for the most relevant demographic characteristics *for the new sample.*
 - c. **Materials and Procedure**
 - i. For this section, things are again very flexible. Some studies include the Materials and Procedure in the same section while others break them up into two sections.
 1. I recommend combining them into one overall Materials and Procedure section. *Here, you can refer back to your Method section from Paper II. (“We used the same Facebook Rudeness manipulation as in study one, but here we included only the Rude Disagree and Polite Disagree conditions”).*
 - ii. Again, the words **Materials and Procedure** is flush left. In this section ...
 1. Provide information about your materials and your procedure.
 - a. Tell your reader what your participants did in the order participants did them. Be specific. Assuming your study is like study one, I have the following recommendations (though your study may differ, so take these only as recommendations!):
 - i. First, talk about informed consent.
 - ii. Second, talk about the different versions of your studies. Provide enough detail so that your readers know how the conditions differ. *Also fully describe your new independent variable for study two in the Method for this second study. Let’s use forewarning as the new IV example (it is only an example!)*

1. Study two looks at the rude disagree vs. polite disagree conditions as two levels of one IV, and warning versus no warning source is a second IV. This gives you four cells: 1) Forewarning rude disagree, 2) Forewarning polite disagree, 3) No forewarning rude disagree, and 4) No forewarning polite disagree —example only, not your true conditions!
- iii. Third, talk about your dependent variables (that is, your survey questions. For these DVs, once again provide enough detail so I know exactly what questions you asked. For dependent variables, tell me how the responses were recorded (yes/no, true/false, a scale of 1 to 9, etc.). If you used a scale, note the endpoints. That is, does a 1 mean it is high or is it low? “Participants were asked, ‘How surprising was the outcome?’, and they responded on a scale from 1 (unsurprising) to 10 (surprising).” Highlight any new DVs you created for this study. For example, I may ask a manipulation check question asking if they were forewarned (“Did you read a warning that belief perseverance might impact decisions? Pick one.”)
- iv. Fourth, make sure to highlight which DVs you analyzed.
- v. Finally, mention debriefing on what content was debriefed to participants.
- d. Missing important aspects of your IVs and DVs or presenting them in a confused manner will lower your score in this section
3. Results Section: I expect the following format (**12 points**)—**four analyses, page length depending on how much you wrote for each analysis**
 - a. First, write **Results** at the top of this section and center it boldfaces. The results section DOES NOT start on its own page.
 - b. You must include 4 analyses—two chi-square tests and two 2x2 ANOVAs.
 - i. First, run two Chi-square tests for two manipulation checks (one for original IV, one for new IV) on your two IVs). If you forgot how to run and write up the results, refer to your Paper II, and lab.
 - ii. Second, run two 2 X 2 ANOVAs for two different DVs (Part II Q2 and Part III Q7). For this design, you will report at least three *F* tests for each DV you analyze (an *F* for the main effect of IV #1, an *F* for the main effect of IV #2, and an *F* for the interaction). If your interaction is significant, then you may report seven different *F* tests for each DV! Let’s take an example of first DV (Part II Q2 Polite Person).
 1. First you can say “Two-way ANOVA was analyzed using forewarning (warned versus not warned) and type of post primed (rude disagree vs. polite disagree) as independent variables and

- politeness as dependent variables”. And then write up two main effects for two IVs, and one interaction effect after.
2. First main effect for first IV **type of post primed**. Provide the degrees of freedom, F value, and p value, and provide the means and standard deviation for both levels of the IV.
 - a. For example: “There was a significant main effect for **primed type of post**, $F(1, 189) = 3.42, p = .002$. Participants agreed more strongly that Facebook user was less polite in rude disagree condition ($M = 7.56, SD = 1.21$) than in the polite disagree condition ($M = 8.24, SD = 0.89$).”
 3. Second main effect for second IV **Forewarning**. Provide the degrees of freedom, F value, and p value, and provide the means and standard deviation for both levels of the IV.
 - a. For example: “There was no main effect for forewarning, $F(1, 189) = 1.97, p = .08$. The degree to which participants thought Facebook user was polite did not differ in the warned ($M = 2.35, SD = 1.21$) versus not forewarned condition ($M = 2.21, SD = 0.87$).”
 4. Finally, interaction effect between IV1 and IV2. Provide the F test again. If interaction effect is not significant, you can report like “There was no significant interaction effect between forewarning and **type of post primed**, $F(1, 189) = 1.57, p = .65$.” Then the 2x2 ANOVA results for first DV was completed. No further post hoc test needed.
 5. However, If there is a significant interaction effect, there are a total of five F tests for this interaction (one for the main interaction and four for the simple effect comparisons)! This one gets complicated, so I’ll show you first the main interaction F test followed by the four simple effects tests. Normally, this can all go in one single paragraph.
 - a. “There was a significant interaction effect between forewarning and **type of post primed**, $F(1, 187) = 6.61, p = .024$.
 - i. First, in the **rude disagree** condition, simple effects showed that participants agreed more strongly that Facebook user was more polite in the no warning condition ($M = 5.76, SD = 1.27$) than in the no warning condition ($M = 2.21, SD = 1.90$), $F(2, 95) = 6.24, p = .005$.
 - ii. Second, in the **polite disagree** condition, agreement on politeness did not differ between the warning condition ($M = 2.78, SD = 3.45$) and the no warning condition ($M = 2.72, SD = 2.87$), $F(2, 93) = 1.13, p = .063$.
 - iii. Third, for participants who were warned, simple effect tests showed that attitudes towards Facebook user showing politeness did not differ in the rude

- disagree condition ($M = 2.76, SD = 1.27$) and polite disagree condition ($M = 2.78, SD = 3.45$), $F(2, 95) = 1.31, p = .14$.
- iv. Fourth, for participants in the no warning condition, simple effect tests showed that participants agreed more strongly on politeness of Facebook user in rude disagree condition ($M = 5.21, SD = 1.90$) than in the polite disagree condition ($M = 2.72, SD = 2.87$), $F(2, 95) = 3.11, p = .003$.
 - b. In general, this shows that participants agreed more strongly on politeness of Facebook user when primed with rude disagree and not warned about the effects of awareness than in all other conditions.
- iii. Similarly, run another 2 X 2 factorial ANOVA on the second DV (Part III Q7 Conversation)
 - iv. Please note that you might run a lot of statistical tests for one DV (like the original F test followed-up with simple effects tests). This still only counts as one DV.
4. Discussion Section (**1 points**)—**1-2 paragraphs**
 - a. In a short paragraph or two, write a brief discussion of your results. First, restate hypotheses (DO NOT copy and paste hypotheses from Paper III, summarize and paraphrase), and then state if the results did or did not support your hypotheses. In this section, do NOT go into detail about the statistics. If I need that information, I'll just look at your results section. Here, I just want a plain English summary of what you found.
 5. References are not required for this paper.
 6. Tables: **APA format Table (3 points)**
 - a. I want you to include all relevant tables in APA format for each of your analyses after each callout in-text. You can title them Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, include the APA formatted tables for 4 analyses that you run. These include two chi square tables, and two F tables. These tables must be in APA format.
 - i. Table 1 and 2: two Chi-square tests results
 1. Make sure to include a table for your both manipulation check. For a chi-square test, this will include chi-square values, p values, and percentage.
 - ii. Table 3 and 4: 2 X 2 ANOVA results
 1. Make sure to include information your Tests of Between Subject Effects table. If your interaction is not significant, you're done. If it is significant, normally you would add a follow-up table.
 - b. **APA-format table template/example is included in "APA Formatted Table Template" document.** The best way to get these tables is to copy directly from example table and change the statistic values and variable names to your **Facebook Rudeness** study. **Picture/screenshot is not allowed.**
 7. Overall writing quality (**2 points**)
 - a. Make sure you check your paper for proper spelling and grammar. The Research Methods Help center is available if you want someone to look over your paper and give you advice.

Other Guidelines:

- **You may get 1-5 points deducted due to lack of originality. For heavy overlapping issue (directly copying from previous/other students work or other Academic Misconduct behaviors), you will be reported to Academic Integrity Office and will bear course, educational, and university sanctions.**
- Use the Checklist on the next page before you turn in your paper to make sure it is the best paper you can write!

Checklist – Paper IV: Study Two Method, Results, and Discussion

Use the check sheet below to make sure your paper is the best it can be! Make sure you answer “Yes” to all questions before submitting your paper or you will lose points! The first two sections duplicate the checklist from Papers I, II, and III, but the rest is unique to **Paper IV**.

General Paper Format (This section is identical to the Papers I, II, and III Checklist)		
Yes	No	
		1. Is <u>everything</u> in your paper in 12-point Times New Roman font?
		2. Is <u>everything</u> in your paper double spaced, including references?
		3. Do you have one inch margins on all sides of the paper?
		4. Are the <u>first</u> lines of all paragraphs indented ½ inch?
		5. Are your paragraphs aligned left?
		6. Is your paper below the 60% plagiarism limit?

Title page (This section is identical to the Papers I, II, and III Checklist)		
Yes	No	<i>Header</i>
		1. Is your Running head title in ALL CAPS?
		2. Is your Running head in 12-point Times New Roman font?
		3. Do you have a page number that is flush right?
		<i>Title / Name / Institution</i>
		1. Is your paper title capitalized using title case, centered and bold?
		2. Are your name and institution correct?

Method Section (This is similar to Paper II, but new elements are in bold purple text)		
Yes	No	<i>Header</i>
		1. Is your header title present and identical to your header title on the title page?
		2. Is your header title in ALL CAPS and 12 point Times New Roman font?
		3. Do you have a page number starting on page 2
		<i>Title for the Method section</i>
		1. Is the word “ Method ” centered and in bold at the top of your Method page?

Method Section Continued		
Yes	No	<i>Participants</i>
		1. Do you have the word “ Participants ” flush left and in bold, right below the word “Method”?
		2. Did you list out your demographic characteristics, including gender, age, and ethnicity / race?
		3. Did you provide the descriptive statistics for (means and standard deviations) for age and italicize

		the letters <i>M</i> and <i>SD</i> ?
		4. Did you provide frequencies for gender and ethnicity/race and italicize the <i>N</i> ?
		5. Did you use the brand-new participant set from study two and NOT the set from study one?
<i>Materials and Procedure</i>		
		1. Did you mention informed consent?
		2. Did you thoroughly describe your two independent variables in enough depth and detail that another researcher could duplicate your materials (though you can refer back to study one if the variable is identical)?
		3. Did you give your IVs names that matches up with the names you refer to in the results section?
		4. Did you describe all of your most relevant dependent variables, noting the scales you used (e.g. “Yes / No”, “A scale ranging from 1 (not at all likely) to 9 (very likely)”) for EACH of your DVs?
		5. Did you fully describe what participants went through in the study, noting the order in which they received study materials (e.g. first informed consent, then IVs, DVs, and debriefing)?

Results Section (This is similar to Paper II, but new elements are in bold purple text)		
Yes	No	
		1. Do you have the word “ Results ” centered and in bold, immediately following the Method section?
		2. Did you analyze four analyses? Two chi-square tests and two 2x2 ANOVAs?
		3. Did you mention all of the IVs and the DV by name when talking about your analysis?
		4. Did you include means and standard deviations within parentheses for each level of your independent variables?
		5. If your factorial ANOVA was significant, did you include follow up simple effect tests? (That is, do you have seven total <i>F</i> tests)?
		6. Did you mention “see Table 1” right after each analysis?
		7. Did you italicize the letters <i>F</i> , <i>t</i> , <i>p</i> , <i>M</i> , <i>SD</i> , and χ^2 (where appropriate)?

Discussion Section (New Information in this section)		
Yes	No	
		1. Do you have the word “ Discussion ” centered and in bold, immediately following the results section?
		2. Did you remind your reader of your study two hypothesis?
		3. Did you mention whether you supported or did not support your study two hypothesis?

Tables (New Information in this section)		
Yes	No	
		1. Do you have 4 tables inserted in the results section?
		2. Does each table have table title?
		3. Is your table APA format?
<i>Table Information</i>		
		1. For your manipulation check, did you include your chi square info? (If a chi square, did you include your chi square value, p value, and percentages?)
		2. For your first 2 X 2 ANOVA, make sure to include information your Tests of Between Subject Effects table. If your interaction is not significant, you’re done. If it is significant, normally you would add a follow-up table.
		3. For your second 2 X 2 ANOVA, same with the first 2x2 ANOVA tables?