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o? rster, Liberman, and Kuschel (2008) examined how people might assimilate further socialjudgements to the prime (judge a target as more hostile than without the prime) or contrastthem away from the prime (judge the same target as less hostile) in 2008.

After their study, the question of whether assimilation or contrast would occur after priming became one ofcentral importance to research on social cognition (Reinhard, 2016). In their article, theyreview the basic assumptions of inclusion-exclusion model (IEM) of Schwarz and Bless; then, they test a new model “ Global vs Local Processing Model (GLOMO).” Specifically, theypropose that globally processing leads to inclusion and assimilation, whereas local processingleads to exclusion and contrast (Fo? rster, Liberman, & Kuschel, 2008). They originally conduct five different studies; however, because the replicated study onlyconsider their first study, this paper also only mentioned the results of their first study(Fo? rster, Liberman, & Kuschel, 2008). They averaged the two aggressiveness items (r = 0. 63)to arrive at an aggressiveness score and submitted it to a 3 (processing: global vs. local vs.

control) X 2 (semantic priming: aggression vs. no aggression) between-participants analysisof variance (ANOVA). Their first study showed a significant moderation of processing styleon the effects of semantic priming on person perception. Whereas global processing relativeto control processing (i.

e. participants focused on both details and shape of the map)intensified assimilation t the prime, local processing produced a significant contrast (Fo? rster, Liberman, & Kuschel, 2008). Table 1. Mean Ratings (and Standard Deviations) of Aggressiveness and Traits Unrelated toAggressiveness as a Function of Induced Processing Style and Semantic PrimingMeasureRating of aggressionSemantic priming of aggressionSemantic priming of neutral wordsRating of unrelated traitsSemantic priming of aggressionSemantic priming of neutral wordsInduced processing styleLocal Control GlobalM SD M SD M SD2. 86 1.

15 5. 63 1. 254. 62 1. 16 4. 29 1.

234. 72 0. 43 4. 43 0. 444.

41 0. 40 4. 53 0. 456. 53 1.

214. 15 1. 254. 58 0. 674.

64 0. 49Replicated StudyIn this replication of Fo? rster et al. (2008), David Reinhard (2016) sought to directlyreproduce the methodology used in the original paper.

In study 1 Fo? rster et. al. (2008)assessed whether or not cognitive processing style influenced the effect of priming on socialjudgements toward a target. Their work had participants view a map of Oldenburg, Germany. Because the replication was run in the United States instead of Germany, David Reinhard(2016) aimed to show participants a map (provided by the authors) of South Carolina instead. In the original study participants were recruited from one their lecture called “ Introduction toSocial Psychology” (Fo? rster, Liberman, &Kuschel, 2008). In the replicated study, participantsstill took the study in a lecture hall with dozens of other students, but it did not occur duringtheir class time. Finally, participants in the original study were from 52 different nations whilethe student in the replication study are primarily from the United States (Reinhard, 2016).

Comparing to original paper, David Reinhard (2016) found different results in the replicationstudy. He averaged the two aggression items to create an aggressiveness score. While therewas a significant correlation between the two aggression items in the original paper, there wasno significant relationship in the replication (r = . 168, p = . 163).

In contrast to the originalfindings, there was no significant difference in aggressiveness ratings between participantsprimed with aggression (M = 6. 88, SD = 1. 55) and those not primed with aggression (M = 7.

33, SD = 1. 33), t(69) = -1. 28, p = . 206 (Reinhard, 2016). In summary, they replicated the main effect of processing style on aggression ratings; however, the global processing induction (and not the local processing induction) mainlydrove this effect.

They did not replicate the main effect of semantic priming on aggressionratings. Finally, I didn’t replicate the target finding of a significant interaction betweencognitive processing style and priming on participants’ ratings of “ John’s (the imaginaryperson’s name in original and replication studies)” behavior. Table 2. Mean Aggressiveness Ratings (and Standard Deviations) as a Function of InducedProcessing Style and Semantic PrimingInduced Processing StyleLocal Control GlobalM SD M SD M SDAggression 6. 38 1. 75 6.

27 1. 29 7. 77 1. 16Neutral 7.

23 1. 46 7. 00 1. 30 7. 67 1. 27My AnalysisI followed the same steps in the replicated study while I was analyzing the data and I willexplain every step with the screen shots of the outputs that I took after I took the necessarysteps.

The three variables are used in this analysis in order to meet the objective of theanalysis which is to measure the effect of interaction between the cognitive processing styleand the priming. Those three variables are aggressiveness score, puzzle conditions and themap conditions. Due to the purpose of the analysis, analysis of variance will be carried out. The aggressiveness score is the response variable while the map condition and the puzzleconditions are the factors in the analysis (Field, Miles, & Field, 2012). The second column of the original data was removed so that the analysis can focus on theparticipants that fully took part in the study. I found the same score with David Reinhard.

The correlation between the two questions (Q5and Q8) is 0. 11675521 which shows that there is low positive correlation between them (r =. 168, p = . 163). From the t. test result shown above, the p-value is 0. 2055 with 95% confidence interval and0. 05 significant level.

Since the p. value is greater than 0. 05, I fail to reject the null hypothesisand conclude that there is no significant difference between the means of the aggressivenessscore (M = 6. 88, SD = 1. 55) and puzzle condition (M = 7. 33, SD = 1. 55), t(69) = -1. 28, p =.

206. The average aggressiveness score is 6. 88. The ANOVA results above explains the effect of the map condition on aggressiveness score. At significant level of 0.

05 the map conditions; global (M = 7. 72, SD = 1. 64), local (M = 6. 77, SD = 1. 64) and control (M= 6. 60, SD = 1. 31) have significant effect on theaggressiveness of the targets, F(2, 68) = 4. 67, p = .

013. For Question 5The p-value 0. 33572 at 0. 05 level of significance. Since the p-value is greater than 0. 05, weaccept the null hypothesis and say there is no significant interaction between the processingstyle and priming. For Question 8The p-value 0.

8293 at 0. 05 level of significance. Since the p-value is greater than 0.

05, weaccept the null hypothesis and say there is no significant interaction between the processingstyle and priming. In general overview of the diagnostic plot, the four graphs explain and reveal informationabout the data set being used for the analysis. From the graph, there is spread residuals around the horizontal line and one can conclude thatthe data set has a linear pattern. The normal QQ plot shows if the distribution status of thedata set Though the pattern may not be straight but the data are normally distributed. It should be noted that the assumptions that the assumptions of normality deals with the errorterm of the model.