

Order, score and
submitted it to a



O’rster, Liberman, and Kuschel (2008) examined how people might assimilate further social judgements to the prime (judge a target as more hostile than without the prime) or contrast them 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 of central importance to research on social cognition (Reinhard, 2016). In their article, they review 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, they propose that globally processing leads to inclusion and assimilation, whereas local processing leads to exclusion and contrast (O’rster, Liberman, & Kuschel, 2008). They originally conduct five different studies; however, because the replicated study only consider their first study, this paper also only mentioned the results of their first study (O’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 analysis of variance (ANOVA). Their first study showed a significant moderation of processing style on the effects of semantic priming on person perception. Whereas global processing relative to control processing (i.

e. participants focused on both details and shape of the map) intensified assimilation to the prime, local processing produced a significant contrast (O’rster

oster, Liberman, & Kuschel, 2008). Table 1. Mean Ratings (and Standard Deviations) of Aggressiveness and Traits Unrelated to Aggressiveness as a Function of Induced Processing Style and Semantic Priming

Measure	Rating of aggression	Semantic priming of aggression	Semantic priming of neutral words	Rating of unrelated traits	Semantic priming of aggression	Semantic priming of neutral words	Induced processing style	Local Control	Global	M	SD	M	SD
2.86	1.15	5.63	1.25	4.62	1.16	4.29	1.23	4.72	0.43	4.43	0.44	4.41	0.53
0.45	0.56	0.53	1.21	4.21	1.15	4.58	0.67	4.64	0.49	4.64	0.49	4.64	0.49

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. 49 Replicated Study In this replication of Fo’rster et al. (2008), David Reinhard (2016) sought to directly reproduce 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 social judgements 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 to Social Psychology” (Fo’rster, Liberman, & Kuschel, 2008). In the replicated study, participants still took the study in a lecture hall with dozens of other students,

<https://assignbuster.com/orster-score-and-submitted-it-to-a/>

but it did not occur during their class time. Finally, participants in the original study were from 52 different nations while the students in the replication study are primarily from the United States (Reinhard, 2016).

Comparing to original paper, David Reinhard (2016) found different results in the replication study. He averaged the two aggression items to create an aggressiveness score. While there was a significant correlation between the two aggression items in the original paper, there was no significant relationship in the replication ($r = .168$, $p = .163$).

In contrast to the original findings, there was no significant difference in aggressiveness ratings between participants primed 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) mainly drove this effect.

They did not replicate the main effect of semantic priming on aggression ratings. Finally, I didn't replicate the target finding of a significant interaction between cognitive processing style and priming on participants' ratings of "John's (the imaginary person's name in original and replication studies)" behavior. Table 2. Mean Aggressiveness Ratings (and Standard Deviations) as a Function of Induced Processing Style and Semantic Priming

Induced Processing Style	Local Control	Global	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Aggression	6.38	1.75	6.					

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

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

The three variables are used in this analysis in order to meet the objective of the analysis which is to measure the effect of interaction between the cognitive processing style and the priming. Those three variables are aggressiveness score, puzzle conditions and the map 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 puzzle conditions 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 the participants that fully took part in the study. I found the same score with David Reinhard.

The correlation between the two questions (Q5 and 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 and 0.05 significant level.

Since the p. value is greater than 0.05, I fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference between the means of the aggressiveness score ($M = 6.88$, $SD = 1.55$) 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 the aggressiveness of the targets, $F(2, 68) = 4.67$, $p = .$

013. For Question 5 The p-value 0.33572 at 0.05 level of significance. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and say there is no significant interaction between the processing style and priming. For Question 8 The p-value 0.

8293 at 0.05 level of significance. Since the p-value is greater than 0.

05, we accept the null hypothesis and say there is no significant interaction between the processing style and priming. In general overview of the diagnostic plot, the four graphs explain and reveal information about the data set being used for the analysis. From the graph, there is spread residuals around the horizontal line and one can conclude that the data set has a linear pattern. The normal QQ plot shows if the distribution status of the data 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 error term of the model.