Results and Discussion Section

Your second paper consists of a title page, results section and discussion section, references, and table and/or figure that will focus on the results of data collected in class or in the lab. This paper is worth 65 points. You DO have to turn in copies of your references. For more details about these sections, see page 28, 29, 258, 259, 262-267, 283, 293-308 in your Cozby textbook and the APA manual (p 10-29, 296-320).

To write your results section, use the data that was collected from class. You will find this data on an EXCEL spreadsheet that can be downloaded from my website (http://teach.lanecc.edu/kime). This data includes gender, scores on the Just World Belief (JWB) scale, Need for Cognition (NFC) scale, State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS) and the Rotter Locus of Control Inventory.

Develop a hypothesis to be tested and perform a statistical analysis to test the hypothesis. After looking at several of the references, it is probably easiest to see if there is a gender difference on the five scales. You cannot test to see if there is a gender difference on the JWB scale unless you look at gender differences on multiple scales. Once you have the results, generate a title page and report the results in a results section using the correct APA writing style and format. After you analyzed your results, discuss the results. You will need to read a little bit about each scale from the professional journals.

Searching PsychINFO
- If you do a search in PsychINFO for Just World Hypothesis, you will find 41 hits
- If you do a search in PsychINFO for Need for Cognition, you will find 78 hits
- If you do a search in PsychINFO for State Trait Anxiety, you will find 150 hits
- If you do a search in PsychINFO for Manifest Anxiety Scale, you will find 448 hits
- If you do a search in PsychINFO for Internal External Locus of Control, you will find 5721 hits
Just World Belief

Instructions
Melvin Lerner’s (1974) just-world hypothesis states that we all need to believe in a just world in which people get what they deserve and conversely deserve what they get. Zick Rubin and Letitia Peplau developed the Just World Scale (JWS). Indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements in the blank space next to each item. Respond to every statement by using the following scale.

0 - strongly disagree
1 - moderately disagree
2 - slightly disagree
3 - slightly agree
4 - moderately agree
5 - strongly agree

_____ 1.* I have found that a person rarely deserves the reputation he has.
_____ 2. Basically, the world is a just place.
_____ 3. People who get “lucky breaks” have usually earned their good fortune.
_____ 4.* Careful drivers are just as likely to get hurt in traffic accidents as careless ones.
_____ 5.* It is a common occurrence for a guilty person to get off free in American courts.
_____ 6. Students almost always deserve the grades they receive in school.
_____ 7. Persons who keep in shape have little chance of suffering a heart attack.
_____ 8.* The political candidate who sticks up for his principles rarely gets elected.
_____ 9. It is rare for an innocent person to be wrongly sent to jail.
_____ 10.* In professional sports, many fouls and infractions never get called by the referee.
_____ 11. By and large, people deserve what they get.
_____ 12. When parents punish their children, it is almost always for good reasons.
_____ 13.* Good deeds often go unnoticed and unrewarded.
_____ 14. Although evil persons may hold political power for a while, in the general course of history good wins out.
_____ 15. In almost any business or profession, people who do their job will rise to the top.
_____ 16.* American parents tend to overlook the things that should be most admired in their children.
_____ 17.* It is often impossible for a person to receive a fair trial in the U.S.
_____ 18. People who meet with misfortune have often brought it on themselves.
_____ 20.* Many people suffer through absolutely no fault of their own.

Scoring
1) Reverse individual scores on items 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 20 (change 0 to 5, 1 to 4, 2 to 3, 3 to 2, 4 to 1, and 5 to 0 for the questions).
2) Add the numbers in front of all 20 items.

Total scores can range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating a stronger belief in a just world and lower scores indicating little belief in a just world. For comparison purposes, scores of
Boston University undergraduates were slightly below the midpoint, whereas those of Oklahoma State University students were slightly above the midpoint.

The just world hypothesis is the tendency for people to blame victims of misfortune. Like the fundamental attributional error, people tend to overemphasize personal factors and underestimate situational factors. Blaming a victim reflects the just world belief because the person believes the world is just and victims must have done something to deserve their fate. This belief manifest itself in blaming victims of crimes, women for being abused and assaulted, and the poor for their disposition.

Possible References
18-Item Need for Cognition Scale: (Cacioppo, Petty & Kap. 1982)

1. I would prefer complex to simple problems.
2. I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.
3. Thinking is not my idea of fun. *
4. I would rather do something that requires a little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities. *
5. I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is likely chance I will have to think in depth about something. *
6. I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.
7. I only think as hard as I have to. *
8. I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long-term ones. *
9. I like tasks that require little thought once I’ve learned them. *
10. The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.
11. I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.
12. Learning new ways to think doesn’t excite me very much. *
13. I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.
14. The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.
15. I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.
16. I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that required a lot of mental effort. *
17. It’s enough for me that something gets the job done; I don’t care how or why it works. *
18. I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally.

1 = very strong disagreement
2 = strong disagreement
3 = moderate disagreement
4 = slight disagreement
5 = neither agreement or disagreement
6 = slight agreement
7 = moderate agreement
8 = strong agreement
9 = very strong agreement

The need for cognition scale measures differences in individuals in their tendency to engage in and enjoy thinking. Higher scores indicate that people tend to engage and enjoy thinking.
Possible References:
State Trait Anxiety Inventory and Manifest Anxiety Scale

Anxiety is an important construct in the study of clinical problems and the study of personality. Normal anxiety is experienced in different degrees by everyone. The individual differences in the intensity, frequency and eliciting factors in experiencing this emotion are captured in personality scales like the Neuroticism scales from Eysenck’s EPQ-R (Eysenck, Eysenck & Barrett, 1985) where neuroticism is seen as one of three main personality factors. Anxiety is also a major component of neuroticism as measured by the NEO-PI-R (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Neuroticism is one of the 5 main factors in this model of personality. In each of these cases anxiety is not the only component of the neuroticism dimension (which also include other types of negative affect, like anger and frustration). It is however, the main component so that neuroticism scores correlate highly with measures of anxiety. Individual differences in anxiety/fear also play an important role in theories of temperament (Thomas & Chess, 1977, Rothbart & Derryberry, 1981). Fearfulness differences exist in young infants and children.

Anxiety is also a common clinical problem. Clinical anxiety problems may manifest themselves in a variety of ways. The anxiety may be specific to a particular eliciting stimulus as in the case of simple phobias or to a somewhat wider range of situations as in social phobias. It may also be very nonspecific as in anxiety disorders like panic disorder or generalized anxiety disorder (Last, 1993).

The two commonly accepted measures of anxiety that we will use are the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) (Spielberger, 1983) and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS) (Taylor, 1953). The STAI trait anxiety scale is a 20 item scale which asks about the frequency of occurrence of a variety of anxiety symptoms in different situations. The response format is a 4 point Likert Scale from “almost never” to “always”. It is largely a measure of social anxiety, though there are other elements as well. The MAS is a 50 item scale which asks about the presence or absence of anxiety symptoms. The answer format is “true”/”false.” The items from the MAS focus heavily on the autonomic symptoms of anxiety. Both of these measures are reliable. The trait scale of the STAI shows Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (another measure of internal consistency type reliability) in the range of .85-.95. Alpha coefficients for the MAS are in the range of .83-.92. The average score on the STAI trait scale for college students is 41.7 with a standard deviation of 10.25. The average score on the MAS, also for college students, is 11.43 with a standard deviation of 5.68. Despite the differences in item content and response options these 2 scales correlate highly with r =.79 (Tanaka-Matsumi & Kameoka, 1986).
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Rotter’s Locus of Control Inventory

For each pair of items, circle the letter of the one that most accurately describes your own belief.

1. A. Many of the unhappy things in people’s lives are partly due to bad luck.
   B. People’s misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

2. A. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don’t take enough interest in politics.
   B. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

3. A. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   B. Unfortunately, an individual’s worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he or she tries.

4. A. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   B. Most students don’t realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

5. A. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   B. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

6. A. No matter how hard you try some people just don’t like you.
   B. People who can’t get others to like them don’t understand how to get along with others.

7. A. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   B. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

8. A. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
   B. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

9. A. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
   B. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

10. A. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
    B. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

11. A. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
    B. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyway.

12. A. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
    B. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

13. A. What happens to me is my own doing.
    B. Sometimes I feel that I don’t have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

A high score indicates an external locus of control; a low score indicates an internal locus of control.
Locus of control in social cognitive theory

According to psychologist Julian Rotter (1966), some people have a generally low expectation of success in their behaviors. These people believe that their own behavior doesn’t matter much and that rewards in life are generally outside of their control. Rotter says that such people have an external locus of control: They believe that control of life’s reinforcements does not reside within themselves, but in external forces or persons. On the other hand, some people have an internal locus of control: They believe that their own actions determine the rewards that they obtain. Of course, not everyone has a completely internal or completely external locus of control. Social cognitive theorists conceive of locus of control as a continuum: Some people are primarily external, and others are primarily internal. Still others are somewhere in between the two extremes.

Hundreds of studies have examined individual differences in locus of control (Carver & Scheier, 1992). Many of these studies have used Rotter’s original measure of locus of control (see Handout 13.3). However, Rotter’s scale has been criticized for mixing perceptions of control over personal outcomes with perceptions of control over such things as government. Such criticisms have led to the creation of new locus of control tests that focus selectively on one domain of behavior, such as health. A person who has an internal locus of control regarding health would be more likely to exercise and eat a balanced diet, whereas someone with an external locus of control to would feel that their behavior had no impact upon their physical health. (Note that someone could have an internal locus of control regarding health issues and yet have a primarily external locus of control regarding employment or romantic relationships.)

Other researchers have questioned the underlying rationale of the locus-of-control concept. Rotter assumed that the important personality variable was the belief that success was internally or externally determined. Someone with an internal locus of control believes that personal qualities such as skill lead to success, whereas someone with an external locus of control believes in outside factors such as luck. But many researchers argue that Rotter’s examples confound the notion of internal control with the notion of stable control; qualities such as skill are stable factors, whereas luck and chance are completely unstable. These researchers claim that the crucial belief which shapes behavior may be in a stable cause of success rather than an internal cause of success (Meyer, 1980). In summary, the concept of locus of control has been influential in social cognitive theory, but there are still unresolved questions about this determinant of personality.