### Pooled Results for Plotting Graphs

The pooled results for the xxx Hope students (xxx females, xx males, xx non-binary, xx other) who participated in the Impression Formation experiment are presented in the tables below. The pooled results are presented in the same order as your own results on your data sheet, to help you plot the correct values on each graph.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Group A | Group B |
| **Overall Impression** | 5.05 | 3.61 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Group A | Group B |
| **Desire to Meet Person** | 2.58 | 2.75 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Estimated Frequency** | Group A | Group B |
| Desirable Behaviors | 8.82 | 5.94 |
| Undesirable Behaviors | 4.79 | 6.24 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Estimated Frequency** | Females | Males |
| Desirable Behaviors | 7.81 | 6.83 |
| Undesirable Behaviors | 4.70 | 5.97 |

### Comparison with Results from Hamilton and Gifford (1976)

*The major finding of the original Hamilton and Gifford study was that their participants overestimated the number of undesirable behaviors for Group B. Remember that, in our study, there were 18 individuals in Group A and 9 individuals in Group B, but the ratio of undesirable to desirable behaviors was exactly the same for each group. Group A members exhibited 6 undesirable behaviors and 12 desirable behaviors (a ratio of 6/12 or .50), whereas Group B members exhibited 3 undesirable behaviors and 6 desirable behaviors (a ration of 3/6 or .50).*

Here are the ratios of undesirable to desirable behaviors in our study and the Hamilton/Gifford study:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratio of the Estimated Frequency of Undesirable to Desirable Behaviors** | Group A | Group B |
| Hope College Participants’ Estimate | .54 | 1.05 |
| Hamilton/Gifford Participants’ Estimate | .52 | .79 |
| Actual Ratio of Undesirable to Desirable Behaviors | .50 | .50 |

### Statistical Analyses (*Using t-tests to test for differences between means)*

*The mean values for each group or condition are presented here, along with the t-statistic and the probability (also called* ***p-value*** *or* ***significance level****) that a difference this large would have occurred by chance alone. Pairs of means are considered significantly different if the* ***p-value*** *is less than .05.*

Effect of Group Membership (using **paired t-tests**, because all participants contributed to both means in each comparison)

**Overall Impression** (1=highly unfavorable, 7=highly favorable)  
A = 5.05, B = 3.61 -- *t*(262) = 12.24, *p* < .001 (significantly more favorable impression of Group A)

**Estimated Frequency of Desirable Behaviors**  
A = 8.82, B = 5.94 -- *t*(262) = 15.24, *p* < .001 (significantly higher in Group A) -- actual frequency was A=12, B=6

**Estimated Frequency of Undesirable Behaviors**  
A = 4.79, B = 6.24 -- *t*(262) = -7.29, *p* < .001 (significantly higher in Group B) -- actual frequency was A = 6, B = 3

Effect of Group Members' Gender (using **paired t-tests**)

Important Note: These comparisons do not refer to the gender of the Hope College student participants, but rather the gender of the individuals in Groups A and B.

**Estimated Frequency of Desirable Behaviors**  
F = 7.81, M = 6.83 -- *t*(262) = 8.62, *p* < .001 (significantly higher in Females) -- actual frequency was F = 9, M = 9

**Estimated Frequency of Undesirable Behaviors**  
F = 4.70, M = 5.97 -- *t*(262) = -10.03, *p* < .001 (significantly higher in Males) -- actual frequency was F = 5, M = 4