

**Lab Report Analysis of 3 Psychological Studies and Environmental Factors**

Anthony Cuzo  
ENGL 21007 Lab Report Analysis  
Professor Rodwell  
February 27, 2023

Studies have been done to demonstrate how social and environmental factors affect the other people around them and if outside factors affect people with different diagnosis of SAD (Social Anxiety Disorder). Through these studies we can see more about how the human brain works and these studies/results can potentially help expand the psychological field. The lab reports analyzed are mixed between clear and interesting, and unclear and confusing; one of these labs show a general example of what a thorough lab report should ideally consist of and the other two show what authors should prevent while writing their lab reports. The lab report titled "Peers at work: Evidence from the lab" written by Roel van Veldhuizen, Hessel Oosterbeek, and Joep Sonnemans discuss a study of different groups consisting of three cashiers. The first and second cashier work together, and the third cashier works alone. The study conducted intended to measure (if any) the effect high productivity works have on other co-workers in the same work space. The lab report titled "Does Cognitive Reappraisal Reduce Anxiety? A Daily Diary Study of a Micro-Intervention With Individuals With High Social Anxiety." mention the use of daily messages and other various tests, including self-interventions through diaries, run on people with Social Anxiety Disorders to see if cognitive reappraisal reduces their anxiety. "Emotion regulation in social anxiety: a systematic investigation and meta-analysis using self-report, subjective, and event-related potentials measures." reports 4 different studies that consist of 15 participants answering a questionnaire to measure levels of social anxiety and emotion regulation. The last two lab reports were written by Yogeve Kivity and Jonathan D. Huppert.

For the purpose of separating each lab report, I will use the first few words in their title to specify which lab I am talking about. The abstract section of "Peers at work" reviewed the topic and essential idea and purpose of the study, and included key findings and their major

conclusion. The main purpose of this study was to determine what effects high productivity workers had on their co-workers, those being slow and others being fast. Their key findings were that cashiers who worked fast together tend to work a little slower since both workers work fast. Their major conclusion was that there is no direct effect of high-productivity workers on slower workers. The introduction of this lab report is also well done and accurately gives information as to what we are about to read. Background information tells that the cashiers in this study are those of a large supermarket chain. Additional data such as how many workers were used in each group, how many groups there were, etc. were also given in this section of the lab report. The only part of the introduction that should have been more clear is what certain numbers and abbreviations mean. For example we are given terms such as “Baseline Productivity” and next to that in parenthesis is “(BaseProd, N=84). It is unclear what 84 means. Those who are reading this can only assume N=84 refers to the number of people, however there are alternate possibilities. The method section is also accurate and thoroughly covers most of the lab. However, certain sections of the method was misleading, as the text mentions that to get the baseline for their study they had to begin with giving the cashiers addition questionnaires. It is unclear if these questions were complex or simple, or how many questions were asked. Another part of the method section that was unclear was the use of the term IRB and term “PHP/MySQL”. Although self research is needed, context around this can give us an understanding of these terms which can be useful.

The results section of this lab report was mostly clear in their findings and gave an accurate response to this experiment. Although finding that high productivity workers do not directly affect other workers, there are some factors of the result that could have potentially

altered these findings. For example, a total of 10 workers failed to fill out and submit the first and second questionnaires given to them. This affects the results since the results depended on the normalized time of the individual workers divided by the average time of all workers, based on how many items they scanned per minute. It is unclear if these workers were not part of the results or calculated since they failed to hand in their questionnaires. Found in the discussion section of this lab was only links and proper citations to this lab. The discussion section is not essential to understanding this lab since the report was thorough and clear.

The second lab report titled “does cognitive reappraisal reduce anxiety?” has a well structured abstract. It correctly mentioned the topic of this lab, which is to examine emotion regulation with people with social anxiety disorder. The abstract also properly mentions their key findings/major conclusion which is that the result show a short intervention in social anxiety can improve treatment for social anxiety. Their method and procedure sections were unclear and misleading. Although giving a lot of information throughout these two sections they failed to mention major term simply. The term block randomization was mentioned and is not clear what it is and how they used it. Part of the method and procedure sections mention that the participants SAD (social anxiety disorder) is measured through the social phobia inventory. The social phobia inventory is not properly described and explained. Nor is their explanation of how they managed to access the social phobia inventory. Part of what should be in the result section was also found in the method and procedure sections. For example there are multiple charts and numbers that are described and analyzed in these sections, but there is no mention on how these numbers correlated to the studies and how these numbers were tracked during the study. Thus making this lab difficult to replicate. If the audience were to read this lab they can get an

understanding of what is going on, but to replicate this lab would be difficult since there is no proper explanation on their procedure. The results section of this lab were clear and straightforward. It is understood that at baseline the participants reported higher social anxiety and the groups that experienced the interventions showed a significant six point decrease in social anxiety than those other two monitored groups that did not follow an intervention. Explanation for the results follow within the next three pages and although these numbers and terms are explained these, numbers, terms and abbreviations are clustered together and are given a vague explanation. Enough to understand what they mean, however fails to mention what significant value these terms have in concluding the results. The discussion section of this lab is well done and thorough. The discussion section accurately summarized the introduction, methods, procedure, and results, but could have briefly reminded the readers of the abbreviations used to prevent having to flip back into the report or remember what the abbreviations signify.

The abstract of the lab report titled “Emotion regulation in social anxiety:” is well written. Abstract properly mentions the purpose of this lab which was to study, throughout four separate studies, whether individuals with social anxiety are impaired in using cognitive reappraisal. Key findings were also mentioned such as the meta-analysis of these studies report less frequent and effective. The major conclusion was that subjects of social anxiety showed strong deficits in emotion regulation and individuals with social anxiety experienced difficulties with reappraisal in their life. Although well written next to the part where the abstract mentions there were four separate studies, written is (N=193). It is unclear what the letter “N” stands for and it is also unclear what the number “193” stands for. As well as the term “HSA”, this term is used and not explained in the abstract. The introduction of this lab report is formal and thorough

and mentions all the details used throughout the four studies that were conducted. Although properly worded it is difficult to understand the basic information of this lab since the organization of the introduction has no indentation or other paragraphs that help us separate which data belongs to which study. Also mentioned in the introduction is that this study is the first to mention what other studies have failed to find. This claim has no proof and is only mentioned without an example of which other studies they can be referring to.

The method and procedure sections were once again thrown together however both method and procedure sections were simply a sentence explaining what the other sub-paragraphs of the sections were going to cover. The method and procedure section fails to mention how the participants we're assigned to the groups, uses the mention of a score threshold however fails to mention what that score was, mentions questions asked in a questionnaire but fails to explain and cover what type of questions were asked and how many questions were asked, and the data and numbers given in the method and procedure section we're thrown in and a reader can only use context clues to determine what the report is referring to. Terms such as "ER", "HSA", and "LSA" are not explained and are only thrown in as details to explain how this lab was conducted. These terms could have been mentioned and explained in the introduction to help the structure of the method and procedure seem less clustered. The results section of this lab is confusing to understand and unclear. Understandably so because there are four separate studies that were conducted, the results of each study was difficult to understand since the findings were not straight forward and the organization of which result applied to which study was added as another paragraph and not separated by a smaller sub-title under results. The discussion section of the lab was well written and well structured. The discussion section properly summarized the

lab and mentioned important information to help us understand the main purpose of this lab.

Data that was not properly explained in the methods and procedure section was mentioned in the discussion section and again failed to mention what this data meant in the lab.

When comparing these tabs to see which one of the three is most efficient and clear, the lab “Peers at work” demonstrates a clear and accurate lab report. When comparing the introduction section of all three lab, “Peers at work” shares the most data that is needed to understand what comes next in the lab. Compared to the other two labs, data is given to introduce the lab being conducted however, the terms are given into context without proper definition of what the terms and data represent. “Peers at work” demonstrates an ideal method section among the three. This method section showed clarity on what methods were used throughout the lab and although failing to mention what an IRB is and what specific questions were asked, “Peers at work” explains the methods so this lab can be replicated without many errors. In comparison to the other two labs, “Peers at work” can be understood whereas it is hard to understand the methods being used in the other labs since the other method sections fail to mention a handful of terms and are simply put in the section to complete the lab, rather than to help understand what all data signifies. In comparison to all labs and the procedure section it is fair to say that the same analysis that goes for the method section also applies to the procedure section since the same data is used and analyzed, however, is broken down into steps. Though these labs all show a fair and clear procedure section, “Peers at work” demonstrates a better procedure section since their data is clear, and the organization of this section is transitioned well; whereas the other procedure sections lack better organization since it is difficult to tell

when the authors are moving to a different step of the procedure. When considering the result section of these labs, once again “Peers at work” shows more clarity since they only mention necessary information as to how they concluded their results and simplified/narrowed their findings, so we clearly know how the lab was concluded. “Does Cognitive Reappraisal Reduce Anxiety” and “Emotion regulation in social anxiety” over complicate their results and it is difficult to distinguish what is either a key finding or a major conclusion. The result sections in both “Cognitive Reappraisal” and “Emotion regulation” are covered with data and mention how the data got their result, and not what the result (in numbers) signify. All discussion sections were clear and varied in information since all labs had a different amount of data. The discussion sections of all labs summarized the essentials of the lab conducted and were clear in writing.

“Peers at work” showed a significant difference in quality as readers can understand and follow this lab better. A possibility as to why lab reports “Does Cognitive Reappraisal Reduce Anxiety” and “Emotion regulation in social anxiety” lack in quality is because the two labs reports are written is by the same authors. The three reports do their job and accurately discuss the labs, but the quality of the context differs from author to author. More information is shown and is accurate in lab “Peers at work.”

### **References**

Kivity, Y., & Huppert, J. D. (2016). Does Cognitive Reappraisal Reduce Anxiety? A Daily Diary Study of a Micro-Intervention With Individuals With High Social Anxiety. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 84*(3), 269–283. <https://doi-org.ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/10.1037/ccp0000075>

Kivity, Y., & Huppert, J. D. (2019). Emotion regulation in social anxiety: a systematic investigation and meta-analysis using self-report, subjective, and event-related potentials measures. *Cognition & Emotion, 33*(2), 213–230. <https://doi-org.ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/10.1080/02699931.2018.1446414>

van Veldhuizen, R., Oosterbeek, H., & Sonnemans, J. (2018). Peers at work: Evidence from the lab. *PLoS ONE, 13*(2), 1–15. <https://doi-org.ccny-proxy1.libr.ccny.cuny.edu/10.1371/journal.pone.0192038>