Anthony Cuzo

Professor Rodwell

2/21/23

Writing for Engineers

<u>Lab Report Analysis Outline</u>

1. <u>INTRO</u>:

   - "Peers at Work: Evidence from the Lab"

      - Authors conducted observations of 3 cashiers; first and second cashier work together as the third cashier works alone. The test intended to measure the effects (if any) high productivity has on co-workers in the same work space.

   - "Does Cognitive Reappraisal Reduce Anxiety? A Daily Diary Study of a Micro-Intervention With Individuals With High Social Anxiety"

      - Maya Musafia/Shiri Lebendiger used daily messages and other various tests to allow subjects to self-record their social anxiety throughout certain groups and people with certain type of SAD (Social Anxiety Disorder).

   - "Emotion regulation in social anxiety: a systematic investigation and meta-analysis using self-report, subjective, and event-related potentials measures"

      - Taylor and Francis conducted 4 separate studies that included 15 participants answering a questionnaire to determine levels of social anxiety and emotion regulation.

2. BODY (CONTENT)-FORMAT STRUCTURE:

2a. "Peers at Work-"

ABSTRACT/INTRO: data given is accurate, explains they are observing cashiers working for a large supermarket chain. In intro, it explains other studies with different results, kind of thrown off topic because it should talk about this study only rather than "others" (doesn't specify which other studies). Explains all abbreviations clearly and how they are used and understood throughout the study.

METHOD: Explains how they got the baseline in this lab, however the specifics such as what addition questions were asked. Complex? Simple? Well explained however some terms need to be explained such as IRB, certain numbers throughout method section, and which excersises belonged to which part of the method. This method would be a little complex to EXACTLY replicate since we don't know some specifics that can potentially drastically change the outcome of the lab (such as what questions were asked to get the baseline). Also experiment done with euros, would need to self calculate the euros to dollars if we are doing this lab in New York (hypothetical).

RESULTS: Part of method was found in the results- cashiers had to guess how many questions their peer answered. Also failed to explain how this is significant. Results cannot be 100% accurate since 6 workers did not fill out questionnaire for the first result, and 4 did not fill out questionnaire to get 2nd results. Results also included how they got the results-normalize time of individual worker, divide by average time of all workers. Overall peers only respond to high productivity workers if they adjust to own speed.

CONTRIDICTIONARY to last paragraphs stating there was no significant peer effects on

others, and then another by saying peer effects play a role by two fast workers potentially working slower together.

DISCUSSION: No proper discussion, discussion section mixed with results section.

2b: "Does cognitive reappraisal-"

ABSTRACT/INTRO: a lot of detail since there are four different studies being conducted, very formal and clear however since there is so much information with proper language it can be difficult for certain readers try to understand the basics of this lab.

METHOD/PROCEDURE: Fails to mention certain terms such as "block randomization", how they measured through social phobia inventory (how did the participants get access to this?), and fails to mention how the method of each part correlates to the different studies. (overall fails to mention how they kept track of the data).

RESULTS: Clear/straight forward, however since there is a lot of data shared throughout the different studies, the results fails to translate and/or summarize in basic terms what the numbers and terms signify. Some are needed to understand the basics of each result.

DISCUSSION: did good at summarizing the entire lab, however maybe s brief summarization of the abbreviations might be necessary to fully understand the lab. Unknown "facts" in discussion such as "first study to report reductions in anxiety", use of term "to the best of our knowledge"- what research helps prove this is "one of the first studies?".

2c. "Emotion regulation in social anxiety-"

ABSTRACT/INTRO: Good info but fails to mention what certain terms mean such as "N=193", how does this signify 4 different studies? What does this info mean? What self

reports mentioned in this section were done? "certain studies-" such as?->fails to explain info stated. At least clearly mentions goal which is do what other studies "haven't found"; "others fail to find impairments in reappraisal".

METHOD/PROCEDURE: The section titled "method" is a sentence explain what the following subsections are going to cover. Even then we cannot replicate the participants since it does not tell us how to find people prior to the social anxiety tests to assign them to groups. Fails to mention certain score threshold, questions asked in questionnaire, and meaning of numbers throughout method section. Procedure section tells us how to get consent of participants to be recorded for study, but fails to mention the actual procedure of this lab. Vaguely explains findings and numbers, enough info to assume which numbers signify which study.

RESULTS: mixed info with "results" and "procedure" and results are not straight forward since information is spewed out".

   SAME ANALYSIS APPLIES TO THE THREE OTHER STUDIES IN THIS LAB

3. Similarities and Differences (what made these more accurate then the others)

- 2a. had an accurate abstract and method page and is accurate enough to replicate a similar experiment, however need to assume certain things to get the SAME lab. Unlike the other labs, the results section contradicted each other and made it difficult to understand the results since the wording was a little confusing.

- 2b. and 2c. has missing info that can help readers of the lab report fully understand the study conducted. Missing info, meaning, and context.

- 2c. terrible example of a professional lab report since it is accurate enough to be published, however when analyzing this lab, we can see this lab report can be improved in many ways such as organization, context, meaning of the titles "method" and "procedure" and helping others replicate this lab if intended.