

Comparison of two scientific studies

This comparison focuses on two scientific articles concerning the theme of forming impressions about people. The first article is an original study completed by Asch et al. (1946), the second text is a replication of this study conducted by Nauts et al. (2014).

Asch et al. (1946) conducted ten experiments (N=834) in which they tried to capture how people form an impression of an imaginary person based on a set of presented personality traits. All of the experiments had a similar design. Every subject was given a set of traits and was instructed to write down how he imagined a person assessing those characteristics is like. There were two or more groups, each having a bit different set of given characteristics, so the researchers could understand how different conditions influence the process of forming an impression. After the process of writing subjects were asked to rate how important they consider every given trait. In two experiments Asch operated with a dichotomy of warm and cold, giving each group one of those dimensions together with few other traits. The scientist focused on many different words and set of traits; sets were predominantly positive, negative, or mixed.

Asch et al. (1946) concluded that every trait can be central or peripheral depending on the context. Traits that are central in some context influence the interpretation of a whole set of traits. The order of the traits also plays a role in the aforementioned process. It was also found that the relationship between traits is dynamic as they influence each other.

Asch's study was often cited as a support for the hypothesis of the primacy-of-warmth effect, however, this conclusion does not stem from the study as the results of experiment IV are incongruent with the primacy-of-warmth hypothesis. Moreover, participants themselves predominantly did not report warm or cold to be the most important trait.

The study conducted by Nauts. et. al. (2014) is a replication of Asch's study. The major differences between the studies stem from the fact that research has evolved significantly during the last seventy years. Nauts et. al. (2014) study is methodologically better. The researchers ensured random sampling of the participants and completed a more complex and systematic analysis of the results. Moreover, they preregistered the study in line with the Open Science standards. Nauts et. al. administered the study online, whereas Asch's study took place in a laboratory setting.

Nauts et. al. (2014) prepared seven sets of traits for participants (total N=1023), who were randomly assigned to each condition. The results indicated *intelligence* to be the trait, which shaped subjects' impression significantly more than *warmness*. Thus this study did not provide any evidence for the primacy-of-warmth hypothesis. The results indicated that participants focused on competence-related traits as much as on warmth.

As mentioned above described studies differed methodologically. The latter study provided more information about the method and procedure. Both studies contributed to the research of impression formation, as they provided more information about the researched area. The limit of both studies is caused by the fact, that researchers observed the phenomenon solely as a result of the spoken or written word, whereas in real-world settings, as expected, the process of forming an impression, is far more complex.

Asch, S. E. (1946) Forming impressions of personality. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 41(3), 258–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0055756>

Nauts, S., Langner, O., Huijsmans, I., Vonk, R., & Wigboldus, D. H. J. (2014) Forming impressions of personality: A replication and review of Asch's (1946) evidence for a primacy-of-warmth effect in impression formation. *Social Psychology*, 45(3), 153-163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000179>

Kritérium hodnocení úkolu	Podíl	Splněno	Body
Účelné shrnutí pro obě studie	14%	1	0,7
Účelné porovnání studií (podobnosti, rozdíly)	14%	1	0,7
Vyvození vlastních opodstatněných závěrů	16%	0	0,8
Kvalita argumentace, její opora v textu, pospolitost, uvědomování si limitů	14%	0,5	0,7
Stylistika projevu a srozumitelnost	14%	1	0,7
Obsahové strukturování a plynulá návaznost textu	14%	0,5	0,7
Formální náležitosti a formální strukturování textu	14%	1	0,7
Maximální počet bodů Získaný počet bodů	5		3,5

Práce se dobře četla, nicméně většinu prostoru zabírají shrnutí informací z obou studií, nikoli porovnávání samo o sobě. Doporučoval bych formátovat text do bloku a lépe obsahově strukturovat text. Zbytek v komentářích.

Ať se daří,

Adam Klocek