1      My experiment is based on operant conditioning. Operant conditioning is an acquisition of

2      voluntary complex and goal direct behaviors (Leonard Lecture). In an operant conditioning there are two

3      types of reinforcement which increase or strengthens a prior response (Leonard Lecture). This

4      reinforcement can be positive which adds something good, or it can be negative which removes

5      something bad (Leonard Lecture). Also, an operant conditioning can have two types of punishment

6      which decreases a prior response. This contains a positive punishment which adds something bad or it

7      can have a negative punishment which removes something good. Although classical conditioning, an

8      object that causes a response originally caused by another object (Leonard Lecture), can also work for

9      this experience as well.

10      Receiving a text message can either make a person happy, upset, or confused depending on it

11      being negative or positive. My theory, an organized set of principles that describes, predicts, and

12      explains a phenomenon (Leonard Lecture), is that whenever something positive is received, the receiver

13      is happier rather than a person who receives something bad since they will become upset. This relates

14      to operant conditioning in two ways because if one receives a positive text message they have a positive

15      reinforcement which makes the person happy. If one receives a negative text message they have a

16      positive punishment since they will now be upset or angry which is adding something bad. In my

17      experiment my hypothesis, a specific testable prediction (Leonard Lecture), is that a person who

18      receives a positive text message will be happy, and if a person receives a negative text message they will

19      become upset or angry.

20      The way to figure if this is true is by gathering a group of people and then splitting the group in

21      half. One group will receive the same positive text message and the other group will receive the same

22      negative text message. Their face expression will either be happy or upset and that's how to tell the

23      difference between the two text messages being sent out. The independent variable, what is being

24      controlled in the study (Leonard Lecture), is the text message being sent out to each group and the

1     dependent variable, what is being measures (Leonard Lecture), is the face expression shown after

2     receiving the message. A confound or extraneous variable, extra variables that could affect relationship

3     between independent and dependent variables (Leonard Lecture), can be that they might not show any

4     face expression at all in which I cannot tell if they are either happy or upset.

5        The story I read was Knock Wood. In this story Skinner is being examined, he is considered by

6     most to be the father of radical behaviorism (Hock, 2013, pp. 1). Skinner is the inventor of the *Skinner*

7     *box,* is the author of over a dozen books and more than 70 scientific articles (Hock, 2013, pp. 1). The

8     Skinner box consists of a cage or box that is empty except for a dish or tray into which food is dispensed

9     (Hock, 2013, pp. 2). Skinner believe that all behavior, internal or external, could be explained by the

10     environmental consequences it produces (Hock, 2013, pp. 1). Reinforces are consequences in which

11     there is satisfaction of solving a problem or receiving money which makes the behavior more likely to

12     repeat in the future in similar situations (Hock, 2013, pp. 1). Superstition with humans may last a life

13     time in accidental reinforcements (Hock, 2013, pp. 3). One of Skinners studies showed that greater

14     levels of superstition behaviors develop under conditions of negative reinforcement than under positive

15     reinforcement (Hock, 2013, pp. 4). Superstitions are everywhere, they can cause severe useful

16     functions, and such behaviors can produce the feeling of strength of control when a person is facing a

17     difficult situation (Hock, 2013, pp. 4-5).

18        This article relates to my study because they both use operational functions. When the article

19     talks about certain behaviors reflect on the environment it makes sense why people react a certain way

20     after receiving something negative. For example when one receives a negative text message it makes

21     them not want to look at a following message since the previous message had made them upset. Also

22     being superstitions ties in since the person would believe that negative text messages would be sent to

23     them after they have received one. This works for receiving a positive text message as well because a

person might become superstitious if they are wearing a special item or believe they are having a lucky day.

This study could be changed to be a correlation study, observing relationship between only two variables (Leonard Lecture), by observing the age. Younger people may react different to a negative text than what older people might, in this case the reaction may change. Also gender can be observed, female tend to be more dramatic than men, that does not mean men aren't dramatic, but using gender can affect the way they view the text message.

References

Hock, R. R. (2013). Knock Wood!. In Forty studies that changed psychology (pp. 78-85). Pearson Education: United States of America.

epic
Educational Policy
Improvement Center

# Work Sample Evaluation

**Subject Area**: Introduction to Psychology
**Task Title**: Dogs, Pigeons, and Texts
**Student Work Sample Title**: Untitled

The document was scored using the *CCR Task Bank Rubric*. The final scores are indicated in the following chart.

| Scoring Criteria | Insufficient Evidence | Developing | Progressing | Accomplished | Exceeds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research and Investigation | | | X | | |
| Ideas and Content | | | X | | |
| Reading and Analysis | | | X | | |
| Communication | | | X | | |
| Organization | | | X | | |
| Accuracy | | X | | | |

**Annotations:** The following evidence from the work sample and the reviewer's comments support the scores above. Page and line numbers refer to the original work sample.

| Scoring Criteria | Page # | Line # | Commentary about the work sample |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Research and Investigation:** *Locating resources independently and/or identifying information within provided texts* | 1 | 2 | The work sample includes reference to one or more class lectures. This information helps develop background for the study. |
| | 2 | 6 | The work sample includes references to the provided text. However, there is no evidence that the student read more than one of the three required texts. |
| | | | |
| **Ideas and Content:** *Presenting a thesis and understanding concepts* | 1 | 2-3 | The student uses terms that show an understanding of concepts (e.g., discusses reinforcement with operant conditioning). |
| | 1 | 23-24 | The student shows an understanding of some concepts (e.g., identifies the independent variable correctly). |
| | 2 | 2-4 | It seems that not all concepts are fully understood by the student (e.g., does not understand confounding variable concept). |
| **Reading and Analysis:** *Evaluating sources and selecting evidence to support the central idea* | 2 | 6-8 | The student includes information that is not closely related to the task (e.g., background information on Skinner). |
| | 2 | 18 | The student makes reference to the selected reading from the provided text that was related to the proposed experiment. |
| | 2-3 | 22-2 | The work sample does not effectively integrate sources that support the proposed study. |
| **Communication:** *Using subject-appropriate language and considering audience* | 1 | 24 | The work sample uses discipline-appropriate language (e.g., independent variable). |
| | 2 | 1 | The student describes concepts for a general audience (e.g., identifies the dependent variable as the measured variable). |
| **Organization:** *Structuring main ideas and supporting information* | 1 | 11 | The student does not present a clear thesis within the work sample. |
| | 1-2 | 20-4 | The student groups the experimental concepts together. |
| | 2 | 18 | The student connects the study from the provided text to the proposed study. |
| | 3 | 3-7 | The student provides a discussion of the correlational study that seemed out of place given the focus of the paper. |
| | 3 | 7 | The paper lacks a strong concluding paragraph. The student does not summarize the paper or restate the thesis. |

epic
Educational Policy
Improvement Center

| Scoring Criteria | Page # | Line # | Commentary about the work sample |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Accuracy:**<br><br>*Attending to detail, grammar, spelling, conventions, citations, and formatting* | 1 | 2-9 | The grammar used by the student takes away from the readability of the content communicated. |
| | 2 | 6 | The page numbers used in citations are not consistent with page numbers listed in the references. |
| | 2 | 9 | The work sample lacks attention to detail (e.g., writes "believe" instead of "believes"). |
| | 3 | 10 | The References list is missing a full citation for the lecture notes. |