Answer these questions for each of the experiments described below:

1. Identify the design (e.g., 2 X 2 factorial).
2. Identify the total number of conditions.
3. Identify the manipulated variable(s).
4. Is this an IV X PV design? If so, identify the participant variable(s).
5. Is this a repeated measures design? If so, identify the repeated variable(s).
6. Identify the dependent variable(s).

Design 1:

College sophomores were given a short course in speed-reading. Three groups had courses lasting for 5, 15, or 25 sessions. At the conclusion of the course, participants were asked to read a paragraph, followed by a test of comprehension. Before taking the test, participants in each group were offered a monetary incentive—no money, $1, or $10 for a certain level of performance. The researcher collected the reading time and number of correct items on the comprehension test for each participant.

Design 2:

A researcher interested in weight control wondered whether normal and overweight individuals differ in their reaction to the availability of food. Thus, normal and overweight participants were told to eat as many peanuts as they desired while working on a questionnaire. One manipulation was the proximity of the peanut dish (close or far from the participant); the second manipulation was whether the peanuts were shelled or unshelled. After filling out the questionnaire, the peanut dish was weighed to determine the amount of peanuts consumed.

Design 3:

A researcher studied the influence of intensity of room illumination (low, medium, and high) on reading speed among fifth graders. Also, children were classified as "good" or "poor" readers from achievement test scores. Each group of children read 750-word passages under all three levels of illumination (three reading trials). The order of trials for each child was randomly determined.

Design 4:

A researcher investigated the effect of a child's hair length on judgments of personality and intelligence. Teachers were shown photographs of children to obtain their "first impressions" of the children. Each teacher was shown a boy or girl whose hair was either very short, shoulder length, or very long. Teachers rated the friendliness of the child and estimated the child's intelligence level.
Design 5:

An investigator was interested in the effects of various treatments on reduction of fear in phobic participants. He suspected that type of phobia may interact with therapeutic treatments; specifically, that the types of treatments for agoraphobics (fear of open spaces) and claustrophobics (fear of closed spaces) might be different. He divided participants into two groups based upon type of fear and then assigned members of each group to treatment groups: desensitization, insight, or implosive therapies. After three months of treatment, participants' anxiety in the feared situation was measured.

Design 6:

Participants participated in a driving simulation study to investigate night-driving reactions as a function of alcohol consumption and road conditions. Participants drank "cocktails" containing either no alcohol, 3 ounces of alcohol, or 6 ounces of alcohol. After 30 minutes, they began the driving simulation test. Each participant simulated a drive on a straight road, a road with gentle curves, or a road with many sharp curves and on which the participants encountered various road hazards. Driving speed and the number of accidents were measured.

Design 7:

A researcher was interested in the effects of sexual arousal on the ability to concentrate, and also wondered whether gender and age are important factors. The researcher had participants read passages that were low, medium, or high in sexual arousal content. The participants included both males and females and were divided into three age categories (18-24, 25-35, and 36-50 years). After reading the passage, participants were asked to perform a proofreading task; the researcher measured the number of errors detected on the task.

Design 8:

In a study by Chaiken and Pliner (1987), research participants read an “eating diary” of either a male or female stimulus person. The information in the diary indicated that the person ate either large meals or small meals. After reading this information, participants rated the person’s femininity and masculinity on a scale where the higher the number, the more feminine the rating.