

(Continued)

3. How many degrees of freedom did the researchers have for this analysis?

A: 2 between-groups (or numerator) degrees of freedom and 59 within-groups (or denominator) degrees of freedom

4. By using Appendix C, approximate the critical value that was used to see whether we reject or do not reject the null hypothesis.

A: Slightly larger than 3.15 (the critical value for 2 numerator and 60 denominator degrees of freedom), but smaller than 3.21 (the critical value for 2 numerator and 44 denominator degrees of freedom).

5. What is the probability that the differences among the three groups' means were due to random variation?

A: Less than .1% ($p < .001$)

6. Did the researchers reject or not reject the null hypothesis?

A: Because the p value is less than .05, we can conclude there is a small likelihood that the differences among our means were due to random variation. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis.

7. What is the effect size? Interpret what this number means.

A: .232. This means that 23.2% of the variability in the dependent variable (time volunteered) is explained by the independent variable (the type of food seen).

8. Given your answer to the previous questions, what does this statistical presentation mean in plain English?

A: People exposed to organic foods were less willing to indicate they would help someone than were people exposed to comfort foods or control foods.