ATTITUDES AND SOCIAL COGNITION LAB
2024-2025 LAB MANUAL

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

As the Principal Investigator (PI) of the ASC Lab, I (KAR) am expected to:

- Ensure the overall quality and rigor of the social-psychological research that is produced by my laboratory. I will maintain high expectations for the work produced in the lab, and will actively work to foster openness, integrity, and reproducibility in our research.
- Ensure a safe and supportive work environment that is not only free from any form of harassment but that is actively working toward dismantling racism, sexism, and other systems of oppression and creating a space where people of all backgrounds can thrive.
- Develop and nurture a culture of curiosity, exploration, learning, teamwork, and positive, solution-oriented attitudes throughout the lab.
- Provide mentorship, training, guidance, and support to those who work in the lab, including idea generation, experimental design, project strategy and planning, manuscript preparation and submission, lab logistics, job searches, award and grant applications, poster and oral presentations, teaching, letters of recommendation, professional development, and issues relating to work-life balance.
- Develop and nurture collaborations with other lab PIs and their lab members.
- Be constructive and timely with comments on abstracts, proposals, and manuscript submissions; this will mean returning drafts within one week unless there are extenuating circumstances in which case we will discuss and come up with a clear timetable.
- Approve all abstracts, manuscripts, posters, and oral presentations of the research that comes from the lab.
- Attend and present at research conferences.
- Give credit where credit is due, actively promote those who work with me, and keep an eye out for opportunities for lab members.
- Provide lab members with informal performance feedback as needed and formal performance feedback at the end of each academic year.
- Hold weekly or bi-weekly all-lab meetings as well as weekly individual meetings with graduate student lab members during the Fall and Winter terms; summer meetings are flexible and ad hoc meetings are always possible if the need arises. Attendance at these meetings is expected for all lab member, including RAs and thesis students. During the summer term we will work out a plan for meeting that allows for academic progress for students but also rest and travel.

All researchers in the ASC Lab are expected to:

- Cultivate your curiosity and creativity. Engage with the psychological literature. Go to talks. Hone your interests to develop expertise. Read papers. Talk to others about your work and theirs. Become a social psychologist by acting like a social psychologist.
- Conduct your research with openness and integrity.
- Represent the lab with pride, and show respect for others; you are now an ambassador for the lab as well as a member – our reputation will be formed in part by how you interact with our colleagues.
- Participate in laboratory group functions; this means paying attention, asking questions, offering feedback, and using phones and computers only for work that is directly related to the meeting at hand.
- Maintain and treat all lab equipment and lab space with care; if we are running low on a necessary supply, if software licenses are set to expire, if computers need updating, etc., let Kate know. Please help to keep the shared spaces clean and organized.
- Show respect for others in the PAS building; keep noise in the hallways to a minimum, make sure to lock the doors, etc.
- Follow all guidelines for research with human participants laid out by the UF Institutional Review Board and the American Psychological Association.

As a graduate student researcher in the ASC Lab, you are expected to:

- Commit to a goal of at least two first-author publications before obtaining your PhD.
- Seek out fellowship/grant/award proposals and apply for those for which you are a good fit. Keep in mind that providing letters of recommendation and feedback on drafts take time and effort on the part of those writing them; do not apply for opportunities for which you do not clearly meet the requirements.
- Present your work at a minimum of one conference per year (if you have funding).
- Be familiar with and meet the deadlines and benchmarks laid out by the area, department, and university. Meeting these deadlines is your responsibility -- I do not keep track of this.
- Manage study-programming, data analysis, and other concrete research challenges in the following order (i.e., “ask three, then me”)
    - Look for answers in the literature
    - Look for internet resources (including threads on Twitter, PsychMap, etc.)
    - Solicit advice from your lab mates
    - Seek advice from Kate; I am always happy to discuss issues but it is in all of our best interest if you work on the problem yourself first

    - If we're still struggling, we'll go outside of the lab for advice (e.g., to a Project Implicit programmer, to another faculty member), but please talk to Kate about this first.
- Share your expertise, experience, and materials with others working in the lab. There are far greater rewards for being generous with your time and knowledge than for keeping things to yourself in an attempt to prevent others from getting ahead.
- Share responsibility for mentoring undergraduates working in the lab.

As an undergraduate student researcher in the ASC Lab, you are expected to:

- Volunteer research assistants are expected to commit at least three hours per week to the lab. RAs signed up for course credit (PSYCH 264 or 464) should commit 8 hours per week for 13 weeks.
- Let Kate know immediately if there is an adverse situation with a lab participant. If you are unsure, check in.
- Check in with Kate regularly about your goals and interests in the lab. We are happy to increase your involvement and responsibility if you have a track record of reliability.
- You can find additional information for honours thesis students here.

GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNICATION AND SOLICITING FEEDBACK

- The lab Teams workspace is the primary means of communication among lab members; please "react" to messages to indicate you have seen them.
- Let Kate know if you will miss any usual lab, area, or department events (for primary mentees, this includes brownbag and colloquium).
- Lab members are expected to respond to email or Teams messages within 24 hours on weekdays unless they have given notice that they will be away. It is totally fine if the response is something akin to, "I cannot look at this now but will get back to you before X date", but the message should be acknowledged within a day.
- If you know you will not be able to respond to email within 24 hours on weekdays, you should turn on an away message (in addition to informing Kate of your absence ahead of time).
- Kate will sometimes email at wacky times (late at night, weekends) mostly due to childcare availability and other family obligations. Please know that your "off" time is respected and you do not need to respond immediately. The guidelines above are totally acceptable.
- Brief submissions (e.g., conference poster or talk abstracts, short award or grant applications, letters of recommendation) should be sent to Kate for feedback at least one week ahead of the deadline.

- You should work together with Kate to create a feedback timeline for more intensive submissions (e.g., grant or award applications that are more than 2-3 pages, job application materials, manuscript or thesis drafts); we will usually trade multiple drafts of these kinds of submissions and working within a timeline will help to make sure we meet deadlines.
- It is highly recommended that you ask your graduate student colleagues for feedback on your work before sending it to Kate.
- Include Kate on all communications regarding any lab research (yours, mine, or other lab members'). This includes cc-ing Kate on emails and making her aware of any conversations outside of emails.
- Keep in mind that, although our social area is quite informal, others are not; use formal writing and professional titles in communication with people outside of the lab; this includes department and university administrative and support staff.
- The quality and specificity of the feedback you receive will be in proportion to the quality and specificity of the work you submit (e.g., an early, rough draft will get more big-picture, general comments than a later draft that is more fleshed out).
- For new manuscripts or lengthy proposals, you should first submit a detailed outline for feedback. This will minimize the chance of needing to restructure large sections of your writing.
- Seek approval and feedback from Kate before submitting anything on which she is a co-author, even if it has been approved for submission elsewhere.

GUIDELINES FOR USING PROJECT IMPLICIT

- Keep in mind that using Project Implicit is a privilege that is granted to few people, and is one that many would love to have. Our participants are a valuable resource. Studies should be run with great care and errors minimized. Do not take more from this shared resource than you need. Keep in mind that participants come from all over the world and come from diverse backgrounds. Be careful not to center or assume White, WEIRD experiences in your studies.
- You are responsible for following all rules and guidelines set by Project Implicit. As Kate's relationship with Project Implicit becomes more distal, it is more important than ever that we do not create any unnecessary work for the team running the organization.
- You are only to use Project Implicit for data collection that is in active collaboration with Kate or someone else on the Project Implicit Executive Committee or Board of Directors.
- It is expected that you will respond politely to all questions and comments about your study that participants send to you and will alert Kate if there is any message that meets the criteria for a reportable event.

- Acknowledge support from Project Implicit for any manuscript, talk, or poster that describes data collected through the Project Implicit infrastructure. In most cases this will mean putting the PI logo on your poster/presentation or including a written acknowledgement in the author's note of a manuscript.

GUIDELINES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND EXPERIMENT ARCHIVING

- You must get approval from Kate before beginning any data collection; the data collection procedure is as follows:
    - Discuss the general outline of the research with Kate and get approval to begin study-building; you might find it useful to trade drafts of materials in .doc or Google Docs format before programming anything as it's much more difficult to edit .html and .js files than Word or Google documents.
    - Submit your study for IRB approval using standard templates where applicable (e.g., description of Project Implicit).
    - Once your study is built and ready for submission, send the link to Kate for approval along with a link to the LEAF.
    - If you are running your study with the Project Implicit infrastructure, change your settings in the dashboard to enable Kate (username: *kratliff*) to download data and view all study files. If you are running in Qualtrics, share your survey.
    - Once Kate has approved the study, you should send it to the lab RAs for extensive testing before submission.
    - Generally, the project lead should be responsible for the steps listed above, though someone other than the first author might take the lead on this for studies that are conducted in collaboration with people outside of the lab. See below for more on authorship.
- Before submitting any manuscript, the first author (or whomever the first author designates) should create a project page on the Open Science Framework (OSF) that includes (at minimum): A link to the study on PI or Qualtrics, all study-building files or a codebook that provides the text of all questions, all cleaned data files, and a file with the syntax (e.g., SAS, SPSS, R) used to transform raw data files to cleaned data files. The abstract should be posted in the "wiki" section. The page may be private until publication (authors can decide this on a case-by-case basis), but the page must be prepared ahead of time.

LAB AUTHORSHIP GUIDELINES

For Manuscripts:

- An author is considered anyone highly involved with most parts of: idea generation (e.g., research question, theoretical framework, hypotheses), research design (e.g., selection and/or creation of materials or methods), data collection (including study-building), data cleaning and analysis, and manuscript drafting.
- Decisions about authorship should be made as early in the writing process as possible, ideally as soon as it is clear that a project is publishable. However, authorship may change as the project develops and contribution shifts; collaborators should be open, straightforward, and respectful of others' feelings during these conversations.
- Except in exceptional circumstances, the first author should write the bulk of the first draft of the paper, including preparation of tables and figures, and should manage submission duties such as drafting the cover letter, preparing the manuscript in the correct format, online submission, and checking proofs. The first author will also be responsible for the project page on the OSF (see below). These responsibilities may be shifted through group discussion, particularly if a potential co-author needs to do more to earn authorship or if someone has not contributed as much as others.
- The first author will also be responsible for developing a project page on the Open Science Framework website for any submitted manuscript (see above for guidelines).
- The first author assumes responsibility for the publication, making sure that the data are accurate, that all deserving authors have been credited, that all authors have given their approval to the final draft; the first author also handles the bulk of the resubmission process and responses to inquiries after publication.
- It is generally assumed that Kate will be involved in any research conducted using lab resources (e.g., lab computers or software, lab Qualtrics account, Project Implicit) and, as a result, will be an author on any resulting manuscript; this is negotiable when students are working with other collaborators (which is highly encouraged!), but: (a) it should be discussed ahead of time, and (b) you should not assume that Kate will provide guidance and feedback on those projects for which she is not a co-author, and (c) Kate will not be the IRB supervisor for projects in which she is not involved.
- Undergraduate RAs are not typically co-authors on the projects for which they test studies, collect data, or perform literature reviews, but should be acknowledged by name. Undergraduates may be co-authors on projects for which their contribution goes beyond typical RA work.

For Talks and Posters:

- If you are interested in presenting work on which you collaborate with others, you should get their approval before moving forward with plans for presentation. In situations where more than one collaborator wants to present the same data, the first author generally has priority, though collaborating and turn-taking is always preferable.
    - If you are presenting on a specific paper, the co-authors of that paper should be offered authorship on the presentation.
    - If you are presenting on multiple papers and someone is a co-author of most or all of those papers, that person should be offered authorship on the presentation.
    - If you are presenting on multiple papers, each with unique authors, you should acknowledge co-authors as collaborators, but do not need to offer them co-authorship.
    - A very general rule of thumb for talk and poster authorship is that you should offer authorship to anyone who is a collaborator on at least 60% of the results you present.