The Effect of Frustration on Unethical Behavior



A Senior Comprehensive Project

Presented by:

Laura Cottington

Submitted to the Psychology Department, Allegheny College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

April 4, 2016

The Effect of Frustration on Unethical Behavior

A Senior Comprehensive Project
Presented by:
Laura Cottington

April 4th, 2016

Pledge: _____

Approved:

_____

Dr. Lydia Jackson, PhD

_____

Dr. Ryan Pickering, PhD

Acknowledgments

I am so grateful for the unconditional support and love of my family. I am thankful for my mom; her strength and unwavering sense of self are an inspiration to me. Mom-you have taught me so much about what it means to be a strong, capable, and secure woman, wife, mother, daughter, and friend. The passion, care, and diligence that you put into everything you do makes you an incredible role model. I am thankful for my dad; his kindness, reliability, and resolute work ethic are qualities that I will always marvel at and strive to emulate. Dad-you have given such an example for us from your love and appreciation of family, your humble and patient character, and your ability to somehow always do the right thing. I am thankful for my two loving, older brothers. Kevin & Steven-thanks for making me laugh, challenging me, including me, frustrating me, playing with me, watching out for me, teaching me, and loving me. You both have given me so much to look up to and I'm lucky I always had two incredible examples to follow in life. I know in you guys I have two people who will always have my back.

Thanks to my best friends, who made my experience here at Allegheny more than I could have ever hoped. It sounds cliche, but I really would not be the person I am today without you. Allyson, Katie and Daniela- thank you for making every single day fun and filled with laughter. I would not want to be Lovely Raisins or Penguins with anyone else, and truthfully my senior year would have been lost without you.

Thank you to the faculty at Allegheny, specifically Professor Jackson. Your support, dedication, energy, and genuine concern has been invaluable to not only me, but all students who are lucky enough to come in contact with you during their time at Allegheny. You've taught me so much about working hard, achieving my goals, and what it really means to succeed.

Abstract

Links between frustration and aggression have been drawn from previous research and have formed theories still widely accepted in psychology today (Dollard et al., 1939). The effects of personality and dispositional factors such as aggression and lack of self-control on criminal behavior have also been researched (Agnew, 1997). However, there is no research exploring the effects of situational frustration directly on unethical or immoral behavior. 36 undergraduates were recruited to participate in the current study, measuring the effects of a frustrating situation on unethical behavior, specifically cheating behaviors. Frustration was manipulated and defined through a dice-rolling game paradigm first implemented by Paul Piff (Piff, 2014). The paradigm was carried out through the design of a computer program, which played an ostensibly random dice game for each participant. The participants played three rounds, as they were informed that the third and final round only would count towards their rewards for participation. The participants were randomly assigned to one of the two experimental conditions; in the frustrating condition, participants rolled two rounds exactly the same as the non-frustrating control condition, but in the third and final round, the frustrating group rolled almost half what the non-frustrating group rolled. This "bad" round of rolls, which counted for compensation, was defined as the frustrating factor. The measure of cheating was defined as reporting in the computer program as scoring a higher total in the third round than the participant actually rolled. Results indicate contradictory conclusions. Cheating occurred equal amounts of times between conditions, and the manipulation of frustration was not successful. The understanding of the motivators and influences that impact an individual's behaviors is imperative for the sustainment of our society. Immoral and unethical choices and behaviors affect society as a whole. Reducing

the unethical or criminal behaviors of society will depend on our understanding of the effects of certain emotions, such as frustration.

Key words: frustration, cheating, unethical behavior

The Effect of an Induced Frustrating Situation on Unethical Behavior

In 2011, there were 4,367 arrests for every 100,000 youths ages 10 through 17 in the United States. 20 percent of youth from low-income families are charged with an adult crime by the age of 24, which is higher than the number of youth from middle- and high-income families, 16 and 12 percent, respectively (Vulnerable Youth Index, 2009). While there are many factors that would influence a person to engage in unethical behavior, some of those factors must be specific to low socioeconomic youth that are not specific to high-income youth. A lot of research has been conducted on aggression, its causes, and how aggression leads individuals to engage in unethical or criminal behavior. Because it is difficult, or rather impossible, to examine and measure criminal activity in a research lab, studying the effects of frustration on unethical behavior would be a first step in the research, as much criminal activity is in fact unethical behavior. It has been shown that frustration leads to aggression and that aggression may lead to crime, but what about the direct effect of frustration on criminal or, in this case, unethical behavior? Because negative affective states and emotions, such as frustration, have been shown to lead to aggression, can the same causation be drawn to unethical behavior?

General Strain Theory

The General Strain Theory of crime, which stems back to the 1930s, outlines how individuals who experience certain strains are pressured into crime as a result of that strain present in their environment. Specifically, Robert King Merton's original theory of strain says that those members of society who are experiencing financial strain, while wishing to achieve financial success and relieve financial stress, will resort to crime in order to achieve these socially driven goals with respect to their financial plight (Merton, 1957). His theory, which stemmed from sociology and criminology, was revised many times, most recently and widely

accepted by Agnew. Agnew thought that Merton's theory was limited in identifying the range of possible sources of strain among especially the youth aged group. Agnew's theory, like the original theory, supports the idea that financial strain exists as a precursor for criminal activity in some individuals, but also claims that when the theory is applicable to youth in particular, other factors incite criminal behavior, citing negative experiences, such as family dysfunction, problems at school, or issues with friends as major causes of stress outside of financially stressful experiences, though they may be linked (Agnew, 1997).

This revised General Strain Theory (Rebellon, Piquero, Piquero, & Thaxton, 2009) defines strain as the broad social phenomenon where frustrations about not achieving goals and aspirations produce unethical, criminal behavior. Strain, in this theory, is most likely to cause criminal behavior in individuals experiencing negative affect, receiving low social support, and limited availability of coping strategies (Rebellon, Piquero, Piquero, & Thaxton, 2009). The theory has three categories of strain: the inability to achieve positively valued goals, the removal or the threat to remove positively valued stimuli, and the presence of a threat to add negatively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992). Like Merton's theory, the theory points to society's social structure and its detrimental effects on low-income families who do not have the legitimate means to attain economic goals (Rebellon et al., 2009). But, Agnew's revised strain theory accounts for the research showing delinquency and crime in middle and high socioeconomic classes as well. Agnew broadened the original theory to explore the perspective accounting for impediments on goals rather than just obstacles on achieving monetary gain causing a person to act criminally (Agnew, 1985).

This revised theory is mainly based on the idea that when people perceive themselves as being treated unjustly and feel that they are wronged, they may get angry and then engage in

crime or deviant behaviors as a form of retaliation. The research behind the effect of negative emotions on crime and delinquency is often based on the theory that strain promotes negative emotions which, in turn, could cause crime. The main negative emotion identified and studied in the strain theory is anger. Anger, according to the research on the GST, can be dispositional, meaning some people are more prone to anger than others, or situational, meaning from environmental and emotional stimuli (Agnew, 1985).

The strain theory proposes one of the main differences between people who engage in crime and those who do not is the level of perceived self-control of those individuals. Individuals with low self control would exhibit many specific traits that would affect and influence their reactions to negative emotions and constraint. Low self-control characteristics would include impulsivity, a preference for risk-taking, and insensitivity to others (Agnew, Brezina, & Wright, 1997). The inverse relationship between self-control and anger has been established across multiple studies, with large effect sizes consistently over .20 (Pratt & Cullen, 2000). Current research suggests that those with lower self-control will have minimal tolerance for frustration, supposing that frustration is a consequence of low self-control (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Or could it be that frustration is a causal precursor to crime and other unethical behaviors that is independent of individual levels of self-control? If individual differences are controlled for, what is the independent effect of frustration on unethical behaviors?

With the General Strain Theory (GST) mainly looking into dispositional, innate negative affect and anger, it is limited in the way it can account for direct effects, and therefore leaves a gap in its application, especially because of its conflicting stances on the importance and influence of self control. Current research on self-control theories point out the discrepancy of the General Strain Theory when it comes to the effects of dispositional self control, or lack of

self control. Research has found that even though anger is brought about primarily by self-control, negative affect exerts significant direct effects on aggression (Ellwanger & Pratt, 2014).

In addition, the GST does not account for the independent and direct effect that emotions, such as anger and frustration, have when they are induced as a response to situational experiences. Because of this failure to account for induced emotions, the effect of these situational emotions on unethical and deviant behavior remains to be shown. While the GST measures objective traits of individuals and how they predispose them for aggressive reactions, this way of measurement overlooks the importance of frustrating and emotional situations. One study that did investigate the relationship between negative affect and aggression found that negative affect in the form of emotions such as anger and feelings of loss of control correlates in some way with engagement in aggressive behavior (Rebellon et al., 2009). But, this study was a correlational survey, which has a strong participant bias, and has no manipulation, which prohibits any cause and effect relationship.

Frustration and Aggression Hypotheses

The most popular and widely known theory about frustration and aggression is the frustration-aggression hypothesis, postulated in 1939 by Dollard. In Dollard's theory, it was assumed that frustration would always result in an aggressive reaction in every circumstance. This formula for frustration and aggression was very restrictive and was eventually challenged and revised, as not all frustrating circumstances result in an aggressive reaction (Berkowitz, 1989). It was revisited and reformulated many times by many different psychologists throughout time, looking at the different factors that point towards a causal effect of frustration on aggression.

One way in which it was expanded is by introducing the idea that people act out in an aggressive way when there is a cue present with aggressive undertones, which could remind the person of aggressive behaviors. This idea was tested in a study in which participants were angered by another participant, who was actually a confederate for the study. Participants were seated at a table that, in the manipulation group, had a shotgun and other weapons resting on the table and, in the control group, had a badminton racquet and shuttlecocks. The participant was to determine what level of electrical shock to give the confederate who had angered them. These shocks measured aggression, and while the participants were told to ignore the items on the table, just the mere presence of the items affected the level of shock introduced on the confederate, as the participants in the presence of the aggressive cue gave significantly higher levels of shock. This "weapons effect" was tested and appeared inside and outside of the lab in many repeated studies (Berkowitz & LePage, 1967).

The "weapons effect" translates into different forms of unethical behavior within and beyond the context of physical aggression. A sample of over 2,000 drivers in the United States discovered that drivers travelling with guns in their cars were significantly more likely to make obscene gestures at fellow drivers (23% versus 16%), and aggressively follow another car dangerously close to the car in front of them (14% versus 8%) on the road than those not carrying weapons (Hemenway, Vriniotis, & Miller, 2006). The addition of this effect to the frustration-aggression hypothesis is very important, considering human's sensitivity to weaponry stimuli. Most recent research on this subject suggests that humans can now identify guns as quickly as spiders or snakes (Blanchette, 2006). While the weapons effect is mostly researched together with anger or frustration, it has also been proven to exist whether a person possesses an innately anger-prone personality. However, the effect occurs significantly more in those with

innately aggressive qualities, expanding the original frustration-aggression hypothesis even more (Carlson et al., 1990).

Aggression as a consequence of frustration has also been studied and expanded upon from the original hypothesis in terms of dispositional aggression, or innately aggressive qualities that a person does or does not possess. Dispositional aggression factors are measured by responses to statements such as “Some of my friends think I am a hothead”, “When frustrated, I let my irritation show”, “Given enough provocation, I may hit another person” (Buss & Perry, 1992). While individual factors like these do influence how one would react to a frustrating situation, if frustration is shown to instigate aggression, regardless of one’s dispositional anger, then the implications of that finding would be extremely important. Given the amount of situational frustration occurring in everyday lives of everyday people, knowing the direct effects of situational anger and frustration on unethical and deviant behavior would be extremely beneficial to society.

Research on the frustration-aggression hypothesis has stated that the frustration-aggression formula can be thought of as a general theory of the effect of aversive stimuli on aggressive reactions, especially when the frustrating situation is unexpected and interfering on a goal one is trying to reach or accomplish (Berkowitz, 1989). Frustration, then, can be defined as an interference with the completion of a goal at its desired time. Aggression is thought of as any sequence of behavior with the intent of causing injury to the person that the behavior is directed toward. The aggressive response depends on how the frustration interfered with some socially accepted norm or socially idealized goal behavior. This frustration, then elicits feelings that are relieved through aggressive acts, because even in situations where aggressive reactions would be socially undesirable, people still act aggressively, just in less overt ways (Berkowitz, 1989).

For example, in a study by Burnstein and Worchel, groups of male undergraduates were prevented from achieving a goal they had been working towards, supposedly because another participant (a confederate) continuously interrupted by asking pestering questions. This they defined and manipulated as frustration as it impeded a goal. However, aggression in the way it classically is thought of did not occur. In a more socially desirable way, the participants who were frustrated aggressed by giving the confederate participant significantly lower scores in evaluations at the end of the study, giving them harsh reports and written evaluations. Surprisingly though, they did not voice these not-overt "aggressive" and angry reports out loud when it could have been viewed as socially undesirable (Burstein & Worchel, 1962). In other words, the need to adhere to social desirable behaviors is greater than the need to release the tension caused from the frustrated emotions, but the need to release the tension is still significant enough to act aggressively in a social situation, just more conspicuously.

If, then, this relief can be achieved by an aggressive release in a socially desirable way, that is the more chosen route of relieving the tension caused by frustration. In the case of the Burnstein and Worchel experiment, this frustration was defined as pestering and intrusive interruptions by the confederate, impeding the completion of the task at hand (Berkowitz, 1989). However, the target of the aggression does not always have to be the direct source of the frustration, as in cases where it is socially undesirable or even impossible to aggress against the source of frustration. If the source of frustration cannot be reached, identified, or if the fear of punishment is too high, then the aggression could be displaced onto someone else, a substitute target, highlighting that the main definitive characteristic of aggression is intent (Berkowitz, 1989).

Positive versus Negative Affect and Unethical Behavior

Every day we witness first-hand, read and hear about in the media, and even take part in dozens of unethical actions in our society. From students cheating on homework and exams, to employees engaging in workplace theft, to tax fraud, and to illegal drug use, it is hard not to notice. These unethical transgressions, though in isolated instances can be seen as minor, do have devastating and damaging consequences to those affected by the deviant behavior and those committing the behaviors. Are negative moods the only types of affect that affect unethical transgressions?

One way that positive affect can affect unethical behavior is that good moods may influence individuals with more positive thoughts, reminding them about the benefits if they were to cheat rather than negative thoughts about the repercussions of cheating if they got caught. This bias may lead to a higher likelihood to cheat for happy people compared to unhappy people (Craciun, 2009). What about happiness and positive affect lead to an increase unethical behavior? Some researchers have suggested that being in a positive mood state allows for more creative thinking processes than a neutral or negative affective state as well as increases the amount of risk-taking in an individual (Isen & Daubman 1984; Isen et al., 1987). Research in support of the theory that positive moods increase unethical behavior due to the expansion in creativity and differing thought processes also supports the concepts of moral disengagement and moral licensing. In the same way that their creativity is expanded, they can create more mental categories for moral behaviors to fit into. Because of this expansion, they can expand also the definition of honesty and the truth, to then license themselves to commit behaviors that they may previously have viewed as unethical (Vincent et al., 2012).

Conversely, a negative state mood has been linked with decreases in prosocial and helping behaviors (Moore, Underwood, & Rosenhan 1973); however, other studies point to negative moods actually increasing helping behaviors and politeness (Cialdini & Kenrick, 1976; Cialdini et al., 1973). Still, research on this subject is conflicted, given the relieving effect that aggressing produces in improving negative moods. People who are feeling bad and experiencing negative affect may try to remedy or repair their mood through aggression or unethical or immoral actions (Larsen, 2000). In this way, negative affect affects unethical and/or criminal behaviors too.

Frustration and Unethical Behavior

People who are angry, frustrated, and experiencing generally negative affect have been thought of as being especially prone to aggressive behavior. It has been shown that negative affective states are causes of aggression and have aggression-producing effects on people's reactions (Berkowitz, 1989). Like the General Strain Theory, which relates criminal acts to a sort of coping mechanism for negative feelings such as anger, attempting to regulate and improve negative moods is a reason that frustration leads to aggression (Bushman, 2001). If a person does not have the outlet to aggress, or if the situation primes a person more to make an unethical choice, will the relief effect be the same? Does engaging in unethical behavior produce the same relieving effects that aggressing does?

Freud argued that feelings of anger or frustration in a person need to be expressed outwardly, displacing this outward expression either onto the source of the frustration or against a substitute target, both exhibiting the same relief effects (Breuer & Freud, 1955). Aggression, used for relieving a negative mood, would then be used for personal benefit, as is unethical behavior used for personal gain over another person's. In this way, aggression and unethical

behavior are similar in that both behaviors hurt others, although intent defines aggression and can be absent in unethical behavior.

Because of the gap left in research testing the GST and the Frustration Aggression Hypothesis, the effect of situational frustration across all dispositional characteristics on unethical and deviant behavior remains to be investigated. It leaves many questions unexplored and unanswered. If frustration can create aggressive inclinations even if the aggressive acts are not taken out on the source personally, then can unethical behavior be thought of as a consequence of frustration just as aggression has been shown to be?

The Present Study

The current study seeks to extend the previous research and its limitations by testing whether the presence of frustration affects unethical behavior. Using a frustration manipulation, the current research seeks to test a causal influence of frustration on unethical behavior. By studying situational, external influences, the experiment will measure generalizable effects instead of focusing on dispositional anger which vary individually and internally. By measuring unethical behavior instead of aggression, the study will expand and generalize beyond aggressive acts to explain everyday unethical behavior in our daily lives. It is hypothesized that the frustration will increase unethical behavior.

The present study is significant and necessary to potentially explaining situational frustration as a contributor to the seemingly minor unethical transgressions so commonly committed among us. The findings from this study could also have implications in areas that are grounds for very large and intense amounts of frustration built into the daily lives of the people residing there. In this way, it could explain one reason for criminal activity in low socioeconomic regions or in the lives of those who are constantly faced with frustrating circumstances with a

lack of control over the outcome of their lives and the goals they are trying to accomplish. If frustration even has a hand in causing unethical behaviors, then we could work to reduce frustrating circumstances in schools, in the workplace, in the societal structures, and in the lives of us all who experience daily frustrations in our lives.

Method

Participants

36 participants, 12 male and 24 female, participated in the present study. Participants were ages 18-21. (*M*=19.86, *SD*=1.14). They were recruited via SONA, an internet-based research participation management system. In exchange for their participation, students were offered course credit for some Psychology classes. In addition to the Sona credit points at the discretion of their instructors, participants were all given the opportunity to be entered into a raffle to win a gift card, if they chose to do so.

Materials

The study took place in a computer cubicle in Carnegie, using MediaLab software (Empirisoft, 2014).

Frustration manipulation. Participants were randomly assigned to either receive the frustration manipulation or to not. Those who did not receive the frustration manipulation were those in the control group. Following research by Paul Piff, a dice-rolling paradigm was used (Piff, 2014). Specifically, the participants were asked to take the total of 4 dice rolls in each of 3 rounds. Participants were told that, because this is a random process, the sum of the last round would be used to determine how many gift card raffle tickets would be entered in the participant's name (number of tickets earned=total score on third round rolls). All participants were prompted to click a "continue" button that would then generate the rolls for their first of

three rounds. The computer would then show each dice roll, one at a time, for each round (4 rolls per round, 3 rounds total). Unbeknownst to the participant, the computer was programmed to show predetermined sums of 16, 17, and 15, for rounds 1, 2, and 3, respectively, in the control group. In the frustration manipulation, the first two rounds were 16 and 17, also, but the third round totaled 9, not 15. These numbers were chosen to manipulate the levels of frustration between participants. 9 was chosen for the third round for the frustration group because, after rolling 2 successful, seemingly lucky rounds, it was predicted that participants would expect and desire another successful and lucky roll and would subsequently be frustrated when the opposite happens during the only round that counted for compensation and they scored nearly half the points of previous rounds. 16, 17, and 15 were chosen for the control group because they were average-good scores that would would not be frustrating to receive, and lead to a satisfied and content participant. The 15 would be a consistent roll with their previous two rounds.

Assessment of unethical behavior. Following Piff (2014), Cheating was measured as any reported number that exceeds 9 or 15, in the manipulation and control group respectively in round 3.

Post-manipulation assessment of mood. After entering the total dice roll score, participants completed a posttest questionnaire indicating their demographics and their current (state) mood. The participants were asked to rate their current level of different emotions on a 7-point scale. They were prompted on the computer to rate "on a scale of 1 to 7" how agitated, content, disappointed, frustrated, sad, lucky, and satisfied they were feeling right now. On the screen, the score of 1 was labelled "not at all" and 7 was labelled "extremely". The study took approximately 10 minutes, and after the participants answered the post test questionnaire, they

were debriefed, and excused. A full debriefing explaining all hypotheses was conducted after data collection had been completed in order to not jeopardize the integrity of the cover story.

Procedure

Participants arrived in Carnegie. They were directed to a private computer cubicle, being told that they were participating in a study on how perceived luck affects mood. The experiment used a dice roll paradigm used in previous research on unethical behavior (Piff, 2014). They were told that they are playing "a game of chance" for the researcher's study on "the effects of luck on mood", as well as handed instructions as to what to expect from the study. After participants signed the informed consent, the program was started and they were left alone in the room. The computer program began by having the participant wait for the computer program to ostensibly generate their first round rolls. After the first dice roll was shown, the participants were prompted on the screen to click through the next three dice rolls, to complete round 1. They were prompted to record their score on the scrap paper provided. The computer, after the end of round 1, generated another round of four rolls. After the end of that round, the participants were prompted to wait for the generation of a third set. This time, the computer reminded them that these next four dice added together would determine how many raffle tickets they would be awarded.

The computer program stated that, to compensate them for their time, their third round, and the third round only, total would arbitrarily be counted and scored. For however many dice rolls they get, they received that number of raffle tickets to be entered to win one of three gift cards. The rolls were predetermined and were the same exact roll each time for each participant based on condition. Every time that any participant rolled the virtual dice, they all got the same scores, differing only in the third round. The first round, the dice rolled a 4, 3, 6 and 3 for each

participant. This totaled to be 16. The next round rolled a 5, 2, 4, and 6 for each participant. This was a total of 17. The last round, which was the only total to be entered into the computer, rolled a 2, 5, 3, and a 5 in the control group, for a total of 15. The manipulation group rolled a 3, 1, 3 and a 2 in their last round. This was a total of 9. After completing the third round, the computer program prompted the participants to answer a series of demographics questions and a mood questionnaire. After the participant completed the demographics and mood post-test, the computer informed the participant the testing was complete. The screen then prompted them to enter in the number of rolls they totaled in only the third round of rolling.

Design

The current study was an experimental design with one factor and two conditions. The independent variable was the manipulation of frustration, defined as rolling the score of 9 in the experimental group in the third round of the dice paradigm game. The dependent variable was unethical behavior, defined as reporting more than nine total score on the third round in the experimental group, or more than fifteen in the control group. The participants were randomly assigned to either group. SPSS software was used to analyze data. It was predicted that the participants receiving the induced frustrating situation would, on average, report rolling a number greater than nine more times than the control group reports rolling more than fifteen, engaging in an unethical behavior by over reporting for the sake of maximizing personal benefits (i.e., raffle tickets).

Results

Manipulation Checks

The study used a manipulation check in the form of a mood survey at the end of the computer program. An independent samples t-test indicated that there was no significant

difference in feelings of frustration between the experimental (*M*=2.35, *SD*=1.37) and the control (*M*=2.00, *SD*=1.33) conditions; *t*(34)=.784, *p*=.439. There was also no significant difference in feelings of agitation between the frustrating condition (*M*=2.65, *SD*=1.54) and the control condition (*M*=2.05, *SD*=1.43); *t*(34)=1.200, *p*=.238. There was no significant difference in feelings of contentment between the frustrating condition (*M*=4.71, *SD*=1.21) and the control group (*M*=4.89, *SD*=1.24); *t*(34)=-.460, *p*=.648. Similarly, there was no significant difference in feelings of sadness between the frustration group (*M*=2.71, *SD*=1.649) and the control group (*M*=2.47, *SD*=1.541); *t*(34)=437, *p*=.665. Overall, this suggests that the manipulations of mood were not successful, and the experimental manipulation of frustration was also not successful.

Effects of Frustration on Unethical Behavior

Out of thirty-six, four participants (11%) cheated throughout the course of the study. Three participants cheated by reporting higher tickets on the computer program, and one extra person cheated by taking more tickets than they earned after the computer portion of the study was completed, instead of over-reporting their winnings on the computer. Two of the cheating participants were in the frustration condition, and two were in the control group, indicating no systematic differences across experimental groups. To see if there was an association between experimental condition and cheating, a Chi-square test of independence was run. Results indicated that, contrary to predictions, there was no association between the two x^2(3,N=35)=2.928, *p*=.403. Participants who were in the frustrating group (*M*=.9412, *SD*=2.66), contrary to the hypothesis, did not cheat significantly more than the non-frustrating group (*M*=.526, *SD*=2.07, *t*(34)=.526, *p*=.602).

Discussion

Frustration is an emotion felt universally and experienced numerous times daily. The effects of the various frustrating circumstances on the ethical decisions people make every day is very important to research. The effect of frustration directly on unethical behavior has not been studied in previous research. However, previous research has suggested that frustration leads to aggression, and aggression is influential on unethical or immoral behaviors (Dollard et al., 1939). Can the conclusion then be drawn that frustrating circumstances increase unethical behavior? Therefore, the hypothesis of this study was that frustration would increase the individual's unethical behavior, specifically lying about how many tickets they earned.

Frustration was operationally defined in this study as experiencing a very low score on a dice game in one round as compared to previous rounds. To add to it, the low-score-round was also the one that determined how many raffle tickets participants may enter in their name for a raffle of one of three gift cards to a desired local store. The unethical behavior was defined as lying, or reporting higher than a score of nine in the frustrating manipulation group and higher than a score of fifteen in the non-frustrating control group. There was no significant change in the amount of unethical behavior taking place in either group. Individuals cheated the same amount of times in both groups, and of the participants who cheated, individuals reported higher numbers (cheating more highly) in the experimental, frustrating group than in the control group. In their reporting on the computerized program, 2 participants cheated in the non-frustration group, and 1 cheated in the frustration group. In their taking of tickets at the end of the computerized program, an additional participant in the frustration group took more than 9, therefore they were counted as cheating.

These results contradict certain research, which suggests that when an individual feels cheated or thwarted from access to or ability to achieve a goal, they will behave more immorally (Agnew, 1985). Research previously has supported the theory that when people perceive themselves as being treated unjustly and feel that they are wronged, they may get angry and then engage in criminal or deviant behaviors (Agnew, 1985).

What may account for the lack of effect? Firstly, the frustration felt as a result of the manipulation was not significantly different between conditions. Another possible explanation for the contradictory results is that participants were aware that they were participating in a peer's research. This could have influenced their perception and decision whether to cheat or not. Noting that only 4 people cheated, 2 from each condition, is a startling observation considering that the "wiggle room" factor in this study was very large, making cheating very accessible and easy to do. Most participants were recruited from Sona, meaning they were at least registered to take one Psychology class this semester, and most likely will either Minor or Major in Psychology. Their awareness and previous knowledge of a Psychology project may have influenced their ability to act unethically. They may have been influenced because the setting of a Comprehensive Project presents a context of honesty and academic integrity.

Also, the participants are knowledgeable about Comprehensive Projects potentially using deception. They are also aware that they themselves will, in the future, have to create and run their own Comprehensive Project, which possibly would prevent them from cheating on someone else's, knowing that they would not want their own project tampered with. Also the size of the campus may have influenced the results as well, given that the researcher knew a good portion of the participants in contexts outside of the study. Peers of the researcher may be more hesitant to cheat on the study, even if they wanted to, out of not wanting to negatively

affect the researcher's study. When replicating this study in the future, researchers should try to avoid recruiting mostly Psychology students, or try to avoid Allegheny students in general due to the small size and familiarity of the participant and researcher.

These results raise more questions than they answer. It is possible that there is an effect of frustration on unethical behavior and that this study, because of methodological flaws or limitations, did not find the effect. It is also possible that there is no effect of frustration on unethical behavior, and that is why the hypotheses were incorrect. It is also possible that there is an inverse effect of frustration on unethical behavior, and those experiencing a non-frustrating event, such as luck or satisfaction, were affected by their dice roll successes and then consequently cheated more. Participants in the control conditions may have experienced feelings of success, luck, and status as a result of getting three formidable scores in a row, which may have induced feelings of entitlement.

Previous research has shown that a powerful sense of entitlement, whether it be on an individual basis, or within groups or even large organizations, creates an unconscious and underlying imperialism, which views anything seen as of value by the entitled person, as owned by that individual (Duchon & Drake, 2009). Whatever the entitled views as valued, is at the same time seen as belonging to them. This research suggests that those with higher perceived status and success then may behave more unethically, which may help to explain the results of this study. Research has suggested that individuals with higher socioeconomic backgrounds are less generous and altruistic. Studies have also been conducted where higher status participants acted more selfishly in an economic game similar to the present study (Piff et al., 2012). Some research suggests that there are certain environments that cause a person to relax their ethical standards. One of those environmental factors are wealth and affluence brought about by reward

systems in our society. One study found that even just simulated wealth in the context of a laboratory study increased unethical behavior in the form of over-reporting successfulness during an experiment (Gino & Pierce, 2009).

In hindsight, it is possible that what was intended to be the control group, acted as a manipulation itself. What was intended to be neutral, could have actually manipulated the participant. The study provided a manipulation check for both feelings of satisfaction and feelings of luck. The results from those manipulations would have been informative in determining whether or not there was an unintended significant manipulation in the control group. However, due to unforeseen technological errors in the computer software program, the records for luck and satisfaction on the mood survey were not recorded and therefore not able to be analyzed. If the data had been collected, it could have been possible to decipher if there was an unintentional manipulation of luck and success in the control group that may have lead to the increased and unpredicted unethical behavior. Because of the framing of the experiment in terms of luck and therefore defining success as higher rolls, participants in the control group may have been manipulated to feel successful and lucky. They rolled scores continuously above average, which may have influenced their cheating behaviors, and turned what was intended to be a neutral control into a manipulation itself.

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the study had a very small sample size compared to an ideal sample size to properly examine the variables. There were 36 participants, 18 in each condition, drawn from a small college community consisting of about 2,000 students. The lack of success during the manipulation check was a major limitation in examining the effects of frustration on unethical behavior, because the manipulation of frustration, it would

seem, did not actually frustrate the participants. This limits the study's ability to accurately measure any effect of frustration on unethical behavior.

Another limitation identified in the methodology was the way participants were instructed to write down their scores on the paper. Mostly all participants came out of the study room with their scrap paper even though they were instructed to throw away the paper they used. Because participants tried to give the experimenter their papers, they could have been less likely to cheat, thinking that they would be caught. Other participants asked if there was a way that the researcher would know how many tickets they really got, alluding to the fact that they might have cheated, but had fear of being caught. Because of this limitation, the methodology was changed slightly halfway through testing participants. The experimenter provided a small sticky note pad in the study room instead of a full sheet of scrap paper, trying to emphasize how little the writing down of the score meant. It did not change anything in the data trends.

Writing down the scores physically may have prevented some from cheating. Future procedures using this paradigm could allow participants to use their calculators to add up scores, so that there would be no fear of tracing the scores back to them. Allowing the participant to use their phones would add even more "wiggle room" because the researcher could never check the participant's phone to tell if they were lying or not. Also, research has shown that lying and cheating behaviors differ in frequency via technology/computers versus on paper or in person (Russel & James, 2008). This is very important knowledge to understand and further research should be done in this field, especially in our increasingly technology-based world. Most undergraduates today use the Internet to complete at least some of their courses throughout their education, even if the course itself is in the classroom and offline. Undergraduate programs

utilize the Internet in the form of quizzes, uploading papers, and even holding discussion forum-based groups with the professor and other students online (Russel & James, 2008).

Future Directions and Outlook

More research is needed to determine any effects of frustration on unethical behavior, as well as if there is an inverse effect present, where luck and success in the dice game lead to more unethical behavior. This knowledge would be helpful in the process of understanding what exactly prompts and leads individuals to committing unethical behaviors and choices. Knowledge of what leads to this behavior could then lead to interventions and reduction of unethical behaviors. In future studies, the methodology could be altered or changed to create a better and more effective study. The manipulation of frustration should be strengthened so that participants actually experience a difference in levels of frustration. Also, ideally the participants would not be peers of the researcher, and the sample size would be larger. Another alteration for future research would be to better define the paradigm, manipulation and control groups, as to not unintentionally manipulate another variable, like this study may have done. To do this, future researchers could make the dice game longer, so frustration could be manipulated stronger over a longer period of time. Also, the scores for the control group could be closer to the average score of twelve. The game could also be framed in a way that makes luck less of the objective, so those who are "luckier" do not feel the entitlement that comes along with that success and luck.

If there is an effect of frustration on unethical behavior, and the study did not find it due to limitations or methodology flaws, this would be important for society to understand. Certain groups in our society experience frustration disproportionately to other groups. Be it financial and socioeconomic inequality, racial inequality, or gender inequality, this leads to certain people being more susceptible and likely to commit unethical, immoral, or criminal acts. Because of the

frequency of these unethical and criminal activities, it would be beneficial for us to know certain triggers, such as frustration, as to be able to reduce those emotional triggers. This would then reduce some criminal behaviors. Beyond the scope of the criminal realm, high-stress, frustration-inducing situations occur in daily life. Employees in their business settings, students in academic settings, workers in health care or social services positions may be under high stress situations. If because of their high stress they are more likely to cheat in their respective settings, much damage would be done to our society in incalculable amounts of ways and avenues.

If there was an opposite effect than the one hypothesized in this study, meaning an effect of luck and success on unethical behavior, this would be equally important and significant information for our society. Research has already found evidence that these positive emotions can and do increase unethical behavior. Positive affect promotes the ability to morally disengage, which, in turn, leads to dishonest behavior (Vincent et al., 2012). Positive emotions such as happiness, successfulness, and contentedness can facilitate moral disengagement, which then increases the spectrum of behaviors which a person views as moral. Because of this increased spectrum of moral behaviors, a person may act in a way that would previously be thought of as immoral, but now falls on the moral spectrum (Vincent, et al., 2012).

Being aware of the effects or non-effects of frustration on unethical behavior is still very important and imperative in understanding the nature and cause of individuals' unethical behaviors. While it is unclear whether this study had an effect that could not be found due to limitations, did not have an effect, or had an opposite effect, it is still an important topic to consider. Reward systems built into our society could be having detrimental effects that we are unaware of. Society in general is centered around the concept that money benefits individuals, and that is the reason people strive to attain it so much. However, research suggests that wealth

can have detrimental consequences when discrepancies in both having and being able to attain wealth exists between groups (Gino & Pierce, 2009). This research is very relevant in our country today, with the inequality of wealth as large as it is.

In addition, even small unethical behaviors have detrimental effects on our economy, our families, and our friends. A typical organization loses approximately 5% of its revenue to fraud, resulting in a global loss of 2.9 trillion dollars annually (Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, 2010). In 2010, 32,885 people were killed in vehicle accidents, roughly 1/3 of which (10,530 people) were killed in crashes caused by speeding and/or aggressive, driving behaviors, which were in violation of one or more laws (Governors Highway Safety Association, 2010). One thing is clear; it is truly imperative to further our understanding of the many every-day situations that may tempt us to act in ways that harm others and benefit ourselves.

References

Comment [1]: double-check them for APA-style ...so, make sure all the journal titles are there and italicized; the list of articles is indented (so, first line left-justified, additional lines of the same references hanging). No spaces between different articles.

Agnew, R.. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces, 64*(1), 151–167.

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology, 30*(1), 47-87.

Agnew, R. (1997). Stability and change in crime over the life course: A strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Advances in Criminological Theory*, (7), 101-132.

Agnew, R.S. (2007). Strain theory and violent behavior. The cambridge handbook of violent behavior and aggression. Cambridge University Press. New York, NY.

Agnew, R., Brezina, T., & Wright, J.P. (2002). Strain, personality traits, and delinquency: Extending general strain theory. *Criminology, 40*(1).

Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*(1), 59-73.

Berkowitz, L., & LePage, A. (1967). Weapons as aggression-eliciting stimuli. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7*, 202–207.

Blanchette, I. (2006). Snakes, spiders, guns, and syringes: How specific are evolutionary constraints on the detection of threatening stimuli? *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 59*(8), 1484–1504.

Breuer, J., & Freud, S. (1955). *Studies on hysteria* (Standard ed., Vol II). London:Hogarth. (Original work published 1893-1895)

Burnstein, E., & Worchel, P. (1962). Arbitrariness of frustration and its consequences for aggression in a social situation. *Journal of Personality; 30*, 528-541.

Bushman, B., Baumeister, R., & Phillips, C. (2001). Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis Beliefs, Affect Regulation Opportunity, And Aggressive Responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 17-32.

Cialdini, Robert B., and Douglas T. Kenrick (1976), Altruism and hedonism: A social development perspective on the relationship of negative mood state and helping," Journal o f Personality and Social Psychology, 34(May), 907-914.

Cialdini, Robert B., B. L. Darby, and J. E. Vincent (1973), "Transgression and altruism: a case for hedonism," J*ournal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9,* 502-516.

Craciun, G. M. (2006). *Mood effects on ordinary unethical behavior* (Order No. 3224422). Available from ABI/INFORM Global. (305274370). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/305274370?accountid=8268

Dollard, J., Miller, N. E., Doob, L. W., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression.* Yale University Press.

Duchon, D., & Drake, B.. (2009). Organizational narcissism and virtuous behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 85*(3), 301–308.

Ellwanger, S. J., & Pratt, T. C. (2014). Self-control, negative affect, and young driver aggression: An assessment of competing theoretical claims. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 58*(1), 85-106. doi:10.1177/0306624X12462830

Gino, F., & Pierce, L. (2009). The abundance effect: Unethical behavior in the presence of wealth. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 109*(2), 142.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime.* Stanford University Press. Redwood City, CA.

Governors Highway Safety Association (2010). Survey of the states: speeding and aggressive driving.

Hemenway, D., Vriniotis, M., & Miller, M. (2006). Is an armed society a polite society? Guns and road rage. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 38(*4), 687–695.

Isen, Alice M., Kimberly A. Daubman, and Gary P. Novicki (1987), "Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 1122-1131.

Isen, Alice M., and Kimberly A. Daubman (1984), "The influence of affect on categorization," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 1206-1217.

Larsen, R. (2000). Toward a science of mood regulation. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 129-141

Merton, R.. (1957). Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, Illinois:The FreePress.

Moore, B. S., B. Underwood, and D. L. Rosenhan (1973), "Affect and altruism," *Developmental Psychology, 8*, 99-194.

Piff, P. Does money make you mean? (2014). . Washington, D.C.: NPR. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/2014/04/04/295360962/does-money-make-you-mean.

Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Côté, S., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Keltner, D. (2012). Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*(11), 4086-4091.

Pratt, T.C. & Francis, T. (2000). The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: a meta-analysis. *Criminology, (38)*3. 931-964.

Rebellon, C. J., Piquero, N. L., Piquero, A. R., & Thaxton, S. (2009). Do frustrated economic expectations and objective economic inequity promote crime? A randomized experiment testing agnew's general strain theory. *European Journal of Criminology*, *6*(1), 47-71.

Russell, S. M., & James, L. R. (2008). Recording lying, cheating, and defiance in an internet based simulated environment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *24*(5), 2014-2025.

Sanchez, Anahi; Lello Ivacevich, Maria Gabriela; Brussino, Silvina; Reyna, Cecilia; (2011). The buss-perry aggression questionnaire: construct validity and gender invariance among argentinean adolescents. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 30-37.

Vincent, L. C., Emich, K. J., & Goncalo, J. A. (2012). *Stretching the moral gray zone: positive affect, moral disengagement and dishonesty.*

Http://Aspe.hhs.gov/index.pdf. Retrieved from

http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/09/vulnerableyouth/3/index.shtml

Table 1
Number of Participants Who Cheated by Over-reporting (by amount -9 or -15)

Condition					
	.00	1.00	8.00	9.00	Total
Frustration (-9)	15	0	2	0	17
No Frustration (-15)	17	1	0	1	19
Total	32	1	2	1	36

Appendix

1. Research Participation Consent Form
2. Research Participation Debriefing Form (part 1)
3. Instructions for Participants
4. Research Participation Debriefing Form (part 2)
5. Mood Survey and Demographics Questions

Appendix 1

Research Participation Consent Form

The Effect of Luck on Mood
Allegheny College
Department of Psychology

Purpose of Research: The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of perceived luck on mood.

Procedure: I understand that I will be asked to participate in a randomized dice rolling game, clicking on a computer image of a dice to roll a six-sided dice for multiple rounds to determine luck. I will then be asked a series of demographics and mood-assessing questions. I will be prompted by the computer program to enter my last round score into the computer, as I will receive that number of tickets to enter into a raffle to win one of three $25 gift cards to The Market House Grille. In all, the study should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Risks to the Individual: I understand that there will be no more risk other than what is normally experienced in everyday life.

Compensation: I understand that I may receive extra credit at the discretion of my instructor, and that I can choose to be entered into a raffle to win to one of three $25 dollar gift cards to the Market House Grille.

Confidentiality: I understand that my name will never be associated with the data I provide and will be completely confidential. I understand that the researcher is interested in patterns in the data as a whole as opposed to individual scores. Any reports made based on the data will focus solely on these general patterns.
Furthermore, I understand that all data will be stored under lock and key in the Psychology Department at Allegheny College. I understand that my consent form will be stored in a locked cabinet separately from my data. When the data I provide today are no longer needed, they will be destroyed.

Voluntary Nature of Participation: I understand that I do NOT have to participate in this experiment. Furthermore, upon beginning the experiment, I may choose to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty. I understand that I may skip any individual questions that I do not wish to answer, and I may choose not to participate in any part of the study without being questioned.

Contact Information: If I have any questions about this research project, I can contact Laura Cottington at cottingtonl@allegheny.edu or the research advisor, Dr. Lydia E. Jackson at ljackson2@allegheny.edu or at (814) 332 5955. If I have questions or concerns about the treatment of research participants, I can contact Dr. Jialu Streeter, Chair of the Allegheny Institutional Review Board (IRB) at jstreeter@allegheny.edu.

I understand that my signature below indicates that I am at least 18 years of age at the time of my participation in this study, and that I have a received a copy of this informed consent form. I have carefully read and understood the information on this form and all of my questions thus far have been answered. I hereby agree to participate in the study.

Participant's Signature _____ date _____

Participant's Name (print) _____ date _____

Researcher's Signature (YOUR NAME) _____ date _____

Appendix 2

Research Participation Debriefing Form

Effect of Luck on Mood
Allegheny College
Department of Psychology

Purpose of Research: The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of luck on mood. To test this relationship, luck was measured from a dice rolling game and studied to see its effect on the mood of participants.

Compensation: Some students may receive extra credit from their professors for their participation if the course allows it. Participants may also enter their name into a raffle to win one of three $25 gift cards to Market House.

Confidentiality: The data you provided for this research project will be confidential and your name will never be associated with your results. Furthermore, when your data is no longer needed, it will be shredded.

Contact Information: If you have any questions about this research project, please consult the information below:

Experimenter: Laura Cottington E-mail: cottingtonl@allegheny.edu
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Lydia E. Jackson E-mail: ljackson2@allegheny.edu
IRB Committee Chair: Dr. Jialu Streeter E-mail: jstreeter@allegheny.edu
Counseling Center (Reis Hall Room 304) - (814) 332-4368

If you would like a copy of the results of this research study, please fill out and tear off the bottom portion of this debriefing statement and return it to the researcher.

I would like to receive a summary of the results of this study.
Yes O No O
If yes, what is your Box #? _____

Appendix 3

The Effects of Luck on Mood

Hello! Thank you for participating in my study!

This study will examine the effects of perceived luck on mood. The study will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. For your time and participation, you will be award 1 Sona credit at the instruction of your professor, and you will earn raffle tickets you can enter to win one of three $25.00 Gift Cards to The Market House Grille.

The computer is designed with a virtual dice rolling program. Once logged on the computer, and beginning the study, you will be prompted by the computer to take a virtual "roll" of the dice. The computer will determine your rolls, and display the first of the four rolls each round. To continue, follow the instructions on the screen to see each roll. You will have three rounds of dice rolling, each round consisting of four rolls. At the end of each round, you should total your score by adding your four rolls together and writing them down to solidify your luck in your memory before completing the next round. After you complete the 3rd round, you may discard your score sheet. At the end of your three rounds, you will be prompted to answer a few demographics questions and complete a short mood survey.To compensate you for your time and participation, you will be awarded raffle tickets to win one of the three $25.00 gift cards. You will be rewarded with as many tickets as you roll in your third round. To make the experimenter aware of how many tickets to enter with your name, at the end of the testing, the computer will prompt you to enter your third round score total.

When you have finished the questionnaire and entered your total, the study will be completed! Thanks so much again for your participation in my study!

Appendix 4

Research Participation Debriefing Form, Part 2

The Effect of Frustration on Unethical Behavior
Allegheny College
Department of Psychology

Purpose of Research: You are receiving this second debriefing form in regards to a research project you participated in. This second debriefing form is necessary because the true purpose of the study could not be revealed to you immediately after your testing session was complete so the validity of the project could be upheld. The setup of the study required that some information be withheld from participants at the time so the data collected could be accurate. The true purpose of the study entitled The Effect of Luck on Mood, was actual to test the effect of frustration on unethical behavior. The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of frustration on unethical behavior. Previous research has shown a relationship between frustration and aggression, as well as a link between aggression and criminal activity. There is a gap in research as to whether there is a direct effect of frustration itself on criminal behaviors.. Because it is difficult or impossible to examine and test criminal activity, I wanted to test the effect on unethical behaviors that are common to everyone, such as cheating. However, studying cheating is difficult also to study in a lab if a participant knows that the study is testing cheating behaviors. It is also problematic to reveal the purpose of the study because students on campus could discuss the true purpose with classmates who may participate in this study, or a study similar to it. Because the study aimed to collect data on unethical behavior, the true purpose of the study could not be revealed until all the data was collected to ensure the validity of the data collected. The hypothesis of the study was the participants who were frustrated by rolling a significantly low score on the third round of dice rolling as compared to significantly high rolls for the first two rounds, would overreport their third round score at the end of the study. I hope that you understand why I could not reveal the true purpose and intent of the study sooner, as I was waiting until data collection was completed. Please feel free to reach out to me or my advisor if you have any questions or concerns remaining.

Compensation: Some students may receive extra credit from their professors for their participation if the course allows it. Participants may also enter their name into a raffle to win one of three $25 gift cards to Market House.

Confidentiality: The data you provided for this research project will be confidential and your name will never be associated with your results. Furthermore, when your data is no longer needed, it will be shredded.

To Learn More: For further information about this topic, please consult the following sources:

Rebellon, C. J., Piquero, N. L., Piquero, A. R., & Thaxton, S. (2009). Do frustrated economic expectations and objective economic inequity promote crime? A randomized experiment testing agnew's general strain theory. *European Journal of Criminology, 6*(1), 47-71. doi:10.1177/1477370808098105

Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*(1), 59-73. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.106.1.59

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime.* Stanford University Press

Contact Information: If you have any questions about this research project, please consult the information below:

Experimenter: Laura Cottington E-mail: cottingtonl@allegheny.edu
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Lydia E. Jackson E-mail: ljackson2@allegheny.edu
IRB Committee Chair: Dr. Jialu Streeter E-mail: jstreeter@allegheny.edu
Counseling Center (Reis Hall Room 304) - (814) 332-4368

Appendix 5

Post-test Mood Questionnaire

Please select a number 1 through 7 for each question the computer prompts you to answer.

1. On a scale of 1 to 7, how **lucky** are you feeling right now?
2. On a scale of 1 to 7, how **sad** are you feeling right now?
3. On a scale of 1 to 7, how **frustrated** are you feeling right now?
4. On a scale of 1 to 7, how **agitated** are you feeling right now?
5. On a scale of 1 to 7, how **content** are you feeling right now?
6. On a scale of 1 to 7, how **satisfied** are you feeling right now?
7. On a scale of 1 to 7, how **disappointed** are you feeling right now?

Demographics Questions

Please answer the following questions as the computer prompts you.

1. Please select your gender- Male Female Transgender Do not wish to disclose
2. Please enter your age.
3. Please select your class standing at Allegheny College- Freshmen Sophomore Junior Senior
4. Please select your race/ethnicity. Check all that apply.
   - American Indian/Alaska Native
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Hispanic
   - Latio/Latina
   - Other