**Study**: In this study, participants were given various news articles to read that discussed the use of chemical weapons in Syria. After reading these articles, they were then instructed to write how they felt about the use of chemical weapons for five to ten minutes. Those writings were analyzed for different markers of linguistic styles (described below). Instead of doing a traditional ANOVA to see if there are group differences between men and women’s writing, we will be predicting gender from their writing patterns.

**Important:** You will find that the predictors are likely not significant. This analysis is practice, so interpret the predictors in the write up/analysis as if they were significant.

**Binominal Simultaneous Log Regression**

IV X-Variables: All variables are z-scored ranges calculated from the raw word frequencies. A person who scores a 0 on any of these scales uses around an average range of complex thinking/honesty/status, etc. A score that is negative indicates that they use less honest/categorical/complex language, while positive scores indicate they use more honest/categorical/complex language.

* Honesty – a marker of how much a person uses deceptive or misleading language.
* Status – a marker of how much a person uses inclusive pronouns (we – high scores indicate more inclusive status) versus exclusive pronouns (I – low scores indicate a more individualistic status).
* Complex thinking – a marker of how much complexity exists in the writing: high scores are more complex, low scores are less complex.
* Cognitive processing – a marker of how much a person wrote about the relationships between things: high scores indicate more causal explanations, while low scores are more simplistic thinking.
* Psychological distancing – a marker of how much a person is relating to an event: high psychological distancing is more abstract thinking, while low scores are more personal thought processes.

DV – Y-variable:

* Gender: 1 = men, 2 = women

1. Data screening:
   1. Accuracy – you can assume the data are accurate.
   2. Missing data:
      1. Include a box with a missing data line to show the data has/has no missing data.
      2. Fix/list what you did with the missing data if necessary.
   3. Multicollinearity:
      1. Include a correlation table of the IVs.
      2. Do you have any multicollinearity issues?
   4. Ratio of cases:
      1. Include a table that indicates how many people are in each category of the DV.
      2. Do you have an appropriate ratio of cases?
2. Analysis
   1. Overall model:
      1. Block 0
         1. Include the classification table for Block 0.
         2. Include the variables in the equation box for Block 0.
         3. Was block 0 significant? Write up the chi-square statistic in APA style.
      2. Block 1
         1. Include the test of model coefficient box for Block 1.
         2. Include the model summary box for Block 1.
         3. Was block 1 significant? Write up the chi-square statistic in APA style.
         4. Include the Hosmer-Lemeshow statistic box (both boxes).
         5. Was the Hosmer-Lemeshow statistic significant? Write up the chi-square statistic in APA style.
         6. Include the classification table for Block 1.
   2. Coefficients
      1. Include the variables in the equation box for block 1.
      2. Create a table of the variables indicating which variables were better predictors for men and which were better predictors for women (pretend they were significant).
3. Write up:
   1. Include a short description of variables/analysis.
   2. Include a brief section on the data screening/assumptions.
   3. Model summary:
      1. Block statistics chi-square values and effect size
      2. Hosmer-Lemeshow
      3. Classification information
   4. Coefficients:
      1. Table of coefficient values (be sure to look at the style for these).
      2. Interpret the coefficients, describe their effects as if they were significant.