Making an Appealing Conference Poster

Michael T. Warren, Ph.D.
Institute for the Study of Human Flourishing
The University of Oklahoma

Academic Conferences

Purpose:
- See what's new
- Share research
- Get feedback
- Network
- See old friends
- Travel the world

Why Posters?

- Reach tons of people
- Promote your work
- More time (60-90 min)
- One-on-one conversations
- Feedback before publication

The Essentials

Introduction (including hypotheses)
Participants/Sample
Measures
Analytic Plan
Results (with tables and figures)
Discussion/Conclusions
References (optional)
Visual(s) (optional)

Design Tips

- Catchy (but relevant) title
- Make it visual! (with high-quality images)
- Keep font size consistent
- Light background with dark text

Easy to read
Hard to read
**Hurts to read**

Design Tips

- "White space" is good
- Use bullets
- Make main point stand out
- Give people a reason to stop and talk to you!

Yikes!

Professionalism

- Cite your sources
- Include contact info
- Dress the part
- Smile and make eye-contact
- Give people time
- It's okay if you don't know everything

BGSU.

REACTIONS TO RELIGIOUS THREAT: SUPPORT FOR TREATING RELIGIOUS IDENTITY AS A PART OF SOCIAL IDENTITY IN OLDER ADOLESCENTS

Cjersti Jensen*[1], Robert Hymes[2], Roger Loeb[2], Erin Baker[1], Marie S. Tisak[1]
[1]Bowling Green State University [2]University of Michigan-Dearborn

INTRODUCTION

- Social Identity
  - Social identity: any membership in a social group that becomes part of the self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1979)
  - Threat to identity: perception that one's in-group is being threatened, discriminated against, or put down (Major & O'Brien, 2005).
  - Social identity theory: suggests that threats to a specific social identity cause a defensive reaction in the form of stronger in-group identification (Duckitt, 1989; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).
- Evidence for Religion as Social Identity
  - Little empirical evidence directly links religion to social identity.
  - Shaffer & Hastings (2007) Religious participants responded with higher levels of fundamentalism and more identification with their religion after facing religious threat as compared to their non-threatened counterparts.
  - Ysseldyk, Matheson, & Anisman (2010) Because religion is a major part of identity, threats to religious beliefs likely elicit similar responses as threats to other parts of social identity.
- Current Study
  - Aim: to determine if responses to threat towards religious beliefs are similar to responses to threat towards other aspects of social identity.
  - Hypotheses
    1. All participants will increase their religiosity scores after the threat.
    2. Threats with the strongest credibility will elicit the strongest changes in religiosity.
    3. Participants with higher religiosity scores would have the most dramatic increase in religiosity after the threat.

METHODS

Participants

- **Recruitment:** University of Michigan-Dearborn psychology subject pool 2014
- **Religion:** P's identified as Christian in order to be eligible (n=60), 50% identified as Catholic
- **Mean Age :** 19.7 years old
- **Gender:** 2/3 female and 1/3 male
- **Race:** 68.3% White, 16.6% African American, 5% Hispanic, 3.3% Arabic, 3.3% Asian, and 3.3% Other

Materials

- **General Religiosity Scale** (GRS, adapted from Kendler et al., 2003)
- **Fabricated "News" Articles:** Pre-Required Military Service (to mask purpose) and Anti-Christian
  - Anti-Christian articles varied by credibility of the news source and quotes, with strong, medium, and weak conditions.
- Other measures were included as part of a larger study.

Procedure

- **Random assignment:** strong, medium, and weak credibility.
- **Pre-test:** P's completed questionnaires including the GRS.
- **Threat:** P's read articles one at a time. To ensure close reading, p's had to summarize and answer questions about the articles.
- **Post-test:** P's were given the GRS and other measures a second time after reading the Anti-Christian article.

RESULTS

Three mixed, repeated-measures ANOVAS were conducted, along with other tests where appropriate. Fifty-seven participants completed both the religiosity pre-test and the post-test.

1. **Overall effects:** The differences between the GRS post-test and the pre-test were not significant.
2. **Condition:** There were no significant changes in religiosity score from pre-test to post-test when the sample was divided by condition.
3. **Level of Religiosity:** High (n=21), Moderate (n=18), and Low (n=18) Religiosity groups were created using a tertiary split of the pre-test scores.
   - Differences in pre-test and post-test means: A mixed repeated measures ANOVA between groups was significant (GRS Score*Group within effects: F=7.508, p<0.01; Group between effects: F=136.31, p<0.01).
     - Post-hoc analysis: all three groups differed significantly (p<0.01).
   - Changes in Religiosity by Group: Three paired samples t-tests revealed that the differences in pre-test and post-test means were significant for the high and low groups only (see table below).

CHANGE IN RELIGIOSITY MEANS[+] BY GROUP

Low Religiosity	Moderate Religiosity	High Religiosity
75.61 / 72.28	101.94 / 101.33	129.91 / 132.19

■ Pre-Test Means ■ Post-Test Means

DIFFERENCES IN POST-TEST AND PRE-TEST MEANS BY GROUP

Group	Post-test – Pre-test	t	p
High	2.29	2.73	0.01*
Moderate	-0.61	-0.73	0.48
Low	-3.33	-2.40	0.03*

*Indicates that the difference between pre-test and post-test scores was significant
+ Possible scores on the General Religiosity Scale range from 30-150

DISCUSSION

- Lack of Changes in Religiosity by Condition
  - Though non-significant, the finding that source credibility does not matter is important because it could suggest that religious older adolescents view any religious threat as dangerous, regardless of source.
- Changes in Religiosity by Group
  - **High:** Significantly more likely to react with stronger in-group identification after faced with a threat to their religious beliefs.
  - **Moderate:** Did not appear to react to the threat.
  - **Low:** Responded with significantly lowered religiosity.
  - **Social Identity Theory:** These findings were consistent with SIT. Strong identification led to a need to protect the in-group and weak identification led to a need to protect the self by distancing oneself from the in-group (Tajfel and Turner, 1979).
- Implications
  - **Erikson's Psychosocial stages (1968):** Late adolescence is vital for forming identity and intimate connections with others. This makes social identity a key issue for this age group.
  - **Social Identity:** Based on these findings, religion functions not only as a belief system, but also as a part of social identity.
  - **Practical Application:** Older adolescents with high religiosity may not be able to integrate threatening information effectively.
- Future Studies
  - Should increase generalizability and investigate: parental variables, intrinsic vs extrinsic belief types, non-Christian religions, younger samples
- Limitations
  - **Limited Sample:** Only Christian Participants
  - **Low n:** can led to issues with statistical power and confidence

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Robert Siegle, Lauren Anthony, Melissa Maczuga, William Isom, and Olivia Deyonker for their tireless assistance with data collection.

CONTACT INFORMATION

For more information on this study, please contact Cjersti Jensen at cjensen@bgsu.edu.

Award Winning Sample Poster

Effect of High School Leadership Training on Adolescent Self-Reported Moral Ideal, Cognitive Autonomy, and Social Responsibility

Andy Harris, Troy E. Beckert, Myles Maxey, Liam Fischback, & Jesse P. Higgins

Department of Family, Consumer, and Human Development, Utah State University

Introduction

Adolescence is an important stage in life for one's identity development including areas of morality (Eisenberg et al., 2014), autonomy (Lee & Beckert, 2012), and social responsibility (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011). Scholars have linked higher levels of civic engagement, volunteerism, and leadership, to higher levels of psychosocial development and identity in adolescents (Crocetti et al. 2012, Pancer et al. 2007). While many leadership programs are designed to provide leadership skills and encourage civic engagement to high achieving adolescents, little is known about how well these programs also enhance adolescent psychosocial development. **The purpose of this study was to determine whether participants experienced changes in various psychosocial domains consistent with program goals.**

Background

- Many programs are available to exemplar and motivated high school students designed to further empower them.
- The Hugh O'Brian Youth (HOBY) Leadership state seminars base their curriculum on the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership.
- The SCM posits that leaders need to develop values in three domains (individual, group, and societal) and work with followers to create positive social change (Komives & Wagner, 2012).
  - Individual domain values include: Consciousness of Self, Congruence, and Commitment.
  - Group domain values include: Collaboration, Common Purpose, and Controversy with Civility.
  - The Societal domain value is: Citizenship.
- Moral ideal (Hardy et al., 2014) and the self-evaluation, comparative validation, and evaluative thinking subscales of cognitive autonomy (Beckert, 2007) align with the individual domain of the SCM.
- The decision making and voicing opinion subscales of cognitive autonomy align with the group domain of the SCM.
- Social responsibility (Pancer et al., 2007) aligns with the societal domain of the SCM.

Research Question: What effects does a high school leadership training seminar have on adolescent psychosocial development?

Methods

Participants:
- High school sophomores from the greater Mountain West, participating in a Hugh O'Brian Youth (HOBY) Leadership Seminar (n=114; female=70, male=37, unknown=7) completed questionnaires before and after the three day seminar. One year later, a small group of participants (n=15) completed a follow-up survey.

Measures:
- **Social Responsibility:** Measured using Pancer's Youth Social Responsibility Scale (YSR) – Short Form (Pancer et al., 2007) which contains 10 items measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree. (eg. "Teenagers should just enjoy themselves and not worry about things like poverty and the environment").
- **Cognitive Autonomy:** Measured using the Cognitive Autonomy and Self-Evaluation (CASE) inventory (Beckert, 2007) which contains 27 items measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree. The CASE Inventory is broken into five subscales: Evaluative Thinking (eg. "I think about the consequences of my decisions."), Voicing Opinions (eg. "I feel that my opinions are valuable enough to share."), Comparative Validation (eg. "I care about what others think of me."), Decision Making (eg. "I can tell my way of thinking has improved with age."), and Self-Evaluation (eg. "I am good at identifying my own strengths.").
- **Moral Ideal:** Measured using the Moral Ideal Self Scale (Hardy et al., 2014). Participants rank 30 attributes (eg. "does good actions, generous, good example, compassionate") using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Not At All to 7 = Very Much based on the prompt: "When you think about the future, what do you want yourself to be like?".

Results

Paired sample t-test analysis (pretest/posttest) revealed statistically significant improvements in self-reported levels of social responsibility, moral ideal, and four of five areas of cognitive autonomy (evaluative thinking, voicing opinions, comparative validation, and decision making).

Moral Ideal Self

Cognitive Autonomy

Social Responsibility

Table 1. Paired-sample t-tests for pretest and posttest of HOBY participants

Instrument	Pre Seminar M	Pre Seminar SD	Post Seminar M	Post Seminar SD	t-test
Moral Ideal Self (m=81)	6.07	(.788)	6.38	(.689)	4.64*
Social Responsibility (m=81)	4.47	(.386)	4.72	(.390)	6.77*
Cognitive Autonomy					
Evaluative Thinking (m=82)	3.86	(.439)	4.23	(.472)	5.33*
Voicing Opinions (m=82)	3.94	(.547)	4.11	(.544)	4.07*
Comparative Validation (m=82)	2.89	(.563)	3.15	(.693)	4.06*
Decision Making (m=82)	4.13	(.359)	4.42	(.353)	7.07*
Self-Evaluation (m=82)	3.54	(.433)	3.65	(.760)	1.70

* = p ≤ .000.

Repeated measures ANOVA analysis of the Follow-up surveys revealed a slight regression from Post survey data. Findings were statistically significant in the same categories except for voicing opinions.

Table 2. Repeated measures ANOVA for pretest, posttest, and follow-up test of HOBY participants

Instrument	Pretest M	Pretest SD	Posttest M	Posttest SD	Follow-up M	Follow-up SD	F	Sig.
Moral Ideal Self (n=11)	5.99	(.625)	6.25	(.568)	6.08	(.567)	1.628	0.249
Social Responsibility (n=15)	4.36	(.442)	4.77	(.229)	4.49	(.264)	11.9	0.001
Cognitive Autonomy								
Evaluative Thinking (n=15)	3.86	(.356)	4.23	(.502)	4.14	(.502)	4.72	0.029
Voicing Opinions (n=15)	3.99	(.583)	4.16	(.633)	4.15	(.536)	1.55	0.250
Comparative Validation (n=15)	3.03	(.570)	3.48	(.627)	3.21	(.750)	11.7	0.001
Decision Making (n=15)	3.98	(.412)	4.51	(.378)	4.23	(.422)	14.5	0.001
Self-Evaluation (n=14)	3.62	(.597)	3.55	(.833)	3.48	(.535)	0.549	0.592

Discussion

- Results from pretest posttest analysis demonstrate significant change in psychosocial areas of moral ideal, social responsibility, and cognitive autonomy as a result of attending this leadership seminar. This shows that in addition to the intended outcomes of enhanced leadership skills and increased civic engagement, youth participants see increases in other important areas of psychosocial development.

- Results from analysis of follow-up data show a slight regression in scores from posttest. However, in no area, where increases were observed from pretest to posttest, did the regression reach pretest levels. In fact, significant retention in changes in the areas of social responsibility, evaluative thinking, decision making, and comparative validation suggest some long-term efficacy of this leadership seminar.

- Future research could extend beyond a homogeneous sample of exemplary students to determine whether a seminar such as this would be valuable to an at risk population. We also suggest the use of a longitudinal design to track stability of changes over time as well as outcome variables for participants of leadership conferences such as this.

References

Beckert, T. E. (2007). Cognitive autonomy and self-evaluation in adolescence: A conceptual investigation and instrument development. North American Journal of Psychology, 9(3), 579—594.
Crocetti, E., Erentaitė, R., & Žukauskienė, R. (2014). Identity styles, positive youth development, and civic engagement in adolescence. Journal of youth and adolescence, 43(11), 1818-1828.
Eisenberg, N., Hofer, C., Sulik, M. J., & Liew, J. (2014). The development of prosocial moral reasoning and a prosocial orientation in young adulthood: Concurrent and longitudinal correlates. Developmental psychology, 50(1), 58.
Hardy, S. A., Walker, L. J., Olsen, J. A., Woodbury, R. D., & Hickman, J. R. (2014) Moral identity as moral ideal self: Links to adolescent outcomes. Developmental Psychology, 50(1), 45-57.
Komives, S. R., & Wagner, W. (2012). Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (2nd Edition). Somerset, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
Lee, C. T., & Beckert, T. E. (2012). Taiwanese adolescent cognitive autonomy and identity development: The relationship of situational and agential factors. International Journal of Psychology, 47(1), 39-50.
Pancer, S. M., Pratt, M., Hunsberger, B. & Alisat, S. (2007). Community and political involvement in adolescence: What distinguishes the activists from the uninvolved? Journal of Community Psychology, 35(6), 741—759.
Wray-Lake, L., & Syvertsen, A. K. (2011). The developmental roots of social responsibility in childhood and adolescence. In C. A. Flanagan & B. D. Christens (Eds.), Youth civic development: Work at the cutting edge. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 134, 11-25.

Acknowledgments

A special thanks to HOBY International and HOBY Utah for allowing us to collect data from participants of their program.

Miscellaneous

- Standard Size – 36" x 48"
- Use handouts for attendees to take home (optional)
- Sign-up sheet for more information (optional)
- Carrying your poster – poster tubes if traveling long distance

Resources

Tips and Articles:
http://www.csun.edu/plunk/documents/poster_presentation.pdf
http://colinpurrington.com/tips/poster-design
http://www.apa.org/gradpsych/2011/01/poster.aspx
https://chroniclevitae.com/news/379-seduction-in-the-poster-session

Getting Critical Feedback:
https://www.flickr.com/groups/pimpmyposter/   (Get critiques from friends and strangers)
http://betterposters.blogspot.com/   (Dr. Zen critiques posters)