Hope College

Hope College Digital Commons

23rd Annual A. Paul and Carol C. Schaap Celebration of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity (2024)

The A. Paul and Carol C. Schaap Celebration of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity

4-12-2024

What Makes a Host Unique? A Prototype Analysis

Tyler Kennedy Hope College

Tasia Parsons Hope College

Lauren Zago Hope College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.hope.edu/curca_23



Part of the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Repository citation: Kennedy, Tyler; Parsons, Tasia; and Zago, Lauren, "What Makes a Host Unique? A Prototype Analysis" (2024). 23rd Annual A. Paul and Carol C. Schaap Celebration of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity (2024). Paper 49.

https://digitalcommons.hope.edu/curca_23/49

April 12, 2024. Copyright © 2024 Hope College, Holland, Michigan.

This Poster is brought to you for free and open access by the The A. Paul and Carol C. Schaap Celebration of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity at Hope College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in 23rd Annual A. Paul and Carol C. Schaap Celebration of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity (2024) by an authorized administrator of Hope College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@hope.edu, barneycj@hope.edu.



What Makes a Host Unique? A Prototype Analysis

Tyler Kennedy, Tasia Parsons, Lauren Zago, Dr. Benjamin Meagher (Faculty Mentor) Hope College

For more information, contact: Benjamin Meagher Hope College 616-395-7731 meagher@hope.edu

Background Literature

The concepts of hosting and hospitality have been in human culture for thousands of years. However, it has rarely been investigated through a psychological lens (cf., Meagher et al., 2022).

We performed a prototype analysis (Samuelson et al., 2014) to discover what people associate with the social role of a good host. Specifically, we test for conceptual overlap between this term and two related social categories: a good visitor and a good person.

Study 1: Methods

assigned to one of three categories (good host,

good visitor or good person). They were then

asked to generate ten words to describe their

We recruited 300 participants through an

online panel, who were then randomly

assigned social category.

Good Host				
Term	Study 1 Frequency	Study 2 Mean	Study 2 SD	
Welcoming	43	6.4	0.819	
Hospitable	8	6.36	0.913	
Inviting	6	6.23	0.827	
Accommodating	20	6.17	0.887	
Friendly	42	6.14	0.96	
Nice	15	6.09	1.006	
Polite	12	6.08	0.889	
Considerate	12	6.04	0.955	

Term	Study 1 Frequency	Study 2 Mea		
Leaves when appropriate	15	6.03		
Respectful	58	6.02		
Trustworthy	7	6		
Considerate	24	5.99		
Polite	42	5.96		
Friendly	40	5.93		
Courteous	20	5.89		
Well mannered	10	5.88		

Good Visitor

Study 2: Methods

A new set of 313 participants through an online panel rated the terms generated in the first study by their prototypicality using a 7-point Likert scale.

Results

Study 1:

After collapsing synonymous responses, we found 68 terms for a good host, 70 terms for a good visitor and 62 terms for a good person. A 0.78 shared to unique ratio was found between host and visitor, 0.48 for visitor and person, and 0.40 for host and person, showing the importance of the home location in how these social roles are viewed.

Study 2:

A pair of paired samples t-tests were conducted for each social category, in order to compare the mean rating of shared terms to the mean rating of unique terms. Across all comparisons, shared terms were rated as significantly more prototypical than unique terms, indicating substantial conceptual overlap. However, the effect size of this difference was weakest comparing a good host to a good person.

Conclusions

We found more conceptual overlap than differences across our three categories. However, across both studies the least overlap was found between a good host and a generic good person, indicating that there are unique aspects of this role as a social virtue.

Good Person				
Term	Study 1 Frequency	Study 2 Mean	Study 2 SD	
Trustworthy	26	6.27	0.88	
Compassionate	25	6.24	0.86	
Caring	35	6.16	0.921	
Considerate	9	6.16	0.86	
Honest	60	6.16	0.942	
Sincere	12	6.12	0.968	
Ethical	3	6.12	0.863	
Understanding	17	6.1	0.842	

Study 2 SD

1.092

0.965

1.141

0.944

1.042

0.998

1.004

1.027

Study 2:

	Only
thers, but close to home: The relationship between home attachment and ment	
101516. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101516 Samuelson, P. L., Jarvine	en, M. Only

References: Meagher, B. R., & Cheadle, A. D. (2020). Distant from other health during COVID-19. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 72, J., Paulus, T. B., Church, I. M., Hardy, S. A., & Barrett, J. L. (2014). Implicit theories of intellectual virtues and vices: A focus on intellectual humility. The Journal of Positive Psychology, 10(5), 389–406. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.967802

home

Mean Comparison	t-test	p-value	Cohen's D
Only Host vs Host and Visitor	-5.317	<0.001	-0.521
Only Host vs Host and Person	2.088	0.39	-0.205
Only Visitor vs Visitor and Host	-4.46	<0.001	-0.437
Only Visitor vs Visitor and Person	-7.891	<0.001	-0.774
Only Person vs Person and Host	-3.681	<0.001	-0.359
Only Person vs Person and Visitor	-4.271	<0.001	-0.417



What Makes a Host Unique? A Prototype Analysis

Tyler Kennedy, Tasia Parsons, Lauren Zago, Dr. Benjamin Meagher Hope College, Holland, MI.

For more information, contact: Benjamin Meagher Hope College 616-395-7731 meagher@hope.edu (Faculty Mentor)

Background Literature

The concepts of hosting and hospitality have been in human culture for thousands of years. However, it has rarely been investigated through a psychological lens (cf., Meagher et al., 2023).

We performed a prototype analysis (Samuelson et al., 2014) to discover what people associate with the social role of a good host. Specifically, we test for conceptual overlap between this term and two related social categories: a good visitor and a good person.

10 Most Prototypical Decriptions of a Good Host			
Term	Study 1 Frequency	Study 2 Mean	Study 2 SD
Welcoming	43	6.4	0.819
Hospitable	8	6.36	0.913
Inviting	6	6.23	0.827
Accommodating	20	6.17	0.887
Friendly	42	6.14	0.96
Nice	15	6.09	1.006
Polite	12	6.08	0.889
Considerate	12	6.04	0.955
Respectful	11	6.03	1.061
Kind	38	6.02	1.07

	No. of the Control of	THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NAMED IN COLUMN TW	
38	6.02	1.07	
10 Most	Prototypical Decript	tions of a Good Visit	or
Term	Study 1 Frequency	Study 2 Mean	Study 2 SD
Leaves when appropriate	15	6.03	1.092
Respectful	58	6.02	0.965
Trustworthy	7	6	1.141
Considerate	24	5.99	0.944
Polite	42	5.96	1.042
Friendly	40	5.93	0.998
Courteous	20	5.89	1.004
Well mannered	10	5.88	1.027
Nice	27	5.84	1.055
Pleasant	6	5.83	0.944

Study 1:

After collapsing synonymous responses, we found 68 terms for a good host, 70 terms for a good visitor and 62 terms for a good person. A 0.78 shared to unique ratio was found between host and visitor, 0.48 for visitor and person, and 0.40 for host and person, showing the importance of the home location in how these social roles are viewed.

Study 2:

Two paired samples t-tests were conducted for each social category, in order to compare the mean rating of shared terms to the mean rating of unique terms. Across all comparisons, shared terms were rated as significantly more prototypical than unique terms, indicating substantial conceptual overlap. However, the effect size of was weakest when comparing a good host and a good person.

Welcome n om e

10 Most Prototypical Decriptions of a Good Person				
Term	Study 1 Frequency	Study 2 Mean	Study 2 SD	
Trustworthy	26	6.27	0.88	
Compassionate	25	6.24	0.86	
Caring	35	6.16	0.921	
Considerate	9	6.16	0.86	
Honest	60	6.16	0.942	
Sincere	12	6.12	0.968	
Ethical	3	6.12	0.863	
Understanding	17	6.1	0.842	
Truthful	9	6.09	0.996	
Kind	78	6.08	0.932	

Conclusions

We found more conceptual overlap than differences across our three categories. However, in both studies the least overlap was found between a good host and a generic good person, indicating that there are unique aspects of this role as a social virtue.

Study 1: Methods

We recruited 300 participants through an online panel, who were then randomly assigned to one of three categories (good host, good visitor or good person). They were then asked to generate ten words to describe their assigned social category.

Study 2: Methods

A new set of 313 participants through an online panel rated the terms generated in the first study by their prototypicality using a 7-point Likert scale.

Mean Comparison	t-test	p-value	Cohen's D
Only Host vs Host and Visitor	5.317	<0.001	0.521
Only Host vs Host and Person	2.088	0.039	0.205
Only Visitor vs Visitor and Host	4.46	<0.001	0.437
Only Visitor vs Visitor and Person	7.891	<0.001	0.774
Only Person vs Person and Host	3.681	<0.001	0.359
Only Person vs Person and Visitor	4.271	<0.001	0.417

Meagher, B. R., Cook, J., Silver, S. C., Van Doosselaere, M., Wint, J. I., & Zheng, X. (2023). Be our guest: The development of the Interpersonal Hospitality Scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 105(2), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2022.2052302 Samuelson, P. L., Jarvinen, M. J., Paulus, T. B., Church, I. M., Hardy, S. A., & Barrett, J. L. (2014). Implicit theories of intellectual virtues and

vices: A focus on intellectual humility. The Journal of Positive Psychology, 10(5), 389–406. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.967802