



# OTRP *online*

office of teaching resources in PSYCHOLOGY

## Psychology 401 (section C) – Issues in Psychology Spring Term 2013

**Instructor:** Dr. Kristi Multhaup      **Office:** 103 Hamilton House  
**Phone:** 704-894-2008      **Office Hours:** T 1:40-2:55, W 3:00-4:30, Th 9:40-10:55,  
**Email:** krmulthaup@davidson.edu      F 10:30-11:30 or by appointment

Class meetings: **TTh 12:15-1:30, Chambers 1096**

### Materials:

Nye, R. D. (2000). *Three psychologies: Perspectives from Freud, Skinner, and Rogers*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ariely, D. (2012). *The (honest) truth about dishonesty*. New York, NY: Harper.

Articles that that can be accessed through Moodle

**Moodle address:** <http://moodle.davidson.edu/moodle2/>  
 & then use your typical Davidson username & password

### Goals:

- To take a “big picture” look at psychology by exploring issues that have been touched on across multiple prior courses, as well as new “big picture” questions
- To further develop your critical analysis skills in the evaluation of theories & research
- To further develop your written and oral communications skills (the latter includes both discussion leading and discussion participation skills)
- To enjoy ourselves as we discuss fascinating issues in psychology

### Major Topics:

- the basic approaches to psychology—what are they & which works best for you?
- psychology’s code of ethics—what is it & how should it be applied?
- giving psychology away—how can we do it & which issue is most important to you?
- “flash issues”—what do you think about a series of issues in the psychology literature?

### Course Requirements:

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essays</li> </ul>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examining a current finding from 2 historical perspectives</li> <li>• Applying 3 psychology current perspectives to a scenario</li> <li>• Applying the APA ethics code to scenarios</li> <li>• Wikipedia project</li> </ul> | <p>15%</p> <p>15%</p> <p>15%</p> <p>19%</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• written responses to discussion questions</li> <li>• participation (partially graded by your classmates)</li> <li>• discussion leading (done with a partner)</li> </ul>   | <p>10%</p> <p>20%</p> <p>6%</p>             |

**Health Policy:** If you are ill, **PLEASE practice good public health:** stay home to get well! This is particularly important if you have flu symptoms. Please do NOT come to my office to tell me you are sick; e-mail and voice mail are the best ways to communicate that situation. Get well, and then we will work on getting you caught up. **Please remember that Davidson’s Honor Code and Code of Responsibility leads me to assume that you will be honest with me on all matters, and specifically in this context, when you tell me that you are ill.**

**Late Assignment Policy:** For each day an assignment is late, including weekends, 5% of the assignment points will be deducted from the total score. You can decide whether an extra day will make your work so much better that it is worth the late penalty, but ***I encourage you to practice hitting deadlines to prepare for post-college life.***

**Audio & Video (& Photo) Recording of Classes Policy:** Davidson College policy prohibits audio/video recording of classes by students without permission of the instructor. You may not record class sessions or portions thereof unless the Dean of Students has authorized recording as an academic accommodation for a qualified student with a disability and has notified me of that authorization. All such recordings are for the sole use of the individual student and may not be reproduced, sold, posted online, or otherwise distributed. Similarly, no photos may be taken without instructor permission.

**Essays:** Each of the four essays will be different. **The first** will enter you into a competition for a departmental award; we will talk more about this in class. **The second and third** involve applying what you have learned about three major perspectives in psychology and the ethics code, respectively, to written scenarios. **The final essay** will be adding or updating a Wikipedia page. We’ll discuss the specifics of each essay at the appropriate time in the course. For planning purposes, however, here are the milestones and due dates for the Wikipedia project

<b>Milestone</b> (% of final grade in course where appropriate; total 19%)	<b>Due Date</b>
Registration (Wikipedia & class page) + Student training completed (1%)	3/28
Topic selected	4/11
Moving to main space, content evaluated (5%)	4/25
Peer reviews (each student does two) (2%)	5/2
“Final” article (10%) & Reflective essay (1%)	5/13 (end finals)

**Discussions:** The goal of the discussion questions is to get you thinking critically about the material and the **written responses** will help the discussion leaders organize the class meeting. You will turn in your written responses to me (**discussion leaders do this too**) AND the discussion leaders ***by 5pm on the day preceding the discussion.*** ***These may be turned in by email, but please paste your response into an email message rather than sending an attachment due to space issues in my inbox.***

**Written responses:** You may choose to skip 2 questions over the course of the semester (if you choose to write nothing on a day that has two questions to answer, you will have used up both of your skips on that one day). **After that, failing to turn in a written response is -½% of your final grade per question skipped.** Skipping a “spark” (see 1/15 explanation in Reading List & Discussion Questions) is a skip too so if you write absolutely nothing on a day that has two questions to answer, you will have lost 1.5% of your final grade (2 questions + 1 spark = 3 \* -½%).

**Participation is NOT OPTIONAL—it is REQUIRED!** The success of this class depends on engaged discussion. To do that every member of the class must come prepared and contribute in a thoughtful way. ***Carefully listening to your classmates and building upon their contributions will facilitate an intellectually engaging and positive classroom experience.*** You will be evaluated by your classmates 4 times during the semester on both the quantity and quality of your contributions—note that talking a great deal does NOT guarantee high marks for quality of contributions. Be sure to listen to

others and take turns making the first comment that others build upon. ***If you are not thoughtful about what others say, we will have lots of talking but no true discussions.*** Let me emphasize again, **speaking up!** This is a seminar so your participation is vital for us all to have a good learning experience. There will be individual differences in your experience with different areas of the literature. Raise your questions as we go! **You are NOT expected to have all of the answers by the time we start the discussion—if you did, what would be the point of having the discussion?** You are expected to have the material read and to be ready to talk about it with your classmates.

**Discussion leading** is not easy, but it can be very rewarding. To encourage creativity, I will grade this pass/fail, and you will be given feedback about how the discussion went. You will be assigned days to co-lead discussion, but you may make adjustments by switching with other students AND by emailing KM & the class ASAP to ensure that everyone knows where to send discussion questions on which day. **Your goals** are to (a) get people thinking critically about the material, (b) make the discussions interactive and intellectually engaging, and (c) use whatever resources or supplemental materials you can to push us into new ways of thinking about the issues. You might:

- (a) go around the circle & ask for each student's responses to a question or quote from readings;
- (b) ask one person a question, then ask the next to respond to the answer, and so on, in a chain;
- (c) ask students to respond in writing to a question, have students trade papers, have each student read the question/quote and the written response aloud and verbally respond to it;
- (d) set up a debate, giving teams 10-15 min to prepare;
- (e) break into pairs that each discuss specific topics, then come together to share insights (this could involve answering questions by writing on the white board or poster paper);
- (f) play a game like *Jeopardy* to review basic concepts before getting into discussion;
- (g) bring in article abstracts or brief biographies NOT included in reading and having class members apply what they learned from the readings to those materials;
- (h) use "degree of agree": left wall = *strongly agree*, right = *strongly disagree*, then make statements and ask people to position themselves, then talk about where they stood and why;
- (i) show a movie clip or some other related art form;
- (j) do role plays (e.g., a task force creating policies for media presentation of science);
- (k) play "wonder ball": toss a ball around and whoever gets it must keep the conversation going.

**Be creative!! Do not limit yourself to the above ideas—it's up to YOU to keep out of a rut!!** Note that one of the hardest parts about leading a discussion is the pause that follows a question. It takes people time to process your question, think about it, formulate a response, and then speak. Even if that whole process takes only 10 seconds, it can feel like 10 minutes! Be patient. If your question is unclear, someone will ask for a clarification. **You can also aid the process by asking questions that YOU could wrap your head around if YOU were part of the class** (e.g., "What do you think about today's readings?" is too broad to be effective, but "Name a strength or weakness of the author's argument" is manageable and discussion can build off of those responses). While it is tempting to let eager people dominate discussion, **please work to include everyone's comments.** For reluctant speakers, prompts like "Kristi, your written comments about X were very interesting, could you please share those?" can often help someone find their voice in a discussion.

**Academic Honesty:** Academic dishonesty of any form will not be tolerated. As always, you are expected to follow the Honor Code. For this course it is an honor code violation to make copies of any essay questions or to make use of old essay questions (spots). There should be no spots for this course, nor are you permitted to make any. **If you encounter any spots, you must report this to the Dean of Students office or to Dr. Multhaup immediately.**

***Students are encouraged*** to discuss the course material **before** they write their responses to discussion questions and **before** they open their essay questions—have fun with this very interesting material! Written material must be **pledged** as being your own work.

**Grading:** Grades will be based on the percentage of points that you accumulate over the course. The anticipated grades are 90% and above is *A* range; 80-89% is *B* range, etc. Thus 82% may be a *B-* rather than a *B*, for example. By the same token 88% may be a *B+* rather than a *B*.

**Schedule:** Over the semester we may need to make changes which will be announced in class and on Moodle. The reading may take you longer than you think; **a suggested estimate is 1 hour per 10 pages.** If you have a college-sponsored extracurricular activity or religious calendar conflict with the schedule, please see me ASAP. Below short descriptions of Wikipedia project milestone deadlines are underlined.

**Schedule of Topics**

<b>1/15:</b> Welcome & Course Organization	<b>1/17:</b> The Big Picture— <b>Essay 1 out</b>
<b>1/22:</b> Psychoanalytic Approach	<b>1/24:</b> Behaviorist Approach
<b>1/29:</b> Humanist Approach	<b>1/31:</b> Consolidation of Gains
<b>2/5:</b> <i>FI: Psy Role in Environmental Sustainability?</i>	<b>2/7:</b> <b>Essay 1 discussion</b>
<b>2/12:</b> Cognitive Approach	<b>2/14:</b> Biological Approach
<b>2/19:</b> Evolutionary Approach— <b>Essay 2 out</b>	<b>2/21:</b> <i>FI: Psychology and the Legal System</i>
<b>2/26:</b> <i>FI: Should Group Differences Be Studied?</i>	<b>2/28:</b> <b>Essay 2 discussion</b>
<b>3/5:</b> <b>SEMESTER BREAK—NO CLASS</b>	<b>3/7:</b> <b>SEMESTER BREAK—NO CLASS</b>
<b>3/12:</b> Ethics Introduction	<b>3/14:</b> Ethics in Assessment
<b>3/19:</b> Ethics in Research	<b>3/21:</b> Ethics in Therapy
<b>3/26:</b> Ethics in Relationships— <b>Essay 3 out</b>	<b>3/28:</b> Talking Nerdy & <u>Wikipedia prep</u>
<b>4/2:</b> <b>EASTER BREAK—NO CLASS</b>	<b>4/4:</b> <b>Essay 3 discussion</b>
<b>4/9:</b> Giving Psychology Away	<b>4/11:</b> Varying Degrees of Success in Giving ( <u>+topic</u> )
<b>4/16:</b> <i>The (Honest) Truth about Dishonesty</i>	<b>4/18:</b> Giving Plans (including yours)
<b>4/23:</b> Public Skepticism about Psychology	<b>4/25:</b> <i>FI: Has Psy Been Too “Negative”</i> ( <u>to main sp.</u> )
<b>4/30:</b> <b>SPRING CONVOCATION—NO CLASS</b>	<b>5/2:</b> <i>FI:Nature/Nurture...&amp; Noëtic/Soul?</i> ( <u>peer evals</u> )
<b>5/7:</b> The Big Picture Redux & Course wrap-up	

**“Final” Wikipedia article & reflective essay due no later than 5:15pm on 5/13**

Psy 401 (section C) | Spring 2013 | Reading List & Discussion Questions

**1/15 WELCOME TO PSY 401—the capstone for YOUR psychology major experience**

A few notes that will make the semester go more smoothly for you: First, I recommend that you do the readings ***in the order listed*** in each section.

Second, the discussion questions that I provide below are meant to start your thinking—use them as a springboard! ***In this spirit, written responses should conclude with a “spark”*** which can be (a) a quote from one of the readings that you believe is worthy of class discussion [cite the reading and the page number], (b) a question or assertion that you would like the class to discuss, or (c) a comment based on an experience outside Psy 401 (e.g., something from another class or a news item related to the day’s topic). In short, I am asking you to practice developing open-ended, interesting ways to spark a discussion. The spark(s) used on a given day will be at the discretion of the discussion leaders. Notice the kinds of sparks that truly ignite discussion and use those as models on future days.

**LAST BUT FAR FROM LEAST:** **As discussion leaders** it is up to YOU to keep variety in the class to help us avoid falling into a rut. **Be sure** to use people’s responses to discussion questions in some part of the class—it is particularly helpful for people who have a hard time speaking up to have “warm ups” with prepared responses. You should also use at least one of the sparks that were generated (it is OK to use your own). See your syllabus for a range of discussion tools & be creative! **As discussion participants**, it is important for you to speak up, whether you find that easy to do or not. Some students don’t like writing papers, yet they must for course requirements. The same is true for class participation, particularly in a course like this one. **After each discussion, participants** need to fill out a Moodle survey. Please mark in your planners/Outlook calendars/phones/smartphone signal routine that you **MUST do this ASAP** after the discussion in order for the leaders to get timely feedback.

**1/17 THE BIG PICTURE: What is psychology? Where do you fit most comfortably?**

**\*\*Before\*\*** you read Stanovich (2004), write out (a) your definition of what psychology is, and (b) what is at the core of it (what *must* be taught?). Approach this task as if you’re having an email exchange with an intelligent friend who has asked you to explain what psychology is. (This should be the first part of what you hand in to me and the discussion leaders.)

**Reminder:** If you’re unsure what the *falsifiability criterion* is as you read Stanovich, review it in your stats textbook or the methods sections of your textbooks—**a habit that you should develop for all readings!**

**Readings—Part 1**

Stanovich, K. E. (2004). *How to think straight about psychology* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon. **ONLY pp. 1-18**

**Questions: Answer 1a OR 1b (remember to do the response listed above first!)**

1a. How does your definition of psychology fit with and/or contrast with Stanovich’s? What, if anything, would you now change in your own definition and/or in Stanovich’s definition?

1b. On p. 6, Stanovich says “The *only* two things that justify psychology as an independent discipline are that it studies the full range of human and nonhuman behavior with the techniques of science and that applications that derive from this knowledge are scientifically based. Were this not true, there would be no reason for psychology to exist.” Do you agree or disagree? Why?

*Continued on next page...*

**Readings—Part 2**

Weiten, W. (2007). *Psychology: Themes & variations*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.) Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.  
**ONLY pp. 6-15.**

**Questions: Answer 2 + add in your spark for today**

2. Weiten reminded you of six “theoretical perspectives” or “approaches” to psychology. Past courses may have introduced you to other approaches as well. Of all the approaches that you have studied, which one “works” best for you? In other words, where do you fit most comfortably among the many approaches in psychology? Briefly explain why.

*NOTE that identifying with an approach does not mean that you ignore the others. For example, I identify with the cognitive approach, but research from other approaches has an influence on my thinking. Please try to pick ONE and explain why it works for you. In the past, some students have HATED this question. Think of it this way: In the movie Runaway Bride, Richard Gere asks each of Julia Roberts’s jilted fiancés what her favorite way to eat eggs is. They all say the way THEY like to eat eggs. Late in the movie Julia is shown with a large number of different egg dishes that she is sampling and is very proud later to announce what HER favorite egg dish is. Put yourself in Julia’s place and try out different psychology perspectives so that—aside from what your professors’ views are—you can identify what perspective works best for YOU.*

**\*Essay 1 will be assigned at the end of class. Essays are due at the beginning of class on 2/7. Be sure to follow the instructions on the essay! As always, the honor code applies.**

**1/22 HOW CAN WE THINK ABOUT OUR FIELD? The Psychoanalytic Approach**

**FYI (NOT required) reading:** To keep the reading for today manageable, I omitted Shedler’s (2010) *American Psychologist* article entitled, *The Efficacy of Psychodynamic Psychotherapy*, as well as the 4 critiques of it and his reply to those in the Feb-Mar 2011 *American Psychologist* (volume 66, issue 2). If you are interested, check out that debate.

**Readings**

Nye, R. D. (2000). *Three psychologies: Perspectives from Freud, Skinner, and Rogers*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. **Chapters 1 and 2.**

Freud, S. (1904/1938). Psychopathology of everyday life. In A. A. Brill (Ed. & Trans) *The basic writings of Sigmund Freud*. New York: Random House. **pp. 73-76.**

Solms, M. (2004). Freud returns. *Scientific American*, 290(5), 82-88.

Hobson, J. A. (2004). Freud returns? Like a bad dream. *Scientific American*, 290(5), 89.

**Questions: Answer 1a or 1b + add in your spark for today**

1a. Based on what you’ve read, what do you see as Freud’s greatest contribution to psychology today? What do you believe is his weakest point? (**Be brief for now;** in class you may be asked to explain why you made the choices that you did.)

1b. Imagine that you are a colleague of Freud’s and are arguing with him about ways that he should revise his ideas. Pick one of his ideas (it does not necessarily have to be an idea you discussed in response to question 1) and try to expand on it or alter it to better fit with other things that you know about human behavior.

## 1/24 HOW CAN WE THINK ABOUT OUR FIELD? The Behaviorist Approach

### Readings

Nye (2000). Chapter 3.

Delprato, D. J., & Midgley, B. D. (1992). Some fundamentals of B. F. Skinner's behaviorism. *American Psychologist*, *47*, 1507-1520. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.47.11.1507.

Overskeid, G. (2007). Looking for Skinner and finding Freud. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 590-595. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.6.590

DeBell, C. S., & Harless, D. K. (1992). B. F. Skinner: Myth and misperception. *Teaching of Psychology*, *19*, 68-73. doi:10.1207/s15328023top1902\_1. **Only Appendix & pp. 69-70.**

### Questions: Answer 1a or 1b + add in your spark for today

1a. Nye referred to Skinner's view that *explanatory fictions* are invoked when people use explanations for behavior such as saying that a misbehaving child is emotionally disturbed. Respond to Nye's description of Skinner's view—be specific about what you are responding to (it's OK to use quotes from Nye's book to do this)—to explain why you do or do not agree that such explanations are explanatory fictions.

1b. Look again at the true-false items from 1/15. From questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, and 12, select ONE and find information in the assigned readings to support why it is either true or false. Include the number you selected in your answer.

## 1/29 HOW CAN WE THINK ABOUT OUR FIELD? The Humanist Approach

### Readings

Nye (2000). Chapter 4.

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 6 (pp. 107-124; *What it means to become a person*).

Koltko-Rivera, M. E. (2006). Rediscovering the later version of Maslow's hierarchy of needs: Self-transcendence and opportunities for theory, research, and unification. *Review of General Psychology*, *10*, 302-317. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.10.4.302

### Questions: Answer 1a or 1b. + add in your spark for today

1a. For our last meeting, you read Overskeid's (2007) article, "Looking for Skinner and finding Freud." Could someone write an analogous article about parallels between Skinner and one of the humanist scholars you encountered in the assigned readings? Explain your answer.

1b. Do you think that Freud would view Rogers's organismic valuing process as similar to or different from psychodynamic drives? Why?

## 1/31 HOW CAN WE THINK ABOUT OUR FIELD? Consolidating our gains

### Readings

Nye (2000). Chapter 5.

Azar, B. (1997, October). Was Freud right? Maybe, maybe not. *APA Monitor*, *28*, 28. Retrieved August 30, 1999, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.apa.org/monitor/oct97/freud.html>

Anderson, M. C., Ochsner, K. N., Kuhl, B., Cooper, J. C., Robertson, E., Gabrieli, S. W., . . . , Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2004). Neural systems underlying the suppression of unwanted memories. *Science*, *303*, 232-235. doi:10.1126/science.1089504.

Rogers, C. R., & Skinner, B. F. (1956). Some issues concerning the control of human behavior. *Science*, *124*, 1057-1066. doi:10.1126/science.124.3231.1057.



**Questions: Answer 1a or 1b. + add in your spark for today**

1a. Briefly state what you believe Rogers and Skinner would each say about the Anderson et al. data. Then pick ONE point in the Rogers and Skinner symposium and indicate what you believe Freud would have said in response.

1b. Briefly state what you believe Rogers and Skinner would each say about one example given by Azar (use the SAME example as you speculate what Rogers and Skinner would say). Then pick ONE point in the Rogers and Skinner symposium and indicate what you believe Freud would have said in response.

**2/5 “FLASH” ISSUE: Does Psychology have a role in environmental sustainability?**

*NOTE: In reading in this area, I found that there is an annual conference on Behavior, Energy and Climate Change (“BECC”). For information about it, see [www.beccconference.org/](http://www.beccconference.org/)*

**Recommended (NOT required) reading: This is an introduction to a special issue on global climate change; feel free to explore the rest of that issue as well if this topic interests you.**

Swim, J. K., Stern, P. C., Doherty, T. J., Clayton, S., Reser, J. P., Weber, E. U., . . . , & Howard, G. S. (2011). Psychology’s contributions to understanding and addressing global climate change. *American Psychologist*, *66*, 241-250. doi:10.1037/a0023220

**Readings**

Winter, D. D. N. (2000). Some big ideas for some big problems. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 516-522. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.516

Doherty, T. J., & Clayton, S. (2011). The psychological impacts of global climate change. *American Psychologist*, *66*, 265-276. doi:10.1037/a0023141

Van Vugt, M. (2009). Averting the tragedy of the commons: Using social psychological science to protect the environment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*, 169-173. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01630.x

Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2011). Apocalypse soon? Dire messages reduce belief in global warming by contradicting just-world beliefs. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 34-38. doi:10.1177/0956797610391911

**Questions: Answer 1a or 1b. + add in your spark for today**

1a. Schouborg (2001) wrote in response to an earlier version of the recommended reading (Oskamp, 2000) that “An Orwellian chill ran down my spine as I read the...articles on psychology’s role in ecological activism” (p.458). By contrast, Riebel (2001) wrote that the APA should “compose a mission statement articulating principles and practices that its members could use to advance environmental sustainability” (p. 455). Are you closer to Schouborg’s or Riebel’s position about our field being actively involved in environmental sustainability? Does your response change if the focus is on the psychological impacts of global climate change (Doherty & Clayton, 2011)? Briefly explain your view.

1b. From today’s readings, what do you see as the most effective strategy for affecting attitudes and/or behavior? Briefly explain your view.

**2/7 Discussion of Essay 1**

Bring your essay to class for a discussion based on your essays.

---

**IMPORTANT INFO:** There is not a book that covers (to my satisfaction) the next three major approaches in the way that Nye's book covered the first three. To fill the role that Nye played in prior weeks, each of the reading lists about the next three approaches has a ***background section***.

---

## 2/12 HOW CAN WE THINK ABOUT OUR FIELD? The Cognitive Approach

### Readings

#### Background on the cognitive approach

**NOTE:** Matlin (1998) will give you a historical perspective that will help you understand the origins of this approach. **PLEASE read the Best (1999) carefully.** His discussion of levels of analysis (**see Figure 1.1**) has been the key to many students understanding how the cognitive approach is different from the biological approach. Foreyt and Goodrick show you how this approach is applied in therapy settings.

Matlin, M. W. (1998). *Cognition*. New York: Harcourt Brace. **pp. 2-10**

Best, J. B. (1999). *Cognitive psychology*. New York: Brooks/Cole. **pp. 5-11**

Foreyt, J. P., & Goodrick, G. K. (1994). Cognitive behavior therapy. In *Encyclopedia of psychology* (Vol. 1, **pp. 245-248**). New York: Wiley.

#### Examples and discussion of the cognitive approach

Strayer, D. L., & Drews, F. A. (2007). Cell-phone-induced driver distraction. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 128-131. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00489.x

**NOTE:** This article includes an EEG study which highlights the growing intersection of the biological and cognitive approaches in the area called "cognitive neuroscience."

Kemps, E., & Tiggemann, M. (2010). A cognitive experimental approach to understanding and reducing food cravings. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *19*, 86-90. doi:10.1177/0963721410364494

De Houwer, J. (2011). Why the cognitive approach in psychology would profit from a functional approach and vice versa. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*, 202-209. doi:10.1177/1745691611400238

### **Questions: Answer 1a OR 1b. Then answer 2 + add in your spark for today**

1a. Cognitive research is sometimes criticized for lacking external validity. Are there issues of external validity in the Strayer and Drew article that make you hesitant to draw inferences from the study about the effect of cell-phone conversations on driving behavior? Explain your answer.

1b. Did Kemps and Tiggemann convince you that a cognitive approach can be used to understand and reduce food cravings? Explain your answer.

2. Do you think Skinner would support or argue against De Houwer's functional-cognitive framework for research in psychology? Be BRIEF for now; you can expand on your ideas in the class discussion.

## 2/14 HOW CAN WE THINK ABOUT OUR FIELD? The Biological Approach

**Note:** It might help to reread portions of your Intro text chapter regarding basics of the brain (e.g., the left hemisphere controls the right [contralateral] side of the body).

### Readings

#### Background on the biological approach

**NOTE:** Leukel (1972) does an excellent job of describing the biological approach in general, as well as noting several techniques that have long been used by this approach. Weiten (2007) adds in newer techniques. Decety and Cacioppo (2010) look to the future.

Leukel, F. (1972). *Introduction to physiological psychology*. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Company. (pp. 3-7).

Weiten, W. (2007). *Psychology: Themes & variations*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.) Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth. **ONLY pp. 84-88.**

Decety, J., & Cacioppo, J. (2010). Frontiers in human neuroscience: The golden triangle and beyond. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 767-771.  
doi:10.1177/1745691610388780

#### Examples of the biological approach

Cahill, L. (2005). His brain, her brain. *Scientific American*, 292(5), 40-47.

Kounios, J., Frymiare, J. L., Bowden, E. M., Fleck, J. I., Subramaniam, K., Parrish, T. B., & Jung-Beeman, M. (2006). The prepared mind: Neural activity prior to problem presentation predicts subsequent solution by sudden insight. *Psychological Science*, 17, 882-890.  
doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01798.x.

**[FYI: Jen Frymiare (now Stevenson) '01 was a research assistant at Penn and Drexel after graduation. She is now an asst prof of psy at Ursinus College in Philly.]**

Stanton, S. J., Mullette-Gillman, O. A., McLaurin, R. E., Kuhn, C. M., LaBar, K. S., Platt, M. L., & Huettel, S. A. (2011). Low- and high-testosterone individuals exhibit decreased aversion to economic risk. *Psychological Science*, 22, 447-453. doi:10.1177/0956797611401752

Hennessy, M. B., Schimi-Webb, P. A., & Deak, T. (2009). Separation, sickness, and depression: A new perspective on an old animal model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 227-231. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01641.x

### **Questions: Answer 1a or 1b. + add in your spark for today**

**\*\*NOTE: We will get into the issue of sex differences on 2/26. The goal for today is to explore the biological approach so let's keep the focus there.**

1a. Can all aspects of behavior be reduced to brain activity? In other words, if we understand how the brain works, will we understand all there is to know about behavior? Be sure to incorporate your thoughts about the Decety and Cacioppo, Cahill, Kounios et al., and Stanton et al. readings into your response.

1b. To what extent did Hennessy et al. convince you that their animal model is a fruitful approach to understanding more about depression?

## 2/19 HOW CAN WE THINK ABOUT OUR FIELD? The Evolutionary Approach

### Readings

#### Background on the evolutionary approach

Rossano, M. J. (2003). *Evolutionary psychology: The science of human behavior and evolution*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. pp. 12-14, 24-33, and 37-48.

Gray, P. (1996). Incorporating evolutionary theory into the teaching of psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 23*, 207-214. doi:10.1207/s15328023top2304\_1

#### Examples and discussion of the evolutionary approach

German, T. P., & Barrett, H. C. (2005). Functional fixedness in a technologically sparse culture. *Psychological Science, 16*, 1-5. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00771.x

Van Vugt, M., & Spisak. (2008). Sex differences in the emergence of leadership during competitions within and between groups. *Psychological Science, 19*, 854-858. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02168.x

Alterovitz & Mendelsohn (2009). Partner preferences across the life span: Online dating by older adults. *Psychology and Aging, 24*, 513-517. doi:10.1037/a0015897

Schaller, M., Neuberg, S. L., Griskevicius, V., & Kenrick, D. T. (2010). Pyramid power: A reply to commentaries. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 335-337. doi: 10.1177/1745691610369474

**[FYI:** *In the interest of keeping the reading manageable, I did not assign the original article or commentaries that Schaller et al. are replying to, but you can easily get those through their reference list. My intention was to get you to focus on how a Humanist proposal, the hierarchy of needs, could be looked at from the evolutionary perspective and this reply should give you that feel.]*

### **Question: Answer 1a or 1b + add in your spark for today**

1a. Briefly state the strongest OR weakest argument you see for the evolutionary approach to motivation as discussed in Schaller et al.

1b. For the German and Barrett data, the Van Vugt and Spisak data, and the Alterovitz and Mendelsohn data, **BRIEFLY** state which of the six perspectives we have now reviewed best explains those data; your answer may differ for each data set.

**\*Essay 2 will be handed out. Essay 2 is due at the beginning of class on 2/28. Be sure to follow the instructions on the essay! As always, the honor code applies.**

## 2/21 "FLASH" ISSUE: Psychology and the Legal System

### Readings

Kassin, S. M., Bogart, D., & Kerner, J. (2012). Confessions that corrupt: Evidence from the DNA exoneration case files. *Psychological Science, 23*, 41-45. doi:10.1177/0956797611422918

Bering, J. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (2005). Evolutionary psychology and false confession. *American Psychologist, 60*, 1037-1038. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.60.9.1037

Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., Mann, S., & Leal, S. (2011). Outsmarting the liars: Toward a cognitive lie detection approach. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*, 28-32. doi:10.1177/0963721410391245

Gazzaniga, M. S. (2011). Neuroscience in the courtroom. *Scientific American, 304*(4), 54-59.

Questions on next page...

**Questions: Answer 1a or 1b. Then answer 2. + add in your spark for today**

1a. Briefly state what interests you most about Vrij et al.'s paper.

1b. Briefly state what interests you most about Gazzaniga's paper.

2. Kassin, Bogart, and Kerner (2012) mention cognitive biases as contributing to false confessions; Bering and Shackelford (2005) discussed false confessions in terms of the evolutionary approach. Pick TWO of the other perspectives we have studied and briefly discuss how you think each would account for false confessions.

**2/26 "FLASH" ISSUE: Should group differences be studied?**

Discussing racial and sex differences can be uncomfortable. Taking a page from a colleague of mine who studies racial issues, I recommend that we start with the assumption that we may offend one another in order to have a frank, useful discussion. Keep in mind two very important points: (a) Everyone in the class is a good person, and (b) We are here to explore ideas and hearing diverse opinions helps us to better understand our own views, as well as the range of views that other people may hold.

**Readings**

Fiske, S. T. (2010). Venus and mars or down to earth: Stereotypes and realities of gender differences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 688-692.  
doi:10.1177/1745691610388768

Herek, G. M. (2010). Sexual orientation differences as deficits: Science and stigma in the history of American psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 693-699.  
doi:10.1177/1745691610388770

Jones, J. M. (2010). I'm white and you're not: The value of unraveling ethnocentric science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 700-707. doi:10.1177/1745691610388771

Medin, D., Bennis, W., & Chandler, M. (2010). Culture and home-field disadvantage. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 708-713. doi:10.1177/1745691610388772

**Questions: + add in your spark for today**

Offer your own viewpoint in response to Eagly's (1995, p. 155; NOT in your readings) questions: "Is psychological research that compares the sexes [or racial, cultural, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status, ... groups] beneficial or harmful? Does this research foster or hinder the social exchange that would increase gender equity?" If you say "both" to the first question, indicate whether you think there is more benefit or more harm. If you answer differs depending on group type (e.g., sex differences versus age differences), note that in your answer.

**2/28 Discussion of Essay 2**

Bring your essay to class for a discussion based on your essays.

**3/5 SEMESTER BREAK—NO CLASS****3/7 SEMESTER BREAK—NO CLASS**

### 3/12 WHAT IS OUR CODE OF ETHICS? Introduction

Policy statements are put forth by the APA Ethics committee every year. We will not go into detail on those, but be aware that they exist (if you're curious, look in the index for any year of *American Psychologist* for that year's Ethics committee report).

#### Readings

- Fisher, C. B. (2003). *Decoding the ethics code: A practical guide to psychologists*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 3-9.
- Behnke, S. (2006, December). Beyond mere compliance: Three metaphors to teach the APA ethics code. *Monitor on Psychology*, 37(11), 54-55.
- American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57, 1060-1073. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.57.12.1060. *If you prefer, you may obtain this information at <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code2002.html>*
- Pope, K. S., & Vetter, V. A. (1992). Ethical dilemmas encountered by members of the American Psychological Association: A national survey. *American Psychologist*, 47, 397-411. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.47.3.397.

#### Question + add in your spark for today

From Pope and Vetter, pick three of the **most tricky** dilemmas (try to include variety in the types of dilemmas you choose where you can). For each one, (a) give the page # it's on, (b) indicate which of the ethical standards seem to apply (use the code numbers), AND (c) state your interpretation of each relevant standard as you apply it to argue what should have been done in that situation, based on your understanding of the APA's ethical standards and principles. (**NOTE:** The code of ethics has been updated since the publication of Pope and Vetter.)

### 3/14 WHAT IS OUR CODE OF ETHICS? Ethics in Assessment

Please review the note regarding the 2/26 discussion.

#### **Recommended (NOT required) reading: Broad view of one type of subgroup = race**

Sue, D. W. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the "invisible" visible. *American Psychologist*, 59, 761-769. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.761

#### **Required readings: Subgroup differences & selection**

Sackett, P. R., Borneman, M. J., & Connelly, B. S. (2008). High-stakes testing in higher education and employment: Appraising the evidence for validity and fairness. *American Psychologist*, 63, 215-227. doi:10.1037/a0015473

Five-commentary exchange:

Duckworth, A. L. (2009). (Over and) beyond high-stakes testing. *American Psychologist*, 64, 279-280. doi:10.1037/a0014923

Kaufman, J. C., & Agars, M. D. (2009). Being creative with the predictors *and* criteria for success. *American Psychologist*, 64, 280-281. doi:10.1037/a0014926

Wichert, J. M., & Millsap, R. E. (2009). The absence of underprediction does not imply the absence of measurement bias. *American Psychologist*, 64, 281-283. doi:10.1037/a0014992

Helms, J. E. (2009). Defense of tests prevents objective consideration of validity and fairness. *American Psychologist*, 64, 283-284. doi:10.1037/a0014924

Sackett, P. R., Borneman, M. J., & Connelly, B. S. (2009). Responses to issues raised about validity, bias, and fairness in high-stakes testing. *American Psychologist, 64*, 285-287. doi: 10.1037/a0015473

Kuncel, N. R., & Hezlett, S. A. (2010). Fact and fiction in cognitive ability testing for admissions and hiring decisions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*, 339-345. doi: 10.1177/0963721410389459

**Questions Answer 1a & just think about 1b. + add in your spark for today**

1a. Let's practice applying APA's ethical standards and principles. Does 9.06 suggest that we *must* adjust scores by subgroups? Give their code letter or number of any other relevant standards and principles and briefly state how they are relevant.

1b. Brown (1994) introduced a series of *American Psychologist* papers on this general topic [none of which were assigned], and she defined subgroup norming as "basing normative reference data on subgroups of a population rather than on the total group" (p. 927). Taking the question from Brown (1994)'s article title, what is your view regarding whether subgroup norming is a legitimate testing practice or discrimination?

**3/19 WHAT IS OUR CODE OF ETHICS? Ethics in Research**

**\*\*Answer 1a OR 1b. Then answer 2 + add in your spark for today**

**Readings—Part 1 of 3: Replicating Milgram**

Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: Would people still obey today? *American Psychologist, 64*, 1-11. doi:10.1037/a0010932

**[FYI: I had to limit the pages assigned, but there are 5 follow-up articles in the Jan 2009 issue of the *American Psychologist*, should you wish to explore those.]**

**Questions:**

1a. Briefly explain how comfortable you are with people replicating the famous Milgram experiments. Which of the APA ethical principles and standards are related to the issues raised (**list them**)?

**Readings—Part 2 of 3: Informed consent**

Mann, T. (1994). Informed consent for psychological research: Do subjects comprehend consent forms and understand their legal rights? *Psychological Science, 5*, 140-143. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1994.tb00650.x

**Questions:**

1b. According to the APA's (2002) ethical guidelines [note Mann did her work when the prior code was in effect], is a researcher ethically obligated to (a) ensure that informed consent is comprehended by participants, (b) write the consent form in clear, non-technical language, or (c) both? Be prepared to defend your answer during class discussion (you don't have to go into detail in writing, unless you would like to do so).

**Readings—Part 3 of 3: Research Retractions & Research Fraud**

Retraction of "Gaining control: Training executive function and far transfer of the ability to resolve interference." (2011). *Psychological Science, 22*, 562. doi:10.1177/0956797611404902

Web story from <http://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2011/12/diederik-stapel.aspx> filed under StapelCaseinAPADec2011PSA

Web story from <http://briandeer.com/mmr/lancet-summary.htm> filed under SummaryAutismMMRvaccineScandal (if this story interests you, a longer version can be found at <http://briandeer.com/solved/story-highlights.htm>)  
**[FYI: The retraction of the Wakefield et al. (1998) paper is in the Feb 28, 1998, issue of The Lancet (vol 351 & starts on p. 637) for those interested.**

**Questions:**

2. Which of the APA ethical principles and standards are related to the issues raised in these Part 3 readings (**list them**)?

**3/21 WHAT IS OUR CODE OF ETHICS? Ethics in Therapy**

**Readings**

- Roberts, L. W., Battaglia, J., & Epstein, R. S. (1999). Frontier ethics: Mental health care needs and the ethical dilemmas in rural communities. *Psychiatric Services, 50*, 497-503.
- Smith, L. (2005). Psychotherapy, classism, and the poor: Conspicuous by their absence. *American Psychologist, 60*, 687-696. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.60.7.687
- Four-commentary exchanged filed separately:
- Aronson, H. (2006). Treating “the poor” —Classism or a rigid loyalty to theory? *American Psychologist, 61*, 335-336. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.335
- Moyer, T. R. (2006). Classism is overrated. *American Psychologist, 61*, 336-337. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.336
- Liu, W. M. (2006). Classism is much more complex. *American Psychologist, 61*, 337-338. doi:10.1034/0003-066X.61.4.337
- Smith, L. (2006). Addressing classism, extending multicultural competence, and serving the poor. *American Psychologist, 61*, 338-339. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.338

**Questions: Answer 1a OR 1b. + add in your spark for today**

1a. Pick ONE of the vignettes in Roberts et al. and offer advice to a psychologist who would find himself or herself in that position. State which ethical principles and standards (**list the numbers/letters**) you used to determine your advice.

1b. If you had to defend one of the author’s points in the classism discussion, which author would you pick (Smith, Aronson, Moyer, or Liu)? **Briefly** say why.

**3/26 WHAT IS OUR CODE OF ETHICS? Ethics in Professional Relationships**

**Readings:**

- Slimp, P. A. O., & Burian, B. K. (1995). Multiple role relationships during internship: Consequences and recommendations. In D. N. Bersoff (Ed.), *Ethical conflicts in psychology* (pp. 237-241). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association. (Reprinted from *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 25*, 39-45, 1994 [selections from original]).
- Keith-Spiegel, P. C., Tabachnick, B. G., & Allen, M. (1995). Ethics in academia: Students’ views of professors’ actions. In D. N. Bersoff (Ed.), *Ethical conflicts in psychology* (pp. 409-414). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association. (Reprinted from *Ethics and Behavior, 3*, 149-162, 1993 [selections from original]).
- Tabachnick, B. G., Keith-Spiegel, P., & Pope, K. S. (1991). Ethics of teaching: Beliefs and behaviors of psychologists as educators. *American Psychologist, 46*, 506-515. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.46.5.506 **Focus on the overall pattern of data (Table 4). It’s OK to skip the**



discussion of Tables 5-7 (starts on p. 507 with “Responses systematically...” section and ends on p. 509 just before the Discussion starts). **Note the cautions that are at the beginning of the Discussion section.**

Rogerson, M. D., Gottlieb, M. C., Handelsman, M. M., Knapp, S., & Younggren, J. (2011).

Nonrational processes in ethical decision making. *American Psychologist*, 66, 614-623.

doi:10.1037/a0025215 **While the whole article is worth reading, if you are pressed for time, focus on pp. 619-622.**

**Question: Answer 1a OR 1b. Then answer 2 + add in your spark for today**

1a. Take a section of Slimp and Burian (e.g., business relationships) and discuss the ideas in terms of undergraduates and their professors. **MAKE SURE to list the APA code letters and numbers** for the principles and standards upon which you draw.

1b. Compare the Keith-Spiegel et al. Table 2 data and the Tabachnick et al. Table 4 data (there is overlap in only a subset of the questions asked to students & those asked to teachers, and that there were some scale differences across studies). Note one pattern in the data that interested you and **list the item number it is in EACH of the questionnaires**. Also, **list the APA code letters and numbers** for the relevant principles and standards.

2. Do you fall closer to Rogerson et al.’s view that “Intuitive and affective responses can guide behavior to ensure better decisions without conscious awareness...particularly in complex circumstances” (p. 620) or their quote from Ford that “To act on the basis of personal preference or cultural biases, rather than be guided by objective, well-reasoned principles, would...involve a very significant risk of acting unethically” (p. 620)?

**\*Essay 3 will be handed out. Essay 3 is due at the beginning of class on 4/4. Be sure to follow the instructions on the essay! As always, the honor code applies.**

### **3/28 Wikipedia preparations for Essay 4**

#### **Required reading/viewing—Part 1 of 2**

Wikipedia’s 5 pillars (see Moodle for link)

Moisse, K. (2011). The YouTube cure. *Scientific American*, 304(2), 34-37. [**FYI:** There are only 2 pages, pp. 35-36 must have been an ad.]

View the ~4-min TED talk by Melissa Marshall about “Talk Nerdy to Me”?

[http://www.ted.com/talks/melissa\\_marshall\\_talk\\_nerdy\\_to\\_me.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/melissa_marshall_talk_nerdy_to_me.html)

**Questions: Answer 1a OR 1b + add in your spark for today**

The rise of populist media such as YouTube, Facebook, and Wikipedia could be an avenue for psychology to help the public understand the importance of carefully conducted research. On the other hand, the public may still ignore important qualifications about research (e.g., Moisse, 2011).

1a. Where do the limitations of research, such as those Zamboni noted about his work, fit into Marshall’s equation at the end of her talk?

1b. What does the failure of the public to understand the limitations of Zamboni’s research suggest needs to be added to or tweaked within Marshall’s equation?

#### **Wikipedia training—Part 2 of 2**

Students must (a) register on Wikipedia, (b) register with our class’s page on Wikipedia (see Moodle for link), and (c) complete the Wikipedia Student Training by 3/28

## 4/2 EASTER BREAK—NO CLASS

### 4/4 Discussion Essay 3

Bring your essay to class for a discussion based on your essays.

### 4/9 HOW DO WE GIVE PSYCHOLOGY AWAY? General Introduction

**\*\*Note to discussion leaders:** Please look at upcoming topics so you don't "steal the thunder" of subsequent discussion leaders in this unit.

**Recommended (NOT required) reading: Miller's famous proposal to give Psy away**

Miller, G. A. (1969). Psychology as a means of promoting human welfare. *American Psychologist*, 24, 1063-1075. doi:10.1037/h0028988

**Required readings**

Zimbardo, P. G. (2004). Does psychology make a significant difference in our lives? *American Psychologist*, 59, 339-351. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.5.339

Sommer, R. (2006). Dual dissemination: Writing for colleagues and the public. *American Psychologist*, 61, 955-958. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.9.955

Rosen, G. M., Glasgow R. E., & Moore, T. E. (2003). Self-help therapy: The science and business of giving psychology away. In S. O. Lilienfeld, S. J. Lynn, & J. M. Lohr (Eds.) *Science and pseudoscience in clinical psychology* (pp. 399-424). New York: Guilford.

Salzinger, K. (2002, April). Take back psychology [Electronic version]. *Monitor on Psychology*, 33(4). Retrieved January 13, 2008, from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/apr02/sd.html>

**Questions: Answer 1a or 1b + add in your spark for today**

1a. Do you fall closer to Zimbaro's or Salzinger's view regarding "giving psychology away"? Briefly explain your answer.

1b. Would you advocate for Sommer's proposal and Rosen et al.'s proposed guidelines? (Your answer can differ for those two.) Briefly say why or why not.

### 4/11 HOW DO WE GIVE PSYCHOLOGY AWAY? Varying degrees of success in giving

**Readings**

Lilienfeld, S. O. (2002). When worlds collide: Social science, politics, and the Rind et al. (1998) child sexual abuse meta-analysis. *American Psychologist*, 57, 176-188. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.57.3.176

Sher, K. J., & Eisenberg, N. (2002). Publication of Rind et al. (1998): The editors' perspective. *American Psychologist*, 57, 206-210. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.57.3.206

Wells, G. L., Malpass, R. S., Lindsay, R. C. L., Fisher, R. P., Turtle, J. W., & Fulero, S. M. (2000). From the lab to the police station: A successful application of eyewitness research. *American Psychologist*, 55, 581-598. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.55.6.581

**Question: + add in your spark for today**

Oishi, Diener, and Lucas (2007), from our 4/3 discussion, stated that, "It is up to psychologists to educate lay people about optimal levels of happiness and the levels of happiness that are realistic" (p. 358). What lesson(s) from today's readings would you suggest to Oishi et al.—and other psychologists—about giving psychology away?

**Wikipedia:** Students must have declared their topics by 4/11.

#### 4/16 HOW DO WE GIVE PSYCHOLOGY AWAY? *The (Honest) Truth About Dishonesty*

##### Readings

Ariely, D. (2012). *The (honest) truth about dishonesty*. New York, NY: Harper.

##### Questions: Answer 1a OR 1b. + add in your spark for today

1. Cite two specific quotes or examples (**with page #s**) that you would like to discuss with your classmates.
2. Was Ariely successful in giving away his ideas to the general public? Elaborate to support your answer.

#### 4/18 HOW DO WE GIVE PSYCHOLOGY AWAY? Giving Plans (including yours)

##### Reading

Gorsuch, R. L., & Wallace, W. L. (2005). Giving psychology away is expensive. *American Psychologist*, *60*, 348-349. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.60.4.348

Epstein, R. (2006). Giving psychology away: A personal journey. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *1*, 389-400.

##### Question: [your Wikipedia topic progress is your spark today]

Should we try to develop a “Department of Human Advancement” (Gorsuch & Wallace, 2005) and/or try to “take back” *Psychology Today* (Epstein [2006] reports the history)?

Briefly explain your reasoning.

[We'll be talking about Wikipedia progress today too.]

#### 4/23 HOW DO WE GIVE PSYCHOLOGY AWAY? Public Skepticism about Psychology

##### Reading

Lilienfeld, S. O. (2012a). Public skepticism of psychology: Why many people perceive the study of human behavior as unscientific. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 111-129. doi:10.1037/a0023963

Newman, L. S., Bakina, D. A., & Tang, Y. (2012). The role of preferred beliefs in skepticism about psychology. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 805-806. doi:10.1037/a0030536

Tryon, W. (2012). Emergence vs. reductionism. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 806-807. doi:10.1037/a0030542

Teo, T. (2012). Psychology is still a problematic science and the public knows it. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 807-808. doi:10.1037/a0030084

Lilienfeld, S. O. (2012b). Further sources of our field's embattled public reputation. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 808-809. doi: 10.1037/a0031015

##### Questions: Answer 1a & just think about 1b. + add in your spark for today

1a. Which of the rebuttals from Lilienfeld (2012a) and/or points raised in the commentaries do you believe is particularly strong. Briefly explain your thinking.

1b. Briefly describe a time you have had to come to the defense of your choice of psychology as your major. Do you use any of the rebuttals discussed and/or think one may have been helpful?

#### 4/25 “FLASH” ISSUE: Has Psychology been too “negative”?

##### Readings

##### Background on positive psychology

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5 **Read pp. 5-8 & 13.**

##### Examples and discussion of positive psychology

Seery, M. D. (2011). Resilience: A silver lining to experiencing adverse life events? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 390-394. doi:10.1177/0963721411424740

Oishi, S., Diener, E., & Lucas, R. E. (2007). The optimum level of well-being: Can people be too happy? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 346-360. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00048.x

##### **Questions: Answer 1a & just think about 1b. + add in your spark for today**

1a. Think back to the six major approaches to psychology we covered in the first part of the semester. Which seems the most negative to you? Pick one finding from Seery (2011) or Oishi et al. (2007)—cite the article AND the page number—and comment on it from the point of view of scientists who advocate the point of view you found most negative.

1b. More broadly, based on the material that you have covered in prior courses, do you think psychology has been too “negative”? Briefly explain your answer.

**Wikipedia:** Students should have moved their work to the main space (content evaluated).

#### 4/30 SPRING CONVOCATION – NO CLASS

#### 5/2 “FLASH” ISSUE: Nature vs. Nurture...or are there more than just the two?

Of course we would not be complete in a psychology capstone if we did not consider the nature-nurture issue. Before we do, please review the note regarding the 2/26 discussion.

*NOTE: For those interested in this area, the January 2005 issue of American Psychologist is a special issue entitled, “Genes, Race, and Psychology in the Genome Era.”*

##### Readings

##### Background on behavioral genetics

Plomin, R. (1990). *Nature and nurture: An introduction to human behavioral genetics*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole. **Read pp. 27-56.**

##### Discussing nature and nurture

Bouchard, T. J., Jr. (2004). Genetic influence on human psychological traits: A survey. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 148-151. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00295.x

Johnson, W. (2010). Understanding the genetics of intelligence: Can height help? Can corn oil? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19, 177-182. doi:10.1177/0963721410370136

*Continued on next page...*

*Is there more than nature & nurture?*

McLafferty, C. L., Jr. (2006). Examining unproven assumptions of Galton's nature-nurture paradigm. *American Psychologist*, 61, 177-178. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.2.178

Koole, S. L., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2006). Introducing science to the psychology of the soul: Experimental existential psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 212-216. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00438.x

**Questions Answer 1a or 1b + add in your spark for today**

1a. Sternberg et al.'s (2006) reply to McLafferty (2006) says, "Whereas we might not fully accept the revised classification proposed by McLafferty, we agree that the nature-nurture division has outlived its value. Nor is there a simple continuum between fully nature and fully nurture—the relevance of variation in nurture depends on the mean and range of variation in nature, and vice versa" (p. 179). Do you agree that the nature-nurture distinction "has outlived its value"? Yes or no, and then briefly say why, drawing on the readings, particularly Bouchard (2004) and Johnson (2010).

1b. Briefly state why you do or do not find (a) McLafferty's noëtic proposal and (b) Koole et al.'s (2006) XXP proposal useful in a possible revision of the nature/nurture dichotomy.

**Wikipedia:** Students will have completed 2 peer evaluations by 5/2.

**5/7 The Big Picture Redux & Course wrap up**

**Readings**

Lehrer, J. (2010, December 13). The truth wears off: Is there something wrong with the scientific method? *The New Yorker*, 86(40), 52-57. Retrieved from <http://www.newyorker.com/archive>

Letters in response to Lehrer's article filed under The Mail

Locke, E. A. (2009). It's time we brought introspection out of the closet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 24-25. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01090.x

**Questions Answer 1a OR 1b. Then answer 2. (sparks are optional today)**

1a. Throughout your time as a psychology major, you have, no doubt, considered the scientific method to be a given so the Lehrer article may have come as a surprise. BRIEFLY, what is your response to the question, "Is there something wrong with the scientific method?"

1b. Cite what you see as Locke's strongest OR weakest point in his discussion of introspection.

2. Go back to your responses to the 1/17 discussion questions. After the semester's readings and discussion, is there anything you would change (or further emphasize) about how you defined psychology and/or which theoretical approach works best for you?

**"Final" Wikipedia article & reflective essay due no later than 5:15pm on 5/13**