



OTRP online

Office of Teaching Resources in Psychology

Psychology 401 B
Issues in Psychology

Spring 2006

Class: T/Th 2:30-3:45 p.m.

Office Hours: M, W, F 11-noon; M, W, F 2:00-3:30, T/Th by appointment

Dr. Ruth Ault
Wat 108B, X 2885

Purpose:

This course is designed (a) to provide an opportunity for you to consider issues which cut across previous course boundaries and thus help you to achieve an overview of the field, and (b) to polish your skills in written and oral communication and in critical analysis of theories and research.

Format:

Readings will be assigned on two major topics: theoretical perspectives and ethics, and several, smaller “hot” topics such as memory in forensic contexts, nature-nurture, psychology in the media, sex and race as IVs. Prior to class, you are expected to read the assignments AND ANY OTHER pertinent material you find necessary to enhance your understanding of the topics. You will TYPE $\frac{3}{4}$ -1 page (single-space) responses to discussion questions that should help you to think critically about the readings and to begin to integrate across readings. Written responses to the discussion questions are to be written alone and PLEDGED, but you are encouraged to have rousing conversations with your classmates prior to writing your responses. Spell-checker and grammar-checker are not only permitted, they are encouraged. These responses need to be literate and thoughtful. You will “pass” if I think you’ve made a good-faith effort to answer the question; you will not get credit if I think you’ve dashed off an answer in two minutes.

Two students will be designated discussion leaders for each day. All students, including that day's leaders, are to TYPE two copies of their responses: one for me and one for the discussion leaders. These will be turned into the “basket” on the second floor of Watson [across from Dr Palmer’s office] by noon of the day before class: Monday or Wed. noon. This serves two purposes: it ensures that you have thought about the material and it helps the discussion leaders prepare for their jobs as leader. Leaders will be able to organize class time more effectively if they know how people reacted to the questions. I will return the copy you gave me so you have something to refer to during class. Late papers will NOT be given credit; they will be considered “missed.”

Role of discussion leaders:

Prior to the class meeting, you and your co-leader will collect one copy of the students' response papers. From these, you will organize the day's discussion, deciding what to talk about

and in what order. This might be based on what material caused the most diversity of opinion or difficulty, which seem more likely to generate extended discussion, the order in which they were assigned, your personal favorites, or whatever. To actually begin discussion, you might ask particular class members to summarize their positions or ask them for clarification, elaboration, or evidence for a certain statement. If a particular topic was not handled well in anyone's discussion paper, you might start with asking why the topic was difficult. You are supposed to facilitate discussion, not "tell the right answer." You and your partner should make sure that all students have an opportunity to participate, and you should balance your leadership role with your partner. Do NOT split up the material with one leader solely in charge of one discussion question [Imagine that person might be ill that day.] Everyone is responsible for everything. If at any time you are confused about how to proceed, ask me.

Role of participants and Attendance Policy:

In addition to being prepared for class by reading the assignments and writing the discussion papers, you are obligated to participate in class discussion by offering your point of view, listening actively to the views of your classmates, and seeking clarification from them as needed. Class time will be supportive, not competitive. Obviously, in a class like this, attendance and active participation is critical; therefore, absences and nonparticipation will negatively impact your grade. I understand, however, that there are personal illnesses and family crises that can arise. Therefore, you may miss ONE class without penalty; the second missed class/no meaningful participation will lower your letter grade by 1/2 letter; each additional missed class, by an additional 1/2 letter grade up to the sixth, which will result in failing the class. If you show up for class with a highly contagious illness (e.g., flu, cold), I will ask you not to attend and it will count as an absence, so do NOT drag yourself out of a sick bed – it won't do you any good.

Grading:	4 time-limited, take-home essays	= 64%
	Discussion leading*	= 10%
	Written responses to discussion questions**	= 16%
	Discussion participation***	= 10%

*Graded pass-fail; severe penalties for unexcused missed discussion leading.

**Graded pass-fail; 2 "free" skipped QUESTIONS (not DAYS); after that, -1/2% per missed question.

*** Graded on basis of peer evaluation at 4 times in the semester (after each unit)

Anticipated grade cut-offs: 90-100% A range; 80-89% B range; etc. Grading is for mastery learning, not competitive.

Honor Code Considerations:

No copies of prior tests for this course should exist and none should be made. If you find/are offered any, you must report this as an honor violation. You will be granted access to Watson building to enable you to turn in your response papers whenever you choose. You may not allow non-class members to use your ID card for access to Watson.

Readings Assignments, Discussion Questions, and instructions for essays: See separate handouts.

Psychology 401 Issues in Psychology

Spring 2006

Dr. Ruth Ault

“Watchword *n.* 1. A secret word or phrase spoken to a guard to gain entrance. 2. A slogan.”
(Webster’s II: New Riverside Dictionary).

Watchword for this class: *Embrace ambiguity.*

Required texts:

Nye, R. D. (2000). *Three psychologies: Perspectives from Freud, Skinner, and Rogers.*
Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole

White, S. (1993). *Private practices.* New York: Penguin.

Colapinto, J. (2001). *As nature made him: The boy who was raised as a girl.* New York:
HarperCollins.

Day 1

Jan. 10 [Introduction]

Questionnaire developed by Miserandino, M. (1994). Freudian principles in everyday life.
Teaching of Psychology, 21, 93-95.

Day 2

Jan 12 [What is Psychology?]

Look through the opening chapter of your Intro Psy book [any one will do] for an overview of
the various theoretical perspectives and how the topic of psychology is introduced.

Gleitman, H. (1984). Introducing psychology. *American Psychologist, 39*, 421-427. (from book
pp. 422-435). Note: you only have to read pages 422-431.

Nye, R. D. (2000). Chp 1 [Intro]

Question A: Of all the psychological theories you've studied in any prior course, which one do
you most identify with? WHY? [Choices include Freudian, neo-Freudian, radical behaviorism
(Skinner), social-cognitive (Bandura), information-processing cognitive, Piagetian cognitive,
cognitive-behavioral (e.g., Ellis's Rational Emotive therapy), psychobiological, humanistic
(Maslow, Rogers), ethological-evolutionary (Lorenz), sociobiological (E.O. Wilson), etc.]

Question B: Gleitman alluded to “links” between various areas of psychology and listed two
possibilities: the nature-nurture debate and what is the basic social nature of humans and
animals. Identify some other possibilities. [HINT: You might look at some Intro chapters from
200-level courses you took and see what themes or issues the authors say are fundamental to that
area.

Day 3:

Jan 17 [Psychodynamic Approach]

Nye, R. D. (2000). Chp 2 [Freud]

Freud, S. (1916-17/1943). *A general introduction to psychoanalysis* (J. Riviere, Trans.). New York: Garden City. Lecture 12 (pp. 163-176). "Examples of dreams and analysis of them"

Freud, S. (1925/1986). *The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud* (vol. 19). London: Hogarth Press. pp. 247-258 "Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes"

Re-examining Freud. (1989, September). *Psychology Today*, 23, 48-52.

Question A. List the most likely Freudian concept associated with each Miserandino questionnaire item. Remember that items 1, 2, 7, 9, and 13 are reversed.

Question B. What do you make of Freud's theories? What is your opinion about Freud's biggest contributions to psychology and his biggest drawbacks?

Day 4

Jan 19 [Behavioral Approach]

Nye, R. D. (2000) Chapter 3.

Delprato, D. J., & Midgley, B. D. (1992). Some fundamentals of B. F. Skinner's behaviorism. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1507-1520.

Skinner, B. F. (1990). Can psychology be a science of mind? *American Psychologist*, 45, 1206-1210.

Q. Skinner made three provocative statements:

1. "the more we know about the body-cum-brain as a biochemical machine, the less interesting it becomes in its bearing on behavior." (p. 1208)
2. "There is no place in a scientific analysis of behavior for a mind or self." (p. 1209)
3. Although cognitive science is the underpinning of education, clinical, developmental, social, etc. fields of psych, "the help it has given them has not been conspicuous." (p. 1210)

For each of these three statements, do you agree with it? If so, why? If not, why not? Try to provide concrete examples or elaborate on your reasoning.

Day 5

Jan 24 [Cognitive Approaches]

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

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. New York: Norton. (pp. 331-336.)
"The Sixth Stage: The Invention of New Means through Mental Combinations"

Pinker, S. (2002). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. New York: Penguin Books. (pp. 30-40) "The Last Wall to Fall" [NOTE: pp. 40-51 for Neuroscience approach]

Question: Do you still agree/disagree with Skinner's criticisms of cognitivism? Why or why not? Be as concrete as you can (e.g. use examples to support your opinion).

Day 6

Jan 26 [Partial Integration]

Azar, B. (1997, October). Was Freud right? Maybe, maybe not. *APA Monitor*, 28, 28.

Gray, P. (1993, November 29). The assault on Freud. *Time Magazine*, 47-51. (note: I removed some pages because of pictures so the article is only 3 pages long).

Solms, M. (2004). Freud returns. *Scientific American*, 290, 82-88. [text of article starts on 84] AND in same file:

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

Todd, J. T., & Morris, E. K. (1992). Case histories in the great power of steady misrepresentation. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1441-1453. NOTE: If you are not familiar with Garcia's taste aversion research, a brief synopsis is included after the Todd & Morris reading.

A set of "commentaries" are in one vertical file under the Bailey name:

Bailey, M. B., & Bailey, R. E. (1993). "Misbehavior": A case history. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1157-1158. [Note, M. B. Bailey is the same person as M. Breland.]

Garcia, J. (1993). Misrepresentation of my criticisms of Skinner. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1158.

Todd, J. T., & Morris, E. K. (1993). Change and be ready to change again. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1158-1159.

Nye, R. D. (2000). Epilogue (pp. 161-166).

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

Q. Can RESEARCHERS (not therapists) be eclectic? Does adopting one of the perspectives change, fundamentally, what topics are researched and how the research is designed, conducted, analyzed, and interpreted? Give 3-4 specific examples to bolster your arguments by considering some well-known (to the class) experiments (either from psychology textbooks or from methods course projects). For example, you could use a study of bystander intervention, the Hawthorne effect, rotation of visual objects, age differences in source memory, reinforcement schedules for autistic children, friendship patterns among adolescents, effects of TV programs on women's

body images, etc. What theoretical perspective did the researcher take and how would the study have changed if the researcher had adopted each of the other perspectives?

Day 7

Jan 31

ESSAY 1 DUE at class time

Day 8

Feb 2 [*Memory on the Witness Stand*]

Farrants, J. (1998). The 'false memory' debate: A critical review of the research on recovered memories of child sexual abuse. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 11, 229-238.

Loftus, E. F. (1993). The reality of repressed memories. *American Psychologist*, 48, 518-537.

Wells, G. L. (1993). What do we know about eyewitness identification? *American Psychologist*, 48, 553-571. Note: You can skip the section on "The identification process" pg 558-560.

Kassin, S. M., Tubb, V. A., Hosch, H. M., & Memon, A. (2001). On the "general acceptance" of eyewitness testimony research: A new survey of the experts. *American Psychologist*, 56, 405-416.

Discussion Question:

Kassin et. al. (2001, p. 414) wrote, "most [experts] agreed that long-term repression and recovery and the related proposition that it is possible to differentiate true and false memories are not reliable enough for presentation in court ... {but} it would be important to sample clinical psychologist whose perspectives do not emanate from the eyewitness area." What do you think clinical psychologist would say about the reliability of these two things: 1) long-term repression and recovery & 2) the ability to differentiate between true and false memories? Why do you say that? Would most jurors believe these two things to be true as a matter of common sense? Why?

Day 9

Feb 7 [*Humanistic*]

Nye, R. D. (2000). Chp 4

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

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand. pp. 3-8 and pp. 189-214.

Question A. Some might consider Freud pessimistic, Skinner neutral, and Rogers and Maslow optimistic about the nature of humans. Which view is closer to reality as you see it? What arguments would you raise or what evidence would you point to in supporting your opinion for your classmates who will have different opinions?

Question B. Consider the propositions Maslow laid out (pp. 189-214) and Skinner's fundamental points as laid out by Delprato and Midgely (1992). Could any of Maslow's propositions be restated in behaviorist terms or could any of Skinner's fundamentals be restated in humanist terms? If so, give some examples. If not, take a Maslow proposition and explain why there's unlikely to be a "common ground" with behaviorism.

Day 10

Feb 9 [Biological/Neuroscience]

Pinker, S. (2002). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. New York: Penguin Books. (pp. 40-51) "The Last Wall to Fall" [second half of Day 5 excerpt]

Panksepp, J. (1998). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorders, psychostimulants, and intolerance of childhood playfulness: A tragedy in the making? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 7, 91-98.

Spear, L. P. (2000). Neurobehavioral changes in adolescence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 111-114.

Q. Panksepp asked (p. 96) "Is it appropriate for society to use psychopharmacological agents to reduce natural and positive brain functions of developing children (i.e., playfulness)?" Answer his question OR indicate why Panksepp is asking the wrong question and propose and answer what a better question would be.

Day 11

Feb 14 [Evolutionary Psych]

Gray, P. (1996). Incorporating evolutionary theory into the teaching of psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 23, 207-214.

Buss, D. M. (1995). Psychological sex differences: Origins through sexual selection. *American Psychologist*, 50, 164-168.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (1997). Beyond difference: A biologist's perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53, 233-258. [excerpt from a book is pp. 240-245]

Bjorklund, D. F., & Pellegrini, A. D. (2002). *The origins of human nature: Evolutionary developmental psychology*. [pp. 28-41]

Q. Gray (1996) asked "How would the tendencies to think and behave in [observed] ways... tend to promote survival and reproduction?" Propose answers either for the social psychology topics Gray mentioned (passive bystander effect, foot-in-the-door technique, social facilitation and interference, and group polarization) or other topics you've studied that Gray did not explain.

Day 12

Feb 16 [Integration]

Nye, R. D. (2000). Chp 5

Rosenthal, R. (2002). Covert communication in classrooms, clinics, courtroom and cubicles. *American psychologist*, 57, 839-849.

Marsh, H. W. & Hau, K. T. (2003). Big-fish-little-pond effect on academic self-concept: A cross-cultural (26 country) test of the negative effects of academically selective schools. *American Psychologist*, 58, 364-376.

Q. What can the various theoretical perspectives (all of them) offer for our understanding of the phenomena described by Rosenthal (interpersonal expectancy) and Marsh and Hau (self-concept loss)?

Day 13

Feb 21

ESSAY 2 Due at class time

Day 14

Feb 23 [*Stereotype Threat*]

Steele, C. (1999). Thin ice: "Stereotype threat" and black college students. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 284(2), 44-54. [12 pages retrieved from:
<http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/99aug/9908stereotype.htm>;
<http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/99aug/9908stereotype2.htm>; and
<http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/99aug/9908stereotype3.htm>]

Question. A Steele said that everyone can experience stereotype threat. Recount a personal example of it, and indicate what, if anything, could have been done differently in that situation to remove the threat to you.

Question B. Steele mentions (in part 3) several ways in which colleges can reduce racial stereotype threat in and out of the classroom. Do these operate at Davidson? If so, where and how? If not, could they be implemented? Pick another stereotype threat (e.g., gender, but it can be anything else you consider appropriate) and answer the same questions about programs to reduce it at Davidson.

SPRING BREAK Feb 28, Mar 2

While you're gone, it'd be a good time to start reading White's *Private Practices*

Day 15

March 7 [*Positive Psychology*]

Seligman, M. & Csikszentmihalyi, M (2000). Positive psychology. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14.

Wallis, C. (2005, January 14). The new science of happiness. *Time Magazine*. pp. A2-A21 (although the copy goes to p. A68. Read further if you want. Missing pages were advertisements.)

Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist*, 55, 56-67.

Question A. Based on the material that you have covered in other psychology courses, do you think psychology has been too “negative”? Explain your answer.

Question B. Briefly comment about what interests you most about the ideas in “positive psychology.”

Day 16

Mar 9 [General Ethical Principles]

American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1060-1073. You can also 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.

Question: In the Pope & Vetter article, some of the dilemmas listed seem truly to be dilemmas--where a reasonable person could argue for or against the action, or could truly not know what to do. Others seemed to be clear ethical violations that the respondent was complaining about (e.g., "hired guns" in the courtroom). From the FORMER set of true dilemmas, pick four to discuss. Do you agree with what the respondent said he/she did, or what advice would you give the respondent? Tie your answer to whichever ethical standards might apply (using the Code numbers).

Day 17

March 14 [Ethics in Therapy]

Stanley, A. (1991, July 15). Poet told all; Therapist provides the record. *The New York Times*, pp. A1, B2.

Dallos, R. (1987). Ethics and family therapy. In S. Fairbairn & G. Fairbairn (Eds.), *Psychology, ethics, and change* (pp. 136-160). New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Lakin, M. (1991). *Coping with ethical dilemmas in psychotherapy*. New York: Pergamon. pp. 1-16 and 19-23.

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.

Answer any TWO of the following three questions.

Q. A. Pick one of the vignettes in Roberts et al. and offer advice to a psychologist who would find himself or herself in that situation. State which ethical principles and standards you used to determine your advice. [HINT: Use the Lakin article as an example of how one applies the ethical code.]

Q. B. [From the Stanley article] Was Orne’s release of Sexton’s therapy tapes (a) a “betrayal to the patient and to the profession,” “an unconscionable breach of . . . ethics,” and potentially

“devastating” if “current patients . . . know that somebody could even look at such private confidential information”? or (b) a “gutsy” step to provide insights that would “inspire and help other troubled people” and performed ethically with the full consent of Sexton’s family, especially the abused daughter who would have the most personal stake in the issue? In your response, refer to the relevant sections of the APA code, and also describe how the eventual description of Sexton’s case would be different from or the same as Freud’s publication of cases in his writings or the therapy excerpts you read in the Rogers’ works.

Q. C. Dallos (p. 141) asked “which is less ethically justifiable, to ‘trick’ a family into attending for therapy [by agreeing that one person is the ‘sick’ one] or to leave them in distress out of a principle of ‘honesty’?” Answer that question and refer to the appropriate specific Code sections to bolster your answer.

Day 18

Mar 16 [Student-Faculty Relationships]

Keith-Spiegel, P. C., Tabachnick, B. G., & Allen, M. (1993). Ethics in academia: Students’ views of professors’ actions. *Ethics and Behavior*, 3, 149-162. [Just Table 2]

Before reading the entire Fine & Kurdek article, look at the 4 cases on pp. 1141 & 1142 and respond whether you think the student deserves authorship credit, and if so, in what “order.” Turn in your responses with the question below.

Fine, M. A., & Kurdek, L. A. (1993). Reflections on determining authorship credit and authorship order on faculty-student collaborations. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1141-1147.

Q. Take the “Ethical/Unethical Behavior Survey” from Keith-Spiegel et al. [The scale is on the bottom of the third page] and turn in your responses anonymously (but sign a sheet to indicate that you have turned yours in). Discussion leaders will collate them roughly and ask students to discuss those items on which there was diversity of opinion.

Day 19

Mar 21 [Subgroup Norming]

Sue, D. W. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the “invisible” visible. *American Psychologist*, 59, 761-769.

Brown, D. C. (1994). Subgroup norming: Legitimate testing practice or reverse discrimination? *American Psychologist*, 49, 927-928.

Sackett, P. R., & Wilk, S. L. (1994). Within-group norming and other forms of score adjustment in preemployment testing. *American Psychologist*, 49, 929-954.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1994). The science and politics of race-norming. *American Psychologist*, 49, 955-963.

Question A. Sue said (p. 767) “equal treatment can be discriminatory treatment, and differential treatment is not necessarily preferential.” How can we, as scientific psychologists, know when equal treatment is equal and when it’s discriminatory? Likewise, how can we know when

differential treatment is or is not preferential? That is, what sorts of criteria could/should we use to explore this topic?

Question B. Like most colleges, Davidson has “diversity” goals (both ethnic and socioeconomic) and also uses standardized tests like the SAT or ACT for admissions. In our school’s context, should Davidson practice “subgroup norming” or is this reverse discrimination? Consider both “cutoff” scores for the standardized tests and our practice of giving “points” to students from “quality” high schools (based on number of AP classes it offers and number of graduates who go on to college), which is highly positively correlated with SES.

Day 20

Mar 23 [*Research Deception*]

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 371-378. (NOTE, copy on reserve is from a book, pages 23-36.)

Baumrind, D. (1964). Some thoughts on ethics of research: After reading Milgram's "Behavioral study of obedience." *American Psychologist*, 19, 421-423. (NOTE, copy on reserve is from a book, pages 273-277.)

Milgram, S. (1964). Issues in the study of obedience: A reply to Baumrind. *American Psychologist*, 19, 848-852. (NOTE, copy on reserve is from a book, pages 278-283.)

Blass, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Obedience to authority: Current perspectives on the Milgram paradigm*. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum. (pp. 35-59). Reprinted from *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, (1999), 29, 955-978.

and browse the following website: <http://www.stanleymilgram.com>

Q. Baumrind said it is difficult for psychologists to demonstrate permanent scientific value in their research and that Milgram’s study, in particular, was not *externally* valid. Milgram obviously disagreed and Blass argued that Milgram’s experimental authority was a combination of legitimate and scientific expertise. Whose arguments did you find more persuasive and why?

Day 21

Mar 28 [*Informed Consent and Research Risk*]

Haney, C., Banks, C., & Zimbardo, P. (1973). Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, 1, 69-97.

Q. Are the ethical issues of Zimbardo's prison study any different from Milgram's obedience study? Why or why not?

Day 22

Mar 30

NO CLASS. Read White’s book if you haven’t already, for Essay 3.

Day 23

April 4

ESSAY 3 due at class time

Day 24

Apr 6 [Nature-Nurture]

Plomin, R. (1990). *Nature and nurture: An introduction to human behavioral genetics*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brook/Cole. [Chpt 3, pp. 28-56 is assigned; Chpt 5, pp. 115-129 is optional] Note, on the 4th photocopy page, right-hand side, (real page 33), you may be able to see a hand-written asterisk in the left column before the sentence "Correlations for relatives are computed..." What I wrote at the bottom of the page for this asterisk was the following:

To calculate covariance, consider pairs of siblings:
Sibling B belongs to the β group which has a group mean of M_β
and Sibling D belongs to the δ group which has a group mean of M_δ
Now take B's deviation from M_β and multiply it by D's deviation from M_δ
Do that for all Sibling pairs (who have been randomly assigned to the β or δ group).
The average of all those numbers (all the products of deviations) is the covariance.

Just FYI:

"If there is little variance...then heritability will be low. Because there is little variation in the number of ears people have, the heritability of having two ears is approximately zero despite the obvious role of genetics." (Collier, G., 1994, *Social origins of mental ability*. New York: Wiley. p. 22, footnote 3.)

Joseph, J. (2004). *The gene illusion: Genetic research in psychiatry and psychology under the microscope*. (pp. 67-76 [chp 3] and pp. 137-153 [chp 5] plus Figure 2.1 [p. 22])

No written question today. In class we'll try to make sense of this information and then consider whether, if we were on a funding panel, we'd recommend funding twin studies.

Day 25

Apr 11 [The Bell Curve]

Murray, C., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1994, October 31). Race, genes, and I.Q. -- An apologia. *The New Republic*, 27-37.

The New Republic (1994, October 31). "The Issue." p. 9, and Letters to the Editor:
"Blue Genes" by R. Nisbett, p. 15; "The Lying Game" by N. Glazer, pp. 15-16; "From P.C. to P. R." by A. Wolfe, p. 17; "The Phony War" by R. Kennedy, pp.19-20; "Brave New Right" by M. Lind, pp. 24-25.

McMurray, J. (1999, April 21). Remarks test academic freedom: Prof's backing of ex-Klan leader's views debated. *Charlotte Observer*, p. A2.

Q. Which of Murray & Herrnstein's arguments did you find the most persuasive (or which has the most support for it) and why? Which of the critics' arguments did you find most persuasive and why?

NO CLASS 4/18 Easter break. Read ahead for Thursday.

Day 26

Apr 13 [A Failed Experiment]

Colapinto, J. (2001). *As nature made him: The boy who was raised as a girl*. New York: HarperCollins.

Q. In the afterward, Colapinto said he “reject[s] any reading of the book that reduces [David’s] story to simpleminded determinism” (p. 277), and he lists a variety of environmental cues that “played a role in undermining the experiment” (p. 279). Evaluate the likelihood that the experiment could have succeeded if the environmental cues had been more supportive of the sex-reassignment. Consider, for example, not having a twin brother, more normal looking genitals following initial surgery, parents counseled to accept tomboyish behavior, having a therapist like Mary McKenty right from the start, etc.

We can also talk about ethics in connection with this book.

Day 27

Apr 20 [Psychology and the General Public and Media]

Fox, R. E. (1996). Charlatanism, scientism, and psychology’s social contract. *American Psychologist*, 51, 777-784.

Blakeslee, A. (1952). Psychology and the newspaper man. *American Psychologist*, 7, 91-94 (from book pp. 292-298).

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.

Stanovich, K. E. (1998). “The Rodney Dangerfield of the sciences.” Ch 12, 194-223 (from book *How to Think Straight about Psychology*).

Question: Both White’s and Colapinto’s books portray psychology to the general public. Evaluate their treatments: Are they favorable or unfavorable? realistic or unrealistic? appropriate or inappropriate? Embarrassing or praise-worthy? Would you have done anything differently? Justify your conclusions.

Day 28

Apr 25 [Psychology & the Internet]

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53, 1017-1031.

Do NOT get stuck in the details of the analyses; keep the big picture they write about in English in mind. See me if you would like to talk about the analyses.

Four commentary exchange filed under Silverman (1999):

Silverman, T. (1999). The internet and relational theory. *American Psychologist*, 54, 780-781.

Rierdan, J. (1999). Internet-depression link? *American Psychologist*, 54, 781-782.

Shapiro, J. S. (1999). Loneliness: Paradox or artifact? *American Psychologist*, 54, 782-783.

Kiesler, S., & Kraut, R. (1999). Internet use and ties that bind. *American Psychologist*, 54, 783-784.

Taylor, C. B. & Luce, K. H. (2003). Computer- and internet-based psychotherapy interventions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, 18-22.

Question A:

Are you concerned about the internet reducing social involvement and psychological well-being? Explain your answer and give a brief comment that you think Kraut and colleague may make on your answer.

Question B: A creative application of internet technology to psychology is for the use of psychotherapy. Can you come up with another area or aspect of psychology that one can similarly benefit from the application of internet technology?

Day 29

Apr 27 [*Should we study sex/race differences?*]

Baumeister, R. (1988). Should we stop studying sex differences altogether? *American Psychologist*, 43, 1092-1095.

Eagly, A. H. (1995). The science and politics of comparing women and men. *American Psychologist*, 50, 145-158. Concentrate on the abstract (p. 145) and conclusions (pp. 155-156)

Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60, 581- 592.

Spelke, E. S. (2005). Sex differences in intrinsic aptitude for mathematics and science? A critical review. *American Psychologist*, 60, 950-958.

Q. 28 Today's readings present arguments for and against continuing to study sex differences. Wolfe (one of the Bell Curve critics in "From PC to PR", Day 25) hinted that if we abolished racial classifications, we couldn't discriminate on the basis of race. Sue (see Day 19) argued that eliminating the study of race would lead to more, not less, discrimination. So, what should we do—study or not study these categories? Justify your position.

Day 30

May 2 [Does Psychology Matter?]

Mental health: Does therapy help? (1995, November). *Consumer Reports*, 60, 734-739.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1995). The effectiveness of psychotherapy: The *Consumer Reports* study. *American Psychologist*, 50, 965-974.

Zimbardo, P. G. (2004) Does psychology make a significant difference in our lives? *American Psychologist*, 59, 339-351.

Question: Of all the areas where psychology MIGHT matter (both areas Zimbardo listed and ones you can think of yourself), which do you think are the most important? Why? Do we have good evidence that psychology DOES matter in those areas, or are we engaging in wishful thinking?

ESSAY 4 due by Friday May 5, 5 p.m. NO LATE PAPERS!!!

Locate an item that is about psychology in the general public media (e.g., an item that is in *Glamour*, *abcnews.com*, *Good Housekeeping*, *The New Yorker*, *The Washington Post*, *NPR's Talk of the Nation*, etc.; old NPR shows are often available on their web site at <http://www.npr.org/> and you might be able to find clips of shows like *48 Hours* on the web too). Then find the original research discussed (or examples of it if the research was talked about in general); include full citations in your written response.

How accurate was the report to the public when compared with the original research report(s)? What did the media get right and what did they get wrong? Were important complicating factors (e.g., interactions) left out of the report to the public? Use concrete examples wherever you can. If you are having trouble finding a media item, you can get ideas from <http://www.psychwatch.com/news.htm>.

Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2001). Media violence and the American public: Scientific facts versus media misinformation. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 477-489.

Brescoll, V., & LaFrance, M. (2004). The correlates and consequences of newspaper reports of research on sex differences. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 515-520.

Review the Bushman and Anderson (2001) paper from last week, particularly their recommendations to scientists starting on the top of the right column on p. 487.

Discussion leaders, if you want to assign certain students to read certain nuggets from the NSF site listed first below and/or the APA & APS sites listed next, send those assignments out ASAP.

Go to the following web site: <http://www.nsf.gov/discoveries/> [This and the following links were working as of 1/4/2005; let KM know ASAP if they are no longer working.]

Read **at least one** psychology-related discovery & **at least one** from a field other than psychology (there are numerous web pages full of topics).

Also read **at least one** article under **Research Topics** at <http://www.psychologymatters.org/> & **at least one** at <http://www.psychologicalscience.org/media/index.cfm>

Finally, search out another web site (e.g., I was interested in Gary Wells' research on eyewitness testimony so I found his site at the University of Iowa: <http://www.psychology.iastate.edu/faculty/gwells/homepage.htm>) **or other way** psychologists may be giving psychology away to the general public.

Questions: Answer ALL.

1. Do you agree with Bushman and Anderson that the research community is responsible for explaining their work to the media and the public? If so, how do we balance the "conservative scientist role" and the "public educator role"? If not, what's the alternative—not sharing what we know? Getting the media to translate science to the public? Something else (explain what you're thinking of)?

2. Consider the NSF web site "discoveries". State which psychology-related discovery you read (give the URL) and rate your understanding of the research where 1 is *don't understand at all* and 10 is *understand completely*. Then do the same rating for the NON-psychology discovery that you read. Taking into account how well you,

as a novice in the non-psychology area, understood the non-psychology discovery, is NSF doing a good job of explaining science to the general public with these discovery stories? Explain your opinion.

3. Comment on the “best” and “worst” aspects of the NSF, APA, and APS attempts to give psychology away.

4. List the source (e.g., paste in the link) you explored on your own. Briefly comment on how successfully the psychologist gave psychology away.