



SHU Faculty Publications

10-2004

Conscientiousness is Key: Incentives for Attendance Make Little Difference.

Maureen A. Conard
Sacred Heart University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/faculty>



Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#), and the [School Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Conard, M. A. (2004). Conscientiousness is key: Incentives for attendance make little difference. *Teaching of Psychology*, 31(4), 269-272. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top3104_8

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in SHU Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact ferribyp@sacredheart.edu, lysobeyb@sacredheart.edu.

FACULTY FORUM

McKeachie Early Career Awardees: Their Training, Work, and Perspectives on Academic Life

Tracy Zinn, Jason Sikorski,
and William Buskist
Auburn University

We surveyed recipients of Division Two's McKeachie Early Career Award, which is traditionally given to promising graduate student instructors of psychology. We found that most recipients work in academic settings after receiving the award. They have devoted the bulk of their academic careers to teaching and, to a lesser extent, research. Awardees' advice to graduate students and new faculty generally centered on viewing research and teaching as being compatible activities.

In the late 1970s, the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP; Division Two of the American Psychological Association, APA) established a national awards program to recognize individuals for excellence in the teaching of psychology (see Cole, 1980; Wight & Davis, 1992). In 1980, STP awarded its first honors in three categories: 4-year colleges and universities (Robert S. Daniel Award), 2-year colleges, and early career contributions to teaching (McKeachie Early Career Award). In 1981, STP gave its first award for outstanding high school teachers (Moffett Memorial Award).

Only a few studies have examined the habits and practices of STP's award-winning teachers. For example, two studies investigated the characteristics and teaching styles of winners of the Robert S. Daniel Award. Griggs (1996) developed a profile of these awardees, revealing that they taught at smaller institutions for nearly two decades and received other teaching awards before receiving the Daniel Award. Buskist (2002) discovered that these individuals had little formal training in teaching and that they attributed their success to a combination of observing others' teaching styles and receiving feedback regarding their own teaching. In addition, these awardees believed that as their careers progressed, their teaching became more student-centered and less lecture-oriented.

In this study, we queried McKeachie awardees to learn about their training and work as well as their perspectives on college and university teaching. McKeachie awardees are exemplars of effective teaching, and we believe that learning about their professional experience and perspectives might provide lessons that graduate students and new faculty could find useful in their development as teachers.

General Procedure

STP has recognized 20 individuals (9 women, 11 men) with the McKeachie Award; the award was not given in 1981, 1985, and 1992. We mailed a cover letter, informed consent information, a demographics sheet, and a 9-item survey to 17 of the 20 recipients of the McKeachie Early Career Award (see Table 1). We could not locate contact information for 3 awardees. We received completed surveys from 13 awardees (76%; 8 men and 5 women). The questionnaire focused on awardees' graduate school training in teaching, their current academic activities, and any advice they might offer individuals pursuing a teaching career.

Teacher Training As Graduate Students

Respondents indicated a wide range of training and mentoring experiences as graduate students. The most frequently cited experience contributing to respondents' development as teachers was their teaching experience and practice (54%). Seven respondents (54%) also indicated either formal or informal mentoring by a faculty member, and five (38%) mentioned taking courses on university teaching as beneficial in preparing them to teach. Six respondents (46%) indicated no formal training in teaching. These comments paralleled those responses of Division Two's Daniel awardees, many of whom indicated that they had no formal training in teaching (Buskist, 2002).

Academic Activities

The 13 respondents worked at a range of institutions: doctoral and research-intensive, 1; doctoral and research-intensive, 2; master's college or university Level I, 6; baccalaureate-liberal arts, 2; and baccalaureate-general, 1. One respondent was no longer in academia.

Respondents' allocation of their time spanned the range of academic duties, with teaching being the activity to which they devoted the most attention. On average, respondents allocated their time as follows: teaching, 44% (range = 25% to 80%); research, 28% (range = 10% to 40%); administration, 17% (range = 0% to 50%); advising 7% (range = 0% to 30%); and consulting, 4% (range = 0% to 20%).

Although awardees devoted the bulk of their time to teaching, their research output outpaced their teaching output in terms of peer-reviewed publications and conference presentations. On average, over the past 3 years, awardees published 5 research articles (range = 0 to 6) and gave 6 research-oriented presentations (range = 0 to 11), but published only 1 teaching-oriented article (range = 0 to 4) and

Table 1. McKeachie Early Career Awardees, 1980 to 2002

Year	Recipient	Institution at Time of Award
1980	Susan Warner	University of Florida
1982	Gary Namie	University of California, Santa Barbara
1983	Hugh Foley	State University of New York, Stony Brook
1984	Michael Stevenson	Purdue University
1986	Lyn Mowafy	University of Arizona
1987	David Pittenger	University of Georgia
1988	Linda M. Brandelberry	St. Louis University
1989	Arthur Kohn	Duke University
1990	Cathy Grover	Texas A & M University
1991	Andrew Schrack Walters	University of Georgia
1993	Joel David Swendsen	University of California, Los Angeles
1994	Steven A. Meyers	Michigan State University, East Lansing
1995	Maria Lynn	St. Louis University
1996	Earl M. Williams	University of California, Los Angeles
1997	Barbara Hofer	University of Michigan
1998	Amy T. Galloway	Northern Michigan University
1999	William Douglas Woody	Colorado State University
2000	Linda R. Tropp	University of California, Santa Cruz
2001	Courtney Ahrens	University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
2002	Bryan K. Saville	Auburn University

gave 3 teaching-oriented presentations (range = 0 to 11). However, keep in mind that these data may not accurately reflect the scholarly activities of those awardees who only relatively recently accepted academic positions.

Five respondents have served as occasional reviewers for *Teaching of Psychology*. Other reported activities included serving in other teaching organizations in addition to STP, organizing symposia, serving as members or organizers of task forces related to improving education, facilitating faculty development workshops, and mentoring graduate students on how to become effective teachers.

Advice for Graduate Students and New Faculty

Five respondents (35%) indicated the importance of making research a priority. Suggestions for doing so included defining a research agenda, setting aside time to conduct research, and publishing as much as possible because a good teaching record alone does not always make a person “competitive for positions advertised with a teaching component.” This point was underscored by one respondent who suggested that graduate students learn to think in terms of “teaching and research” rather than “teaching versus research” in their approach to academic life. This point is particularly salient because of the professoriate’s tendency to cast teaching and research as mutually exclusive activities. Thus, such a categorization is a false dichotomy. Graduate students should begin to develop strategies and tactics for balancing the two over the course of their careers.

In terms of teaching per se, respondents suggested that graduate students should teach diverse, research-based courses and lobby their departmental administrators to be the instructor of record for as many courses as possible. Respondents also recommended that graduate students should find a mentor, seek feedback on teaching skills, read extensively about teaching, and practice teaching skills.

Another recurring theme in awardees’ advice to graduate students was to cultivate passion for teaching. One respon-

dent remarked, “If you love what you teach, students will get caught up in the learning process.” Another respondent suggested that graduate students should think about why they are excited about the topic and “find a way to transmit that excitement to students.” These awardees seemed to echo the sentiments of Brewer (2002), who stated, “teaching is the most exciting, challenging, rewarding, and difficult thing” (p. 500) that he has ever done.

The number of participants responding to our questionnaire was small relative to the number of participants typically involved in survey research. However, our sample size was limited by the size of the population of McKeachie Early Career awardees. Given that our return rate exceeded 65% of the total population (and 76% of awardees asked to respond to the survey), our results would seem to be generally representative of that population. Our data suggest that those individuals recognized early in their careers for their contributions to the teaching of psychology remain largely devoted to academia and teaching. These individuals exhibited a genuine interest in, and passion for, teaching psychology as evident in their advice to psychology’s next generation of teachers.

References

- Brewer, C. L. (2002). Reflections on an academic career: From which side of the looking glass? In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (pp. 499–507). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Buskist, W. (2002). Effective teaching: Perspectives and insights from Division Two’s 2- and 4-year awardees. *Teaching of Psychology*, 29, 188–193.
- Cole, D. (1980). Teaching award winners, 1980. *Teaching of Psychology*, 7, 135–136.
- Griggs, R. A. (1996). Division Two 4-year college and university teaching award winners: A composite profile. *Teaching of Psychology*, 23, 231–232.
- Wight, R. D., & Davis, S. F. (1992). Division in search of self: A history of APA Division 2, the Division of the Teaching of

Psychology. In A. E. Puente, J. R. Matthews, & C. L. Brewer (Eds.), *Teaching psychology in America: A history* (pp. 365–384). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Notes

1. Tracy Zinn is now at James Madison University.
2. We thank the members of the EDGE group in the Department of Psychology for reading and commenting on an earlier version of the manuscript. We also thank Randolph A. Smith and three anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful critique of earlier drafts of the article.
3. Send correspondence to William Buskist, Psychology Department, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849–5214; e-mail: buskiwf@auburn.edu.

Using Common Core Vocabulary in Text Selection and Teaching the Introductory Course

Richard A. Griggs
University of Florida

Alexandra Bujak-Johnson and Derrick L. Proctor
Andrews University

Recent research using textbook samples has indicated that the common core vocabulary among introductory textbooks is not very large. We analyzed the glossaries of current introductory textbooks to identify the set of common core concepts using 2 criteria, common to more than 50% and to 80% or more of the textbooks. Teachers can use these 2 sets of core concepts (415 and 155 terms, respectively) to help structure their introductory courses. We also computed individual textbook glossary size, percentage of coverage of the common core for both criteria, and glossary uniqueness. We found substantial variance among textbooks for these dimensions. These data thus comprise a valuable aid to teachers in the textbook evaluation and selection process.

Recent research on introductory psychology textbooks has indicated that these texts do not share a common core vocabulary. For example, Zechmeister and Zechmeister's (2000) content analysis of the glossaries of 10 introductory textbooks revealed that only 64 of 2,505 different glossary terms appeared in all 10 glossaries and that about half of the concepts appeared in only 1 glossary. Similarly, Landrum (1993) conducted a page-by-page content analysis of "important" terms in six introductory textbooks and found that 1,600 of 2,742 different terms were unique and only 126 were in all six textbooks. Analyzing 52 introductory textbook indexes, Quereshi (1993) also found little commonality; only 3 terms appeared in all of the indexes and only 141 appeared in 75% of the indexes. Thus, three studies, each employing a different type of vocabulary analysis, found that introductory texts did not share a very large common vocabulary. Zechmeister and Zechmeister (2000) pointed out that this lack of a common core vocabulary in introductory textbooks poses a real problem for introductory teachers trying to teach the course

via the prescription "less is more," because there is no clear definition of what the "less" should be.

Zechmeister and Zechmeister (2000) further pointed out that the lack of agreement across studies exacerbates this problem. For example, of the 126 core terms that Landrum found in his 6-book sample, only 44% were in even 8 or more of the 10 textbooks in the Zechmeister and Zechmeister sample. As Zechmeister and Zechmeister concluded, "this lack of convergent validity is obvious and troublesome" (p. 9). However, the sampled textbooks varied greatly across the different studies. To obtain more definitive data on the core vocabulary for introductory textbooks, we analyzed the glossaries of the current population of introductory textbooks. Thus, a teacher who wanted to use the common core vocabulary in introductory texts as the definition of "less" for teaching the course could do so. We used text glossaries because, as Zechmeister and Zechmeister argued, these terms are the ones text authors have identified as most important and students as the most likely to be tested. Landrum (1993) enumerated several other possible uses for these common core data. Of most relevance to this study, teachers could use the common core vocabulary as an aid in the textbook evaluation and selection process. Given the importance of this function, we computed not only how well each text covers the common core vocabulary but also the uniqueness of each text's vocabulary.

Landrum and Hormel (2002) found that introductory psychology teachers rated highly both a text's definition of terms and its glossary when they selected a text and established goals for student learning. For example, teachers rated these text attributes fourth and seventh, respectively, out of 79 attributes for importance to student learning. Chatman and Goetz (1985) also suggested using the extent to which textbooks cover key concepts as a means of reducing the size of the set of texts chosen for further, more detailed analyses during textbook evaluation. For introductory teachers who might heavily weight common core coverage and uniqueness of vocabulary in their text evaluation process, our data should prove extremely beneficial.

Method

In their compendium of introductory psychology textbooks, Koenig, Griggs, Marek, and Christopher (2003) listed 35 current (latest copyright from 2000 to 2003) introductory textbooks. The only other current introductory textbooks are briefer versions of some of these 35. One of the 35 current textbooks, Gaulin and McBurney (2001), was not appropriate for our study. It is idiosyncratically structured around evolution and its applications to psychology and employs a very atypical vocabulary and thus is not comparable to normal introductory texts. Because introductory textbooks are on a 3-year revision cycle, Koenig et al.'s (2003) compendium included only texts with a latest copyright date within the last 4 years (i.e., those textbooks reasonably viable for adoption consideration). To identify additional textbooks that have not been revised recently but might possibly be in the future, we checked the Web sites of introductory textbook publishers for texts with the latest copyright as old as 1997. This search yielded 10 additional textbooks with the

latest copyright from 1997 to 2003 (a time period greater than twice the typical text revision cycle). Reference information for these 44 textbooks appears in the Appendix.

After entering each text's glossary of terms into a computer database, we identified synonyms (e.g., *double-blind procedure* and *double-blind study*; *conditioned reinforcer* and *secondary reinforcer*) through discussion and by consulting Corsini's (1999) psychology dictionary. We counted the frequency of each term across the 44 texts and also how many different terms occurred in all 44 texts, in 43 texts, and so forth, down to unique terms.

Based on Zechmeister and Zechmeister (2000), we employed a criterion of inclusion in 80% (i.e., 35) or more of the 44 text glossaries as the initial common vocabulary criterion. Once we determined this set of terms, we compared it to the list of terms included in 8 or more of the 10 textbook glossaries in Zechmeister and Zechmeister's textbook sample (obtained from J. S. Zechmeister, personal communication, October 2000). To provide teachers with a larger set of common core terms to use in their teaching, we also used a more lax commonality criterion: terms appearing in more than 22 of the 44 text glossaries. To aid teachers in text evaluation and selection, we computed the percentage of terms in each of the 44 texts using each criterion. In addition, we computed the uniqueness of each text's glossary by determining the number of terms appearing only in that text's glossary. Because uniqueness is positively correlated with glossary size (Zechmeister & Zechmeister, 2000), we also counted the total number of terms appearing in each text's glossary.

Results and Discussion

After combining similar terms within and between text glossaries, the total number of different glossary terms across the 44 textbooks was 6,269. As in previous studies, the commonality between text glossaries was extremely low. Only 14 (0.22%) of the 6,269 terms appeared in all 44 glossaries. Over half (3,446; 55%) were unique to only 1 text glossary, and about 74% (4,654) were in 3 or fewer text glossaries.

Only 155 terms (2.5%) met the commonality criterion of appearing in 80% or more of the text glossaries. These terms appear in Table 1, grouped by their frequency of glossary inclusion from 44 to 35. More of these terms come from the biological psychology (25) and learning (25) chapters than any of the other standard introductory chapters. These two chapter topics accounted for almost one third (32%) of the common core terms. The number of terms for any other chapter topic was less than 10%, except for the introductory-methods chapter, which accounted for 10%.

The size of the common core set of terms (155) is less than the 197 found by Zechmeister and Zechmeister (2000) for their sample of 10 texts, but this finding is not surprising because we analyzed the 44-text population and not a small sample. Of the 197 terms included in 80% of Zechmeister and Zechmeister's text sample, 64 (32%) were not in our common core. In addition, 22 other terms were part of our common core but not theirs. The less restrictive criterion of inclusion in more than 50% of the texts yielded 415 terms (6.6% of the 6,269 terms), which means that over 93% of the

Table 1. 155 Common Core Vocabulary Terms

In 44 textbooks ^a	axon
	cerebral cortex
	conditioned response
	conditioned stimulus
	dendrite
	dependent variable
	extinction
	independent variable
	neurotransmitter
	operant conditioning
	schizophrenia
	spontaneous recovery
	unconditioned response
	unconditioned stimulus
In 43 textbooks ^b	autonomic nervous system
	central nervous system
	classical conditioning
	cognitive dissonance
	generalization
	heuristic
	long-term memory
	peripheral nervous system
	punishment
	reliability
	sensation
	shaping
	synapse
	systematic desensitization
	thalamus
	validity
In 42 textbooks ^a	action potential
	discrimination
	ego
	hypothalamus
	id
	parasympathetic nervous system
	personality
	positive reinforcement
	projective test
	psychology
	REM sleep
	sensory memory
	superego
	sympathetic nervous system
In 41 textbooks ^c	absolute threshold
	attitude
	behavior therapy
	defense mechanism
	dissociative identity disorder
	electroconvulsive therapy
	experiment
	learning
	neuron
	object permanence
	observational learning
	perception
	secondary reinforcer
	short-term memory
	somatic nervous system
In 40 textbooks ^d	attribution
	bipolar disorder
	cerebellum

(continued)

Table 1 (Continued)

client-centered therapy
 cone
 conservation
 corpus callosum
 correlational research
 hormone
 hypothesis
 motivation
 negative reinforcement
 obsessive-compulsive disorder
 phobia
 psychoanalysis
 reinforcement
 retina
 rod
 stereotype
 stress
 In 39 textbooks^e
 algorithm
 attachment
 case study
 emotion
 endocrine system
 episodic memory
 limbic system
 self-actualization
 semantic memory
 trait
 In 38 textbooks^f
 accommodation (Piagetian usage)
 anorexia nervosa
 assimilation
 control group
 consciousness
 formal operational stage
 free association
 gene
 general adaptation syndrome
 intelligence quotient
 opponent-process color theory
 personality disorder
 posttraumatic stress disorder
 primary reinforcer
 proactive interference
 transference
 trichromatic color theory
 In 37 textbooks^b
 behaviorism
 chromosome
 circadian rhythm
 cochlea
 concrete operational stage
 conformity
 fixed-ratio schedule
 hypnosis
 intelligence
 major depression
 phoneme
 retroactive interference
 schema
 social psychology
 variable-interval schedule
 variable-ratio schedule
 In 36 textbooks^g
 bulimia nervosa
 concept
 encoding
 fixed-interval schedule

(continued)

Table 1 (Continued)

functional fixedness
 functionalism
 implicit memory
 law of effect
 naturalistic observation
 prejudice
 preoperational stage
 psychotherapy
 puberty
 repression
 sensorimotor stage
 structuralism
 survey
 Type A behavior pattern
 Weber's law
 In 35 textbooks^a
 correlation coefficient
 dissociative disorder
 evolutionary psychology
 fundamental attribution error
 hallucination
 homeostasis
 mood disorder
 motor neuron
 myelin sheath
 partial reinforcement
 reticular formation
 sensory neuron
 stimulant
 theory

^a*n* = 14. ^b*n* = 16. ^c*n* = 15. ^d*n* = 20. ^e*n* = 10. ^f*n* = 17. ^g*n* = 19.

total different glossary terms do not appear in even 50% of the texts.

Table 2 presents the number of glossary terms, the percentage of the 155 (in 80% or more of the texts) and 415 (in more than 50% of the texts) common core terms included in the glossary, and the glossary's uniqueness percentage for each of the 44 texts. With respect to glossary size, the glossaries ranged from only 303 terms to 1,551 terms. The median glossary size was 682 terms; only 9 texts included more than 800 terms and 6 texts had fewer than 500 terms. Coverage of the set of 155 common core terms ranged from 47.7% to 98.1%, with median coverage of 91.6%. Thus, the typical text included most of the core terms, which would be expected given the core inclusion criterion of appearing in 80% or more of the texts.

There was more variability among texts in their coverage of the set of terms derived from the criterion of appearing in more than 50% of the glossaries. Such coverage ranged from 26.5% to 88.0%, with median coverage of 73.2%. Glossary uniqueness ranged from 1.4% to 29.7%, with a median of 10.6%. As expected, the one-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation between these uniqueness percentages and the texts' glossary sizes was significant, $r(44) = .54, p < .01$. Thus, teachers considering texts with larger glossaries should check a text's glossary uniqueness. For example, the text with the largest glossary (the Coon text with 1,551 terms) had 29.7% glossary uniqueness. This figure means almost 1 of every 3 terms was unique to that text. However, a text can have a relatively large glossary and not have such a large uniqueness percentage (e.g., the Nevid text with 915 terms but only

Table 2. Number of Glossary Terms, Percentage Inclusion of Common Core Terms (Both in More Than 50% and 80% or More of the Texts), and Percentage Glossary Uniqueness for each Introductory Textbook

Textbook ^a	No. of Glossary Terms	% Terms in More Than 50% of the Texts ^b	% Terms in 80% or More of the Texts ^c	% Glossary Uniqueness
Barker	524	62.7	85.2	12.5
Baron	663	71.8	91.0	6.2
Bernstein et. al.	648	76.1	91.6	6.9
Bourne & Russo	759	76.1	92.3	10.9
Carlson & Buskist	787	75.9	92.3	14.6
Coon	1551	83.9	98.1	29.7
Davis & Palladino	648	77.1	93.5	7.5
Feldman	496	65.1	90.3	6.0
Fernald	911	83.9	96.1	14.4
Franzoi	629	81.7	96.1	3.0
Gazzaniga & Heatherton	579	62.7	82.6	10.9
Gerow & Bordens	494	63.6	86.5	7.5
Gerrig & Zimbardo	645	72.0	89.7	10.8
Gleitman et al.	1186	77.6	84.5	23.2
Gray	554	58.1	80.0	13.9
Hockenbury & Hockenbury	709	81.9	98.1	7.3
Huffman	479	73.3	92.9	2.9
Kalat	703	72.3	87.1	10.8
Kassin	536	74.9	88.4	2.3
Kosslyn & Rosenberg	743	78.1	94.2	13.1
Lahey	671	70.4	91.0	11.5
Lefton & Brannon	528	69.6	89.7	2.5
Matlin	784	78.8	94.2	12.0
Morris & Maisto	688	76.9	94.2	4.9
Myers	553	78.6	94.8	1.4
Mynatt & Doherty	312	31.6	52.3	18.7
Nairne	529	78.6	91.6	2.1
Nevid	915	87.5	92.3	7.2
Passer & Smith	756	77.8	96.1	11.2
Pettijohn	1041	88.0	96.1	12.1
Plotnik	991	82.2	94.8	17.0
Rathus	825	81.7	96.8	10.3
Santrock	722	68.2	89.0	3.6
Schlinger & Poling	303	26.5	47.7	21.6
Sdorow & Rickabaugh	704	83.9	95.5	7.0
Smith	758	73.0	88.4	11.0
Smith et al.	773	65.5	89.0	21.6
Sternberg	971	83.4	94.8	17.1
Uba & Huang	550	71.8	90.3	5.2
Wade & Tavis	428	60.7	83.2	5.6
Weiten	693	73.3	91.6	6.3
Westen	916	83.9	96.1	14.4
Wood & Wood	773	8.12	93.5	5.4
Wortman et al.	660	73.0	87.7	9.7

^aThe Appendix provides reference information for all 44 texts. ^bPercentage of the 415 terms in the glossaries of more than 50% of the 44 textbooks included in each text. ^cPercentage of the 155 terms in the glossaries of 80% or more of the 44 textbooks included in each text. ^dPercentage of a textbook's glossary terms not appearing in any other text glossary.

7.2% uniqueness) or a relatively small glossary with a large uniqueness percentage (e.g., the Schlinger & Poling text with 303 terms but 21.6% uniqueness).

In summary, we have identified the common core vocabulary among current introductory textbooks. As suggested by recent studies examining samples of introductory textbooks, the common core is not very large. However, teachers may use these common core data in structuring their individual courses to ensure coverage of core vocabulary. A teacher who wants to cover a more substantial common core can use the set of 415 terms derived from the simple majority criterion. Individual introductory textbooks vary greatly not only in their coverage of the common core but also in their glossary size and uniqueness. Teachers may want to include these

glossary size, coverage, and uniqueness data in their introductory textbook evaluation and selection process to reduce the number of texts that they evaluate more thoroughly.

References

- Chatman, S. P., & Goetz, E. T. (1985). Improving text selection. *Teaching of Psychology, 12*, 150–152.
- Corsini, R. J. (1999). *The dictionary of psychology*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Gaulin, S. J. C., & McBurney, D. H. (2001). *Psychology: An evolutionary approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Koenig, C. S., Griggs, R. A., Marek, P., & Christopher, A. N. (2003). *A compendium of introductory psychology textbooks, 2000–2003*. Re-

rieved March 1, 2003, from <http://www.lemoyne.edu/OTRP/introtxts.html>

Landrum, R. E. (1993). Identifying core concepts in introductory psychology. *Psychological Reports*, 72, 659–666.

Landrum, R. E., & Hormel, L. (2002). Textbook selection: Balance between the pedagogy, the publisher, and the student. *Teaching of Psychology*, 29, 245–248.

Quereshi, M. Y. (1993). The contents of introductory psychology textbooks: A follow-up. *Teaching of Psychology*, 20, 218–222.

Zechmeister, J. S., & Zechmeister, E. B. (2000). Introductory textbooks and psychology's core concepts. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27, 6–11.

Appendix

44 Introductory Textbooks Used in Study

Barker, L. (2002). *Psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Baron, R. A. (2001). *Psychology* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bernstein, D. A., Penner, L. A., Clarke-Stewart, A., & Roy, E. J. (2003). *Psychology* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Bourne, L. E., Jr., & Russo, N. F. (1998). *Psychology: Behavior in context*. New York: Norton.

Carlson, N. R., & Buskist, W. (1997). *Psychology: The science of behavior* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Coon, D. (2001). *Introduction to psychology: Gateways to mind and behavior* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Davis, S. F., & Palladino, J. J. (2000). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Feldman, R. S. (2002). *Understanding psychology* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fernald, D. (1997). *Psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Franzoi, S. (2003). *Psychology: A journey of discovery*. Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog.

Gazzaniga, M. S., & Heatherton, T. F. (2003). *Psychological science: Mind, brain, and behavior*. New York: Norton.

Gerow, J., & Bordens, K. (2002). *Psychology: An introduction* (7th ed.). Richardson, TX: Harrison.

Gerrig, R. J., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2002). *Psychology and life* (16th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gleitman, H., Fridlund, A. J., & Reisberg, D. (1999). *Psychology* (5th ed.). New York: Norton.

Gray, P. (2002). *Psychology* (4th ed.). New York: Worth.

Hockenbury, D. H., & Hockenbury S. E. (2003). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Worth.

Huffman, K. (2002). *Psychology in action* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Kalat, J. W. (2002). *Introduction to psychology* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Kassin, S. (2001). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kosslyn, S. M., & Rosenberg, R. S. (2001). *Psychology: The brain, the person, the world*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Lahey, B. B. (2001). *Psychology: An introduction* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lefton, L. A., & Brannon, L. (2000). *Psychology* (7th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Matlin, M. W. (1999). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

Morris, C. G., & Maisto, A. A. (2002). *Psychology: An introduction* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Myers, D. G. (2001). *Psychology* (6th ed.). New York: Worth.

Mynatt, C. R., & Doherty, M. E. (2002). *Understanding human behavior* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Nairne, J. S. (2003). *Psychology: The adaptive mind* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Nevid, J. S. (2003). *Psychology: Concepts and applications*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Passer, M. W., & Smith, R. E. (2001). *Psychology: Frontiers and applications*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pettijohn, T. F. (1998). *Psychology: A connecttext* (4th ed.). New York: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.

Plotnik, R. (2002). *Introduction to psychology* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rathus, S. A. (2002). *Psychology in the new millennium* (8th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

Santrock, J. W. (2000). *Psychology* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schlinger, H. D., Jr., & Poling, A. (1998). *Introduction to scientific psychology*. New York: Plenum.

Sdorow, L. N., & Rickabaugh, C. A. (2002). *Psychology* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smith, B. D. (1998). *Psychology: Science & understanding*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smith, E. E., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Fredrickson, B., & Loftus, G. R. (2003). *Atkinson & Hilgard's introduction to psychology* (14th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sternberg, R. J. (2001). *In search of the human mind* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

Uba, L., & Huang, K. (1999). *Psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wade, C., & Tavris, C. (2000). *Psychology* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Weiten, W. (2001). *Psychology: Themes and variations* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Westen, D. (2002). *Psychology: Mind, brain, & culture* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Wood, S. E., & Wood, E. G. (2002). *The world of psychology* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wortman, C. B., Loftus, E. F., & Weaver, C. (1999). *Psychology* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Notes

1. The listings of the glossary terms included in more than 50% of the 44 text glossaries or any other reported analysis are available from the authors on request.
2. We thank Jeanne Zechmeister for providing us with the core concept data from Zechmeister and Zechmeister (2000), and Randolph Smith and three anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this article.
3. Send correspondence to Richard A. Griggs, Department of Psychology, P.O. Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611; e-mail: rgriggs@ufl.edu.

Conscientiousness Is Key: Incentives for Attendance Make Little Difference

Maureen A. Conard
Sacred Heart University

This study examined differences in class attendance at different levels of conscientiousness and incentives (3.5% vs. 6% of course points). Results of a 2 × 2 (Level of Incentives × Level of Conscientiousness) ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for conscientiousness. Conscientiousness accounted for 14% of the variance in attendance, compared to 1% for incen-

tives. Attendance appears to be influenced more by conscientiousness than by incentives.

Both students and faculty have agreed that class attendance is important (Sleigh & Ritzer, 2001). Empirical evidence supports that opinion. Attendance correlated with course grades (Brocato, 1989; Buckalew, Daly, & Coffield, 1986; Launius, 1997; Van Blerkom, 1992), even after controlling for mental ability, motivation, grade point average (GPA), and Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT; Durden & Ellis, 2003; Jones, 1984; Schuman, Walsh, Olson, & Etheridge, 1985). Moreover, attendance correlated with GPA (Kowalewski, Holstein, & Schneider, 1989; Lawrence & Taylor, 2000), even after controlling for SAT (Rose, Hall, Bolen, & Webster, 1996; Schuman et al., 1985; Wolfe & Johnson, 1995), and over a period of years (Farsides & Woodfield, 2003).

Studies of factors affecting attendance indicated that attendance was higher when it counted toward the course grade, either through bonus points or frequent testing (Baum & Youngblood, 1975; Beaulieu, 1984; Hansen, 1990; Hovell, Williams, & Semb, 1979; Lloyd et al., 1972), and also when students simply signed an attendance sheet (Shimoff & Catania, 2001). In each case, the attendance measure was a group-level variable (i.e., the percentage of students attending class per day).

Most researchers who studied factors that affect attendance used a behavioral approach and focused on external, situational factors such as rewards or course structure and overlooked internal, dispositional factors, which personality research indicates are also important determinants of behavior. Conscientiousness is a personality trait that is related to self-control, academic achievement, planning, organizing, and accomplishing tasks (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Conscientiousness correlated with attendance (Farsides & Woodfield, 2003), even after controlling for SAT scores (Conard, 2002).

Furthermore, most attendance studies did not allow for legitimate absence. Faculty and students agreed that absence for jury duty or to attend a relative's funeral was excusable, although absence to wait for the cable installer or go to the gym was not (Sleigh, Ritzer, & Casey, 2002). Unexcused absence related to frequency of patronizing bars, using marijuana (Kowalewski et al., 1989), and lower GPAs (Trice, Holland, & Gagne, 2000). Therefore, it is important to separate legitimate absence from unexcused absence (Hackett & Guion, 1985) to test the relations among variables more sensitively.

This study extended previous research in important ways. First, I investigated a dispositional factor (conscientiousness), a situational factor (incentives), and their interaction. Second, attendance excluded legitimate absence. Third, attendance was an individual difference variable (number of classes attended per student) rather than a group variable (number of students attending per class).

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 141 undergraduates from two sections each of General Psychology I and General Psychology II taught by the author (105 women, 36 men; 87 freshmen, 35

sophomores, 11 juniors, 1 senior, 7 missing data; M age = 19.9 years, SD = 4.95). Participants received course credit and could opt to do an alternate assignment.

Both courses had similar course structures based on 200 points with three exams worth 50 points each, and the remaining 50 points allocated for written assignments, exercises, and attendance. Exams focused primarily on lecture material and assigned readings, in approximately equal proportions per course.

I explained the attendance policy, included it in the syllabi, and took attendance at every class. Documented absences (e.g., a doctor's note or coach's request to attend a game) were excused. The high-incentive condition (General Psychology I) provided up to 12 points for attendance (equal to 6% of course grade or 24% of an exam). The low-incentive condition (General Psychology II) provided 7 points for attendance (equal to 3.5% of course grade or 14% of an exam).

Measures

Conscientiousness, measured with the NEO Five-Factor Inventory, Form S (Costa & McCrae, 1992), had a mean of 32.44 (SD = 6.52), similar to college student normative statistics. The low-conscientiousness group included scores at or below the mean of 32 (n = 71). The high-conscientiousness group included scores above 32 (n = 70).

Results

Students were from intact classes and therefore were not randomly assigned to conditions. A series of t tests assessed the equivalence of the high- and low-incentive groups on several variables. The groups were not significantly different on conscientiousness, $t(139) = -1.37, p = .17$; age, $t(139) = -1.14, p = .26$; GPA, $t(129) = -1.10, p = .21$; SAT, $t(122) = -0.71, p = .48$; credits, $t(134) = 0.55, p = .58$; or work hours, $t(134) = -0.36, p = .72$. Overall, students earned a mean of 90.1% of attendance points (SD = 9.2), indicating that on average, they attended 90% of classes.

I conducted a 2×2 (Level of Incentives \times Level of Conscientiousness) ANOVA on the attendance data. With an alpha level of .05, the main effect for incentives was not statistically significant, $F(1, 137) = 1.61, p = .21, \eta^2 = .01$. Mean attendance in the low-incentive condition was 88.5% (SD = 10.4) and 91.5% (SD = 7.6) in the high-incentive condition. The main effect for conscientiousness was significant, $F(1, 137) = 11.31, p < .001, \eta^2 = .14$. Mean attendance for low-conscientiousness students was 86.7% (SD = 9.8) and 93.6% (SD = 7.0) for high-conscientiousness students. The interaction was not significant $F(1, 137) = 1.09, p = .30, \eta^2 = .01$. Mean attendance for low-conscientiousness students was 85.2% (SD = 10.2) in the low-incentive condition and 88.5% (SD = 9.1) in the high-incentive condition. Mean attendance for high-conscientiousness students was 93.4% (SD = 9.0) in the low-incentive condition and 93.7% (SD = 5.5) in the high-incentive condition. Overall, the results indicated that high-conscientiousness students had higher attendance than low-conscientiousness students, regardless of the level of incentives offered.

Discussion

Conscientiousness, a dispositional factor, accounted for substantially more of the variance in attendance (14%) than did incentives (1%), a situational factor. Previous studies found higher attendance with grade incentives. However, no previous studies compared the relative contribution of dispositional and situational factors. Furthermore, previous studies measured attendance as a group variable (i.e., the percentage of students attending class per day). In this study attendance was an individual difference variable, (i.e., the percentage of classes attended per student). Therefore, the findings are not directly comparable.

In practical terms, the marginal means indicate that students in the low-incentive condition had 3.2 unexcused absences out of 28 classes during the semester, whereas students in the high-incentive condition had 2.4 unexcused absences. Although the interaction was not significant, the cell means revealed that the difference came primarily from the low-conscientiousness students because the high-conscientiousness students had nearly identical attendance in both incentive conditions. The marginal means indicate that low-conscientiousness students had a mean of 3.7 unexcused absences, compared to 1.8 for high-conscientiousness students.

The interaction was not statistically significant in this sample. However, if the result proves to be robust in future studies, some educators may consider the difference to be of practical significance, particularly because studies have linked attendance to grades. It will be of particular note if a relatively small (2.5%) increase in incentives results in a small (3%) but reliable increase in attendance among low-conscientiousness students because previous studies have shown that they also tend to get lower grades.

Alternatively, it is possible that the difference in incentives (7 vs. 12 points) was not large enough to produce a statistically significant difference in attendance. Future studies might include lower or higher levels of incentives, although given the results of this study, incentives might have to be very high to overcome the effects of low conscientiousness.

The different levels of incentives occurred in different courses. Therefore, level of interest in the course content is a potential confound with attendance. However, the high-incentive condition was in General Psychology I, which covers topics that are typically less interesting for students (e.g., history of psychology, research methods, sensation and perception) compared to General Psychology II (e.g., psychotherapy, psychological disorders, and development). Therefore, if level of interest in the course was a contributing factor, attendance should have been higher in the low-incentive condition than in the high-incentive condition. Also, one would expect the difference to manifest itself for high-conscientiousness individuals as well, and it did not.

The results of this study suggested that conscientiousness influenced attendance more than incentives did. Furthermore, McCrae and Costa (1994) showed that conscientiousness was not amenable to change from external forces, so professors are not likely to be able to improve conscientiousness in their students. Previous studies found that both con-

scientiousness and attendance correlated with academic performance, and although it is common practice to implement policies and procedures aimed at encouraging attendance, it appears that professors do not have as much influence as do the students themselves.

References

- Baum, J. F., & Youngblood, S. A. (1975). Impact of an organizational control policy on absenteeism, performance, and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 688–694.
- Beaulieu, R. P. (1984). The effects of traditional and alternative rewards on attendance. *College Student Journal, 18*, 126–130.
- Brocato, J. (1989). How much does coming to class matter? Some evidence of class attendance and grade performance. *Educational Research Quarterly, 13*(3), 2–6.
- Buckalew, L. W., Daly, J. D., & Coffield, K. E. (1986). Relationship of initial class attendance and seating location to academic performance in psychology classes. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 24*, 63–64.
- Conard, M. A. (2002, April). *Personnel selection meets college admissions: Personality, ability, and college performance*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Durden, G., & Ellis, L. (2003). Is class attendance a proxy variable for student motivation in economics classes? An empirical analysis. *International Social Science Review, 78*, 42–46.
- Farsides, T., & Woodfield, R. (2003). Individual differences and undergraduate academic success: The roles of personality, intelligence, and application. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 1225–1243.
- Hackett, R. D., & Guion, R. M. (1985). A reevaluation of the absenteeism–job satisfaction relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 35*, 340–381.
- Hansen, T. L. (1990). A positive reinforcement program for controlling student absenteeism. *College Student Journal, 24*, 307–312.
- Hovell, M. F., Williams, R. L., & Semb, G. (1979). Analysis of undergraduates' attendance at class meetings with and without grade-related contingencies: A contrast effect. *The Journal of Educational Research, 73*, 50–53.
- Jones, C. H. (1984). Interaction of absences and grades in a college course. *The Journal of Psychology, 116*, 133–136.
- Kowalewski, D., Holstein, E., & Schneider, V. (1989). The validity of selected correlates of unexcused absences in a four-year private college. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 49*, 985–991.
- Launius, M. H. (1997). College student attendance: Attitudes and academic performance. *College Student Journal, 31*, 86–92.
- Lawrence, R., & Taylor, L. W. (2000, September–October). Student personality type versus grading procedures in intermediate accounting courses. *Journal of Education for Business, 76*, 28–35.
- Lloyd, K. E., Garlington, W. K., Lowry, D., Burgess, H., Euler, H. A., & Knowlton, W. R. (1972). A note on some reinforcing properties of university lectures. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 5*, 151–155.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1994). The stability of personality: Observations and evaluations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 3*, 173–175.
- Rose, R. J., Hall, C. W., Bolen, L. M., & Webster, R. E. (1996). Locus of control and college students' approaches to learning. *Psychological Reports, 79*, 163–171.
- Schuman, H., Walsh, E., Olson, C., & Etheridge, B. (1985). Effort and reward: The assumption that college grades are affected by quantity of study. *Social Forces, 63*, 945–966.

- Shimoff, E., & Catania, A. C. (2001). Effects of recording attendance on grades in introductory psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 28*, 192–195.
- Sleigh, M. J., & Ritzer, D. R. (2001). Encouraging student attendance. *APS Observer, 14*(9), 19–20, 32–33.
- Sleigh, M. J., Ritzer, D. R., & Casey, M. B. (2002). Student versus faculty perceptions of missing class. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*, 53–56.
- Trice, A. D., Holland, S. A., & Gagne, P. E. (2000). Voluntary class absences and other behaviors in college students: An exploratory analysis. *Psychological Reports, 87*, 179–182.
- Van Blerkom, M. L. (1992). Class attendance in undergraduate courses. *The Journal of Psychology, 126*, 487–494.
- Wolfe, R. N., & Johnson, S. D. (1995). Personality as a predictor of college performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*, 177–185.

Notes

1. Support for this research was provided by a University Research and Creativity Grant from Sacred Heart University.
2. I thank Randolph A. Smith and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions concerning this article.
3. Send correspondence to Maureen A. Conard, Sacred Heart University, 5151 Park Avenue, Fairfield, CT 06825; e-mail: conardm@sacredheart.edu.

Student-Based Psychology Journals: Perceptions by Graduate Program Directors

Joseph R. Ferrari
DePaul University

Vanessa B. Hemovich
University of Washington

A national sample of graduate program directors (N = 162) completed a survey about their awareness and perceptions of publications in 5 leading psychology student-based journals in relation to determining graduate admission acceptance. Program directors reported little familiarity with student-based journals, were not likely to recommend these journals to undergraduates to publish, and believed publications in undergraduate periodicals were a nonsignificant factor for acceptance into their graduate program. These results suggest that graduate faculty need greater awareness about student-based psychology journals and undergraduate advisees need to caution students when they recommend publishing in such journals.

Undergraduate students with original research publications may have an advantage compared to other applicants to graduate programs in psychology (Cashin & Landrum, 1991; Mayne, Norcross, & Sayette, 1994; Norcross, Hanych, & Terranova, 1996). High rejection rates for journal submissions, however, often make publication difficult for students (Powell, 2002). To provide undergraduates an opportunity to publish, several nonpay, refereed, student-based psychology periodicals have emerged. Unfortunately, few faculty and honor society advisors (less than 10%) were aware of these

journals (Ferrari & Davis, 2001) despite the common faculty belief that undergraduates who publish have an advantage for graduate school admission (Ferrari, Weyers, & Davis, 2002). No study has explored the awareness and perceptions of undergraduate journals by psychology graduate directors of clinical, experimental, or industrial/organizational (I/O) doctoral and master's programs. Program directors often supervise and are directly involved in the admission process for prospective graduate students. Compared to other faculty, program directors may be aware of how undergraduate publications may be influential in accepting students into graduate programs.

Based on research findings from undergraduate faculty and advisors regarding their unfamiliarity with student-based psychology journals (e.g., Ferrari et al., 2002), we hypothesized that psychology graduate program directors would also have little knowledge of such periodicals. Consistent with previous research (Ferrari & Davis, 2001), we expected the *Psi Chi Journal* (because of its affiliation with the national honor society) to be the most recognized student journal. We also expected undergraduate publications in these journals might have a minor influence in the graduate admission acceptance process.

Method

Participants

A random sample of program directors listed in the 2002 APA Directory of Graduate Programs representing 293 doctoral (PhD) programs and 405 master's-level programs served as our participant pool. A total of 83 PhD (28%) and 79 master's (20%) program directors actually participated in the study. Participants reported means of 535 undergraduate psychology majors ($SD = 51.2$), 59 graduate students ($SD = 8.1$), and 26 full-time faculty ($SD = 4.4$) at their institution. The directors of the PhD programs represented 34 clinical (41%), 25 experimental (30%), and 24 I/O (29%) program specializations. The master's-level program directors were from 26 clinical (33%), 24 experimental (30%), and 29 I/O (37%) settings.

Periodicals Assessed

We used the same five student journals assessed by Ferrari and Davis (2001): (a) *Journal of Psychological Inquiry (JPI)*, founded in 1996 by the Great Plains Behavioral Research Association; (b) *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences (JP&BS)*, created at Farleigh Dickinson University in 1966; (c) *Journal of Undergraduate Research in Psychology (JURP)*, available online through George Fox University; (d) *Modern Psychological Studies (MPS)*, established by the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in 1992; and (e) *Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research (PCJ)*, first published in 1996.

Procedure

We sent each director a cover letter signed by the authors, the periodical survey, demographic items about the

participant's institution, and a postage-paid return envelope to return completed questionnaires within 6 weeks. The cover letter explained that the questionnaire concerned undergraduate journals in psychology that might impact student applications for admission in their graduate program. We presented in random order five items used in other studies (Ferrari & Davis, 2001; Ferrari et al., 2002) about each of the five undergraduate journals. Two items asked respondents to check *yes*, *no*, or *don't know*: (a) Have you or any member of your psychology department ever published in this periodical? (b) Does your school's library subscribe to this periodical? Three other items used 7-point rating scales ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*): (a) How well do you know this periodical? (b) If an undergraduate in your department wanted to continue toward graduate studies in psychology, how strongly would you recommend this periodical as an outlet in which to publish his or her research? (c) Assuming you were reviewing an applicant for admission into a graduate program in psychology, how much emphasis or weight would his or her publication in this periodical play in your acceptance decision? Respondents also indicated whether their degree program was doctoral or master's level, as well as the number of psychology undergraduate majors, graduate students, and departmental faculty at their institution.

Results

Chi-square analyses examined the frequency of responses separately between program levels and program specializations for personally published or knowing someone who published in each journal and for whether one's institutional library subscribed to each student journal. There were no significant differences between program levels or across program specializations on either categorical item. Across both

master's and doctoral program levels and across clinical, experimental, and I/O program specializations, almost none of the directors personally published or knew anyone who published in any of these student-based journals (*Mdn* = 3.3%; range = 2.0% to 5.6%). Most program directors also believed their institution's library did not subscribe to these journals (*Mdn* = 9.3%; range = 5.1% to 15.9%), although around 16% did believe *PCJ* was available in the library.

Tables 1 and 2 present the mean rating for the three survey items for each student journal by directors at master's and doctoral programs and by the three areas of specialization (i.e., clinical, experimental, and I/O), respectively. We performed a series of 2 (program level: master's vs. doctoral) \times 3 (program specialization: clinical vs. experimental vs. I/O) MANOVAs on the three rating scale items. Because of the large number of analyses performed, we set the alpha level at $p < .001$ to reduce Type 1 errors.

No significant interaction effect emerged, but there were significant multivariate main effects for program levels, $F(15, 137) = 5.88, p < .0001$, and for program specialization, $F(15, 274) = 7.61, p < .0001$. As noted in Table 1, directors of master's-level programs were more familiar with both *JURP* and *PCJ* than directors of doctoral programs. Directors of doctoral compared to master's programs were more likely to recommend *MPS* to undergraduates wishing to publish. In contrast, directors of master's compared to doctoral programs were more likely to review favorably candidates with *PCJ* publication. As shown in Table 2, directors in clinical programs were more familiar with *JURP* than directors of experimental or I/O programs. Directors of I/O programs were more likely to recommend both *JPI* and *JURP* to undergraduates than directors of clinical or experimental programs. Finally, directors of clinical and I/O programs were more favorably impressed by an applicant who published in *JPI* than were directors of experimental programs.

Table 1 Mean Ratings by Directors Across Student Journals by Program Level

Survey Item	Program Level					
	Master's ^a		Doctoral ^b		Total ^c	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Familiarity with this journal						
<i>Journal of Psychological Inquiry</i>					1.59	.58
<i>Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences</i>					1.89	.73
<i>Modern Psychological Studies</i>					1.99	.80
<i>Journal of Undergraduate Research in Psychology</i>	2.72 _a	1.19	1.97 _b	0.98		
<i>Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research</i>	3.53 _a	1.09	3.03 _b	1.07		
Recommend this journal to undergraduates wanting to publish						
<i>Journal of Psychological Inquiry</i>					2.54	.60
<i>Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences</i>					2.91	.70
<i>Modern Psychological Studies</i>	2.71 _b	0.76	3.03 _a	0.75		
<i>Journal of Undergraduate Research in Psychology</i>					3.52	.90
<i>Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research</i>					3.94	.80
Applicants published in this journal viewed favorably						
<i>Journal of Psychological Inquiry</i>					2.55	.64
<i>Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences</i>					2.85	.61
<i>Modern Psychological Studies</i>					2.69	.60
<i>Journal of Undergraduate Research in Psychology</i>					3.08	.61
<i>Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research</i>	3.54 _a	0.82	3.04 _b	0.58		

Note. Ratings based on scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). Scores with different subscripts are significantly different ($p < .001$).

^a $n = 79$. ^b $n = 83$. ^c $n = 162$.

Table 2. Mean Ratings by Directors Across Student Journals by Program Specialization

Survey Item	Program Specialization							
	Clinical ^a		Experimental ^b		I/O		Total	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Familiarity with this journal								
<i>Journal of Psychological Inquiry</i>							1.58	0.51
<i>Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences</i>							1.88	0.71
<i>Modern Psychological Studies</i>							2.01	0.82
<i>Journal of Undergraduate Research in Psychology</i>	2.97 _a	0.69	1.48 _c	0.55	2.58 _b	1.38		
<i>Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research</i>							3.25	1.10
Recommend this journal to undergraduates wanting to publish								
<i>Journal of Psychological Inquiry</i>	2.53 _b	0.60	2.27 _c	0.54	2.77 _a	0.54		
<i>Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences</i>							2.89	0.71
<i>Modern Psychological Studies</i>							2.86	0.72
<i>Journal of Undergraduate Research in Psychology</i>	3.10 _b	0.66	3.40 _b	0.94	4.02 _a	0.87		
<i>Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research</i>							3.96	0.80
Applicants published in this journal are viewed favorably								
<i>Journal of Psychological Inquiry</i>	2.62 _a	0.66	2.23 _b	0.43	2.85 _a	0.69		
<i>Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences</i>							2.87	0.60
<i>Modern Psychological Studies</i>							2.72	0.64
<i>Journal of Undergraduate Research in Psychology</i>							2.99	0.64
<i>Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research</i>							3.31	0.77

Note. Ratings based on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). Scores with different subscripts are significantly different ($p < .001$). I/O = Industrial/organizational.

^a $n = 60$. ^b $n = 49$. ^c $n = 53$. ^d $n = 162$.

Discussion

Psychology graduate program directors seemed unaware of five leading journals created to give students an opportunity to publish their research. Overall, some directors were familiar with *JURP*, and directors of master's-level programs were more familiar and favorable than directors of doctoral-level programs toward *PCJ*. Still, familiarity and favorable ratings were low across periodicals. Taken together, these results suggest that psychology graduate programs directors, like academic faculty and psychology honor society advisors (Ferrari & Davis, 2001; Ferrari et al., 2002), are not very familiar with periodicals created for student-based research. That directors of graduate programs in psychology would not recommend that undergraduate students publish in one of these periodicals is disconcerting. Consequently, academic advisors might think carefully about how they recommend one of these periodicals to their students.

Although this study suggests that students who publish in one of our survey journals may not increase their odds of acceptance, undergraduate students who publish original research generally have an advantage when applying to graduate school (Norcross et al., 1996; Powell, 2002). The process of designing, conducting, analyzing, writing, and submitting an empirical paper provides skills that facilitate graduate school admission. These processes may assist a student in strengthening organizational abilities and developing critical thinking and writing skills that are advantageous, regardless of postgraduate plans. Undergraduate publications offer the opportunity to bring projects to closure, model scientific activities, and work closely with faculty as mentors fostering relationships. The skills and strategies learned from the pub-

lication process are abilities desirable to those who do enter such programs (Ferrari et al., 2002).

This study had several limitations. The relatively low return may reflect responses from persons with substantially different attitudes than nonrespondents, suggesting a biased sample. Respondents may have rated some periodicals more favorably because of name recognition. For example, *PCJ* is associated with Psi Chi, the National Honor Society in Psychology, with major affiliation with the American Psychological Association and the American Psychological Society. Respondents might be familiar with *JURP* because the title is straightforward and easily recognizable. We also should have asked program directors how long they held this administrative position because new directors might be less familiar with the impact of each journal on admissions.

Nevertheless, this study illustrates psychology program directors' considerable lack of familiarity with five leading student-based periodicals. Consistent with past studies (Ferrari & Davis, 2001; Ferrari et al., 2002), advising students to publish in undergraduate periodicals may not be advantageous for admission to graduate programs, as some may believe. It seems graduate faculty need more information about these journals. Editors of student-based journals should intensify, strengthen, and broaden their journals' visibility and merits to graduate faculty and program directors. Applicants to graduate programs should briefly explain the status, background, and focus of the student-based journal as well as include a copy of the article with their submission application. Undergraduate students who publish original research should be praised for such high accomplishments, but the current state of awareness of undergraduate, student-based journals does not support that goal.

References

- Cashin, J. R., & Landrum, R. E. (1991). Undergraduate students' perceptions of graduate admissions criteria in psychology. *Psychological Reports, 69*, 1107–1110.
- Ferrari, J. R., & Davis, S. F. (2001). Undergraduate student journals: Perceptions and familiarity by faculty. *Eye on Psi Chi, 5*(1), 13–17.
- Ferrari, J. R., Weyers, S., & Davis, S. F. (2002). Publish that paper—But where? Faculty knowledge and perceptions of undergraduate publications. *College Student Journal, 36*, 335–343.
- Mayne, T. J., Norcross, J. C., & Sayette, M. A. (1994). Admission requirements, acceptance rates, and financial assistance in clinical psychology programs: Diversity across the practice–research continuum. *American Psychologist, 49*, 806–811.
- Norcross, J. C., Hanych, J. M., & Terranova, R. D. (1996). Graduate study in psychology: 1992–1993. *American Psychologist, 51*, 631–643.
- Powell, J. L. (2002). Creative outlets for student research, or what do I do now that my study is completed? *Eye on Psi Chi, 4*(2), 28–29.

Notes

1. Portions of this article were presented at the 2003 annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Baltimore, MD.
2. Because of space limitations, only major findings are reported in this article (contact the first author for details).
3. We are grateful to the graduate directors who completed this brief survey.
4. Send correspondence to Joseph R. Ferrari, Department of Psychology, DePaul University, 2219 North Kenmore Avenue, Chicago, IL 60614; e-mail: jferrari@depaul.edu.

Diagnosing the Stars: A Technique for Teaching Diagnosis in Abnormal Psychology

W. Brad Johnson
*Department of Leadership, Ethics, and Law
United States Naval Academy*

Writing diagnostic evaluations requires students in abnormal psychology to apply material from the study of psychopathology to real cases. It also allows them to practice one of the main professional activities of practicing psychologists. I describe a variation of the diagnostic write-up assignment that allows students to select a famous person or “star” as the subject of their written evaluation. Evaluation of this technique indicates that the assignment enhances enjoyment of diagnostic report writing. It also provides an enjoyable mechanism for reviewing for the final examination.

Psychologists who teach abnormal psychology often discover that students respond favorably to exercises and assignments that incorporate real or fictitious cases of psychopathology. Assignments that require students to arrive at a diagnosis for specific disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2000) encourage application of material to solving focal diagnostic problems (Middlecamp, 2003). For example,

students respond with intrigue and enthusiasm when given the opportunity to apply fledgling diagnostic skills to film characters (Badura, 2002; Wedding & Boyd, 1999). Autobiographies, biographies, and therapist case studies may also become the focus of practice psychological assessments (Halgin & Whitbourne, 1998; Oltmanns, Neale, & Davison, 1999), and these are sometimes used effectively as one component of an abnormal psychology course (Neysmith-Roy & Kleisinger, 1997; Norcross, Sommer, & Clifford, 2001). For example, Poorman (2002) found that having students write a fictitious biography and then role-play the character enhanced both student learning and empathy.

I now require students to apply knowledge from the abnormal psychology course to diagnostic report writing. Because diagnostic evaluation remains one of the most frequent activities of practicing psychologists (Norcross, Karg, & Prochaska, 1997), it is useful for students to practice applying knowledge of psychopathology to real cases. Report writing requires students to discriminate between disorders, think critically about a range of data, and consolidate case material into a terse report. I discovered that this assignment can be more enjoyable and meaningful when students select a famous personality as the subject of their evaluation.

Teaching Evaluation Write-Up Skills

Each semester, I require abnormal psychology students to write four, one- to two-page (single-spaced) psychological evaluations. For the first three evaluations, I supply detailed material about the client. I ask for a multiaxial diagnosis and specific treatment recommendations. Although the cases are often based loosely on clients I have evaluated, I am careful to mask all identifying and demographic information. Prior to handing out the first client packet, I provide a sample case (with write-up) and an outline of the required sections (including a summary of what to include in each) for the report. These required components include (a) reason for referral, (b) history of present complaint, (c) social and psychiatric history, (d) mental status examination, (e) diagnosis, and (f) treatment recommendations. Because I provide several pages of history and other data, this is a good exercise in learning concise clinical writing. I also ask that students write the mental status exam in the first person, as though they conducted the interview. I provide detailed feedback on each report and focus on quality of writing, accuracy of diagnosis, strength of the case made for each diagnosis, and relevance and accuracy of treatment recommendations.

The “Diagnosing a Star” Assignment

Although students report that these write-ups are both interesting and helpful when it comes to “thinking like a psychologist,” they are particularly fond of the final evaluation assignment (something I added to the course a year ago) in which I ask them to select any “star” or famous person whom they believe has a clinical disorder. I instruct them to choose someone personally intriguing and famous such as a musician, movie star, politician, historical figure, or criminal. I ask

them not to select a family member, friend, professor, or anyone else in the local community. I ask that they employ the same format for this final evaluation and that they gather data from a variety of sources including books, popular magazines, Internet sites, and even television interviews. They are to make up a reason for referral as well as material for the mental status examination; however, I emphasize that this material should be congruent with existing evidence about the person's behaviors and symptoms. Finally, I require students to get my approval for their subject before starting work on the assignment, which helps eliminate overlap in assessment subjects.

Some of the disorder categories and accompanying stars from the most recent semester include (a) major depression (Kurt Cobain, Ludwig van Beethoven, Elvis Presley), (b) bipolar disorder (Walt Disney, Linda Hamilton, Margot Kidder), (c) eating disorders (Tyra Banks, Paula Abdul), (d) antisocial personality disorder (Charles Manson, Ted Bundy, Adolf Hitler), (e) obsessive compulsive disorder (Mark Summers, Melvin Udall played by Jack Nicholson), (f) sexual paraphilias (Pee Wee Herman, Jeffery Dahmer), (g) impulse control disorders (Mike Tyson, Winona Ryder), (h) Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (Bart Simpson, Robin Williams), and (i) body dysmorphic disorder (Michael Jackson).

My students often find this evaluation to be both fun and interesting. They typically select a star of particular personal interest and relish the chance to research stories about them in such refreshingly unscholarly sources as *People* magazine. Finally, because this assignment is due near the end of the semester, it also offers an ideal vehicle for course review and preparation for the final exam. I hand back the evaluations on the final day of class by introducing each star by name and then asking the class to guess what the diagnosis was according to the student report. This practice inevitably leads to good diagnostic discussions and debates about the meaning of specific symptoms in the person of focus.

An Ethical Caution

Although the star diagnosis write-ups are purely fabricated and often based on unreliable media evidence, I now require my students to place a brief disclaimer at the top stating that the document is entirely fictional, that the person named in the evaluation was never actually evaluated, and that the report author is not qualified to conduct psychological evaluations. I made this addition after a colleague expressed ethical concern about the assignment. Although the American Psychological Association (2002) ethical code grants students wide latitude in using assessment and diagnostic techniques and instruments for training purposes, I think the disclaimer is good ethical modeling for undergraduate students.

Preliminary Evaluation

For the past four semesters, I have used a qualitative course evaluation form. In previous semesters, most of the comments addressed teaching, favorite film clips, and in-class role-plays. After instituting the "star" assignment last semester, I began to get frequent comments about the evaluation write-ups and the star assessment in particular.

Students frequently report that studying the behavior and symptoms of someone famous made them start to become aware of pathology in the real world. They also comment that the star assignment made the specific disorder much more interesting.

At the conclusion of the most recent semester, I examined students' views of this assignment by asking them to indicate, anonymously, their agreement with five statements that I developed, on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). All 61 students completed the brief survey. Responses indicated that students enjoyed this assignment ($M = 4.6, SD = .73$) somewhat more than the traditional evaluations ($M = 4.1, SD = .94$), $t(60) = 2.09, p < .05$, but not as much as watching film clips of disorders ($M = 4.8, SD = .41$), $t(60) = -1.08, p = ns$. Finally, students preferred the write-up assignments ($M = 4.2, SD = .98$) to exams ($M = 3.3, SD = 1.13$) as a method of evaluating course performance, $t(60) = 3.60, p < .05$.

Overall, students react positively to the applied diagnostic evaluation assignments and more enthusiastically to the final "star" variation than to the other evaluation assignments. Their comments suggest that this assignment heightens interest in the material and animates potentially dry diagnostic categories with tangible and memorable real-life examples.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist, 57*, 1060–1073.
- Badura, A. S. (2002). Capturing students' attention: Movie clips set the stage for learning in abnormal psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*, 58–60.
- Halgin, R. P., & Whitbourne, S. K. (1998). *A casebook in abnormal psychology: From the files of experts*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Middlecamp, M. K. (2003). Uncover the disorder: A review activity for abnormal psychology courses. *Teaching of Psychology, 30*, 62–63.
- Neysmith-Roy, J. M., & Kleisinger, C. L. (1997). Using biographies of adults over 65 years of age to understand life-span development psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 24*, 116–118.
- Norcross, J. C., Karg, R. S., & Prochaska, J. O. (1997). Clinical psychologists in the 1990s: II. *The Clinical Psychologist, 50*, 4–11.
- Norcross, J. C., Sommer, R., & Clifford, J. S. (2001). Incorporating published autobiographies into the abnormal psychology course. *Teaching of Psychology, 28*, 125–128.
- Oltmanns, T. F., Neale, J. M., & Davison, G. C. (1999). *Case studies in abnormal psychology* (5th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Poorman, P. B. (2002). Biography and role playing: Fostering empathy in abnormal psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*, 32–36.
- Wedding, D., & Boyd, M. A. (1999). *Movies and mental illness: Using films to understand psychopathology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Notes

1. I am indebted to Linda Mallory for her assistance with statistical analyses.

2. Send correspondence to W. Brad Johnson; Department of Leadership, Ethics, and Law; United States Naval Academy; Luce Hall–Stop 7B; Annapolis, MD 21402; e-mail: johnsonb@usna.edu.

Using *The Simpsons* to Teach Social Psychology

Judy Eaton and Ayse K. Uskul
York University

We examined students' perceptions of the effectiveness of clips from the popular animated television show The Simpsons in illustrating key concepts in social psychology. Students rated the clips favorably and reported that the clips helped them understand the material better and apply social psychological concepts to real-life situations. In addition, students' exam performance was significantly better on clip-related questions than nonclip-related questions. These findings suggest that television clips can facilitate the learning process.

Many instructors have found that showing all or part of popular films during class can increase student learning, interest, and enjoyment of key concepts by helping them make the connection between abstract theories and real-world examples (e.g., Badura, 2002; Boyatzis, 1994; Gee & Dyck, 1998; Kirsh, 1998; Raingruber, 2003; Roskos-Ewoldsen & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 2001). One disadvantage of using feature-length films is that they take up a significant amount of class time (Roskos-Ewoldsen & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 2001).

An alternative to showing feature-length films is to use parts of a single television series to illustrate various key concepts throughout the course. In our undergraduate social psychology course, we showed clips from the animated television

series *The Simpsons* to illustrate key social psychological concepts. We chose this particular cartoon for several reasons. First, we predicted that many students would be familiar with the show, which has been on television since 1989 and is also in syndication. Even if they did not watch the show, it was likely that students would be familiar with the characters and premise. We hoped this familiarity would decrease the set-up time for individual clips. Second, we expected that students had not thought about this particular show in an academic or critical way before. By examining social psychological concepts in novel ways, we hoped to increase students' learning (Kirsh, 1998; Mathis & Tanner, 1991). Third, the cartoon provides a humorous look at various social situations. We hoped that the clips would make students laugh and have fun while helping them see the concepts depicted in more-or-less realistic situations. Research has shown that students respond to cartoon humor in a generally positive way (Lowis, 2002). In addition, the research on mood and learning suggests that positive moods are positively associated with certain kinds of learning (e.g., Ashby, Isen, & Turken, 1999; Fiedler, Nickel, Asbeck, & Pagel, 2003).

After identifying clips from the second season of *The Simpsons* (Groening, 2002; available on DVD) that could effectively illustrate key social psychological concepts (a complete list of which is available from the authors), we selected five of the most appropriate to show in class: one general clip depicting many different possible social psychological phenomena to present on the first day of class to generate discussion and four depicting specific concepts to present throughout the course (see Table 1). The length of each clip ranged from approximately 4 to 7 min. We were careful not to have clips from *The Simpsons* every class, partly because we did not want to overuse the technique and partly because we wanted to show other films and film clips.

During the first lecture, we told students that they were to watch a short video clip and their task was to identify any possible social psychological phenomena in the clip.

Table 1. Episode Clips from Season Two of *The Simpsons* and Social Psychological Concept Portrayed

Episode Title and No.	Scene No., Title, and Description ^a	Social Psychological Concept	Length ^b
Brush With Greatness (7F18)	No. 1: <i>Main Title</i> and No. 2: <i>No One Gains 30 Pounds of Bone!</i> A television commercial prompts Bart and Lisa to persuade Homer to take them to a water-themed amusement park. Homer gets stuck in a tube because he is too fat, is publicly humiliated, and vows to lose weight.	Persuasion, the self, prosocial behavior, social influence	5 min 46 sec
Bart vs. Thanksgiving (7F07)	No. 5: <i>Now We Can Blame Him for Everything!</i> Lisa tries to figure out why Bart ruined her Thanksgiving centerpiece.	Attributions	3 min 54 sec
Dead Putting Society (7F08)	No. 2: <i>Marge, Beer Me!</i> Homer is upset that his neighbor, Ned Flanders, seems to have a better life than he does.	Social comparison theory	3 min 50 sec
Three Men and a Comic Book (7F21)	No. 4: <i>It Smells Like My Grandpa.</i> and No. 5: <i>If You Guys Hadn't Tied Me, I Could Be Saving the Comic.</i> Bart and two friends pool their money to buy a collectible comic and then fight over who gets to take it home.	Conflict resolution	7 min 20 sec
Itchy & Scratchy & Marge (7F09)	No. 2: <i>I Told You, My Baby Beat Me Up.</i> and No. 3: <i>Dear Purveyors of Senseless Violence.</i> After baby Maggie responds aggressively after watching a violent television program, Marge campaigns against the makers of the program.	Television violence and aggression	5 min 28 sec

^aScene numbers and titles correspond with those on the DVD (Groening, 2002). ^bClips start at the beginning of the scene.

They then viewed the first *Simpsons* clip. The purpose of this exercise was twofold. First, research has shown that film clips shown on the first day of class can lighten the mood of the class and generate interest in the course (Badura, 2002). Second, we hoped that the clip would encourage class discussion. This exercise indeed seemed to lighten the mood of the class, and it was successful at encouraging students to participate in a class discussion.

We showed the remaining four clips throughout the course, immediately before introducing the relevant concept, a strategy recommended by Roskos-Ewoldsen and Roskos-Ewoldsen (2001). Following a brief discussion about what was depicted in the clip, the lecturer described the concept in detail, referring back to the clip when possible.

At the end of the course, students completed a questionnaire assessing their opinions of the various teaching aids used, including *The Simpsons* clips. We told students that their feedback would help the instructor assess and improve the effectiveness of various pedagogical aids, including the course Web site, the textbook, and other films shown in the course.

Students ($N = 71$) rated their agreement on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) with four items regarding the clips from *The Simpsons*. The items included "The use of the *Simpsons* clips was an effective way to illustrate key points" ($M = 4.68$, $SD = .60$), "The *Simpsons* clips helped me to understand the material better" ($M = 4.41$, $SD = .86$), "I enjoyed the use of the *Simpsons* clips" ($M = 4.77$, $SD = .54$), and "The *Simpsons* clips helped me to apply key concepts to real-life situations" ($M = 4.11$, $SD = .85$). These ratings suggest that students found the clips from *The Simpsons* to be effective at illustrating key points and in helping them understand the material better and apply the key concepts to real-life situations. Students also regarded the clips as highly enjoyable, as evidenced by both their high ratings and their written comments on the course evaluation. In addition, many students spontaneously mentioned how much they had enjoyed the use of the clips from *The Simpsons* in conversations with the instructor.

The fact that students enjoyed the clips and indicated that the clips helped them understand the concepts better is encouraging; however, student ratings do not allow us to determine whether the clips actually had a positive effect on student achievement. To address this issue, we examined students' performance on multiple-choice exam questions related to the *Simpsons* clips. The midterm and final exams contained a total of 8 questions on the topics illustrated by the clips, and 142 questions on topics not illustrated by clips. We converted both scores to percentages for each student, and compared the mean performance. A total of 104 students wrote both exams. A paired-samples t test indicated that the percentage of correct answers on the questions relating to the clips ($M = 83.17$, $SD = 13.58$) was significantly higher than the percentage of correct answers on the questions not relating to the clips ($M = 75.66$, $SD = 11.25$), $t(103) = 6.03$, $p < .05$.

The combination of self-report and actual performance measures in this study provides converging evidence that the clips were effective at both generating student interest and increasing comprehension of the material. These re-

sults should be interpreted with some caution, however, as we were unable to control all potentially confounding factors in this classroom study. A fully experimental design would be a more powerful test of the clips' effectiveness. Further investigation might involve comparing the *Simpsons* clips to other non-*Simpsons* clips, controlling for the amount of time spent on clip and nonclip topics in class, and testing other ways to use the clips (e.g., explaining the concept before showing the clip). Nonetheless, we believe that our results provide preliminary evidence that using television clips in the classroom can help the learning process. As suggested by an astute student in the class, one reason for the enduring success of *The Simpsons* may be its unique ability to tap into key social psychological concepts. We believe that this feature also makes it a potentially useful pedagogical tool for teaching social psychology.

References

- Ashby, F. G., Isen, A. M., & Turken, A. U. (1999). A neuropsychological theory of positive affect and its influence on cognition. *Psychological Review*, 106, 529–550.
- Badura, A. S. (2002). Capturing students' attention: Movie clips set the stage for learning in abnormal psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 29, 58–60.
- Boyatzis, C. J. (1994). Using feature films to teach social development. *Teaching of Psychology*, 21, 99–101.
- Fiedler, K., Nickel, S., Asbeck, J., & Pagel, U. (2003). Mood and the generation effect. *Cognition and Emotion*, 17, 585–608.
- Gee, N. R., & Dyck, J. L. (1998). Using a videotape clip to demonstrate the fallibility of eyewitness testimony. *Teaching of Psychology*, 25, 138–140.
- Groening, M. (Producer). (2002). *The Simpsons: The complete second season* (DVD collector's edition) [Television series]. Los Angeles: Twentieth Century Fox Home Entertainment.
- Kirsh, S. J. (1998). Using animated films to teach social and personality development. *Teaching of Psychology*, 25, 49–51.
- Lewis, M. J. (2002). A study into regional, age, and sex differences in students' ratings of cartoon humor. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 94, 1079–1080.
- Mathis, R. D., & Tanner, Z. (1991). Clinical assessment of a TV cartoon family: Homework to encourage systemic thinking in counseling students. *Family Therapy*, 18, 245–254.
- Raingruber, B. (2003). Integrating aesthetics into advanced practice mental health nursing: Commercial film as a suggested modality. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 24, 467–495.
- Roskos-Ewoldsen, D. R., & Roskos-Ewoldsen, B. (2001). Using video clips to teach social psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 28, 212–215.

Notes

1. We thank Randolph Smith and three anonymous reviewers for their insightful and helpful comments on a previous version of this article.
2. Send correspondence to Judy Eaton, Department of Psychology, Behavioural Sciences Building, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M3J 1P3; e-mail: jeaton@yorku.ca.

Teaching Application and Personal Relevance Through Writing in Courses on Gender

Robin M. Kowalski
Clemson University

Chad E. Lakey
University of Georgia

Bloom (1956) included "application" in his taxonomy of educational objectives. Consistent with this goal, this study examined the effectiveness of 2 writing exercises in a gender class, keeping a journal and completing a cross-gender question exercise, in increasing students' awareness of both the personal relevance and the applicability of course material outside the classroom. Students found the exercises to be effective both personally and pedagogically. Students perceived the journal and the questions as effective means of gaining insight into societal issues confronting men and women and into the other sex.

In teaching any course, one of the challenges is bringing the material to life and allowing students to see the personal relevance and applicability of the material (Bloom, 1956). For example, one of the primary goals in teaching a course on gender is typically to increase students' awareness of the ways society and the media represent men and women and the ways in which gender issues influence their personal relationships. Simply lecturing on topics related to gender is unlikely to have the desired effect of increasing student awareness. What is required is some mechanism for teaching students to see the relevance of the material for their lives, to raise questions both inside and outside the class, and to spend time thinking about the personal and societal application of the course material.

The objective of teaching students relevance and application is not new (Bloom, 1956). However, there is a difference between having a goal of facilitating thoughtful application and actually having the tools to do so (Nummedal & Halpern, 1995). One avenue for teaching personal relevance and application is writing. Writing actively engages students in the learning process and requires a personal investment on their part (Angelo, 1995; Hettich, 1990; Wong, Kuperis, Jamieson, Keller, & Cull-Hewitt, 2002). Writing also encourages students to think reflectively and evaluatively (Spalding & Wilson, 2002; Yinger, 1985). In one study illustrating the effectiveness of journal writing in facilitating student learning, grades in a personality course requiring journals were significantly higher than those in the course without the requirement (Connor-Greene, 2000).

In gender courses, I (RMK) have found two exercises particularly useful for teaching personal relevance and application that actively engage students in the learning process. One involves students keeping a journal and the other revolves around cross-gender questions that students generate.

The journals provide a forum for students to write about gender issues as they see them in their experiences and in society at large. Although I also assign review papers, those pa-

pers do not allow students to make the connections and to see the application of course content to their lives in the same way as the journals. Unlike the papers, the journal provides a mechanism for students to take the information presented in class and apply it to their personal experiences or to situations occurring in the world. The journals require students to think about and process the information they receive in class or glean from situations outside class (Rickabaugh, 1993; Sa, 2002).

The cross-gender question exercise requires students to generate questions they always wanted to ask the other sex. My assumption is that these are questions that students have been curious about and about which they have speculated. These questions provide an excellent jumping-off point for class discussions that further serve to enhance students' critical thinking skills.

Assignment

I make the journal assignment the first day of class and require students to write in their "reaction" journals at least three times a week. The only restriction placed on what they write about is that it must relate to gender. Suggestions I give them include writing about things we discuss in class; comments made by their classmates during class discussions; things they read in the textbook, see in movies, or read in newspapers, magazines, and books. I also give them the first journal assignment, which is the following:

Imagine you woke up tomorrow morning and you were the other sex. How would your life be different? Include in your discussion differences in your morning routine, clothes that you wear, food that you eat, classes that you attend, selected college major, personality, friends, ways in which you are treated, and career goals.

Some of the responses to this assignment are amusing and others are serious. Almost everyone, however, concludes their entry by stating that they are really glad that they are the sex they are. If students have trouble generating journal ideas throughout the semester, their classmates or I suggest possible topics. This exchange of ideas alone generates good class discussion. I assign grades on a check, check-plus, check-minus basis. More important for the students, however, are the comments that I provide throughout their journals.

The second assignment involves students writing questions that they always wanted to ask the other sex. Sample questions asked by women of men include "Do guys have emotional connections to their first sexual partner to the extent that females do?" "What does intercourse feel like?" "What type of concerns do men have when they are on a date?" "If you were a father and your son was 18, how would you go about explaining the birds and bees to your son? How about your daughter?" and "What is the most important attribute a woman should have?" Questions that the men have asked of women include "Why do women say nothing is wrong when, in fact, something is?" "What do you enjoy the most about sex?" "Why do women make guys try hard to find out their true feelings about a certain situation?" and "Why do some girls wear so much make-up instead of natural

beauty?” Once students write their questions, I collect them, type them up, and hand them out to the other sex to answer. I then compile all the answers by gender, type them, and hand them back to the class. That way, women get to see what other women wrote and men get to see how other men responded. We typically spend at least 1 day discussing the questions.

Method of Assessment

To examine students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of these exercises in teaching personal relevance and application, 6 male and 22 female students who had taken the course completed a questionnaire asking their perceptions of the journals and the cross-gender question exercise. Regarding the journal exercise, respondents answered questions about the personal and educational benefits of the assignment. They also indicated the overall benefit of the journals. Participants responded to each question using 5-point scales ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). Respondents completed similar questions regarding the cross-gender questions again using the same response format. We omitted questions regarding the cathartic and therapeutic value of the exercise asked about the journals for lack of relevance to the cross-gender question exercise. Following both sets of questions, participants had the opportunity to write open-ended responses.

Results and Discussion

Mean ratings for questions related to the benefits of journal writing appear in Table 1 and for the cross-gender questions in Table 2. As shown in the tables, students found both exercises to be effective and personally beneficial, although their overall preference ratings were higher for the cross-gender questions than for the journals. Part of this difference may reflect the labor-intensiveness of the journals. Part of this preference may also reflect the fact that the journals are a reaction to the course, including class discussions, whereas the cross-gender questions are a facilitator of class discussions.

Several students provided open-ended comments. Common responses to the journals were that, although students had dreaded the assignment when it was first made, they really enjoyed writing in the journals. Many students reported that they planned to continue to write in the journals. They also indicated that the journals made them aware of issues to which, previously, they had given little thought. The journals gave students an opportunity to develop their thoughts and feelings about different issues. One student said “Keeping the journals was very helpful. It helped me to face certain situations I had ignored in my past. I have since resolved some of those problems and I want to thank you for your help whether you knew you were helping or not.” The most common open-ended response to the cross-gender questions was a desire that students could complete them earlier in the semester. This exercise typically occurs about two thirds of the way through the semester after students have had time to get to know one another and to feel comfortable responding to one another. This time frame also allows students time to have

Table 1. Evaluations of Journal Assignments

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
How beneficial were the journals to you personally?	3.50	0.79
How important do you perceive the journals to be to the class?	3.71	0.81
Of all of the assignments that you completed for this course, how useful were the journals?	3.46	0.79
How educational were the journals?	3.68	0.81
To what degree do you think the journals were an asset to the course?	3.82	0.86
To what degree would you recommend assigning the journal in future gender courses?	3.96	1.04
How valuable were the journals?	3.64	0.91
To what degree did writing the journals make it easier to understand the topics in the course?	3.25	0.93
To what degree did writing in the journals force you to go back and reexamine topics and information we covered in class?	4.04	0.74
How cathartic was it for you to write in the journals?	3.64	1.06
To what degree did you find writing the journals therapeutic, in that they helped you deal with past experiences?	3.36	1.22
To what extent did writing in the journals give you personal insight into yourself?	3.64	0.91
To what extent did writing in the journals give you insight into the issues confronting men and women in today’s society?	3.82	0.90

Note. Ratings were based on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*).

Table 2. Evaluations of Cross-Gender Question Exercise

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
How beneficial were the cross-gender questions to you personally?	3.68	0.95
How important do you perceive the questions to be to the class?	4.24	0.72
Of all of the assignments that you completed for this course, how useful were the questions?	3.72	0.98
How educational were the questions?	4.08	0.95
To what degree do you think the questions were an asset to the course?	4.00	0.71
To what degree would you recommend assigning the questions in future gender courses?	4.56	0.58
How valuable were the questions?	4.08	0.86
To what degree did you feel that members of the other sex responded honestly to the questions?	3.96	0.79
To what degree do you feel you learned something about the other sex that you didn’t already know?	3.68	1.11

Note. Ratings were based on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*).

mastered a core amount of the course material. However, the point of moving the exercise earlier in the semester is well taken. The questions provide an excellent jumping-off point for class discussions and encourage the vastly outnumbered men to become involved in course discussions.

Although not reflected in the assessment questions that students answered, the nature of the journal entries changes over the course of the semester. With each week, the entries become longer and more personal. Part of this increased self-disclosure may reflect a comfort level with me as the professor and a certain degree of trust that develops, but more so, I believe it reflects student engagement in the process of writing. The more they write, the more they see the benefits of doing so and the more questions they generate for which they want to find answers. They become acutely more aware of how pervasive gender issues are in their lives. The insights that students bring to these journals are truly phenomenal. Nothing that I have found gives me greater insight into my students than reading their journals.

In conclusion, the data support the use of both the journal writing and the cross-gender question exercise in the gender course. Student evaluations of the projects were consistently positive. Although both exercises help students to see the personal relevance of course content and to see the application of this content to the outside world, they differ in critical ways. The journal exercise allows students to generate and respond to personally probing questions based on their personal observations and reflections. The cross-gender question exercise allows students to generate and respond to questions that are more other-focused than self-focused. Certainly students gain personal insights from this exercise, too, but the real benefits seem to be an increased understanding and awareness of how members of the other sex feel and respond (i.e., application).

For the instructor, these exercises are also beneficial. They give me insights into my students, their lives, and their feelings about different issues. They also establish a connection between me and them. Particularly with the journals, students are entrusting to me very personal information about their thoughts, feelings, reactions, and life experiences. In no course that I teach do I feel the type of connection with the students that I do with the students in this course. Grading the journals is time-consuming for the professor, but more than worth the effort.

References

- Angelo, T. A. (1995). Classroom assessment for critical thinking. *Teaching of Psychology, 22*, 6–7.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook I. Cognitive domain*. New York: Longmans, Green.
- Connor-Greene, P. A. (2000). Making connections: Evaluating the effectiveness of journal writing in enhancing student learning. *Teaching of Psychology, 27*, 44–46.
- Hettich, P. (1990). Journal writing: Old fare or nouvelle cuisine? *Teaching of Psychology, 17*, 36–39.
- Nummedal, S. G., & Halpern, D. F. (1995). Introduction: Making the case for "Psychologists teach critical thinking." *Teaching of Psychology, 22*, 4–5.
- Rickabaugh, C. A. (1993). The psychology portfolio: Promoting writing and critical thinking about psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 20*, 170–172.
- Sa, J. (2002). Diary writing: An interpretive research method of teaching and learning. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 8*, 149–168.
- Spalding, E., & Wilson, A. (2002). Demystifying reflection: A study of pedagogical strategies that encourage reflective journal writing. *Teachers College Record, 104*, 1393–1421.
- Wong, B. Y. L., Kuperis, S., Jamieson, D., Keller, L., & Cull-Hewitt, R. (2002). Effects of guided journal writing on students' story understanding. *The Journal of Educational Research, 95*, 179–191.
- Yinger, R. (1985). Journal writing as a learning tool. *Volta Review, 87*, 21–33.

Note

Send correspondence to Robin M. Kowalski, Department of Psychology, 418 Brackett Hall, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634; e-mail: rkowals@clemson.edu.

Using Case Law to Teach Professional Ethics

Samuel Knapp

*Pennsylvania Psychological Association
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania*

Leon VandeCreek

Wright State University

We provide examples of how to use case law in teaching professional ethics. Instructors can use the case law to illustrate crucial ethical issues facing professional psychologists, review the essential ingredients in disciplinary actions, and reflect on fundamental philosophical issues facing professional psychologists. We also recommend some useful supplementary readings.

Courses in professional ethics are common in graduate programs in clinical, counseling, and school psychology. One tool for teaching ethics is to use case law, or actual court cases with written judicial opinions. Instructors can find these cases in the law libraries of most universities, county courthouses, or sometimes online. These cases are in the public domain, and instructors may copy them for students. Instructors who do not know how to find cases in the law libraries only need to present the librarian with the legal citations provided in the reference section of this article.

Using case law has several advantages as a teaching tool. First, case law regulates the conduct of psychologists. Although statutes, regulations, and ethics codes may establish the broad standards of conduct in most areas of care, case law expands on, clarifies, or applies those standards in real-life situations. For example, Standard 2 of the ethics code of the American Psychological Association (2002), which becomes law to the extent that it is embedded in the regulations of psychology licensure boards, requires psychologists to be compe-

tent in delivering services. The case of *Osheroff v. Chestnut Lodge* (1985), which we describe in detail subsequently, exemplifies how a court applied that concept in actual practice.

Second, these cases tell real stories that happened to real people. The written case summaries typically review the facts of the case, including the events and actions of individuals leading up to the alleged misconduct. They tell interesting and compelling stories. The presentation of facts provides an opportunity for students to engage in ethical decision making, albeit after the fact in these cases (Oljar, 2002). In some instances, it can be helpful for instructors to ask students, "Given these facts before you, how would you have responded to the situation?"

Furthermore, two of the cases concern malpractice issues, which can give instructors an opportunity to review the essential ingredients in malpractice cases and how these criteria differ from those used for licensing board or ethics committee complaints. Malpractice cases occur when a professional deviates from accepted norms of behavior and that deviation directly causes damages to a patient. In contrast, a licensing board complaint requires only a violation of a licensing law or licensing board regulation. In addition, malpractice courts allow the patients an opportunity to receive monetary compensation.

Finally, judicial opinions often reflect a broader philosophical debate concerning the relevant moral principles involved. The judges tell what conclusions they reached, why they reached them, and the way competing factors influenced their decision. If some judges disagree with the majority conclusion, they may write a minority or dissenting opinion. Sometimes cases include two or more dissenting opinions.

We describe three well-known cases and discuss how instructors can use them to teach ethics. *Jaffee v. Redmond* (1996) was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court. The other cases were decided in state courts, but the *Tarasoff* (1976) case has been widely cited by other state courts, and the *Osheroff* (1985) case has been widely publicized as well.

Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California et al. (1976)

Prosenjit Poddar was a patient at a California university counseling center. During treatment, Poddar told his treating psychologist that he intended to kill a fellow student, Tatiana Tarasoff, following her return from her summer vacation. Two months later, Poddar killed Tarasoff. Following this murder, the victim's family filed a lawsuit claiming that the various officials and clinicians responsible for Poddar's care had a duty to warn or protect the intended victim. The family argued that although the treating psychologist had no direct professional relationship with the victim, he had a duty to protect the victim because the killer (the patient) had specifically threatened the victim.

In deciding *Tarasoff* (1976), the California Supreme Court attempted to balance an individual's right to privacy (patient confidentiality in psychotherapy) against the need to protect the public. It explained why it held that the professionals in this case had a duty to warn or protect the intended victim. The case also includes a minority opinion that argued against

imposing such a duty. Essential resources for teaching about this case include the case itself and a commentary such as the one by VandeCreek and Knapp (2001). It may also help to read the historical fictional account of the murder by Blum (1986) as well. Instructors can include basic information about the American judicial system, including the important point that *Tarasoff* applies only in California and that students need to know the applicable case or statutory law in their state.

The case opinion provides an opportunity to read different perspectives on how to balance the need for patient privacy with the need for protection of the public. Of course, the case raises the question of how to predict or assess dangerousness or implement a duty to warn or protect. Fortunately, several good references are available on those topics. For example, Appelbaum (1985) described a three-step decision-making model in determining the optimal response in duty to warn or duty to protect situations. Borum (2000) and Otto (2000) reviewed evaluation and patient management strategies for youth and outpatients, respectively. Binder and McNeil (1996) described the impact of a warning on the victim and on the psychologist-patient relationship. McNeil, Binder, and Fulton (1998) reviewed practical considerations when implementing a duty to warn or protect.

Finally the instructor can ask students to put themselves in the place of the psychologist involved and describe how they would have responded to the events. As detailed in the case, the psychologist accurately predicted that Poddar was dangerous and took steps to involuntarily hospitalize him. When the police failed to implement the involuntary hospitalization, the supervisor of the psychologist ordered him to destroy his notes and take no more steps to compromise the privacy of Poddar. This response on the part of the supervisor raises questions for students concerning appropriate conduct when an ethical or legal obligation (e.g., the need to protect an identifiable third party) conflicts with an institutional policy (e.g., the supervisor's instruction to take no further action to protect Tarasoff).

Jaffee v. Redmond (1996)

In 1991 Mary Lu Redmond, a police officer working alone, responded to a fight in progress call at an apartment complex in a suburb of Chicago. The accounts of what happened next differ, but Redmond killed a man whom she claimed was carrying a knife, chasing another man, and allegedly ignoring her orders to stop. Although another police officer testified that a knife was at the side of the slain man, other witnesses claimed that the slain man was unarmed at the time of the shooting.

During pretrial discovery, the petitioner learned that the police officer had participated in about 50 counseling sessions with a social worker after the shootings. The treating social worker refused to respond to specific questions about her treatment of the police officer. The issue of the admissibility of the testimony hinged on the interpretation of privileged communication law, which grants patients the right to withhold evidence in court under specific situations.

The case gives instructors an opportunity to discuss the principles of privileged communications. Many students have heard of the case, but do not realize that it applies only

to federal courts, although most cases involving psychologists are decided in state courts. Consequently, students need to know the privileged communication law in their states. Furthermore, Jaffee (1996) only applied a federal law that already gave courts the authority to decide whether to adopt such privileges. Most lower federal court cases had already accepted a psychotherapist–patient privilege. Also, many students do not understand that the privilege belongs to the patient; it confers no special status on the psychologist. Finally, the privilege has exceptions enumerated in case law or statutes.

In teaching about this case, instructors can rely on some commentaries about Jaffee. Knapp and VandeCreek (1997) and DeBell and Jones (1997) provided background on privileged communications laws in general, the facts surrounding the Jaffee decision, and its impact on other situations involving privileged communications. Glossoff, Herlihy, Herlihy, and Spence (1997) provided a state-by-state review of privileged communications laws for psychologists and noted the commonalities and variations among them. Also, this case provides an opportunity to discuss the related issue of how psychologists should respond when they receive subpoenas or court orders for information (Committee on Legal Issues, 1996).

Osheroff v. Chestnut Lodge (1985)

In *Osheroff v. Chestnut Lodge* (1985), a patient diagnosed with a personality disorder received 7 months of intensive psychodynamic psychotherapy in a hospital. His family complained about the lack of improvement and, after the hospital refused to change the treatment plan, transferred him to another hospital. There the patient responded well to medications and was discharged within 3 months. In the subsequent malpractice suit brought against the first hospital, the court determined that the psychiatrists in the first hospital were negligent in their diagnosis and treatment of the patient. Expert witnesses opined that the treating psychiatrists should have modified the treatment plan when it became obvious that the patient was not responding to the intensive psychotherapy.

The case raises questions of what duties psychologists have when they treat patients who do not improve with treatment. This case can help students understand the decision-making process of the courts in determining malpractice. Especially relevant to this case is the fact that the psychiatrists at Chestnut Lodge were using psychoanalytic treatment. The question consequently arises as to when the use of that treatment or other nonmedical treatments would be considered negligent. Several articles could be helpful in addressing these and other issues in this case. Stone (1990) argued that the outcome was a legal error with unfortunate implications for clinicians and patients, whereas Klerman (1990) showed more sympathy for the decision and believed that such decisions may improve the quality of patient care. Packman, Cabot, and Bongar (1994) took a balanced approach to the legal arguments, but carefully noted relevant risk management lessons.

In addition, the case raises the importance of informed consent in the therapeutic process. Specifically, should the patient or the patient's family have been better informed of the pharmacological options that were available? Beahrs and

Guthiel (2001) described the history of informed consent and provided practical suggestions in implementing sensitive informed consent policies. Braaten and Handelsman (1997) described the opinions of former patients and nonpatients concerning what should be included in informed consent forms. Although Beahrs and Braaten did not deal with the *Osheroff* case, they did address general issues of informed consent.

Conclusions

These cases involve psychotherapists dealing with serious questions that come before them in their clinical work. They provide an opportunity for students to discuss potential issues that may come before them, albeit usually not in such a dramatic fashion as found in these cases.

Instructors can use other cases to illustrate other important ethical issues. The three cases we have presented dealt with conflict with organizational authority (*Tarasoff*), competence (*Osheroff*) and confidentiality (*Tarasoff* and *Jaffee*), and informed consent (*Osheroff*). However, instructors could pick other cases, including those unique to their state, to illustrate other important points.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57, 1060–1073.
- Appelbaum, P. S. (1985). Tarasoff and the clinician: Problems in fulfilling the duty to protect. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 142, 425–429.
- Beahrs, J. O., & Guthiel, T. G. (2001). Informed consent in psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 158, 4–10.
- Binder, R. L., & McNiel, D. E. (1996). Application of the *Tarasoff* ruling and its effect on the victim and the therapeutic relationship. *Psychiatric Services*, 47, 1212–1215.
- Blum, D. (1986). *Bad karma*. New York: Avon.
- Borum, R. (2000). Assessing violence risk among youths. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58, 1263–1288.
- Braaten, E. B., & Handelsman, M. M. (1997). Client preferences for informed consent information. *Ethics and Behavior*, 7, 311–328.
- Committee on Legal Issues. (1996). Strategies for private practitioners coping with subpoenas or compelled testimony for client records or test data. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 27, 245–251.
- DeBell, C., & Jones, D. (1997). Privileged communications at last? An overview of *Jaffee v. Redmond*. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 28, 559–566.
- Glossoff, H. L., Herlihy, S. B., Herlihy, B., & Spence, E. B. (1997). Privileged communication in the psychologist–patient relationship. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 28, 573–581.
- Jaffee v. Redmond*, 135 L.Ed.2d 337 (S. Ct. 1996).
- Klerman, G. L. (1990). The psychiatric patient's right to effective treatment: Implications of *Osheroff v. Chestnut Lodge*. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 147, 409–418.
- Knapp, S., & VandeCreek, L. (1997). *Jaffee v. Redmond*: The Supreme Court recognizes a psychotherapist–patient privilege in federal courts. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 28, 567–572.
- McNiel, D. E., Binder, R. L., & Fulton, F. M. (1998). Management of threats of violence under California's duty-to-protect statute. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 155, 1097–1101.

Oljar, E. A. (2002). The value of case law in teaching philosophical ethics. *Teaching Ethics*, 3, 1–18.

Osheroff v. Chestnut Lodge, 490 A.2d 720 (Md. App. 1985).

Otto, R. K. (2000). Assessing and managing violence risk in outpatient settings. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 56, 1239–1262.

Packman, W. L., Cabot, M. G., & Bongar, B. (1994). Malpractice arising from negligent psychotherapy: Ethical, legal, and clinical implications of *Osheroff v. Chestnut Lodge*. *Ethics and Behavior*, 4, 175–197.

Stone, A. A. (1990). Law, science and psychiatric malpractice: A response to Klerman's indictment of psychoanalytic psychiatry. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 147, 419–427.

Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California, 551 P.2d 334 (1976).

VandeCreek, L., & Knapp, S. (2001). *Tarasoff and beyond: Legal and clinical considerations in the treatment of life-endangering patients* (3rd ed.). Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource.

Notes

1. The views expressed here do not necessarily represent those of the Pennsylvania Psychological Association.
2. Send correspondence to Samuel Knapp, 76 Country Lane, Landisville, PA 17538–1042; e-mail: sam@papsy.org.