

Essays from
E-xcellence
in Teaching
2002

Volume II

A collection of monthly essays originally published on the
PsychTeacher™ Electronic Discussion List

Edited by

William Buskist
Auburn University

Vincent W. Hevern
Le Moyne College

G. William Hill, IV
Kennesaw State University

Society for the Teaching of Psychology
2003

Copyright and Other Legal Notices

The individual essays and articles contained within this collection are

© Copyright 2002 by their respective authors.

This collection of essays and articles as a compendium is

© Copyright 2003 Society for the Teaching of Psychology

You may print multiple copies of these materials for your own personal use, including use in your classes and/or sharing with individual colleagues as long as the author's name and institution and a notice that the materials were obtained from the website of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP) <www.teachpsych.org> appear on the copied document. For research and archival purposes, public libraries and libraries at schools, colleges, universities and similar educational institutions may print and store in their research or lending collections multiple copies of this compendium as a whole without seeking further permission of STP (the editors would appreciate receiving a pro forma notice of any such library use). No other permission is granted to you to print, copy, reproduce, or distribute additional copies of these materials. Anyone who wishes to print, copy, reproduce, or distribute copies for other purposes must obtain the permission of the individual copyright owners. Particular care should be taken to seek permission from the respective copyright holder(s) for any commercial or "for profit" use of these materials.

PsychTeacher™ and its associated graphics are trademarks of APA Division 2, Society for the Teaching of Psychology for the distribution of educational, instructional, and other information by all means of printed, electronic and/or digital encoding, storage, retrieval, and transmission.

Suggested Reference Format

Following examples in the 5th edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association for reference materials found online, we suggest that the overall text be referenced in this fashion:

Buskist, W., Hevern, V. W., & Hill, G. W., IV. (Eds.). (2003). Essays from e-xcellence in teaching, 2002. Retrieved [insert date] from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/eit2002/index.html>

Individual articles and chapters may be referenced in this fashion:

Prieto, L. R. (2003). Teaching assistant development: Research and impressions. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern, & G. W. Hill, IV, (Eds.). Essays from e-xcellence in teaching, 2002 (chap. 1). Retrieved [insert date] from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Web site: <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/eit2002/index.html>

These essays may also be retrieved from the site of their original posting, the *PsychTeacher™ Electronic Discussion List*, archived at <<http://list.kennesaw.edu/archives/psychteacher.html>>.

Table of Contents

	Introduction	v
	Bill Buskist, Vincent Hevern, & Bill Hill	
1.	Teaching Assistant Development: Research and Impressions (January 2002)	1
	Loreto R. Prieto, The University of Akron	
2.	Making the Leap: Advising Students on Selecting a Graduate Program (February 2002)	6
	Gary R. Hann and Jane S. Halonen, James Madison University	
3.	Bring Psychology to Life (March 2002)	12
	Charles Blair-Broeker, Cedar Falls (Iowa) High School	
4.	Teaching Students with Disabilities (April 2002)	16
	David Johnson, James Brown University	
5.	The National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology: Twenty-Five Years and Counting [Special Invited Essay] (April 2002)	20
	Douglas A. Bernstein, University of South Florida	
6.	Helping Your Students to Become Savvy Psychology Majors (May 2002)	23
	Drew Appleby, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis	
7.	Focusing on How We Know What We Know in the Psychology Classroom (June 2002)	27
	Laura L. Namy, Emory University	
8.	Organizing and Maintaining University-Wide Teaching Circles (July 2002)	30
	Lauren F. V. Scharff, Stephen F. Austin State University	
9.	The Landscape of Excellence in Teaching (August 2002).....	34
	Barney Beins, Ithaca College	
10.	Amen to Passion (September 2002)	40
	Janie Wilson, Georgia Southern University	
11.	When Psychology Teachers Introspect (October 2002)	44
	Larry W. Bates, University of North Alabama	
12.	On the Distinction Between the Scholarship of Teaching and Scholarly Teaching (November 2002)	47
	Monica-Reis Bergin, James Madison University	
	With Replies	
	The Scholarship of Teaching: The Best of Both Worlds	51
	Diane F. Halpern, Claremont McKenna College	

	<i>Pursuing Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching</i>	52
	Randolph A. Smith, Ouachita Baptist University	
	<i>An Additional Model of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</i>	54
	Daniel Bernstein, University of Kansas	
	<i>Why I am Not a Chef Yet—A Reply to Halpern, Smith and Bernstein</i>	56
	Monica Reis-Bergan, James Madison University	
13.	<i>Is This Going to be on the Test?</i> (December 2002)	61
	Phillip Lewis, Auburn University	
	<i>Biographical Notes on Individual Contributors and Editors</i>	65

Introduction

The Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP) launched its Internet electronic discussion list, PsychTeacher™ in the fall of 1998. In the spring of 2000, a monthly column called “E-xcellence in Teaching,” was added to this list. The column features monthly essays devoted to high school, community college, and university teaching in general and on the teaching of psychology in particular. The essays take the form of lessons learned, advice and hints on particular aspects of teaching, lore regarding teaching, book reviews, and reflections on our roles as teachers of psychology. In general, though, the primary focus of the column is to provide a form for the discussion and promotion of effective teaching.

This compilation of essays forms Volume II in what we hope will become a series of volumes of E-xcellence in Teaching essays. The first volume was posted to STP’s home page last year and contains the first 20 E-xcellence in Teaching essays posted to the list in 2000-2001. This volume contains the next 13 essays which were posted to the list in 2002.

We thank the authors of these essays for the insightful contributions they made to the literature on the teaching of psychology and the scholarship of teaching. We also thank the STP leadership for their continued support of the e-column. We dedicated Volume I to Jane Halonen (University of West Florida) for the role she played in helping establish E-xcellence in Teaching. We dedicate Volume II to Randy Smith (Kennesaw State University), for his consistent and unwavering championing of the scholarship of teaching in his role as editor of STP’s journal, *Teaching of Psychology*.

Bill Buskist
Auburn University
Auburn, AL
buskiwf@auburn.edu

Vinny Hevern
Le Moyne College
Syracuse, NY
hevern@lemoyne.edu

Bill Hill
Kennesaw State University
Kennesaw, GA
bhill@kennesaw.edu

Teaching Assistant Development: Research and Impressions

Loreto R. Prieto
The University of Akron

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for January 2002.)

I am honored to have the opportunity to share a few of my ideas on the topic of teaching assistant (TA) development. I will do what I can to forward some points for consideration, gleaned both from the literature and my own experience with training and supervising TAs.

I’ll begin by outlining some current challenges I see in this particular area of research and practice. First, surveys of academic departments and TAs consistently indicate that teaching assistants frequently lack sufficient training for and supervision of their teaching duties (Prieto, 1999; Prieto & Altmaier, 1994)—this finding holds for the discipline of psychology as well (Meyers & Prieto, 2000). This much is clear: We need to do a better job of training and supervising psychology TAs both before and during their teaching assignments.

Second, it is often difficult for TA trainers or supervisors to know what modalities of training or supervision are best to use. Historically, very little research in the area of TA development has been theory-driven or has moved beyond investigating simple methods or techniques for training TAs. Few comprehensive models of TA training or supervision exist. Accordingly, the bulk of the literature offers little understanding as to why certain techniques or interventions actually work in training TAs or which methods are most appropriate for particular training needs or purposes. More recent efforts in the TA literature provide examples of both theoretical models (cf. Nyquist & Wulff, 1996; Prieto, 1995, 1998) and theory-driven hypotheses testing in research on TA development (cf. Prieto, 2001; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto, Scheel, & Meyers, 2001).

Finally, faculty efforts at training and supervising TAs tend to go unrewarded. Watching TAs become hooked on the science and art of teaching psychology is, without doubt, a highly satisfying experience for faculty supervisors. However, faculty committed to developing the skills of TAs may find requests for institutional support for TA training and supervision less than adequately answered. Realistically, if appropriate TA training and supervision is to occur, in light of the typical pressures on faculty (especially pre-tenure faculty) to carry out research and manage heavy teaching loads, then administrators need to support such efforts at the program, departmental, college, and university levels. Such support could include funding and resources to provide orientation programs for new TAs, pedagogy-based coursework or teaching practica for TAs, on-going training or skill-building workshops for TAs, and the granting of load hours for faculty who train and supervise TAs (see Prieto & Meyers (2001) for a comprehensive text on developing and implementing TA training within college and university settings).

Thus, with respect to the challenges surrounding psychology TA development, psychology educators need to increase the prevalence of TA training and supervision. Educational administrators need to provide better support for the faculty who offer this service for TAs. Using theory-driven research, investigators need to examine the utility of various TA training and supervision methods. Additionally, investigators should examine the outcomes of TA training and supervision with respect to increasing TAs' teaching skills and enhancing undergraduate learning in the classroom.

However, given that psychology faculty and TAs historically have generally managed to take care of teaching obligations despite the presence of these challenges, a logical question to pose might be “why does anything need to be done—why not continue with business as usual?” Let me share a few thoughts on this point that I believe argue against becoming complacent with the current state of affairs.

1. Teaching assistantships are the foundation of faculty development. This point helps to clarify the simple fact that teaching careers do not begin the first day we step foot in a classroom, graduate degree in hand. The skills and sense of efficacy toward teaching acquired by TAs during assistantships can and does prepare them for what they will find in the classroom as future faculty. In fact, graduate students often accept TA positions because they are interested in academic or teaching careers. Because many academic positions prioritize and reward accomplishments in areas such as research or grant productivity, it becomes even more important for TAs to focus on developing their skills as instructors during assistantships as they will likely eventually work professionally within environments that do not value, reward, or foster good teaching skills (Prieto, 1994).

Ironically, however, although we require intense training and supervision surrounding certain aspects of graduate training in psychology (e.g., research projects, clinical practica), we often do not oversee students' development as teachers. A failure to train and supervise TAs adequately may mean that many of them head into academic careers with a less than optimal grasp of pedagogical issues. Conversely, many promising TAs who plan to be teachers and who do great jobs in the classroom, may become demoralized and lose interest in teaching because they do not have sufficient training or guidance to help them through the predictable difficulties that all TAs (and veteran teachers) inevitably face. Either way, we lose an opportunity to strengthen the base of teaching skill within the psychology professoriate. Finally, academic departments that employ psychology TAs cannot overlook the fact that the level of TAs' compensation sends a clear message regarding the importance of their roles. That message currently appears bleak: In a national survey of psychology departments, Meyers & Prieto (2000) found that some psychology TAs may ultimately earn as little as \$1.94 an hour for their work—including both salary and tuition remission!

Offering TAs meaningful, responsive, and rigorous training and supervision is a concrete way of communicating that college teaching is important (Steven A. Meyers, personal communication, November 30, 2001). Furthermore, providing TAs with better financial compensation and other benefits (e.g., awards, recognition of innovative teaching skills)

may help to convey the message that the discipline of psychology values teaching skills as much as research, grant writing, or professional service skills.

2. Teaching assistants are our primary connection with students new to the field of psychology. TAs handle a great deal of the undergraduate teaching at most major academic institutions (Allen & Rueter, 1990): Introductory level psychology classes, labs, and discussion sections are frequently taught by TAs. This fact plays into two critical realities. First, when it comes to attracting and sparking the interest of students new to the field of psychology, TAs embody the welcoming hand our field extends to these newcomers. Second, when it comes to responding to state Boards of Regents or other groups regarding mandates to improve the quality of undergraduate education, it is often our TAs who are in the classroom addressing this matter on behalf of the discipline. Therefore, the better we train our TAs, both in the content of the discipline and in teaching methods, the greater the potential for a favorable outcome in attracting new students to the field and ably educating those new students as they move through the ranks. Notably, it is each new generation of psychology undergraduates who will, in turn, become the new crop of TAs, who will, again in turn, welcome and teach the next generation of psychology undergraduates as the cycle starts anew. The caliber of undergraduates we accept into graduate psychology programs is directly related to the investment we make in them during their undergraduate psychology training. Therefore, the caliber of these undergraduates is directly related to the investment we make in the TAs who are responsible for the laying the foundations of undergraduate training.

3. The training and supervision of TAs is likely best conceptualized as a developmental process. In my research and activities as a TA trainer and supervisor, it has become apparent to me that there are discernible levels of ability and mastery—stages, if you will—that TAs travel through in learning to teach. Across these stages, the pedagogical tasks and concepts they master become increasingly complex, and accordingly, TAs’ training and supervision needs vary according to their level of experience.

This idea is far from new in the TA and teacher education literatures, but it is often forgotten in real-life practice (cf. Kagan, 1988; Nyquist & Wulff, 1996; Sprague & Nyquist, 1989). More specifically, novice TAs present faculty supervisors with many challenges. These challenges are not always well articulated by TAs or easily recognized by faculty supervisors. Novice TAs need concrete direction and structure and faculty may presume too much as they guide beginning TAs in their efforts. We must remember to be declarative in our transmission of knowledge regarding teaching rather than presuming that TAs understand what we mean when we relay complex ideas like “use the test as a learning tool,” “use active learning strategies in your classroom,” or “be flexible with students.”

As TAs gain experience and skill over time, faculty supervisors must foster TAs’ independence and help them develop a personal identity and style as classroom teachers. Faculty supervisors also must effectively mentor TAs in the vagaries of teaching, the very real differences between teaching and learning, and the uncertainty of predicting precise learning outcomes for students given various teaching interventions. Thus, a

developmental approach to TA training and supervision calls for a great deal of energy, a priori and post-hoc trouble-shooting, and mentoring from faculty supervisors. However, the ultimate payoff rests in providing a graduate teaching experience for TAs that has the potential to instill a sound foundation of pedagogical skills and a strong personal identity as a psychology educator. In turn, this training enhances the probability that our TAs will move into the professoriate with a solid start to their development as faculty, with the ability to teach well and encourage positive learning outcomes, and with the ability to offer their own TAs rigorous training and supervision in the teaching of psychology.

Closing Thoughts

There are certainly many other major issues surrounding TA training and supervision to consider than those I have raised here. The points I have raised seem to me to represent core ideas regarding the rationale for and necessity of TA training and supervision. Thus, these ideas would seem to be a good place to start a broader discussion or consideration of issues in this area.

Like any other teacher and mentor, I am still learning as I go, trying to stay a few steps ahead of those TAs I lead as we travel together down the path that is the teaching of psychology. Through our collective discussion and work on these issues, I look forward to the gains we will make as we investigate the scholarship of teaching and learning in psychology.

References

- Allen, R., & Rueter, T. (1990). *Teaching assistant strategies: An introduction to college teaching*. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.
- Kagan, D. (1988). Research on the supervision of counselors- and teachers-in-training: Linking two bodies of literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 58, 1-24.
- Meyers, S. A., & Prieto, L. R. (2000). Training in the teaching of psychology: What is done and examining the differences. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27, 258-261.
- Nyquist, J., & Wulff, D. (1996). *Working with graduate assistants*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Prieto, L. R. (1994). Psychology students and graduate teaching: Issues of professional development. *Newsletter of the American Psychological Association of Graduate Students*, 6 (2), 10.
- Prieto, L. R. (1995). Supervising graduate teaching assistants: An adaptation of the Integrated Developmental Model. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*, 2, 93-105.

- Prieto, L. R. (1998). Supervising graduate teaching assistants on the ethics of teaching: A developmental approach. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*, 5, 109-118.
- Prieto, L. R. (1999). Teaching assistants' preferences for supervisory style: Testing a developmental model of GTA supervision. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*, 6, 1-8.
- Prieto, L. R. (2001). The supervision of graduate teaching assistants: Theory, evidence and practice. In L. Prieto & S. Meyers (Eds.) *The teaching assistant training handbook: How to prepare TAs for their responsibilities* (pp. 103-129). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Prieto, L. R., & Altmaier, E. M. (1994). The relationship of prior training and previous teaching experience to self-efficacy among graduate teaching assistants. *Research In Higher Education*, 35, 481-497.
- Prieto, L. R., & Meyers, S. A. (1999). The effects of training and supervision on the self-efficacy of psychology graduate teaching assistants. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26, 264-266.
- Prieto, L. R., & Meyers, S. A. (Eds.). (2001). *The teaching assistant training handbook: How to prepare TAs for their responsibilities*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Prieto, L. R., Scheel, K. R., & Meyers, S. A. (2001). Psychology graduate teaching assistant preferences for supervisory style. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*, 8, 37-40.
- Sprague, J., & Nyquist, J. D. (1989). TA supervision. In J. Nyquist, R., Abbott, & D. Wulff (Eds.), *Teaching assistant training in the 1990's: Number 39. New directions for teaching and learning* (pp. 37-56). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Making the Leap: Advising Students on Selecting a Graduate Program

Gary R. Hann

Jane S. Halonen

James Madison University

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly "E-xcellence in Teaching" e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for February 2002.)

Following your recommendations, they've dotted all of the I's and crossed all of the T's. They have pored over the most recent copy of the APA's *Graduate Study in Psychology* (2002 Edition) and *The Complete Guide to Graduate School Admission: Psychology, Counseling, and Related Professions* (Keith-Spiegel & Wiederman, 2000). If your students have worked hard and prepared well, chances are good that the process will result in more than one acceptance. How can you help your students make the important decision of which offer to accept?

Although we went through the graduate admissions process separated by over two decades (Gary in 1999 and Jane in 1972), we compared our stories and found some remarkable similarities in identifying the things we wished we had known when making our decisions. From those experiences we constructed a framework to help your students differentiate graduate school offers and find the best match for their needs and values.

We think it is helpful to draw a distinction between "overt" (data on program Web sites and print materials) and "covert" program characteristics that should contribute to your students' decision. Covert characteristics require a bit more work to uncover. Your students may need a more complex Internet search, library explorations, campus visit, or conversations with insiders to uncover this helpful information. Doing that last piece of investigation will enhance the likelihood of your students choosing just the right program.

Campus Profile

A visit to the campus Web site will determine some important overt factors such as the size of campus, description of library holdings, and level of support from the state or private donors. There also are other aspects of campus life about which to learn:

- How well funded is the campus? Is it fiscally secure?
- How committed is the campus to graduate education?
- What's the parking situation like? (Probably bad...)

Program Theoretical Orientation

Program guides or Web sites probably will describe whether the program has a dominant theoretical orientation. If your students have developed some paradigmatic preferences,

finding out about the values that drive a program will be critical to making a good match. Questions that may help determine covert data include:

- Is the program orientation rigorously (fanatically?) defined?
- How do “true believers” deal with opposing opinion?
- To what extent are multiple perspectives part of the educational plan?

Program Research Climate

Program Web sites or print materials will often list the most recent publications of the faculty associated with the program. However, your students can determine faculty productivity by checking individual faculty Web sites or by checking citation rates in the Social Science Index. In "publish or perish" institutions, faculty members can be hard pressed to crank out research, sometimes at the expense of high quality teaching and mentoring of students. In those circumstances, students must understand that they often will "piggy back" on a faculty member's research concentration rather than develop their own independent ideas. On the other hand, a high-pressure research setting may be just the right context if your student aspires to an academic profession in a comparable setting. Some other questions include:

- To what degree do faculty concentrate on developing their students as researchers?
- What is the nature and rate of publication of the students in the program?
- Where do graduate students present their work?
- How much independence do students have in selecting their own research projects?

Program Reputation

Although there are national listings of graduate program quality, it may be more useful if you help your students find an insider. For example, by connecting with colleagues in professional organizations, you may be able to direct your students to the just the right person who can provide some inside information about program quality. Some questions your students might want to ask an insider about reputation include:

- What are the best features of the training program?
- How is the morale of faculty and graduate students?
- Has the program had any student-generated litigation filed against it?
- Does the program climate promote an atmosphere of professional and personal integrity?
- Would you embark on this program if you had the opportunity? Why or why not?

Typical Student Progress

It can be surprising once students enroll in a graduate program that success among their peers will be variable. What data will help them compare programs on this important

dimension? Here are several questions to which your students may want to gather answers.

- How critical is it to arrive on campus with some viable research ideas to facilitate your progress on a Master's project?
- How can you increase the possibility that your Master's work could be publishable?
- What percentage of students do not progress beyond the Master's? What happens to them when they are not successful?
- What is the average time in the program until dissertation defense?
- How many students fail the dissertation? What happens to them when they are not successful?

Program Design Features

Due to the relatively small size of most graduate programs, graduate students may not have the degrees of freedom regarding courses that they are used to as undergraduates. What information about program design can be a persuasive?

- What is the typical class size of the courses?
- Do the classes consist of only people formally admitted to the program? Are some of these courses also taken by undergraduates?
- Is there any rationale provided for course sequences, where relevant?
- How regularly are new courses introduced in or deleted from the curriculum?

Student Characteristics

Graduate program guidebooks usually describe average board scores of applicants, but that may not help you determine other important characteristics of program peer groups. What are the important dimensions?

- How big will the incoming class be?
- Does the program emphasize taking students with significant work experience or can students move directly into advanced work without such background?
- From which part of the country do students typically come?
- What is the gender and age balance?
- Did the faculty make a purposeful attempt to recruit diverse students in the cohort? (See Bernal, Sirolli, Weisser, Ruiz, Chamberlin, & Knight, 1999).

Learning Climate

All graduate programs offer intellectual stimulation but the quality of the climate in graduate schools varies (Halonen & Young, 2000). Your students need to know that some faculty design their programs to be maximally rigorous. Some pertinent questions to have your students ask include:

- What kind of learning atmosphere do the program faculty attempt to create?
- Do faculty practice an open-door policy and strive to be available to students?
- Does the program have warring faculty factions that divide student loyalties and make the environment feel perilous?

Professional Development Climate

Nearly every program will brag about their excellence in helping people craft their chosen careers. However, some programs treat professional development as a byproduct of their programs rather than the primary purpose for their existence. These questions may help your student gauge faculty commitment to students' professional development:

- Are students treated with respect or disdain?
- Are there mentoring programs that provide career advice on research and teaching?
- Does the program offer established professional opportunities or do students need to be entrepreneurial to find opportunities on their own?
- To what extent do the faculty facilitate entry of their students into arenas relevant to their professional interests?

Alumni Track Record

Programs may offer testimony from successful students on their Web sites or in print material, but these public relations promotions may not capture the typical experience of students in the programs. Some other questions may help your students identify helpful alumni data:

- What types of jobs have past graduates landed successfully?
- What is the percentage of graduate employment 6 months after graduation? Three years after graduation?
- Do graduates stay involved as active alumni in the program through networking or alumni contribution?

Financial Support

Funding can often be the top priority for applicants, but the amount of support made available is just a starting point. Programs are usually explicit about the amount of money for grants, scholarships, fellowships, and assistantships. Encourage your students to find out about the potential strings attached or other not-so-obvious costs:

- Does support obligate working hours and, if so, in what capacity?
- Are there limits on the number of years a student can be supported in the program?
- Are there other fees that will eat away at resources, such as parking fees, student activity fees, etc.
- What are typical textbook costs in the program?

- Are there prohibitions in your contract about earning outside money?

Administrative Support

Unlikely to be found on the program Web site or the catalog is potentially one of the most important figures in your student's graduate career--the department secretary. Encourage your students to make a point of introducing themselves to the program's secretary during campus visits and ask the following:

- What is it like to work here?
- How demanding are the faculty?
- Are departmental procedures difficult to learn?

Library Access

The library may hold thousands of volumes, but if it is not well maintained, your students may find constant disappointment in securing appropriate resources. Your students may want to ask:

- How comprehensive are the psychology holdings?
- How efficient is the interlibrary loan process?
- Can the library holdings be accessed from home?
- Is there a psychology library liaison who especially skilled in solving psychology-related retrieval problems?

Office Space

Psychology departments are notoriously cramped for space on most campuses and graduate students may find a woeful short supply of space allocated to them. (Your students may have to get used to the idea that graduate students represent the lowest entity in the academic food chain.) Encourage them to ask the following questions:

- Do graduate students have office provisions set aside for them? Is there space available for informal meeting with other graduate students?
- Do graduate students have access to private or shared computer resources?

Community Factors

Students should think about the nature of the geographical location of a program for several reasons. Encourage your students to look up the Web site of the chamber of commerce for additional information about lifestyle in the area. Other issues to consider include:

- In what parts of the community do graduate students typically live?
- Where does the university community shop, dine, and play?
- What recreational activities are popular?

- How safe is mass transit?

Conclusion

Graduate education represents a significant investment of time, energy, and resources. If we had to do it over again, we would do so without hesitation. However, knowing what we know now, the process for making the decision would have been far more comprehensive, deliberative, and interesting than it was the first time around. With a little extra advising attention, we hope that your students will be able to make the graduate school leap with greater confidence.

References

Bernal, M. E., Sirolli, A. A., Weisser, S. K., Ruiz, J. A., Chamberlain, V. J., & Knight, G. P. (1999). Are clinical psychologists prepared for service and research with ethnic minorities? Report of a decade of progress. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 5*, 43-55.

Graduate study in psychology: 2002 Edition. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Halonen, J. S., & Young, R. E. (2000). Is that all there is? Graduate study in Psychology. *Contemporary Psychology, 44*, 233-235.

Keith-Spiegel, P., & Wideman, M. W. (2000). *The complete guide to graduate school admission: Psychology, counseling, and related professions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bringing Psychology to Life
 Charles Blair-Broeker
 Cedar Falls (Iowa) High School

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for March 2002.)

It’s pretty obvious that I don’t see enough movies. Almost every week students relate concepts from my course to a movie they have seen but I have not. Get to the memory unit and someone in every class says, “You’ve seen *Memento*, haven’t you?” Jack Nicholson’s role in *As Good as It Gets* comes up like clockwork when we discuss obsessive-compulsive disorder. Savant syndrome still leads to a *Rainman* discussion. I even had several students tell me about a Freudian reference, which they were proud to have understood, in *Titanic*.

The problem is that I have not seen most of these movies. I am a little better with the old ones (*One Flew over the Cuckoo’s Nest* and *Awakenings*, for example), but usually the film in question is simply an item on a “movies to see” list that is forever lost in one of my desk drawers. What is a teacher to do? Here I’ve got what appears to be a teachable moment—an opportunity to relate curricular concepts to popular culture—but I’m in the dark and can’t comment. A percentage of the class is in the dark, too—even in the case of blockbuster hits, not every student has seen the film. I always get the sense I’m leaving these students behind if I spend too much time discussing a movie they have not seen.

Even when I have seen the film, I worry—a lot—about the accuracy of the portrayal. I learned this lesson from the movie *Sybil*. I actually used to show the video in class because I thought it offered such insight into what was then called multiple personality disorder (DSM-IV changed the label to dissociative identity disorder). It turns out that the movie does indeed offer insight, but into an entirely different set of lessons than the ones I had originally assumed: the constructive nature of memory and the subtle, suggestive influence a therapist can have on a client, to name but two. When I should have been discussing the debate about whether multiple personality disorder even exists, I was presenting *Sybil* as a fascinating case study “based on the true story.”

Oh, how I’ve grown to be wary of that five-word phrase! Perhaps my critical thinking skills are better as a result of being burned in the past (who says we don’t learn from punishment?). Thus, when *A Beautiful Mind*, the “based on the true story” biographical film of Nobel Prize-winning mathematician John Nash’s descent into and apparent recovery from paranoid schizophrenia, came along this year, I was ready. The Ron Howard adaptation of Sylvia Nasar’s (1998) meticulously referenced, award-winning biography of Nash, is a beautiful movie, but both the portrayal of schizophrenia in general, and John Nash’s struggle in particular, are an interesting mix of fact and fiction.

Some of the scenes depict events that most likely actually happened, but others, such as Russell Crowe (playing Nash) continually scribbling mathematical formulae on windows

in his dorm room and the Princeton library, seem to be a form of artistic license. There are many errors of omission, which, I suppose, is understandable given the need to condense a 400-page book covering almost 50 years into a feature film. The film provides no information about the out-of-wedlock son Nash fathered and largely abandoned, his arrest for indecent exposure in a public restroom in Santa Monica, or his divorce from and subsequent remarriage to his wife Alicia.

More troublesome are the liberties taken with his disease, and the confusing blend of what really happened and what didn't. I had no idea that insulin shock therapy was used as a treatment for schizophrenia in the 1960s, but the book leaves little doubt that Nash was treated with insulin. This part of the film, to my surprise, was real.

On the other hand, I'm concerned about two aspects of the movie's depiction of schizophrenia. Much of the film centers on Nash's relationships with hallucinated individuals, the two most important being his Princeton roommate and the agent through whom Nash offered code-breaking services to the government. These hallucinations are presented in the film as people—Nash not only can hear them, he can also see them and touch them (he was even bloodied as he wrestled with his "roommate" at one point). There is no mention of such extensive hallucinations in the Nasar's book. The symptoms depicted in the book are far more typical of what one would expect from a paranoid schizophrenic. The emphasis is on delusions of persecution, grandeur, and reference, and only auditory hallucinations are mentioned.

The second major concern relates to treatment issues. The movie implies that Nash somehow, with his wife's constant love and support, willed himself well. Nasar's biography paints a different story. Nash clearly found his involuntary hospital commitments to be unpleasant experiences, but it was equally clear that both the insulin therapy and especially the antipsychotic medications he was given (Thorazine, and later Stelazine) led to a remission in his symptoms. The implied lesson of the film is that treatment is optional, or even detrimental. The book's message is that treatment is a necessary component of regaining one's health. The film motivated me to read the book, and when we get to the disorders unit in class I will be well prepared to respond when students, inevitably, mention the movie. Even if I had not taken the time to do the research, experience has taught me to proceed with caution when the topic is motion pictures. I've learned that raising questions about films is a good way to reinforce the content I want to teach.

It's not just the movies. Not too long ago, Carol Dean's Lake Park High School Psychology Club members sported t-shirts with the phrase "Psychology Is Ubiquitous" on the front. Is there any discipline with as many connections to "real life" as ours? Students cite popular music as being linked to course themes. All manner of television shows, from 20-20 type news magazines to entertainment shows, deal with psychological issues. Even the school environment itself provides a constant and relevant stream of material. My test essay in the learning unit requires students to find examples of concepts related to operant and classical conditioning at work here at Cedar Falls High School. Glance through a few of their responses and you will find references to the negative

reinforcement provided by semester test exemptions available to good students, tongue-in-cheek descriptions of classically conditioned taste aversions traceable to our cafeteria, analyses of classroom procedures in terms of schedules of reinforcement, utilization of discriminative stimuli to determine what one can get away with in certain teachers' classes, and a variety of other clever and appropriate connections between school and learning theory.

Then, of course, there are current events. The Enron scandal provides a vehicle for discussing lie detection, motivation theory, and decision-making. I don't believe a week has gone by since September without reference to the implications of terrorism. I bet the clever among us could rather easily find important ways to connect September 11th events to every unit in the introductory psychology curriculum.

Sometimes the current events are local. In Iowa recently, there has been a great deal of coverage regarding a study commissioned by the state grocers' association. The association is trying to change the state's "bottle bill," which requires them to redeem beverage containers for a nickel deposit. The study indicated there were nasty bacteria and other contaminants on the counters and in the storage areas where beverage containers are returned. The implication is that the containers pose a health risk and grocers should—for the good of their customers—be relieved of the admittedly unpleasant job of dealing with bottle returns. My students, bless them, remembered the importance of control conditions. At this point I really am curious to learn about the bacteria counts in the dairy case, on the deli counter, at the checkout stations, and in the grocery carts that are sometimes used to transport sloppily-diapered babies as well as my fresh produce.

We should never forget the tremendous opportunity our ubiquity provides. Too often, I fear we don't make the connections we could be making. Maybe we don't feel well enough informed. If I haven't seen the movie, how can I allow it into class discussion? If I haven't seen the news or read the article, how can I incorporate the story? What if the story (or the movie) gets it wrong? Worse, what if I get it wrong? What if (as frequently happens to my own embarrassment and my students' infinite amusement) I mispronounce the name of the latest rock group or hip-hop artist?

No doubt these things will happen. The risk in expanding our lessons to include the real world is that we will sometimes screw it up. We are safer when we don't venture beyond our textbooks and the four walls of our classrooms. We are also less effective and engaging with our teaching (Kreiner, 2001). I've learned to have much greater faith in the ability of my students to make the extensions if I only allow them the chance. They can extend the concepts from each chapter to real world events, and they can exercise critical thinking skills when analyzing the latest movie or song. We all learn as a result. To make it work, our role as teachers remains critical. We are here to:

- make sure students understand what it means when a movie or even a news report is "based on the true story,"
- help identify where they might go to learn the rest of the story,

- review, and gently correct, students when they apply concepts inappropriately (as they inevitably will),
- follow up when issues raised require a little out-of-class research (perhaps by assigning students to find the answers), and
- draw on our deeper knowledge of history, culture, and psychology to aid student understanding of the psychological world.

Yes, we'll still get burned occasionally. There are days when I want to contact all those former students and tell them the latest about *Sybil*. However, if, as I've heard Ken Weaver of Emporia State University say, "nothing is not psychology," then we ought to be taking advantage of this glorious truth to teach better. Pass the popcorn.

References

- Kreiner, D. S. (2001, December). Taking risks as a teacher. *E-xcellence in Teaching*. Society for the Teaching of Psychology Psychteacher Listserv [Online].
- Nasar, S. (1998). *A beautiful mind: The life of mathematical genius and Nobel Laureate John Nash*. New York: Touchstone.

Teaching Students with Disabilities

David Johnson
John Brown University

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for April 2002.)

In 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became law and ushered in a new era for the rights of persons with disabilities. Although the ADA was not the first legislation to protect the rights of persons with disabilities, its scope and far-reaching effects caused quite a stir among leaders of business, industry, and education. Public attention focused on the language of the ADA, which mandated that organizations make “reasonable accommodations” for individuals with disabilities.

A disability is a “physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of such an individual, a record of such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment” (ADA, 1992, § 12102, § 3, (2)). What is a reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities?

Changes in a work or school site, program, or job that make it possible for an otherwise qualified employee or student to perform the duties or tasks required constitute a reasonable accommodation. Exceptions can be made if the accommodation causes undue hardship on the organization being asked for the accommodation. Undue hardship may take into account the cost of making the accommodation in relation to the size and financial status of the organization.

The implications of ADA for educational institutions and instructors are still unclear over a decade after the passage of the act. The wording of ADA is ambiguous and each year the courts make rulings that clarify the limits of the act. However, although we may not know the limits of the act, most institutions have made considerable progress in upholding the spirit, if not the letter, of the law. In this essay, I will address several issues that faculty may encounter when teaching students with disabilities. However, I’m going to give only one piece of general advice: Be prepared!

Part of this process of preparation involves knowing the services your institution provides for students with disabilities. Unlike 15 years ago, most institutions today maintain an Office of Disability Services (ODS). ODS officials work with students to certify disabilities and act as liaisons among students, faculty, and administration. Most ODSs also provide a variety of services for students and faculty that make the offering of accommodations fairly easy. Some ODS offices offer testing services, note-taking services, and a variety of disability-specific help. Working closely with ODS and the students will generally lead to a more satisfying experience for all concerned.

Be prepared for a lesson in diversity. Most of us give special attention to diversity issues in our classes, but our focus is more frequently oriented toward issues related to ethnic

diversity. However, students with disabilities also comprise a diverse group that may provide a challenge to our teaching methods. Although I don't wish to oversimplify, I find it useful to classify student disabilities into two groups.

The first group might be called The Silent Disabilities: Many of the disabilities with which we regularly deal in our classes are those that are not noticeable by casual observation. Learning disabilities may not be evident, but those who have been diagnosed with them may have significant problems with processing auditory and/or visual information. Obviously, students with auditory processing difficulty may need assistance with information presented orally. Taping lectures allows students to replay parts that they may not have adequately processed the first time. Providing students with outlines ahead of time or even arranging for a note taker may be helpful. Alternatively, providing copies of overheads or PowerPoint slides may reduce the load on students. Verbalizing material on overhead transparencies in class may be helpful to students with visual processing difficulties. Students with learning disabilities may need more time on exams or even require another person to read a particularly long multiple-choice exam. Most of these accommodations can be easily handled with a minimum of preparation on the instructor's part.

The second, somewhat smaller group may require considerably more preparation on the instructor's part. These students have significant sensory disabilities such as loss of sight and hearing, or significant mobility deficits due to conditions such as cerebral palsy. Although diverse in its own right, this group may require instructors to consider more elaborate accommodations compared to the first group.

When preparing to provide accommodations for this latter group, be careful to avoid stereotypes. Nearly 20 years ago, before the days of ODSs, a student who was blind informed me that she was enrolling in my class in the fall semester. I initially thought that I should plan for this student by getting handouts, notes, exams, and other course materials transcribed into Braille. I was the master of good intentions. After I spent quite a bit of time and effort getting Braille transcriptions, I discovered that this student was, in fact, a Braille reader. If she had not been a Braille reader, my advance preparation would have been wasted due to my stereotype that blind people generally read Braille. In fact, after this experience, I learned that many blind individuals do not read Braille. The percentage of Braille readers has declined over the last 20 years or so. Computer-assisted functions such as audio screen readers now take the place of Braille for many who are blind. It is all too easy to fall into the trap of believing that there is a particular profile of students with specific disabilities.

I do two specific things to prepare for teaching students with significant sensory disabilities. First, I ask ODS personnel if they can recommend specific teaching methods of which I might not be aware. Second, and more importantly, when dealing with students whose disabilities require more than simple accommodations such as taping lectures and providing outlines, I discuss with them their preferences and past experiences in similar courses.

These conferences have been very helpful. Students with disabilities are usually much more knowledgeable than instructors regarding specific techniques that allow them to be successful in their courses. I determine their specific preferences in classroom situations, such as special seating arrangements. For blind students, I might determine if their condition is congenital or was acquired after a period of visual experience, which can be helpful to me in formulating my verbal descriptions during lectures. I might also inquire about their preferred ways of handling classroom discussion. Some blind students appreciate the instructor calling other students in class by their names prior to making comments during discussion. This tactic is particularly helpful early in the semester, when blind students attempt to connect specific voices to specific students. Other blind students may prefer to avoid this tactic because they believe that it draws too much attention to their disability. In sum, students usually make an excellent guide for instructors who attempt to structure their classrooms to provide accommodations.

In your interactions with some students with disabilities, be prepared to encounter things that may, at first, be distracting. For example, if you have a student with a severe hearing impairment, you may find yourself communicating to that student through a signer. You may find that this arrangement is a bit unnerving at first, but it does not typically take too much time for you and your other students to adjust. Likewise, when communicating directly to the student it is tempting to “talk at” the signer. Instead, talk directly to the student, who may actually be using a combination of signing and lip-reading to “hear” you.

As prepared as you may be, unexpected things may happen. For example, it took some time to get used to having a guide dog in classes. One of my students had two guide dogs over the course of a year. At first, I found it a little disconcerting when the guide dog sat in the front row and stared at me, although the staring was preferable to when she fell asleep and snored loudly. (The dog may have been in good company, though, in an 8:00 am statistics course.) The second guide dog that attended class was flatulent, which made for a rather interesting atmosphere. Although guide dogs in the classroom may provide some interesting experiences, they may also provide instructors an opportunity to educate other students about the etiquette of dealing with them. For example, students should be informed that they should not feed or touch a guide dog when it is in harness. Instructors should emphasize that the dog is working and should not be treated as a pet. The Guide Dog Foundation (<http://www.guidedog.org>) provides an excellent set of rules for dealing with guide dogs.

Although the goal of providing accommodations to students with disabilities is to allow otherwise qualified students to succeed in learning, I believe instructors reap benefits, too. Teaching students with disabilities tends to give instructors a new perspective on their teaching. Preparing accommodations forces instructors to rethink teaching methods and strategies. Over time it is easy to develop habits in the classroom that may not be conducive to learning for students with disabilities. Talking while writing on the board or facing away from the class might be particularly problematic for hearing impaired students who use lip-reading as part of their verbal acquisition strategy. Verbal descriptions of materials on the board or on overheads may facilitate the classroom

experience of a blind student, but it also may cause instructors to give considerable thought to what specific information they include on these media. In fact, instructors may find that other students appreciate the changes the instructor makes for students with disabilities.

One final thought regarding terminology. You may notice that throughout this column I varied the manner by which I referred to students with disabilities. In some places, I used the phrase “a student who is blind.” In other places, I referred to a “blind student.” I prefer using the former rather than the latter for one simple reason: Referring to the student first focuses on the person, not the disability. However, in writing it can be cumbersome to use that format consistently, so for variety, I varied the way by which I referred to the students. In my experience, students appreciate the focus on them rather than on their disability. In a similar vein, I also believe that students appreciate candor about their disability. A student who is blind usually does not require us to avoid that fact by using terms such as “visually challenged.” My advice is to be sensitive to this issue and let the students be your guide. Ask them if they have preferences in this regard.

The goal of the ADA was to provide “otherwise qualified” individuals the opportunity to succeed in the workplace and classroom. It appears to be well on its way to meeting this goal, and more. Passage of the ADA not only mandates that we consider practices that constitute fairness for students with disabilities, but also encourages us to be conscientious in evaluating our classroom practices. That cannot be a bad thing!

Reference

Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (West 1992))

***The National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology:
Twenty-Five Years and Counting***

Douglas A. Bernstein
University of South Florida

(This essay originally appeared as a special article for the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for April 2002.)

To some of our younger faculty, it must seem that there has always been a National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology (NITOP). The rest of us, though, can clearly recall a time when there was no NITOP, and therefore, absolutely no reason for any department head or dean to pay to send psychology teachers to Florida in January. Now, it happens every year. The details of how and why NITOP came to be, and how it grew, can be found in a chapter I contributed to a book co-edited by Steve Davis and Bill Buskist (Bernstein, 2002), but Bill thought the members of the PsychTeacher listserv might like to read a shorter version of that story, and to get some idea of my views on the conference. I hope he is right, and that this column will fill the bill.

NITOP met for the first time on October 9-11, 1978 on the campus of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). Many people assume that NITOP was my idea, but it was actually the brainchild of Frank Costin, a fellow member of the UIUC psychology department in whose memory the Costin award is now given at NITOP. Frank’s simple, but vital, idea was to give psychology faculty a chance to get together to exchange ideas and advice about the challenges, frustrations, problems, and pleasures of teaching psychology. To be honest, I don’t recall if I attended the institute that first year. I don’t think I did, because the first I remember hearing about it was when Frank asked me to be a speaker at the second annual meeting, in the fall of 1979. So I was not present at NITOP’s birth, but I was there for its first birthday party. Still, to me the invitation to speak was just that. I had no idea at the time that the institute would become an institution or that I would become so involved in it, and certainly no inkling of the impact it would come to have on psychology teachers, on how and what they teach, and even on the growth of other teaching conferences.

I remember being struck by how intensely interested the participants were in listening to the speakers talk about teaching methods and updating course content, and how eager they were to talk to each other about student-faculty relationship issues, grading policies, ethical dilemmas, and the like. I had no idea that so many faculty in my discipline cared so much about these things because, frankly, most members of my research-oriented department did not talk much about teaching—especially undergraduate teaching—other than to complain about having to do it. As someone who loved teaching and who wanted to find out how to do it better, I had learned to keep my mouth shut about this nasty little secret, and just do the best I could. (I remember being laughed at by a senior colleague when I told him how happy I was to have been “trusted” with a 350-student section of abnormal psychology in my first semester at Illinois.) However, now I wondered: If there were faculty who took the trouble to come to Champaign, Illinois of all places, in an

effort to improve their teaching, maybe there was a way I could help make that happen, and improve my own teaching in the process.

Early in 1980, Frank Costin asked me to join the planning committee for the Third Annual Institute, and it was at a meeting of that committee that we decided to try to broaden the appeal of the institute, and serve more people by moving it to Florida in January, where it has been held ever since. At the 5th Annual Institute, in 1983, we tried something else that was new: we included two roundtable discussion sessions that were suggested by previous participants. The format was popular enough that the following year we scheduled six roundtables. By 1988, at program committee member Bob Hendersen's suggestion, we began inviting all participants to submit topics for discussions that they themselves would lead during what came to be called Participant Idea Exchanges (PIE). That same year, we also invited participants to present posters on any topic related to the teaching of psychology. The response to these invitations was stunning, as dozens of participants submitted PIE topics, poster proposals, or both. No doubt they did so partly because giving a presentation at NITOP helped support requests for travel money, but years of touring crowded rows of posters and eavesdropping on packed PIE sessions has made it clear to me that these presentations and discussions are helping to meet much more fundamental needs. They actually give participants at our conference a chance to confer with one another, to tell interested colleagues about what they are doing in their classes, and to hear what those colleagues are doing, too. Perhaps even more important, they provide participants with an opportunity to describe the problems they are having in their courses, and to get ideas for solving them. In the process, they discover they are not alone in having to face those problems, or in being perplexed, worried, and even frightened by them.

I am particularly proud of these features and of the stellar talks our distinguished speakers have delivered over the years. Together, they have helped to realize the vision that Frank Costin had for NITOP a quarter of a century ago—to get teachers of psychology together in a way that benefits their teaching, and their lives as teachers. Past participants tell me that attending NITOP helps them to renew their enthusiasm for teaching, gives them new ideas for making their classes more interesting and up to date, and offers them fresh perspectives and strategies for dealing with the inevitable student-faculty problems they must face. I, too, am gratified, that NITOP's impact has been amplified through its role in helping others who seek to promote the teaching of psychology. NITOP appears to have served as a stimulus and a model for the many regional teaching conferences that have developed since 1984, and for the American Psychological Society's efforts in the realm of teaching—most notably in the form of its own annual Preconvention Institute on the Teaching of Psychology. I am pleased, too, to have played a role in helping APS forge closer ties to the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP), first by inviting STP members to introduce speakers at the APS Teaching Institute's sessions, and then by turning over the planning of the APS institute to STP. In the years to come, I look forward to working with the NITOP program committee to find new ways to improve our institute, and to expand its role in promoting excellence in the teaching of psychology.

The most recent of these new efforts takes the form of the Annual Summer Institute on

the Teaching of Psychology. The first annual summer institute took place in 2001, and the second annual meeting is scheduled for July 23-26, 2002. This 4-day event is designed for a diverse group of participants, including high school teachers who want to enrich their psychology courses, graduate students preparing for academic jobs, young faculty who are developing their teaching style, and senior faculty with a desire to recharge their batteries, and sharpen established teaching skills. The format includes not only the usual speaker presentations, but hands-on workshops focused on skills relating to lecturing, classroom demonstrations, ethical issues, and the like.

Let me close by saying how grateful I am to those of you who have come to NITOP in the past, and especially for the comments and suggestions you have made to help us to plan and improve NITOP. Though the committee and I tend to get the credit for NITOP's value and success, NITOP would not be what it is without your loyalty and your help. I hope that NITOP will continue to serve you, and those who follow you, for another 25 years.

Reference

Bernstein, D.A. (2002). Promoting the teaching of psychology: A history of NITOP. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (pp. 271-280). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Helping Your Students to Become Savvy Psychology Majors

Drew Appleby

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for May 2002.)

The English word “savvy” is related to the French word *savoir*, which means “to be aware of, to understand, or to know how” (Dubois, 1971, p. 243). When the French add the word *faire* (“to do”) to *savoir*, the result is *savoir-faire*, a phrase used to describe people who are both (a) knowledgeable and (b) willing and able to use their knowledge to accomplish their goals. Savvy psychology majors possess *savoir-faire*. This means they are aware of the importance of the following questions, they are eager to discover and understand their answers, and they are willing and able to translate their newly acquired understanding of these answers into success-producing actions.

- How can I survive my first year in college?
- How can I become a successful psychology major?
- What can I do with a bachelor’s degree in psychology?
- How can I identify, clarify, and accomplish my occupational goals?

Unfortunately, not all psychology majors are savvy. The media often portrays today’s college-bound generation as clueless slackers who lack the knowledge (i.e., are clueless) and ambition (i.e., are slackers) to achieve their goals. Research reported by Schneider and Stevenson (1999) in their book, *The Ambitious Generation: America’s Teenagers, Motivated but Directionless*, refutes the slacker component of this portrayal with data collected from current college-age students and a similar group of their peers from the 1950s. When these two groups were compared, the results were clear. Today’s students are far more ambitious than their peers from the 1950s because many more want to earn a college degree (90% vs. 55%) and many more strive to enter professional careers (e.g., medicine and law) as opposed to blue-collar jobs (e.g., mechanic and secretary).

The data related to the clueless component of this portrayal were less clear-cut. Schneider and Stevenson discovered that today’s college-bound students fall into two groups, those possessing aligned ambitions and those whose ambitions are misaligned. Those with aligned ambitions have complementary educational and occupational goals and are likely to construct educational plans that enhance their chances of successfully attaining their desired occupations. These students understand how they must change to reach their occupational goals (i.e., the knowledge and skills they must acquire) and are more thoughtful when they make decisions about which courses to take, which organizations to join, and how to spend their time.

Students with misaligned ambitions are equally ambitious, but often find it difficult to fulfill their dreams because they are unaware of the steps that will enable them to achieve

their ambitions. According to Schneider and Stevenson (1999, p. 4), their ambitions are “dreamlike and not realistically connected to specific educational and career paths. Regardless of how hard they try, they find themselves running in place and unsure of where to go.” They are the drifting dreamers who have limited knowledge about four crucial aspects of their futures:

- their proposed occupations,
- the educational requirements of their schools,
- the educational opportunities that can prepare them for their occupations, and
- the future demand for their proposed occupations.

The word clueless comes to mind when I think of students with misaligned ambitions. My wish for my psychology majors is that they will become just the opposite. I urge them to use their undergraduate education to become “clueful” (i.e., savvy) psychology majors who know what they want to do with their lives and how to use their undergraduate experiences to get what they want. I have three favorite quotations that help me communicate with my students about their journeys toward cluefulness.

The first part of their journeys to the land of cluefulness requires them to do what Socrates suggested more than two thousand years ago when he said, “Know thyself.” I advise them to begin—as early as possible in their undergraduate careers—the process of serious self-examination that will enable them to identify their skills, characteristics, goals, values, and resources. I spend a considerable amount of time explaining the student learning outcomes of both my department and my university so my students can become aware of the skills (e.g., writing, speaking, and critical-thinking) and characteristics (e.g., open mindedness and adaptability) they can acquire if they engage conscientiously in their education. I encourage them to think about their undergraduate experience as an authentic means for preparing themselves for their occupational futures, not just four years of burdensome requirements that must be “gotten out of the way” before they can begin their real lives. I refer my less-well-focused students to our career center where they can discuss their futures with well trained career counselors and engage in interactive software programs such as SIGI Plus, which can help them match their skills, characteristics, goals, values, and resources with the requirements and realities of thousands of vocational possibilities.

The second leg of their journey involves the famous advice Polonius gave Laertes in the second act of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, “To thine own self be true.” Once they begin to know themselves, the next steps are (a) to discover who they would like to become and (b) to create a plan of action to reach their aspirations that fits their own unique set of skills, characteristics, goals, values, and resources. The Occupational Outlook Handbook (OOH) and the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) are particularly helpful resources at this point because they provide students with accurate “reality checks” on their intended occupations (i.e., is my dream job really what I envision it to be?). The DOT provides them with brief descriptions of the requirements, demands, and training for over 22,000 jobs. The OOH describes far fewer occupations, but in much greater detail (i.e., the nature of the work, working conditions, employment statistics, training,

outlook for the job, earnings, related occupations, and additional sources of information). Other valuable sources of career information are books such as *Career Paths in Psychology* (Sternberg, 1997), *Majoring in Psych? Career Options for Psychology Undergraduates* (Morgan & Korschgen, 2001), *The Psychology Major: Career Options and Strategies for Success* (Landrum, Davis, & Landrum, 2000), *Succeeding in Graduate School: The Career Guide for Psychology Students* (Walfish & Hess, 2001), and *The Handbook of Psychology* (Appleby, 1997). *Eye on Psi Chi* (the newsletter of our national honor society) also contains a wealth of career-oriented articles written specifically for undergraduates. For example, Huss (2001, p. 25) wrote an article entitled “What Is Forensic Psychology? It’s Not Silence of the Lambs!” He used this opportunity to inform the burgeoning number of undergraduates drawn to forensic psychology that, sensationalistic media portrayals [about forensic psychology] may not be accurate nor offer realistic employment opportunities. Students may become disheartened to learn that certain media depictions are less than realistic but should be excited to learn about the real possibilities forensic psychology has to offer

The third part of their journey involves putting their plans into action. I can think of no better way to state the urgency of this crucial component than by quoting Nike, the Greek goddess of victory, (speaking through her 21st Century commercial namesake) who says, “Just do it.” This final leg of their journey will put the “faire” into their “savoir-faire” and transform them into truly savvy psychology majors who know who they are, who know where they are going, and who are actually headed in the direction of their goals. Advising my students actually to “do” their intended careers by engaging in internships, co-ops, practica, and service learning projects is probably the best advice I give them during this stage of their journey. These experiences allow them to discover if they (a) possess the skills for the tasks their proposed occupations will require and (b) experience the passion for the challenges they will encounter on the job. As I tell my students, you will have found your ideal occupation (i.e., the one that makes you WANT to get out of bed and go to work in the morning) when you discover the career that exists at the intersection of your skills and your passion. Nothing can make you feel better about your job—and yourself—than being both good at and excited about what you do.

As I reflect upon three decades of college teaching, I am amazed at my pedagogical evolution. My initial strategy was to concentrate on insuring that my students became knowledgeable about the contents and methods of psychology (e.g., the location of the hippocampus, why the rat turned left, the duration and capacity of iconic memory, and the relative merits of the cross-sectional and longitudinal methods). I still teach my students these things, but my focus is now on who, rather than what, I am teaching. I make a clear and conscious effort to tell my students how they can use the subject matter of psychology to construct life plans compatible with their talents, values, and characteristics (i.e., to become savvy). I received a letter from one of our alumni (who sells new homes) that describes the results of my new strategy quite well. She ended her letter with the following paragraph, which I will use to end my essay.

My studies in psychology helped me to understand people and their differences. I think I may understand more than most the importance of listening and patience. Different people may respond to situations in different ways, but everyone wants the same thing. People want to be respected, listened to, and understood. Psychology helped me understand this, and I believe I am a better person—and a better new home sales consultant—for this. Thank you again for taking the time to care about and listen to your students. I hope this letter can help you show other psychology students that all psychology majors need not go to graduate school or become psychologists. There are many other fields in which psychology majors can be successful and happy!

References

- Appleby, D. C. (1997). *The handbook of psychology*. New York: Longman.
- Dubois, M. (1971). *Larousse's French-English English-French dictionary*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Huss, M. (2001, Spring). What is forensic psychology? It's not Silence of the Lambs. *Eye on Psi Chi*, 25-27.
- Landrum, E., Davis, S., & Landrum, T. A. (2000). *The psychology major: Career options and strategies for success*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morgan, B. L., & Korschgen, A. J. (2001). *Majoring in psych? Career options for psychology majors*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schneider, B., & Stevenson, D. (1999). *The ambitious generation: America's teenagers, motivated but directionless*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. (1997). *Career paths in psychology: Where your degree can take you*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Walfish, S., & Hess, A. K. (2001). *Succeeding in graduate school: The career guide for psychology students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Focusing on How We Know What We Know in the Psychology Classroom

Laura L. Namy
Emory University

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for June 2002.)

Students enjoy learning the facts of psychology—what causes mental illness, why there are gender differences in some domains and not in others, what factors we use in making decisions, how memory works, and so on. The only trouble is that the facts of psychology are actually few and far between. Rather than providing definitive answers, we are often only in the position to provide suggestive evidence or theories, complete with their limitations and alternative explanations. Students often express surprise and frustration with the dearth of “facts” psychology instructors are able to provide. Even after taking a research methods course, students also often seem to have little genuine understanding of the process by which those facts or hypotheses about the mind and behavior are acquired.

Clearly, it is an instructor’s mission to convey what we know about a particular topic or domain of study within the field. However, another central aspect of our job as instructors is to impress upon students the challenges involved in inferring information about human thought and behavior. Even more importantly, it is our responsibility to impart to students an understanding of the process by which such information may be gleaned.

Understanding this process contributes to students’ ability to evaluate critically and reason about evidence more generally. This is fundamental not only to their understanding of course content, but also to their ability to contribute to society as a critical consumer of information. From voting to making medical decisions to choosing to play the lottery, an understanding of how we know what we know and how to assess the strengths and limitations of research will put students in good stead to make careful, informed, and well reasoned decisions.

Unfortunately, humans are notoriously poor at the logical inference that underlies scientific reasoning. This became evident to me as early as my senior year in college when I served as a teaching assistant for an introductory logic class. Daily, I observed students’ struggles with what was, for them, a highly unintuitive process. As I continued my training in cognitive psychology, I learned about the empirical evidence confirming that humans reason by example, by heuristics, and with strong biases that do not conform to the rules of logic. Unfortunately, the heuristics and biases employed in people’s everyday lives have very real and often very negative consequences. We, as psychology instructors, have a unique opportunity and responsibility to cultivate critical reasoning skills that contribute to students’ understanding of the scientific inquiry into the mind.

But how do we do this? How do we motivate students to care about how we know as well as what we know? How do we improve students’ ability to critique study designs, evaluate evidence, draw logical conclusions, and generate alternative explanations? Here

are some classroom activities that I have found useful in facilitating student engagement in the scientific process:

1. I require students to read, discuss, and write about primary sources. There is nothing like delving in to the intricacies of an experimental report to provide students with concrete evidence of the process by which psychological evidence is acquired (and of their own lack of understanding of this process). Textbooks are designed to provide an overview and synthesis of the relevant material, but they often do so at the expense of details about the design, logic, and often, the actual findings. Primary sources serve as an important alternative perspective on course content. Students find primary sources challenging to understand and will need a lot of guidance and scaffolding. However, over the course of a semester, students can develop some clear skills in reading and synthesizing articles for themselves.

Many textbook publishers now sell “current readings” anthologies that provide reasonably short, non-technical articles clustering around a particular theme. Consider augmenting your textbook assignments with such readings. I provide at least one article reading assignment for every topic discussed in class, and strategically incorporate that reading into the lecture at an appropriate place. Students are expected to answer questions about the goals, methods, findings, and conclusions of the paper either during class discussion or in a short written summary. Learning to articulate (both orally and in writing) a research article’s goals, approaches, and findings goes a long way toward training students to evaluate evidence critically.

2. I expect students in my classes to know and be able to answer “Namy’s Five Questions.” For every experiment discussed in class, students must be able to answer these five questions. Students are warned that these questions are fair game on the exams covering any of the experiments or studies discussed in class. The five questions are:

- What was the question that this study was designed to answer?
- What was the experimental design?
- What is the logic of how the design answers the question?
- What were the results?
- What were the conclusions?

Are these questions earth-shatteringly insightful? Unique? Of course not. However, they provide a context and a structure for students’ knowledge bases. I have found that asking students to be sure they can deconstruct an experiment into these five parts has dramatically increased the depth of their understanding of the experiments discussed in class (as well as their subsequent test performance). Students engage the material in a more science-minded fashion and most impressively, begin to identify and rectify holes in their own understanding. When I began using “Namy’s Five Questions,” students suddenly began raising their hands in class to ask me questions such as “Can you go over the logic of study X again?” and started e-mailing me prior to exams to ask “Can you clarify the conclusions of study Y?” or “I don’t understand the main question in experiment Z.” When students are expected to understand the process and are given the

tools to do so, they become more active participants in their own learning. They become more focused on the intricacies of the experiments, not just the bottom line.

3. I provide in-class experiments and demonstrations whenever possible, or (when feasible) require students to collect their own data. I encourage students to make predictions about the outcomes of experiments, propose extensions to the experiments we discuss, and even generate research proposals of their own. These sorts of activities provide a personal involvement on the part of the student (as subject or prospective experimenter) that generates an interest in the outcome of the experiment and an investment in the motivation for and interpretation of the study. This experience gives students a heightened level of insight into the phenomena and the process of conducting research. One of the most valuable aspects of designing or conducting an experiment of their own is that students must make their own judgments and decisions about how to measure, collect, organize, and present the data. Because they make these decisions for themselves, they experience with great vividness the sometimes subjective nature of experimental design, coding, and analysis. This process can drive home for them why definitive answers are often sparse in science.

In summary, these activities are designed to encourage students to analyze the logic of studies, evaluate evidence, and articulate their ideas both orally and in writing. None are terribly difficult to implement but they do involve a slight shift in focus during lectures and in readings and paper assignments. I am convinced that these activities increase students' understanding of and appreciation for the process of studying the human mind and behavior. These skills will serve students beyond the classroom, ensuring that they are more thoughtful consumers of information in their everyday lives. This is the best possible legacy that we can provide for our students.

Organizing and Maintaining University-Wide Teaching Circles

Lauren F. V. Scharff

Stephen F. Austin State University

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for July 2002.)

One of the most rewarding activities in which I have participated at Stephen F. Austin State University (SFA) has been organizing and maintaining teaching circles. A teaching circle is a group of persons who meet and talk about teaching and issues related to teaching. I first heard of teaching circles while attending the Southwest Regional Conference for Teachers of Psychology, where one of the conference attendees mentioned that she participated in a teaching circle at her institution.

How teaching circles came to be part of faculty life at SFA was due to some fortunate circumstances. Our university had been part of the American Council of Education's project on Institutional Change in Higher Education, and I was one of the committee members for that project. At one of the round table forums, I happened to sit at a table with several faculty from around our campus interested in teaching issues. I mentioned the idea of teaching circles, and a brainstorming discussion ensued. We proposed the idea of teaching circles at SFA to our Vice-President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) and received permission to start university-wide teaching circles. That was the easy part.

The good news is that, although it does require some time and effort, organizing and maintaining teaching circles is not horribly onerous. If you like the idea of teaching circles, but don't feel comfortable starting at the university-level, organize a circle in your department, or with faculty who you know personally across campus. Perhaps over time you and a few others might feel comfortable trying to increase participation across campus. I encourage wider, as opposed to narrower, teaching circles because I feel strongly that gaining perspectives from faculty in different departments has been one of the reasons our circles have been so successful. One important advantage of campus-based circles is that circle members often become friends with faculty across campus as a direct result of their participation in the circle. In a more global sense, I think it makes those of us involved in the circles feel like we belong to a university-wide community rather than to isolated departments.

In this essay, I will outline some properties of our teaching circles that I believe make them successful. I will then share some of the lessons about teaching circles that we have learned.

Basic Organization

A coordinator oversees activities across all campus teaching circles. Each circle has a facilitator who helps organize the meetings by sending e-mail reminders to circle members, sometimes obtaining and distributing readings, and sometimes sending

discussion summaries so they can be posted on the teaching circles Web page. (These discussion summaries provide an idea of the variety of topics and readings that have been part of our circles.) Circles tend to have between 3 and 8 members in addition to the facilitator.

Circles meet once a month for one hour. Thus, depending on the calendar, there tend to be 3-4 meetings per semester. Some circles have opted to meet more often. The times and facilitators for the circles change each semester. When organizing the circles, my goal is to always offer some variety of times and days when the circles meet in order to maximize the number of people who might potentially participate.

Some circles have themes that guide discussions all semester, although most circles have very different discussion topics each meeting. Sometimes circles discuss a book or readings; however, most circle discussion is based solely on what is in the members' heads at the time. The meeting place is generally the facilitator's departmental conference room, although some circles have met in other places, such as a local coffee shop.

Teaching Circle Coordinator Duties

A few weeks prior to the start of the semester, the teaching circle coordinator confirms who will facilitate the circles for that semester. I get 2 or 3 preferred meeting times from each facilitator and then set up a schedule that offers the best variety of days and times for everyone involved. After confirming the facilitators and their meeting times, I send an e-mail to the teaching circles e-mail list announcing that its time to sign up to participate in a circle. My e-mail list has grown over the years to include about 150 of our approximately 450 faculty at SFA. The list contains anyone who has participated in the past, plus other faculty and instructors who have asked to have their names on the list. I remove anyone as soon as they ask to be removed. Faculty reply to me by e-mail in order to sign up for their preferred teaching circle. I make a list of those individuals and forward it to the facilitators. I also update our Web page each semester so that those interested can also see what circles are being offered at what times and who is in them. When I receive the discussion summaries from the facilitators, I post them on the Web page. Based on input from faculty, I occasionally organize speakers and workshops. When I come across items of general interest, I may forward them through the e-mail list or through the current facilitators.

Facilitator Issues

When recruiting potential facilitators, I make sure that they know exactly what is expected of them. The most important facilitator duty is to keep circle discussions from becoming merely gripe sessions. It is all too easy for most of us to complain about our problems regarding students, administration, and so on. My thought is that a teaching circle should offer more than just a place to vent and commiserate with like-minded colleagues. It should also serve as a wellspring of ideas to inform our teaching. Although facilitators are instructed to allow a little venting, they know that the emphasis is on productive discussions of teaching issues, drawing on group member's combined teaching

experience to address the issues at hand. I stress that facilitators do not need to feel like they are experts on all (or even any) teaching-related issues. Mostly they are there to facilitate and guide the discussion, not to lead it.

Once the circles are formed, the facilitators are in charge of their individual circle organization. I send them an e-mail list of their members, and then they contact the members about the specific dates and locations of the meetings. I strongly recommend one to two reminder e-mails be sent prior to each meeting.

The Web Site

In our first semester of the teaching circles, I set up the teaching circles Web site (<http://hubel.sfasu.edu/otherendev/tc/teachcir.html>). It is not very fancy, but it helps communicate what teaching circles are about, and makes it easy for faculty to find out about the current circles and any other related events that might be scheduled. The Web site has also helped recruit new circle participants because I have coordinated with the SFA Web master so that there is a link to the site from the faculty page for SFA.

Recruiting Circle Participants

At SFA, participation in the circles is voluntary. We encourage all participants to bring friends, and to tell others about the circles. Occasionally I attend the SFA chairs' meeting so that I can ask the chairs to tell their faculty about the circles. It is important that faculty know that their chairs support their participation in teaching circles (although some chairs do not). Faculty are more likely to see participation in the teaching circles as a good use of their time for both personal and professional reasons (an activity to report on one's annual review) if they know that their chair supports their participation in the circles. Finally, I attend the New Faculty Orientation session and talk about teaching circles.

Bringing in Speakers and Holding Workshops

Several times I have coordinated with individuals both on and off campus to organize talks or workshops related to teaching. Because these are university-wide circles, I choose speakers carefully so that the topics aren't too narrow to be useful for the faculty at large. Our VPAA has been very supportive of the teaching circles and has paid for some travel and honoraria for presenters and for refreshments at the workshops. The workshops are a good way to help increase the visibility of the teaching circles. I make them open to everyone, not just those who have participated in teaching circles. I also make sure there is an article in the school paper, which means more people are likely learn about the circles.

Lessons Learned and Other Things to Keep in Mind

The first semester that we held teaching circles at SFA, a wonderful chair from another department coordinated recruitment. She contacted other chairs and asked for names. Unfortunately, many of the names given to her were those people that the other chairs felt

should attend the teaching circles, rather than individuals who wanted to attend (many of this latter group did not learn about the circles until later). Obviously, such a recruitment strategy would lead to problems, both in participant attitude and attendance. Needless to say, we did not take that approach again.

Facilitators can be difficult to recruit. Many of my colleagues from around campus enjoy being participants in the circles, but hesitate to be facilitators. Often they claim that they do not know enough or are too new to teaching. Some seem afraid that it will take too much time. The best solution I have found for this problem is to assure potential facilitators that the discussion usually leads itself; the facilitator's job is to keep the discussion on track and do what they can to avoid the discussion turning sour. To help new facilitators to get started, I share articles with them if they need fresh topics for their circles. Once a facilitator has "led" discussions once or twice, they almost always report that it was easier and more enjoyable than they expected

We do not take attendance. I stress this point during sign ups. Although it's just one meeting a month for only an hour, many faculty feel that they do not have time for teaching circles. In addition, many faculty who are interested are very active in all phases of their work, which means they have many other meetings, conferences to attend, and so on. So, I encourage (over and over again) that they should sign up and attend as many meetings as they can. I think such an approach encourages people to sign up, which is the first step toward participation.

Realize that some circles will be more successful than others. This is an especially important point if you are starting with only one circle for the whole campus. Many factors influence a circle's success: member personalities and how well they mix (or not), unavoidable scheduling difficulties, social skills and organizational abilities of the facilitator, location of the meeting (room atmosphere, how far people have to walk to get there), and so on. I try to talk to circle facilitators and participants so I know how well the circles are going. If participants are not happy with their present circle, I suggest that they switch circles or try a different one the next semester. Be positive. Have unhappy attendees talk to a faculty member for whom the experience was good. That way you reduce the likelihood that they will drop out of the circles.

Summary

Teaching circles are a fantastic means by which to create a sense of community among faculty who care about teaching. Participants in our circles often report feeling isolated in their departments before they joined a circle, and that their participation helps them realize they are not unique in some of the issues they face. Further, it revitalizes faculty and gives them new ideas and techniques to try in their classrooms. Even faculty who do not believe that they are currently struggling can benefit, sometimes simply by sharing, and sometimes by gaining ideas that they had not considered previously. Thus, teaching circles are worth the effort needed to organize and maintain them.

The Landscape of Excellence in Teaching

Barney Beins
Ithaca College

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for August 2002.)

Excellent teaching doesn’t happen by accident. It requires notable thought, planning, and collaboration. Being interested in teaching and wanting to excel in teaching do not equate with being effective in educating students, however. So it is worthwhile to examine what factors will help excellence to emerge. We will be well off considering excellence as a process rather than as a goal, as something we do continuously rather than as something we achieve, as something we share with our students because if their learning isn’t excellent, neither is our teaching.

Over the past two years, I have directed the Office of Pre-College and Undergraduate Education at the American Psychological Association. During that time, I have had the opportunity to see the attempt toward excellence from a broader perspective than I had when my horizon stopped at the edge of my classroom. It has become obvious to me that we are more likely to excel if we labor in a community of teaching scholars than if we work alone. We may each be individually dedicated to our students and to our teaching, but we will be more effective as teachers if we recognize the forest of potential that abounds around us.

Fortunately, quite a few people in higher education have reached this same conclusion. The landscape is dotted with scholars of teaching and with organizations that may help us in our quest. The professional environment of teaching has shifted over the past few decades in ways favorable to teachers. We obviously have to balance different demands in our professional lives, like teaching and research. But there are new pressures to teach well that facilitate our work. For example, the movement toward greater accountability, which arose outside the classroom, has provided faculty with an opportunity to improve their teaching.

I will highlight some effective organizational and institutional efforts that facilitate teaching. As an academic, I have a feel for some of the important elements in teaching; as Director of Pre-College and Undergraduate Programs, I have discerned a larger picture.

First of all, it would be hard to claim that we were effective teachers if we did not have a sense of the outcomes we desire. Education is nonlinear and complex, so as we perambulate the pedagogical forest, our instincts and expertise will move us toward the outcomes we seek. But the path isn’t direct or obvious, so we can benefit from the accomplishments of other scholars of teaching to guide us.

The Education Directorate at APA created a task force of sagacious and diverse psychologists to consider the desired competencies of undergraduate psychology majors. This task force produced a document that outlines 10 learning outcomes, 5 associated specifically with psychology and 5 with psychology as a liberal art (<http://www.apa.org/ed/pcue/reports.html>). The learning outcomes are not course-based. Rather, they focus on the skills, knowledge, and attitudes that students should have gained as psychology majors. The first five outcomes or goals involve knowledge, skills, and values consistent with the science and application of psychology.

- Goal 1. Knowledge Base of Psychology: Students will demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and historical trends in psychology.
- Goal 2. Research Methods in Psychology: Students will understand and apply basic research methods in psychology, including research design, data analysis, and interpretation.
- Goal 3. Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology: Students will respect and use critical and creative thinking, skeptical inquiry, and, when possible, the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.
- Goal 4. Application of Psychology: Students will understand and apply psychological principles to personal, social, and organizational issues.
- Goal 5. Values in Psychology: Students will be able to weigh evidence, tolerate ambiguity, act ethically, and reflect other values that are the underpinnings of psychology as a discipline.

The second set of outcomes extends beyond psychology, involving knowledge, skills, and values consistent with liberal arts education that are further developed in psychology.

- Goal 6. Information and Technological Literacy: Students will demonstrate information competence and the ability to use computers and other technology for many purposes.
- Goal 7. Communication Skills: Students will be able to communicate effectively in a variety of formats.
- Goal 8. Sociocultural and International Awareness: Students will recognize, understand, and respect the complexity of sociocultural and international diversity.
- Goal 9. Personal Development: Students will develop insight into their own and others' behavior and mental processes and apply effective strategies for self-management and self-improvement.
- Goal 10. Career Planning and Development: Students will emerge from the major with realistic ideas about how to implement their psychological knowledge, skills, and values in occupational pursuits in a variety of settings.

The next phase of the task force involves assessment—as teachers, how do we know we have achieved our desired outcomes? Although we often use test scores as measures of success, there are myriad other options for assessment, like portfolios, behaviors in practica or on internships, and the ability to plan and complete research projects. Some

assessments may be relevant only after students graduate, such as surveys of alumnae or employers about how well are former students are prepared for the workplace.

For the past half century, psychologists have been renovating the psychology curriculum; the report of the 1951 Cornell conference (Buxton, Cofer, Gustad, MacLeod, McKeachie, & Wolfe, 1952) makes vastly different recommendations than the Brewer et al. (1993) report from the St. Mary's Conference. In each consideration of the curriculum, all of these psychologists have noted the tentative nature of their guidelines. As we discover more about psychology and about learning and when we factor in cultural context, it is manifest that excellence in psychology education is provisional and dependent on more than a fixed set of principles.

Have you thought about what you hope to achieve in educating your students? If not, how do you know whether you have made a difference in the way your students approach complex issues, how they make decisions, and whether they are critical and empirical thinkers? Too often we rely on classroom test scores to validate our teaching, but memory for specific facts or theories is a very limited way to assess whether we are reaching our outcomes.

Knowledge of content is not an unimportant issue, but the content itself may be a trivial issue because facts are only provisionally true and only meaningful within a limited context. We can draw from B. F. Skinner's statement that "Education is what survives when what has been learned has been forgotten." The most important learning is how to think, not what to think. If we are to achieve excellence, we must identify outcomes that are not essentially trivial. How can we decide on appropriate results? Luckily, we have help from the APA task force, which has outlined a useful constellation of outcomes.

Beyond the APA task force, other organizations are thinking about curricular issues in the empirical disciplines. Project Kaleidoscope (PKAL) (<http://www.pkal.org>), partially funded by the National Science Foundation, has taken an active role in consideration of science education.

For the past three years, under the aegis of PKAL, psychologists have partnered with faculty from various other sciences to discuss the renovation of the undergraduate science curriculum. Most faculty across these disciplines share the same concerns of psychologists: balancing teaching and research, creating an active learning environment, developing a collegial departmental atmosphere, coordinating departmental needs and institutional demands, and so forth.

PKAL has provided some impressive documents (available at its Web site) that will help us in recognizing and establishing our desired endpoints. It is all too easy to labor in isolation, but we don't need to. We can benefit from the shared wisdom of our colleagues in other disciplines.

It is apparent that our discipline has unique perspectives. At the PKAL Summer Institutes and its other meetings, it has become clear that psychologists recognize the research

sequence as the backbone of the psychology curriculum. Psychology seems unique in its emphasis on teaching students how psychologists create and generate knowledge. Other scientific disciplines tend to focus on the tools of their trade. This emphasis isn't a dichotomy, but a continuum, and psychology occupies a unique place on that continuum.

PKAL has afforded the opportunity for psychologists to discuss how we can improve our approaches to teaching research, then to develop, implement, and report on plans for curricular and pedagogical renovation that will enhance the way our students learn about research. PKAL participants have seen how different curricular models, ranging from very flexible to very prescriptive, show the potential to lead to the same educational outcomes. The constant give and take of ideas, along with feedback from colleagues at other institutions, has let individual psychologists and entire departments assess themselves with an eye toward renovation (Beins & Marco, 2002). Again we see the role of organizations outside our immediate spheres in fostering excellence.

Connected with PKAL, the Disciplinary Society-Educational Association (DSEA) Alliance meets regularly so representatives of disciplinary and educational organizations can discuss common problems in need of solution. Regular representatives of APA, the math organizations, microbiology, chemistry, sociology, and other scientific membership organizations attend the meetings. Ideally, the discussions generate ideas that ultimately benefit the membership of the associations and provide the chance to discuss commonalities across disciplines.

Have you regularly connected your students to different disciplines? If education is a dense forest, have we persuaded our students to look at psychology as part of the overall landscape? Or is the focus on psychology in which we and our students are missing the forest for the single tree? The other scientific disciplines are related to psychology in ways that we should discover and pass on to our students. The humanities are also important in understanding psychological issues (Dunn, 2002). The DSEA Alliance tries to foster these interrelationships.

PKAL is also involved in the Faculty for the 21st Century program (F21); information is available through the PKAL Web site. This endeavor works to create leaders in educational reform across the sciences. Psychologists are active participants in this program and have provided stimulating leadership in F21. The F21 Leadership Institutes connect young academics with mentors who will create the paths that the subsequent generation will follow.

Closer to home, psychology has the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP), about which I need not say very much. Its accomplishments testify to the impact it continues to have on teachers of psychology in all environments. The Society is looking to the future with its Preparing the New Psychology Professorate (PNPP) programs.

The regional psychological conventions will feature PNPP workshops for new faculty and academically oriented graduate students. These workshops will plant the seeds of

excellence in the next generation of psychology teachers. We can only benefit when new faculty enter the professorate with the desire to excel in their teaching.

Where will all of these organizations and institutions take us? Toward excellence, we hope. One of the brightest aspects of these initiatives is that they have arisen from academics—those of us in the classroom. But we haven't restricted our focus to that part of the landscape right at our feet. Because the initiatives are organizational rather than individual, they can be more widespread in their influence and more stable because they are not dependent on a single person.

Because of the work in the Education Directorate of APA, PKAL, STP, and others, we are beginning to develop permanent, institutional support for our scholarship of teaching. As it is now, all too often we teach in isolation. This is a mistake.

As I have discovered over the past two years, we can engage in excellence by involving ourselves in the scholarship of teaching through the organizations that exist for us, that will welcome our participation, and that we can further shape. A path through the forest has been created, so the journey will be easier than if we had to blaze the trail ourselves. We are remiss if we don't join our colleagues in our march of excellence.

As I prepare to resume teaching, my perceptions on improving my teaching and my students' learning have changed. I am more aware of the advantages of, and perhaps of the need for, looking beyond my own classroom to improve my classroom. Having been involved in the administration of psychology education, I see how I can use the products of that administration.

I need to remember, though, that excellence is a process, not a product and that the journey will never end. As I strive toward excellence in my teaching, I need to remember that the moment I think I have attained it is the moment I will have lost it. So as I traverse the heavily wooded forest of teaching, I will remember Robert Frost's sylvan image:

The woods are lovely, dark and deep
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep
And miles to go before I sleep.

References

- Beins, B. C., & Marco, C. (2002, June). *Methods that fly and methods that flounder*. Workshop presented at the 2002 Project Kaleidoscope Summer Institute. Williamsburg, VA.
- Brewer, C. L., Hopkins, J. R., Kimble, G. A., Matlin, M. W., McCann, L. I., McNeill, O. V., Nodine, B. F., Quinn, V. N., & Sandra (no last name). Curriculum. In T. V.

McGovern. (Ed.) (1993). *Handbook for enhancing undergraduate education in psychology* (pp. 161-182). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Buxton, C. L., Cofer, C. N., Gustad, J. W., MacLeod, R. B., McKeachie, W. J., & Wolfle, D. (1952). *Improving undergraduate instruction in psychology*. New York: Macmillan.

Dunn, D. (2002, February). *Leading and teaching in psychology by reading and writing*. Presented at the Southeastern Conference on the Teaching of Psychology, Atlanta, GA.

Task Force on Undergraduate Psychology Major Learning Outcomes and Outcomes (2002). [Online] Available: <<http://www.apa.org/ed/pcue/reports.html>>.

Amen to Passion

Janie Wilson

Georgia Southern University

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for September 2002.)

Several years ago I stood at a podium and taught probability in a statistics class, watching 26 faces stare back at me as though I was speaking a different language. My pitch rose, my speech-rate increased, and I began to pace eagerly back and forth across the front of the room. I had to make them see the logical, almost spiritual, perfection of the sampling distribution of means. One by one, they began to nod their understanding as I stopped at each row and drew pictures of symmetry in the air. When they were all nodding, I was moved to call out, “You get it! I can see it on your faces!”

In the back of the classroom, a young woman jumped from her desk, threw her hands toward heaven, and yelled, “Amen!”

As a graduate student, I was fortunate enough to take a course on how to teach. It was a one-hour class with discussions of syllabi, tests, textbooks, and grading. We might even have talked about classroom management, but I was too inexperienced at the time to apply it to real people. I am certain we never discussed the “less” important aspects of our profession, like loving your job, respecting your students, and being passionate about teaching.

To be honest, if we had covered those topics, I wouldn’t have understood them any better than classroom management, especially passion. I would have thought knowledge was more important than passion—that the mere promise of knowledge was enough to bring students to class and entice them to read fascinating textbooks full of facts, theories, and applications. I would have told the instructor that passion was for family, religion, and country, but certainly not teaching.

Living The Classroom Taught Me Something Different

When I started teaching, each lecture was structured, complete with a detailed outline of all the material I had to cover in a 50-minute period. I droned on about every topic in an Introductory Psychology textbook, stuffing as much information as I possibly could into half of the class. The other half was absent. Then an older student had the nerve to interrupt my lecture on operant conditioning. I tried to ignore her, but she kept waiving her hand and wiggling in her desk, demanding my attention. When I finally allowed her to speak, she asked me why operant conditioning of pigeons was relevant. I had to admit, it was a fair question. With great care, I put down my precious lecture notes and talked about reinforcement and punishment of children’s behavior. The students told me their beliefs, and I told them about research. When the class period ended, most of them

wanted to keep talking, and I had to promise that we would continue our discussion the next time we met.

I wish I could say that I never went back to notes, but that wouldn't be true. However, I did abandon detailed outlines in favor of relevant examples, open discussions, and the freedom to make a human connection. I embrace the sort of passion born of less structure, more humanity.

With the revelation that passion might be important to students, I thought back on my own education. Which teachers mattered? Who made psychology matter? The research methods professor with a perpetual grin peeking from under his gray mustache as he energetically drew a cross-lagged correlation on the chalkboard, explained it three different ways, and never showed frustration nor lost his enthusiasm. A soft-spoken young woman with incredibly long red hair who drove her old Ford 240 miles to an undergraduate research conference so her student could present a research project. They were passionate about psychology, passionate about teaching, and passionate in their dedication to students' success.

Passionate Students

These professors and others not only revealed their own passion for psychology and teaching, but they also somehow fostered passion for psychology in their students. They showed that passion is contagious. I try to remember that when a student in research methods says she wants to study the effect of room color on mood. Instead of telling her it's been done a thousand times before, I nod and tell her it sounds great. When another student says he wants to study responses to aggression by being aggressive to participants and watching their reactions, we discuss using scenarios illustrating different aggressive situations and a rating scale as a dependent variable. Any topic will work. We'll make it work. After all, if that's what they're interested in, that's what they should study. Choosing their own way is a step toward finding their passion.

A few students from each class even go on to present their research at a conference, where their enthusiasm grows among colleagues who nurture a budding professionalism. I stand back and watch, in awe of the community of support we offer students of psychology. In return, we bring back greater passion within ourselves as teachers, as keepers of the faith. This synergistic relationship between instructors and students continually renews the passion that we share for each other, our discipline, and our profession.

Passionate Teaching

I don't presume to know what works for other instructors, but my path taught me this about fueling my own passion for teaching:

1. Know the material so well that I can teach it without notes. Projected outlines (overheads or PowerPoint slides) allow me to glance quickly at the main points and return attention to the students.
2. Ditch the notes (at least the detailed ones). Students' faces guide lecture better than notes ever could.
3. Use examples relevant to students' lives. If students can relate to the examples, they'll listen, and if they listen, they'll have a better chance of learning. Besides, no discipline is more useful to everyday life than psychology. I want students to know that.
4. Attend teaching conferences as often as possible and attend the sessions. My favorite conferences to get new ideas about teaching and network with other dedicated instructors are the Southeastern Teaching of Psychology (SETOP) and the National Institute for the Teaching of Psychology (NITOP).
5. Try different teaching techniques in the classroom. When I return from a teaching conference, I look forward to trying a new approach on my students. If the technique doesn't work for us, we laugh together and move on. If it works, even better.
6. Talk with enthusiastic instructors. Spending time with people who dislike teaching and students drains energy and is just plain depressing.
7. Encourage questions, skepticism, and even disagreement. For the first few days of class, students don't believe I really want them to question me. After they catch on, we have discussions in which we both deepen our understanding of the material. I learn just as much from them as they do from me.
8. Share opinions, beliefs, and convictions, but teach research. I can't spend the bulk of my adult life standing in front of people and pretending to be a machine. Sharing the "real" person lets students know that I'm honest and they can trust me, which is particularly important when I'm explaining research on controversial topics like why they should never hit their children and why ESP is not scientifically valid.
9. Never discourage. Students taking their first academic steps need encouragement to keep walking and working. They can learn about the "real world" of discouragement and rejection when they've grown to love psychology and the process of learning.
10. Care. Above all, I want students to know I care about them and want them to succeed. It always amazes me how hard they work when they know I'm one of their biggest fans.

I still have a lot to learn, but the past decade has taught me that passion isn't just for family, religion, and country. Now I wholeheartedly add teaching to this list. I realize that passion is a natural extension of believing in something and allowing it to be a central part of life. The next time a student interrupts my carefully laid plans for class structure

and dares to ask for emotion behind the facts, I'll leap from behind the podium, raise my hands to heaven, and shout, "Amen!"

When Psychology Teachers Introspect

Larry W. Bates

University of North Alabama

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for October 2002.)

Pulitzer-nominee Frederick Buechner (1989) wrote a short life-affirming book entitled *The Alphabet of Grace*. With only three chapters (gutturals, sibilants, and the absence of vowels) Buechner explores the undeserved wonders of one day on the planet. When asked to write about teaching, I am drawn to Buechner’s ideal of grace, for I, too, feel lucky. Hence, I chose to use similar pastry shells from Buechner’s book to cook a rather different pie.

Psychology’s first interest was the science of introspection. Today we consider introspection a much different animal than that tested in the Leipzig laboratory. The term conjures up the idea of examining oneself for strengths and weaknesses, a kind of self-assessment followed by internal self-to-self communication. Although introspection may no longer be what the Structuralists investigated, I cannot help but think that, when you and I, as teachers of psychology, talk to ourselves about our craft—when we introspect just a bit, Grandfather Wundt smiles. After all, it is in taking time to teach ourselves about the important matters of our lives that we are positioned to make the greatest impact on our students. Any such self-examination will necessarily involve a few gutturals, consonants, and sibilants.

The Gutturals of Teaching

Gutturals are those unpleasant throaty sounds that English speakers find harsh to the ears. They form the language of Klingons. Teaching has its fair share of gutturals, things we do not like and seemingly must vent. Primary among gutturals, for me, are final grades. I still take grading much too personal and my angst increases as final exams approach. Students come to our offices after final exams with tears, even panic, to request a better grade. They have real needs for a better grade: they will not graduate, their scholarships will be revoked, a promising collegiate sports career will end, academic suspension awaits, or, as I once heard, “my father will kill me.” I cope with this guttural by providing a speech, with great honesty, just before the final exam:

“I care very much about your grade in my class. In the past I stayed up late and worried about where to redraw the line for grades. I was stressed and irritable; my wife hated me, my cat avoided me, and I hated myself. Stress is very harsh on my family and my body. The probability of me developing heart disease or cancer increases when I am stressed. Death or divorce is too high a price to pay. So until I learn a better way to cope, your grade is your grade. If you need a better grade to graduate, you may need someone to cry with you. If so, come by my office because I will cry with you. I really will. But I won’t change your grade...ever. Not because I don’t care, but because I think I care too much.”

This speech inhibits considerably the requests for a better grade. However, occasionally students take me up on the offer to cry with them.

Minor gutturals for me include grading tests, committee work, and money. Regarding the task of grading tests, it is repetitive and boring, and any chimpanzee could be shaped to do it. Committee work, the epitome of diffusion of responsibility, sometimes seems to function only to give the illusion of shared governance. Money, there is never enough of it, personally or as a department. Express your gutturals judiciously.

The Consonants of Teaching

Not all languages have vowels; nevertheless, consonants are basic necessities in most languages. What are the consonants, the important elements of teaching? Academia involves many activities, but few are essential for professional success. E-mail is a non-consonant; it can be a serious way to waste a day. Web sites are not consonants. You cannot compensate for horrible teaching with a great Web site. These are only tools, not teaching.

The true consonants of teaching, in my opinion, can be broken down into two necessary constructs: truth and passion. What we teach our students is extremely important, but not because the truths we teach will stand the test of time. Instead, the truths we teach will give our students a foundation with which to charge the ignorance of our day and leave it in ruins. This foundation is critical. Because truth is crucial, because behavior is life, preparation is essential. Remind yourself that what you teach is ubiquitously important.

Passion for our craft is likewise consonantal. Facts are dead and only the messenger has resurrection powers--the ability to breath life into the mere clay of data. Until quickened by our passionate voices, the truths that are so important for living will remain moribund details.

Lastly, part of our theatre is to convey that we actually like our students, that we have passion for them. If we do not care about their success we are unlikely to have much success in conveying our truths to them. Liking students is part of teaching, a consonant.

The Sibilants of Teaching

Sibilants are those sounds that can only be made with a whisper, (e.g., the “s” in essence). If unvigilant, we may never hear the sibilants of teaching. These are what Annie Dillard (1990) refers to as the bright copper pennies cast all about us, seen only by those who look for them. Remember how much fun it was the first time you taught? You merely spoke and people actually wrote down what you said. They still do it, but some of us no longer hear this particular sibilant.

Each semester I have students who come to my office and cry about something other than schoolwork. Maybe it is because I teach abnormal psychology, but maybe, just maybe, it

is because they think I care. In a great paradox, I sleep better at night because they come, because they cry in my office, because they reify so silently, that perhaps I am a decent and caring human.

But the whisper to which I am most often deaf is the incredible freedom that I possess as a teacher of psychology. Within broad parameters I decide what I will teach, when I'll slink into work in the morning, and when I'll drag myself home in the evening. My job is to investigate whatever interests me and to share it with a largely captive audience. Whether I am teaching about sex, sleep, prejudice, or abnormality, I am wallowing in the single subject that is maximally fun to teach, human behavior. I can't imagine a job anywhere on the planet with greater freedom or fun. Too often I fail to hear that habituated sibilant of life.

Last Thoughts

When students ask me why I chose to teach psychology, I tell them of looking out of my office window on a sunny June day at 3:30 p.m. At that moment I recalled a few jobs that I had endured in the past (e.g., working in the steam room at a garment factory) and knew that right at that minute, all across America, many people were begging a slothful minute hand to speed up, effectively petitioning their life to end sooner as they pled with Father Time to just let them go home. On the other hand, I was working at my office during my vacation, because, unlike too many others, I love my job. So I tell this story to my inquisitive students and ask them, "What will you do when the clock reaches 3:30, some twenty years from today? I hope you don't care. I hope you don't try to speed up your life. I hope you sacrifice a few bucks for a job for which you have great passion."

With the myriad of choices for a profession at our disposal during post-adolescence, with so many oreless mines awaiting our spades, somehow we, the teachers of psychology, struck a vein of gold. Maybe Wundt was correct in spotlighting introspection. Perhaps our communication with self—the gutturals, consonants, and sibilants—will enhance our ability to appreciate the yellow glitter, to remain passionate toward our science, our craft, our students, even life.

References

- Buechner, F. (1989). *The alphabet of grace*. Harper-Collins: New York.
- Dillard, A. (1990). *Three by Annie Dillard*. Harper-Collins: New York.

***On the Distinction Between the
Scholarship of Teaching and Scholarly Teaching***

Monica Reis-Bergan
James Madison University

(This essay and the invited responses that follow it originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for November 2002.)

The challenge of distinguishing between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching reminds me of a similar dilemma I faced in my third-grade art class. The favorite activity of my teacher in this class was a color game. She would tell us the object to be colored and the specific crayon or crayons to use to color it. She would call out, “Color the sky greenish-blue, color the water in the pond bluish-green.” My 8-year-old brain struggled to understand the difference between these two colors. Weren’t they both somewhat blue and somewhat green? Why would this distinction ever be important? However, now as an adult, after selecting a greenish-blue suit jacket, helping a friend paint her office a bluish-green and thousands of other color experiences, I can articulate the significant difference between these hues despite the redundancy in their names. In greenish-blue the dominant color is blue and green is the accent color; likewise, bluish green is predominantly green but the essence of blue is present as well.

So it is true with the challenge of distinguishing between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. Like those hues that caused me consternation in third grade, there are strong similarities between the concepts. However, careful observation and exploration of their nuances yields significant differences as well.

In the years following World War II, scholarship was typically defined as the publication of original research. Boyer’s (1990) treatise, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, broadened the definition of scholarship beyond this narrow focus to include the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, and the scholarship of teaching. This novel conceptualization of scholarship fueled debate about the role of teaching and research in the broader educational community. These discussions resulted in a diverse array of publications and conferences debating and discussing the concept of scholarship across a variety of disciplines.

For example, The Society for Teaching of Psychology charged a task force to redefine scholarship in psychology (Halpern et al., 1998). The task force articulated a multifaceted definition of scholarship in psychology that was published in the *American Psychologist* (Halpern et al, 1998). The new definition of scholarship included five domains of activities: original research, integration of knowledge, application of knowledge, pedagogy, and teaching. Original research was defined as the “creation of new knowledge” (Halpern et al., 1998 , p. 1295). Included in this category are activities typically recognized and rewarded as scholarly activities (e.g., dissemination of original data or theory in a refereed scholarly journal). Integration of knowledge as a scholarship domain highlighted the value of creating new knowledge based on the original work of

others. Review articles, books, and meta-analyses represent examples of scholarly work included in this domain.

Application of knowledge as a domain of scholarship can take many forms but ultimately involves using psychological knowledge to benefit society at large. The scholarship of pedagogy is unique to the discipline of psychology. Psychology includes a growing knowledge base of how people learn and remember, thus it is a natural fit for psychologists to conduct research on teaching and learning processes. An example of a scholarship in this domain would be the development of a specific form of learning software to promote student learning and the evaluation of this product's effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes. The scholarship of teaching is reflected in the work of exceptional teachers who make an original contribution to the field of psychology as a whole. An example of scholarship in this domain might include integrating information in a unique way that stimulates intellectual curiosity in students, colleagues, and the larger community of scholars.

The task force agreed with the view that scholarship in all areas can be judged with a shared set of features and endorsed the six features described by Diamond and Adams (1995). Diamond and Adams' (1995) work was the culmination of broad survey of scholarship definitions across a wide variety of disciplines. These authors noted that activities that require a high level of expertise in a given discipline, are innovative, can be extended or replicated, can be documented and peer reviewed, and have significance or impact in the discipline characterize work that would be considered as scholarship in most disciplines (Diamond & Adams, 1995).

According to my interpretation of these guidelines, teaching is scholarship when it builds on existing knowledge and requires expertise in a discipline specific area. For example, consider listening to a lecture on the history of psychology given by Dr. Ludy Benjamin. He is an expert in this field and his teaching expands beyond the knowledge that exists in any textbook. The teacher as scholar is intentional in his or her quest for expertise. The purposeful action of accumulating knowledge and becoming an expert often leads to creative insight into the discipline material. This leads naturally to the second criteria of scholarship, innovation. The teacher as scholar is inventive and pioneering in some way. By presenting information in unique and original ways the teacher as scholar stimulates students to be curious intellectually. With a solid understanding of the discipline area, the teacher as scholar can challenge and modify information to meet the unique needs of the students in the course. Beyond living in the moment in front of the class, the scholarship of teaching involves important documentation of the class experience. The teacher as scholar organizes and evaluates his or her work in a manner suitable for public presentation. Scholarship documentation may involve putting together a teaching portfolio or a teaching publication. By packaging the teaching experience into a portable form, teachers as scholars may make their work public and available for peer review. By seeking evaluation of expert colleagues at other universities, teachers as scholars may gain valuable feedback to enhance further their teaching expertise.

Peer review may also take the form of observation in the classroom. The teacher as scholar invites multiple visitors to provide a reliable assessment of teaching effectiveness. This peer review is not chance based but intentional. Teachers as scholars seek out review of their work and perceive the feedback as a valuable tool in striving toward excellence. Scholarship in teaching requires more than just one good lecture. Teachers as scholars continually evaluate and reflect on their teaching. As a result, scholarship in the classroom can be replicated from class period-to-class period and year-to-year. Because of the public nature, the intentional peer review, and replication of expert teaching, the teacher as scholar exists beyond the walls of the classroom. Teaching is scholarship when it has a significant impact in the field of psychology nationally and internationally. The teacher as scholar educates future teachers, models the scholarship of teaching for others to emulate, and takes an active role in shaping the discipline for future generations of teachers. This sort of impact could be accomplished, for example, by publishing an article on teaching or hosting a teaching conference.

What, then, is scholarly teaching? For me, understanding the distinction is a similar process to the one learned in my art class. When I had successfully colored the sky greenish-blue, then I knew that the color on the pond had to be different. Scholarly teaching builds on existing knowledge but not at the level of expertise. Scholarly teaching might involve teaching a course outside of your area or teaching a course for the first or second time. Just like in other areas of scholarship, it takes time and effort to be an expert in a given topic area. The scholarly teacher might only read one or two textbooks on a topic. The teacher as scholar has expertise in the topic and is current in his or her reading above and beyond the textbook. When preparing lectures, the scholarly teacher will pull ideas from published teaching manuals and use effective teaching methods but not necessarily demonstrate new and inventive teaching strategies. The scholarly teacher might save syllabi and course materials in a file drawer but not document them in a polished form as demonstrated by the teacher as scholar. The scholarly teacher will rarely seek out a peer to sit in their course. By contrast, the teacher as scholar will seek the evaluation of others, especially those who are also experts in his or her field. Scholarly teachers may have a significant impact on the lives of their students but remain unknown beyond the halls of their institution. The teacher as scholar has the additional responsibility of having an impact on the teaching profession as a whole.

As a new teacher, my self-evaluation is that my teaching is not at the level of scholarship stressed by the task force (Halpern et al, 1998). As I ponder this new view of scholarship, I am unsure if it is something I will strive to achieve as a new faculty member. Unlike the literature in my research field, many of the influential articles and leading writers in the scholarship of teaching are new to me. As I worked on this essay, I read classic articles that I had never seen or heard about in my graduate education. Although I found this reading exciting and stimulating, I'm not sure if I have the time as a new faculty member to refine my courses, keep current in the readings related to the course, keep current with my research literature, conduct research and publish in my field, and read this new body of literature.

Another question I have is how to break into the big leagues of the scholarship of teaching. Research scholarship as traditionally defined has a clear procedure. You conduct research and prepare a manuscript tailored to a desired journal. Many different publication outlets exist, each with a particular audience and reported level of excellence. It might be easiest to think of it as something similar to college basketball tryouts. You can try out for the Duke Blue Devils or the Bridgewater College Eagles. If you are a competent basketball player, you can generally find a program that will welcome you as a player. Likewise, if you have a research manuscript, you can often find a publication outlet suitable for your work. The accomplishment of having a paper published is accepted by most as a “win.” For less critical audiences any publication is seen as positive. For more discerning audiences the accomplishment of publishing an article in a prestigious journal article is valued more highly than publishing in a lower level journal.

The pathway to achievement in the scholarship of teaching is less understood. Even after reading many articles on this topic it wasn't until after I read the article by Mary Taylor Huber (2001) describing four case studies of individuals crafting their careers around the scholarship of teaching, that I understood how this process might work. As I thought about the scholarship of teaching, I was picturing a linear accumulation of accomplishments in the area of teaching. However, the case studies brought to light that the scholarship of teaching often involves crossing traditional boundaries of teaching, service, and research. For example, the teacher as scholar develops an innovative class activity designed to reduce gender stereotypes in the workforce. Research on the effectiveness of this activity is published in a teaching journal and the teacher is invited to give a talk about the activity for state employees. These activities, when organized under the heading of teaching as scholarship, make a nice package. However, each activity could also fit under the traditional categories of teaching, research, and service. From this perspective, the accomplishments of the teacher as scholar are fragmented and moderate in status. The challenge I see for the scholarship of teaching is presentation and acknowledgement of accomplishments. This is a plight also experienced by track and field competitors in the decathlon and heptathlon. Like the teacher as scholar, they excel in many areas and combine their skills together to amass total points. However, like the teacher as scholar, their accomplishments are often downplayed as a result of the diversity of events they must complete. When asked to describe the “world's greatest athlete” many will think of Michael Jordan or Ken Griffey Jr. or other sports figures who have honed specific talents confined to an individual arena of sport. Generally only among track and field enthusiasts is the decathlon or heptathlon athlete revered for his or her excellence as a balanced all-around athlete.

As I ponder the rest of my academic life, I appreciate the options in front of me. I may choose at some point to strive for excellence in the scholarship of teaching or simply keep my aspirations at being a scholarly teacher. Both pursuits are worthwhile, but require different kinds of skills and audiences.

The Scholarship of Teaching: The Best of Both Worlds
Diane F. Halpern
Claremont McKenna College

Thanks to Monica Reis-Bergan for advancing the conversation on “the scholarship of teaching” with her honest reflections about a difficult and controversial topic. Apparently the greenish-blue—bluish-green confusion that she articulates so well in her essay is a common one. Because the confusion seems to center on the question of boundaries—where does scholarship end and teaching begin—a good place to continue the dialogue on this topic may be by defining what the scholarship of teaching is NOT. One problem with crossing boundaries between any two areas is the risk that everything becomes some of both—in this case both teaching and scholarship. The scholarship of teaching is NOT a new term for really good teaching. It is not as though teaching turns into scholarship as it improves. The boundary between these concepts is not as permeable as the blend of two colors along the color scale. Both teaching and scholarship can vary along quality dimensions ranging from awful to super; they do not morph into each other no matter how good or how awful either becomes. Original research, defined as the collection of data that (usually) support a hypothesis, can also be good or awful, just as it can be more or less innovative, public, useful, or insightful. Both scholarship and teaching can vary independently along multiple dimensions.

All scholarship involves the creation of something new. When teaching is scholarly, the instructor creates a new way of understanding or advancing knowledge about the topics being taught and learned. The innovation could be a new way of putting two topics together, a new technology that accelerates learning or makes transfer more probable, a framework for integrating seemingly diverse concepts, or almost any other innovation in instructional design. The creation of new ways of teaching and learning must also conform to the other standards of scholarship. For example, they must be made public so others can judge their quality. The scholarship of teaching can be made public by submitting the creative product to a peer-reviewed Web site, for publication in a teaching or content area journal, or for presentation at a scholarly conference. The instructional innovation must be judged to be high quality, reflect a high level of expertise, and it must be capable of being extended or replicated—just like any other type of scholarship. The innovation cannot be categorized as scholarly if any of these components are missing.

The scholarship of teaching permits a broader definition of scholarly activities—one that is more in line with the public perception that teaching is a primary activity of college faculty and more in line with a primary mission of every college and university—the promotion of quality learning. Colleges and universities have multiple components to their mission; the commitment to quality instruction is only one of them, but it should be a central part of every college or university mission. The scholarship of teaching is compatible with the other missions of colleges and universities, such as the creation of new knowledge through research, community service, and the preparation of a professional workforce. The inclusion of scholarship of teaching as a scholarly activity does not denigrate the more traditional types of scholarship; it adds additional

possibilities for academic success and encourages a type of scholarship that has direct effects on student learning.

There are many reasons why we need a definition of scholarship that includes innovations in teaching and learning. Higher education is facing many new challenges because advanced learning is critical for the success of every individual in our increasingly complex society. Life-long learning has moved from being a slogan to a reality as more adults return to classrooms at periodic intervals throughout their adult years and seek more on-the-job and experiential learning to maintain or advance their employment status. Our students are also changing—a broad range of international students are studying in U. S. colleges and the “junior year abroad” option is becoming the norm for U. S. students, and not just a prerogative for the wealthy few. More students need more education, which makes it incumbent on us to find better ways to advance learning. Many of us can make meaningful contributions that will change how others teach and learn. However, if excellence in the complex area of innovations in teaching is not recognized in tenure and promotion decisions as scholarship, even the most dedicated among us will choose to spend our limited time on the more traditional types of scholarship that offer tangible rewards in the areas of promotion, tenure, and salary. If the scholarship of teaching is not recognized as such, then there will be fewer gains in this important area.

Reis-Bergan modestly claims that, by her own self-evaluations, she is not yet at the level of scholarship in her teaching. Although we have never met, I expect she will soon be at that level and beyond. I make this prediction based on her insights into the important questions about teaching and scholarship. I look forward to learning from her future scholarship and wish her generation of new professors a lifetime where their creative methods are rewarded and legitimized as an exciting and new type of scholarship.

Pursuing Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching
Randolph A. Smith
Ouachita Baptist University

Professor Reis-Bergan has shared her beliefs about the distinction between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. I agree with much that she had to say and wish to offer some thoughts of my own.

Reis-Bergan wonders if she should pursue the scholarship of teaching or remain content with being a scholarly teacher. This is certainly a valid question, but it is not much different than the question any graduate student faces: What area of scholarly activity should I pursue for my career? Am I more interested in development, learning, cognition, psychopathology, or just what aspect of psychology? Although pursuing one area of scholarship does not automatically rule out pursuing another, it is increasingly difficult to maintain expertise in two or three areas thanks to psychology’s ever increasing specialization. It is rare, indeed, to find Renaissance scholars within psychology today.

Thus, I don't believe that everyone should pursue the scholarship of teaching any more than I believe everyone should conduct research in the field of cognitive psychology or clinical psychology (or any other specialization).

I applaud Reis-Bergen's pursuit of scholarly teaching. Certainly, we, as teachers, owe our students the best possible information and the best possible presentation that we can offer. Thus, scholarly teaching requires a two-pronged approach: We must keep updated in our content areas, but we must also stay current about teaching styles and approaches (i.e., current pedagogical theory and practice). Just as we have not-so-fond memories of teachers who used the legendary yellowed lecture notes, we also have dismal memories of teachers who couldn't "teach their way out of a wet paper bag." Scholarly teaching demands that we avoid both of these pitfalls. Thus, I take issue with a couple of Reis-Bergen's statements about scholarly teachers. I do believe that scholarly teachers should pursue "new and inventive teaching strategies." If we do not, we run the risk of presenting material in the same style we adopted as beginning teachers. Most of us, I think, would like to believe that our teaching has evolved (for the better) since those early days. However, it is paramount that we *act* on that belief—we must take steps that help turn the belief into reality. For example, I believe that scholarly teachers can pursue teaching improvement through attendance at regional or national teaching conferences and teaching sessions held at the APA and APS meetings. For somewhat selfish (but also altruistic) reasons, I hope that scholarly teachers regularly read *Teaching of Psychology (ToP)*. Thus, I believe that scholarly teaching involves long-term and consistent attempts to improve one's teaching abilities.

Along that same line, I believe that scholarly teachers may well seek out a colleague to sit in on their classes. If we want to improve our teaching, peer evaluations certainly have the potential to help us. Many colleges involve a peer observation as part of their faculty evaluation program. However, rather than inviting colleagues to visit their classes because they have to, scholarly teachers may wish to invite colleagues to visit in order to get feedback on their teaching style and approach. In addition, scholarly teachers may wish to visit colleagues at their campus who have excellent teaching reputations—peer observation is certainly a two-way street with the opportunity for both colleagues to benefit. I have heard Drew Appleby (Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis) say that he systematically observed his undergraduate teachers and learned teaching strategies that he would later use as a teacher (as well as strategies that he would avoid). I wish I had been as systematic as Drew. However, I have learned to observe colleagues in classes I have taken since I began teaching at Ouachita and to observe colleagues from around the country at professional meetings as they make presentations. I have found some helpful classroom skills in these venues also. I believe that scholarly teachers can learn from observing other teachers and by having other teachers observe them.

Finally, I would like to address Reis-Bergen's question about "how to break into the big leagues of the scholarship of teaching." Unlike the big leagues of athletics where you have to play your way on to the team, you can volunteer to join the team that is involved in the scholarship of teaching. The Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP) is open to membership from all levels of teaching. Additionally, STP is almost always looking

for volunteers to get involved with its work on behalf of teaching. For example, in the first 2002 issue of *ToP*, there was a call for volunteers to serve as mentors for less experienced teachers and for STP members to be considered for nomination to APA boards and committees. In the second 2002 issue, STP President Bill Hill called for suggestions for new initiatives for STP, and Program Chair Regan Gurung called for volunteers to review for the 2003 STP program at the APA convention. Reading the News section of *ToP* is a good way to find out about opportunities to get involved in STP's activities. Everyone I know who is part of the STP hierarchy got their start by volunteering in some capacity. I strongly encourage anyone wanting to get involved with the scholarship of teaching to volunteer for service in STP

Best wishes to Professor Reis-Bergin as pursues her teaching career—whether she opts for scholarly teaching or the scholarship of teaching, being mindful of the options and the importance of teaching is critical for our discipline.

An Additional Model of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Daniel Bernstein
University of Kansas

Dr. Reis-Bergin's essay is a very thoughtful and perceptive reflection on the topic of the scholarship of teaching (and learning; SOTL). She identifies the tension between different conceptions of this increasingly popular term, and her color metaphor aptly points out the importance of even subtle nuances in meaning. Overall, her essay provides a useful rumination on the idea underlying the term and on some of the issues that surround an individual's decision to enter into this professional activity; anyone considering doing the SOTL would be well advised to work through the issues and topics put forward here. As I read it, there were a few places in which additional and complementary perspectives occurred to me, and I will add them here in support of the basic position articulated in her essay.

The Diamond and Adams (1995) and Halpern et al. (1998) treatments of scholarship are very worthwhile, and there is another account of this subtle topic that also merits the attention of interested readers. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) produced a volume called *Scholarship Assessed* for the Carnegie Foundation that is the follow-up volume to Boyer's (1990) book. Building on the ethnographic work of cultural anthropologist Mary Huber, the authors examined the practices and beliefs of the community of people who call themselves scholars, looking for common themes and shared characteristics. Their list of key characteristics includes having the following: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, meaningful results, critical reflection, and clear communication.

Although the overlap among the three works is great, the Glassick et al. (1997) account highlights the recognition that methods of inquiry need to be appropriate to the ways of knowing characteristic of each field of study and that the results of the inquiry are central

to reflective consideration of what has been learned. These two features have some specific relevance to SOTL. One is that there are a wide variety of forms of inquiry into knowing about human action, and we should explore a full range of approaches beyond those generally promoted by experimental psychologists who study education. Another is that presentation of evidence and examples of what students understand should be the centerpiece of any reflection on teaching, and teaching suggestions that do not engage the resulting learning are not yet complete as scholarly work. I recommend this work for the consideration of anyone interested in SOTL, and a brief and readable summary (written by the authors) is available at < <http://www.unl.edu/peerrev/about/scholarship.html>>.

I believe Dr. Reis-Bergan is very much on target in focusing on the documentation of teaching as a key issue for our consideration. There are many forms of presentation for intellectual work from which to choose, and it is not obvious which is best. I would like to add to the list of possible documentation methods something called a “course portfolio,” which was developed by Bill Cerbin, a psychologist at the University of Wisconsin–La Crosse. As elaborated in Hutchings (1998), a course portfolio presents a reflective analysis of the learning in a single course, and even perhaps across several offerings of that course. The teacher identifies clear intellectual goals for learners, describes the instructional design intended to achieve those goals, offers samples of student work on assignments created by the instructor, and finally reflects on how well the goals were met and what further refinements might be attempted in the next available opportunity to teach the course. For the teacher, preparing a course portfolio provides an occasion for learning from each semester’s experience with teaching and student understanding. For the reader there is both an opportunity to build on what a colleague has done as a teacher and an opportunity to evaluate the quality of the understanding of a field that has been demonstrated in a class.

For many university teachers the format of a course portfolio seems unfamiliar, and it appears to give privilege to the social science way of knowing (make a plan, gather evidence, ask if the plan worked). However, the point of the Glassick et al. (1997) book is that all scholarly inquiry has a similar deep structure of planning, evaluating results, and thinking about what has been learned. In this more inclusive model, course portfolios are constructed within the rules of evidence appropriate to the field that is being taught, and more faculty members are comfortable engaging in this kind of scholarly work. Although this approach is both more challenging than doing well controlled experiments and less likely to yield definitive conclusions that would move educational or psychological theory forward, it is an activity that virtually all college teachers could engage in without taking time away from the other missions that also demand their attention.

For the past several years a consortium of research-oriented universities has been promoting the use of course portfolios to build a community of discourse around teaching, and over 50 professors have generated course portfolios in a wide range of fields. These works look different from typical scholarship of teaching in a number of ways, most prominently in that there is rarely any attempt at formal experimental evaluation and that there are virtually always samples of student performance that illuminate the teacher’s goals and their students’ resulting understanding. This work is

highlighted on the Web site <<http://www.unl.edu/peerrev/aahe>> and linked pages. There are three examples of portfolios at that Web location, and anyone who would like to look at a larger sample of portfolios (including half a dozen in psychology) can contact me directly to arrange access.

The course portfolio approach also offers a complement to the conventional view that visiting a classroom is the primary way of understanding a colleague's teaching. Presenting a portfolio (Bernstein, 2002) focuses on the instructional design prepared by a teacher for the whole course experience (not just class time), the creation of opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding, and samples of the work students do in the course. This model does not give privilege to any personal style or teaching method; instead it asks about the outcomes and allows the professor to identify an effective means of achieving rich intellectual goals.

Finally, I think Dr. Reis-Bergan's comment about the problem of gaining recognition as a well rounded academic is extremely important. It appears that the academic world, perhaps like the rest of nature, favors specialization; those who focus on one professional domain often achieve results that more part-time contributors can only admire. I have found it very useful to consider a lifespan developmental view of a career, including serial periods of focus on different parts of my life as a college professor. After getting tenure as an all-rounder, I had a period focused on large grants, one focused on editorial work, and most recently a time focused on teaching. I have been fortunate to find a very lively audience for the work on teaching that I have done recently, and it was possible only because my job allowed me some release time from research to treat teaching with the same focused energy that I have given at other times to research. Considering the varied context of faculty positions in higher education, perhaps we can identify appropriate ways to make sure that at some point we have time to focus deeply on teaching without other distractions. Such a plan might allow for the production of outstanding work on learning that would gather the attention it deserves.

Why I Am Not a Chef Yet—A Reply to Halpern, Smith, and Bernstein

Monica Reis-Bergan
James Madison University

As I read through the comments of my esteemed colleagues, I became perplexed over how to respond. I was struck by certain aspects of their essays and due to the rather odd way my mind works, I found a metaphor to capture some of the elements highlighted in their essays.

Most adults can cook. Some individuals are very poor cooks and others astound and amaze us with their delectable meals. Some cooks are specialists (grilled cheese or crême broulee) and others are generalists. Cooking meals is a staple of American life. Likewise, teaching is a staple of American education. In this particular set of essays, the authors have pondered the distinction between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching.

A similar discussion could be had on the distinction between the concept of being a cook and being a chef. I will argue that the scholarship of teaching is similar to the work of a chef and the work of a scholarly teacher is similar to that of a great cook.

What does it mean to be a chef versus a cook? If asked this question many would answer that a chef creates new dishes. Diane Halpern concisely noted, “All scholarship involves the creation of something new.” The teacher as scholar creates new knowledge related to teaching and learning. Similar to the chef, the teacher as scholar is not creating new ingredients, but rather combining them in ways that are novel or incorporating ingredients that typically are not used. This is not to say that cooks aren’t occasionally making new dishes as well. In fact good cooks often go beyond the recipe box. This difference between cooks and chefs is what happens when they create the new dish. For chefs and teachers as scholars the creation itself is the focus of their attention. Therefore, considerable energy is expended analyzing their unique contribution to their profession. Dan Bernstein remarked on the critical role of reflection and documentation of teaching as it relates to scholarship. The chef and teacher as scholar examine their creations critically and write down the goals, plans, content, consequences, and potential future refinements of their work. This documentation facilitates extension and replication of the work as well as making the process and product available for peer and public review. The teacher as scholar is very likely to find the course portfolio to be an important and useful tool.

The course portfolio however, would also aid the scholarly teacher and likewise critical reflection and documentation would be beneficial to the household cook. As an example, my grandmother was an outstanding cook. Her recipe box, however, was a disaster. The recipe cards were tattered and torn. My grandmother simply used the recipe cards as a guide and then dismissed them as soon as the dish was prepared. If she did something original to the recipe, such as blending in an extra ingredient, it remained undocumented and unappreciated. The recipe card, therefore, was not representative of the corresponding food dish and thus many of us failed to make the dishes like Grandma when we inherited her recipe cards after her death. I desperately wish my grandmother had documented her recipes in more detail. Likewise, at the beginning of each semester when I pull out my course notes, I berate myself for not including more critical reflection and documentation.

Cooking shows on television provide chefs with outside evaluation of their work. Chefs are often showcased for their cooking techniques as well as the final product. For cooks, however, the focus is typically on the final outcome. When asked to attend dinner at a friend’s house the time of arrival is typically after the meal is prepared. Rarely is this friend asking you to come watch him or her whip up the eggs in some inventive way. The focus of the cook is satisfaction with the final dish. Differences in public accessibility to process are also apparent between scholarly teachers and teachers as scholars. Scholarly teachers often approach evaluation of their work with evidence of teacher ratings, student letters, and performance assessments. Scholarly teachers are quick to showcase the final outcome of their teaching, the individual student. Colleagues often appreciate the skills and motivation that students possess after a class with “Dr. Scholarly Teacher” but

remain mystified as to what actually occurred within the walls of the classroom. The teacher as scholar provides an examination of the process as well as the outcome.

Scholarly teachers, like good chefs, appreciate outside evaluation of their techniques. Randy Smith highlighted the value of peer evaluation in his essay. He described a culture of public teaching that opens the doors of the classroom to teaching colleagues as well as to students. Teachers as scholars welcome observations by peers and in turn observe others in their teaching venues. This mutually beneficial process leads to learning by evaluation and observation. A peer might have a helpful comment on how to refine a demonstration. It is also possible that in observing a fellow teacher a strategy is showcased that the observer is able to use in his or her own classroom. Opening the doors of the classroom can also be beneficial to the scholarly teacher. It is important for the scholarly teacher to keep evolving and better serving the needs of the student. Observation by peers may provide insight into areas of improvement as well as areas of excellence.

Smith also mentioned the importance of interacting with the teaching profession beyond the scope of the institution. Regional and national teaching conferences provide sessions that focus on strategies to improve teaching. Keeping current in the teaching literature and taking advantage of mentoring opportunities provided by STP are other ways to improve one's teaching abilities. These resources are useful for scholarly teachers in keeping current in the field but have the added importance for teachers as scholars because these activities provide opportunities to make their scholarly work public. A similar dynamic exists in the cooking profession. Culinary practices and knowledge change and chefs must stay current in their profession by going to conferences and participating in apprenticeship programs through societies like the Professional Chef's Association and the American Culinary Federation. The National Culinary Review provides chefs with information about current trends and techniques in the culinary arts. These resources are crucial to the chef, but likewise many household cooks might benefit from reading and expanding their cooking repertoire.

I agree with Diane Halpern's argument that teaching and scholarship "do not morph into each other." Scholarly teachers and teachers as scholars can both benefit from innovation, documentation, peer evaluation, and expanded interaction with the field of teaching. However, this does not imply that they are the same or that scholarly teaching is a weaker form of the scholarship of teaching. The goal of being a scholarly teacher is not settling for second best. The scholarly teacher is similar to the good household cook. It takes hard work and planning to cook well-balanced healthy meals for yourself or a family. Not everyone is good at it and the consequences of an unhealthy diet are significant. Poor nutrition has been implicated in the development of several cancers, hypertension, coronary heart disease, obesity, and diabetes. The scholarly teacher likewise works hard to provide the best academic environment for the growth of students' minds.

The scholarship of teaching deserves its own status as a form of scholarship. No one would assume that being a household cook is the same as being a chef. There are similarities in the actual work, but the structure of the work and the expectations are

different. The chef is seen as an expert in the culinary field. Likewise, we need to make clearer the distinction between the scholarly teacher and teacher as scholar. Too often work related to the scholarship of teaching is relegated as additional work in the teaching domain and the activities of the two distinct types of teachers are merged together. Diane Halpern makes the eloquent argument that higher education is facing many challenges and needs meaningful contributions that advance our understanding of teaching and learning. I agree. However, in order to facilitate this type of interest and energy in young faculty, the scholarship of teaching needs to exist as a research emphasis in graduate education. Teachers as scholars need to be educated about this domain of scholarship and mentored in the unique techniques and skills. They need to think about teaching as their scholarship domain—and not as an additional teaching activity. The energy demanded to achieve excellence in any area of scholarship is substantial. Therefore, work related to the scholarship of teaching needs to be regarded by colleagues and administrators as scholarship.

Thus, at this point in my career I am working hard to be a scholarly teacher and publish scholarly articles in health psychology. I also cook meals for my husband and children when I am not working late grading papers or meeting with research groups. My future career development might involve the scholarship of teaching. I am fairly confident, though, that I won't be a chef anytime soon.

References

- Bernstein, D. (2002). Representing the intellectual work in teaching through peer-reviewed course portfolios. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist, (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (215-229). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Diamond, R., & Adams, B. (1995). *Recognizing faculty work: Reward system for the year 2000*. New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Halpern, D. F., Smothergill, D. W., Allen, M., Baker, S., Baum, C., Best, D., Ferrari, J., Geisinger, K. F., Gilden, E. R., Hester, M., Keith-Spiegel, P., Kierniesky, N. C., McGovern, T. V., McKeachie, W. J., Prokasy, W. F., Szuchman, L. T., Vasta, R., & Weaver, K. A. (1998). Scholarship in psychology: A paradigm for the twenty-first century. *American Psychologist*, 53, 1292-1297.

Huber, M. T. (2001). Balancing acts designing careers around the scholarship of teaching. *Change*, 33, 21-29.

Hutchings, P. (Ed.) (1998). *The course portfolio*. Washington: AAHE.

Is This Going To Be On The Test?

Philip Lewis
Auburn University

(This essay originally appeared as the monthly “E-xcellence in Teaching” e-column in the *PsychTeacher Electronic Discussion List* for December 2002.)

How often have we heard our undergraduate students ask questions like “Professor Lewis, is this going to be on the test?” Or thinly disguised accusations like “I came to every lecture, took good notes, did all the reading, studied really hard, and I still got a low C on your exam.” Unless you teach at a Harvard or a Stanford, these refrains may be all too familiar. And if you have been teaching for many years, as I have, you may also have the impression that their frequency has not diminished over time. What do you make of these students? Are they just not as bright as most? Are they less motivated? Do they come from academically weak high schools?

In this essay, I will offer a partial answer to these questions based on contemporary constructive-developmental theory. I will argue that rather than being less motivated or more intellectually limited or having a poorer academic background that what these students are actually expressing is a typical early adolescent cognitive-developmental level. At this level, they see knowledge as concrete and external, and they understand their job as students to be to memorize material so they can spit it back to us on a test. They are trying hard to be good students, and they don’t understand why we fail to appreciate their diligence.

At this point you may be asking yourself something like “Is this essay going to turn out to be worth taking the time to read or is it something I already know?” In the act of raising these sorts of questions for yourself, be aware that you are demonstrating that how you approach learning is qualitatively different from the approach of those students I described in the first paragraph. I will attempt to illuminate that difference drawing upon the ideas of William Perry, Robert Kegan, and Patricia King and Karen Kitchener, all with a nod to the metapsychology of Jean Piaget.

What Matters Most is How Students Construct Their Relationship To Knowledge

Over 30 years ago William Perry, Director of the Counseling Center at Harvard University, noticed that some undergraduates found their initial experience of college profoundly unsettling. Despite having been academic superstars in high school, they found it impossible to understand what was being expected of them as Harvard undergraduates. Perry concluded that college professors expect their students to approach their course work using their own interpretive framework. Unfortunately, Perry’s floundering Harvard students had no such framework, no internal mechanism for structuring a relationship to the course content. Instead, these students struggled to figure out what their professors wanted them to “know. They were baffled by the idea that they were somehow expected to discover this for themselves.

In Perry's view, these students, who were only a very small minority of Harvard freshmen, were what he termed "dualistic" thinkers (Perry, 1981). In their approach to knowledge they experienced themselves as radically separate from a vast world of "Truths" (with a capital T), truths that they expected to have to commit to memory in the process of becoming educated. From their perspective, their professors had already learned those "Truths" and would convey this knowledge, chiefly through lectures and carefully chosen reading assignments.

Although Perry focused on the duality of "Right Answers" versus "Falsehoods," the more fundamental duality was the separation between the learner and what needed to be learned. Even when successful in becoming educated, what these dualistic students believed they "knew" remained as objective, external, and unchanged as did they, the learners. One image that comes to mind for me of this type of radical separation from an external, objective world of received knowledge is a scene from the movie *Jerry Maguire* when 5 year old "Ray" surprises an inebriated Jerry by wandering out of the bedroom to announce "The human head weighs 8 pounds." It is a funny moment, because Ray's comment is so out of context. It doesn't strike us as so funny when we find a listing of similar unassimilated "facts" in some of our students' essay answers.

Most of Us Expect Our Students to Learn, Not Just Remember

If we are worth our salt as teachers, we expect more than memorization and regurgitation from our students. We want them to become "smarter" as a result of having taken our classes. We want our students to be able to think more like psychologists. What does this type of learning entail? According to Patricia King and Karen Kitchener, writing in their 1994 book *Developing Reflective Judgment*, we expect our students to become what they term "reflective thinkers." Whether we realize it, we expect our students to understand that being knowledgeable is not a state. Instead, it is an active process employed to deal with complexity and uncertainty in particular situations or contexts. More specifically, becoming educated in the discipline of psychology entails the developing capacity to use various conceptual frameworks for organizing and evaluating psychological data. In this process, students begin to understand that certain constructions of the data are more valid than others based on their meaningfulness, usefulness, or parsimoniousness.

Reflective Learning is a Developmental Capacity Not a Set of Concrete Skills

The genius of Jean Piaget's vision of the cognitive development of children lies in his discovery that there are progressive qualitative shifts in the complexity and breadth of our "schemas" or perspectives as we move through childhood and adolescence and into adulthood. At each successive stage we are able to reconstruct the physical world in a fashion that grants to it more of the complexity that was there in the world all along but that we could not yet perceive using simpler schemas.

From this constructive-developmental perspective, those undergraduate students who are still dualistic thinkers have a simple and incomplete understanding of the nature of

psychological knowledge. Why? Because they operate on or “construct” the physical world using a “structure of knowing,” as Robert Kegan terms it, that is simpler than we expect it to be. From Kegan’s (1994) constructive-developmental perspective it is a capacity to view the world from alternative points of view using “durable categories.” At this stage, the world is made up of stable, concrete properties that exist apart from one’s ability to perceive them. Hence, knowledge is absolute, external, and concrete. Only when this concrete, absolutistic world can be subordinated to a new and more complex capacity in order to construct the interrelationships among the durable categories does reflective thinking and abstract thought become possible.

The nature of this developmental shift is not easy to convey in a few sentences—an example may help. Categorical or dualistic thinkers are notoriously bad at making sound time management decisions. They routinely opt for exciting activities in the present and disregard their well-articulated long-term interests. Why? Not for a lack of “impulse control,” as some would argue. Rather, their lack of what we might call “common sense” stems from the dualistic thinker’s inability to hold together two categories at the same time. In this instance those are the category “the exciting thing I want to do right now” and the category “the important goal I am interested in achieving in the future.” In contrast, the reflective thinker can and often does reflect on both the desire to be engaged in an exciting activity and the desire to achieve a desired future goal all at the same time. The result is that, for the reflective thinker, the current possibility is informed by the future desire. The exciting current activity isn’t experienced as all that exciting because it is being placed in the context of its implications for future goal attainment. So, the reflective thinker is more likely to study, the dualistic thinker to party. The opposite can also happen, and often does, but the point is that the two students are experiencing the conflicting desires in qualitatively different ways. For the dualistic thinker it is a simple conflict between two alternative desires, both external. For the reflective thinker it is an internal experience that constructs the interrelationships among the two desires, each informed by the other.

Our Dualistic Thinkers Require Both Sympathy and Challenge

As Kegan (1994) suggested, it’s a poor school that requires its students to know already what they most need to learn. Our first responsibility as college teachers is to recognize that our classrooms contain some students at each of three places in relationship to knowledge and knowing. Some are still dualistic thinkers. Some are reflective thinkers and some are in the process of becoming reflective thinkers. Because we are reflective thinkers ourselves, most of us enjoy those in the second and third categories. However, to be helpful to those in the first category we have to be able to “see” them. When we do, we find ourselves more in sympathy with the fact that they are struggling to survive in a world whose complexity is increasing beyond their grasp. It is that sympathy, more than anything else, that will enable these students to begin to reconstruct their relationship to the discipline of psychology. So when they ask us, “Is this going to be on the test?,” give them a simple answer to what for them is a very good question. Then you can move on to try to help them begin to see that something more is also going to be required. You might say something like the following: “Yes, you will need to know the definition of the

defense mechanism called projection. But you should also give some thought to how you can tell when someone is projecting their own unacknowledged conflicts and fears on to you." Struggling with this question on their own will, hopefully, help them experience the limitations of a dualistic approach to learning and invite them into a more interactive relationship with our discipline.

References

- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perry, W. G., Jr. (1981). Cognitive and ethical growth: The making of meaning. In A. W. Chickering (Ed.). *The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students and a changing society* (pp. 76-116). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Biographical Notes on Individual Contributors

Drew Appleby received his BA in psychology from Simpson College in 1969 and his Ph.D. in experimental psychology from Iowa State University in 1972. After teaching at Marian College for 27 years—and chairing its Psychology Department for the last 21 of those years—he assumed the position of Director of Undergraduate Studies in the Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) Psychology Department in 1999 where he holds the rank of Professor of Psychology. He is the author of *The Savvy Psychology Major* and the *Study Guide* that has accompanied three editions of *Psychology* by Margaret Matlin, has numerous publications in professional journals, and has made over 200 presentations to a wide variety of professional and nonprofessional audiences. He is also the author of the multiple-choice test banks that accompany *Professional Cooking* and *Professional Baking*, two textbooks used in professional culinary arts programs throughout the world. He is a fellow of APA's Divisions One and Two; presented APA's G. Stanley Hall Teaching Lecture in 1998; and received Division Two's Outstanding Psychology Teacher Award in a Four-Year College or University in 1993, Marian College's Award for Teaching Excellence in 1993, and IUPUI's Chancellor's Teaching Excellence Award in 2003. He was recognized for his advising skills by the National Academic Advising Association when he received the Outstanding Adviser Award of its Great Lakes Region in 1988, by the IUPUI School of Science when he received their Advisor of the Year award in 2002, and by the IUPUI Psychology Department when he received their Academic Advisor of the Year Award in 2002 and 2003. He was recognized for his mentoring skills by being the charter recipient of Marian's Mentor of the Year Award in 1996 and IUPUI's Psychology Department's Mentor of the Year in 2000. He directs Division Two's Mentoring Service, chairs Division Two's Recruiting, Retention, and Public Relations Committee, created Division Two's Project Syllabus, serves as Division Two's annual international dinner coordinator, and has served as a consultant to other psychology departments.

Larry Bates received his B.S. in psychology from the University of North Alabama in 1992. He was awarded the Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from Auburn University in 1999. He completed his clinical internship at the University of Mississippi-Veterans Affairs Medical Centers Consortium in Jackson, Mississippi. The Department of Preventive Medicine at University of Alabama at Birmingham Medical School provided his post-doctoral work. Finally, he made it back to his alma mater and for the last three years has served as an assistant professor of psychology at the University of North Alabama in Florence, Alabama. He regularly teaches introductory, abnormal, and physiological psychology. His current research interests include psychophysiology of stress and anxiety and the psychology of religion. He lives with his wife and one deaf cat in Muscle Shoals, Alabama.

Barney Beins is Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Psychology Department at Ithaca College. He was elected to serve as President of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology in 2004 and served as its Secretary from 1992-1994. Barney is a Fellow of

APA. For two years on an extended sabbatical, he was Director of Precollege and Undergraduate Education at APA. In 1994, he founded the Northeastern Conference for Teachers of Psychology, which continues in conjunction with the New England Psychological Association convention. He also participated in the St. Mary's Conference in 1991 and in the Psychology Partnerships Project in 1999. Barney served as inaugural editor for the "Computers in Psychology" section of *Teaching of Psychology* from 1987 to 1996, and is currently an Associate Editor. He authored *Research Methods: A Tool for Life*, published by Allyn & Bacon, co-edited the *Gale Encyclopedia of Psychology*, and recently contributed to the *Readers Guide to the Social Sciences*, published by Fitzoy Dearborn, a London publisher. Barney earned his bachelor's degree from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio and his doctorate from City University of New York.

Dan Bernstein received an A.B. in psychology from Stanford University in 1968 and a Ph.D. in social and experimental psychology from the University of California at San Diego in 1973. He joined the psychology faculty of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 1973. He has designed courses at all levels of higher education that make learner understanding the primary goal, and he has worked to promote teaching within the profession through participation in four FIPSE-funded projects at UN-L, including one on peer review of teaching. Most recently he has been exploring and evaluating various uses of technology to promote student understanding, and he is interested in representation of the intellectual work in teaching, especially through the external review of electronic course portfolios centered on student work. In August of 2002 he moved to the University of Kansas, where he serves as the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence and as Professor of Psychology and Human Development.

Doug Bernstein completed his bachelor's degree in psychology at the University of Pittsburgh in 1964 and his masters and Ph.D. in clinical psychology at Northwestern University in 1966 and 1968, respectively. From 1968 to 1998, he was on the psychology faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, where he served both as Associate Department Head and Director of Introductory Psychology. He is currently Professor Emeritus at the University of Illinois, and Courtesy Professor of Psychology at the University of South Florida. He is a fellow of both the American Psychological Association (Division 2) and the American Psychological Society. His efforts to promote excellence in the teaching of psychology include serving as chair of the program committee for NITOP, founding the APS Preconference Institute on the Teaching of Psychology, and helping to plan the First Annual Summer National Institute on the Teaching of Psychology. From 1989-1991, he served on the steering committee for the APA National Conference on Enhancing the Quality of Undergraduate Education and, in 2001, on the advisory panel to the APA Board of Educational Affairs Task Force on Undergraduate Psychology Major Competencies. His teaching awards include the University of Illinois Psychology Graduate Student Association Teaching Award and the University of Illinois Psi Chi award for excellence in undergraduate teaching, both in 1979, the Illinois Psychology Department's Mabel Kirkpatrick Hohenboken Teaching Award in 1993, and the 2002 American Psychological Foundation's Award for Distinguished Teaching in Psychology. He has co-authored textbooks in Introductory Psychology, Abnormal Psychology, Clinical Psychology, Criminal Behavior, and

Progressive Relaxation Training, and he has co-edited books in Applied, Developmental, and Introductory Psychology. He has also contributed chapters to *Teaching introductory psychology: Theory and practice* (edited by Robert J. Sternberg, 1997), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (edited by Stephen F. Davis and William Buskist, 2002), and (with Sandra Goss Lucas) *The compleat academic: A career guide* (edited by Henry Roediger, John Darley, and Mark Zanna, 2002). He occasionally offers workshops on textbook-writing for prospective authors, and as a hobby, he collects student excuses.

Charlie Blair-Broeker has taught psychology and Advanced Placement Psychology at Cedar Falls (Iowa) High School since 1978. He has been involved in a number of APA initiatives, serving as a member of the Task Force that authored the *National Standards for the Teaching of High School Psychology*, chair of the Executive Board of Teachers of Psychology in Secondary Schools (TOPSS), and co-editor of the 4th volume of the *APA Activities Handbook for the Teaching of Psychology*. For three years, he co-directed Teaching the Science of Psychology, a summer institute for high school psychology teachers supported by the National Science Foundation and the Northern Kentucky University Foundation. He has been a table leader or reader for Advanced Placement Psychology Examination since the test was first administered in 1992, and completed a three-year term on the A.P. Psychology Test Development Committee. He and Randy Ernst have recently completed *Thinking About Psychology*, a high school-level text book.

Gary R. Hann is a third year doctoral student in the APA-Accredited Combined Doctoral Program in Clinical, School, and Counseling Psychology at James Madison University in Virginia. Prior to doctoral studies, he worked in a variety of clinical settings, including crisis assessment, substance abuse counseling, and outpatient therapy. Gary is also a student board member of Division 29 (Psychotherapy) of APA and serves as a student liaison to APAGS and a contributing editor to the *Psychotherapy Bulletin*. Gary is now waiting to hear about another career decision—acceptance in a clinical internship for next year. He recently finished another important project with his wife, Vicky, welcoming his new son Grayson into the world.

Jane S. Halonen is the Director of the School of Psychology at James Madison University. Jane is a past president of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology and works actively to promote psychology education as a departmental consultant and project leader in various venues, including APA, APS, and Advanced Placement. She is a self-described “teaching conference junkie.” She is on the planning committee for STP’s Assessment Conference, scheduled to take place next September at Kennesaw State University. When not working for improved psychology education, Jane enjoys movies, travel, novels, the music of Diana Krall, and dancing with her new and improved husband, Brian.

Diane F. Halpern is Director of the Berger Institute for Work, Family, and Children and professor of psychology at Claremont McKenna College (one of the Claremont Colleges) in the Los Angeles area. She is a former president of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology, the APA Division of General Psychology, and the Western Psychological

Association. She will serve as President of the American Psychological Association in 2004. Diane is the author of several books on teaching and learning including *Thought and Knowledge: An Introduction to Critical Thinking* (4th edition, 2003); *Sex Differences in Cognitive Abilities* (3rd edition, 2000), and co-editor with Milton Hakel of the New Directions in Teaching and Learning series volume entitled, *Applying the Science of Learning to University Teaching* (2002).

David Johnson is Professor of Psychology at John Brown University in Siloam Springs, AR where he has served as both chair of the Department of Psychology and the Division of Social & Behavioral Sciences. He earned his Ph.D. in experimental social psychology at the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville, where in 1999 he received the Distinguished Alumnus Award and was inducted into the Fulbright College Alumni Academy. Professor Johnson is a past president and a Fellow of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (Division 2 of APA). Professor Johnson has been a strong proponent of active learning, and with Mark Ware, co-edited a 3-volume set of demonstrations and activities for the teaching of psychology, now in its second edition. He also served as a Consulting Editor for the journal *Teaching of Psychology* and currently serves as News Editor of *ToP*. His primary research interests are in pedagogy, attribution theory, and counterfactual thinking.

Phil Lewis teaches psychology at Auburn University in East Central Alabama where he has been on the faculty since 1977. Although his degree is in clinical psychology (Syracuse, 1968), he considers himself a developmental psychologist (the cognitive-developmental psychologist David Hunt was his major advisor at Syracuse). Phil has done research for the Army related to the conceptual development of leaders, which he approaches from a constructive-developmental perspective. Most of Phil's teaching has been at the undergraduate level, including a year as a Visiting Professor at the United States Military Academy, and his favorite courses are Theories of Personality and Adolescent & Adult Development. For fun, he races his 25' O'Day sailboat on nearby Lake Martin.

Laura L. Namy is an assistant professor in the Psychology Department at Emory University. She received her undergraduate degree in Philosophy and Psychology from Indiana University. She completed her doctorate in Cognitive Psychology at Northwestern University in 1998 and has been at Emory since then. Her research focuses on the origins and development of verbal and non-verbal symbol use in young children, and the role of comparison in conceptual development. She teaches undergraduate courses in Language Acquisition and Cognitive Development. Her graduate courses focus on Language and Concepts. She also conducts both formal and informal workshops for graduate students on topics relating to professional development, including teaching techniques and teaching challenges, establishing a research program, applying for funding, giving professional talks, and the use of Web resources for instructional and professional purposes.

Loreto R. Prieto received his undergraduate and doctoral degrees from The University of Iowa in 1984 and 1996, respectively. A counseling psychologist by training, Dr. Prieto also conducts research in the areas of multiculturalism and psychological testing and

assessment. He has been involved with several Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP)-related activities including serving as the current Chairperson of the STP Task Force on Diversity, the Chairperson of the Working Group on Diversity for the Psychology Partnerships Project (P3), and a Member-at-Large on the STP Long Range Planning Committee. He has recently been appointed as a Consulting Editor for the *Teaching of Psychology*. Dr. Prieto thanks his colleague and friend, Dr. Steven A. Meyers (Roosevelt University), with whom he has collaborated in investigating the area of TA development.

Monica Reis-Bergan is an Assistant Professor at James Madison University. She received her Ph.D. from Iowa State University in 2000. She is currently teaching Health Psychology and a capstone course for seniors in addictive behaviors. Her research interests include the academic social comparison, procrastination behaviors, and health risk behaviors such as smoking and binge drinking.

Lauren F. V. Scharff is an associate professor in the Department of Psychology at Stephen F. Austin State University, where she has been teaching since January, 1993. She completed her Ph.D. in Human Experimental Psychology in December, 1992 from the University of Texas at Austin. At SFA, she has coordinated initiatives to reorganize new faculty orientation, create teaching circles, and write a faculty "survival guide." She received two president's awards for these efforts, in addition to receiving the SFA Foundation Faculty Achievement Award for Teaching in 2000 and the College of Liberal Arts Teaching Excellence Award 1998. In her department, she established a graduate teaching seminar for students who desire to instruct courses while in graduate school. She regularly teaches introductory psychology, research methods, physiological psychology, and perception courses. Her major research interests include text readability, visual search and depth perception, although her students continually shift her research efforts to new directions. For the past four years she has collaborated actively with researchers at NASA-Ames to create a metric to predict text readability. In her community, Dr. Scharff has been a coordinator and/or presenter since 1994 at the Annual Expanding Your Horizons Career Day for Girls. She is currently serving her second term as the Texas State Representative for the Southwest Psychological Association. She has a wonderful husband, a three-year-old son, and two dogs who all help her stay well-balanced.

Randolph A. Smith is Professor of Psychology and chair of the department at Ouachita Baptist University. Randy serves as Editor of *Teaching of Psychology*, the journal of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology. He is the editor of the instructor's resource package for Wayne Weiten's introductory psychology text, author of a critical thinking text (*Challenging Your Preconceptions*), and coauthor of *The Psychologist as Detective* (a research methods text with Steve Davis). He has worked with high school teachers grading AP tests since the test's inception and is currently one of the faculty advisors for TOPSS (Teachers of Psychology in Secondary Schools).

Janie Wilson began her adventure in teaching during graduate school and continued in a full-time teaching position at Columbia College before receiving her Ph.D. in Experimental Psychology from the University of South Carolina in 1994. Since that time,

she has been teaching and conducting research at Georgia Southern University. Her teaching includes courses in physiological psychology, large sections of introductory psychology, research methods, and statistics. She is currently working with Prentice Hall to create a statistics textbook written in a straightforward manner that relies on relevant examples to keep students' attention. Teaching and research merged when she was awarded an NSF grant as principal investigator for a physiological teaching laboratory. She works with both undergraduates and graduate students on research projects involving social buffering of stress responses in rats and human adults and children. Dr. Wilson also conducts research on student evaluations of instructor immediacy and the instructor's ability to predict students' attitudes, motivation, and grades. An admitted workaholic, she spends down-time with her husband and three children, practices Taekwondo, and writes fiction.

About the Editors

William Buskist is the Distinguished Professor in the Teaching of Psychology at Auburn University. At Auburn since 1982, he taught over 30,000 students. His research interests center on identifying and understanding the qualities and behaviors involved in "master teaching" and in designing training programs that promote effective undergraduate teaching. In 2000, he received the Robert S. Daniels Teaching Excellence Award from the Society of the Teaching of Psychology.

Vincent Hevern graduated from Fordham College and received his Ph.D. in clinical psychology from Fordham University in 1985, the same year he was licensed as a psychologist by New York State. For 8 years he both taught psychology and practiced as a clinician in New York City. He moved to Le Moyne College in 1991 where he is Associate Professor and former chair of the Psychology Department. At Le Moyne he has taught a broad array of clinical and non-clinical courses. His most recent research interests include the narrative perspective in the social sciences and the pedagogical implications of emerging digital technologies such as the Internet. He is the founding Internet Editor for STP for which he has developed and maintained several online sites since 1997 (the *STP Homepage* and *OTRP Online*). He is a Fellow of APA in Division 2.

Bill Hill received his Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Georgia in 1979 and has been on the faculty at Kennesaw State University (KSU) since then. During his tenure at KSU he has been a full-time teaching faculty member, Psychology Department Chair (1988-1994), Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs (1998-2002), and Acting Vice-President for Academic Affairs (April-July, 2002). In the fall of 2002 he assumed the position of Director of the KSU Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning, which coordinates faculty development programs at KSU. His professional activities and research have primarily revolved around teaching-related issues. In 2001-2002, he was a member of the American Psychological Association (APA) Board of Educational Affairs task force that developed expected learning outcomes for the undergraduate major in psychology as well as an accompanying online assessment guide.

In 1989 he founded, and continues to coordinate, the annual Southeastern Conference on the Teaching of Psychology. He was a member of the steering committee for the Best Practices in Assessment in Psychology Education conference in September 2002 and is a will co-coordinate an upcoming conference on Best Practices in Teaching the Introductory Psychology Course in September 2003. He has also been active in a variety of leadership roles in the Society for the Teaching of Psychology (STP), Division Two of the APA. He was STP President in 2001-2002 and was recently appointed as STP Director of Programming. He received the KSU Distinguished Teaching Award in 1985 and is a Fellow of APA Divisions 1 (General Psychology), 2 (STP) and 52 (International Psychology).