

Fifth Directed Exercise

Due: 25^h February (5pm) [note extended deadline]

- Your fifth directed exercise is due by 5pm on **Friday, February 25th**. (I have extended the deadline to Friday afternoon because so many of you handed in the Fourth Directed Exercise between 3am and 7am on Thursday, and I am worried about your health.)
- Your assignment should be submitted to our Classes V*2 site under “Assignments” as an attached document.
- As you know from the syllabus, because this is a large lecture class, it is important to have explicit and uniform policies. Among those policies is the following:
 - Directed exercises will be marked down 1 point for each 24 hours that they are late (rounded up to the nearest 24 hours).

Exercise:

Your fifth directed exercise has two parts, for a total of 5 points:

- (1) Identify an empirical claim that was made in one of the articles or chapters that we have read so far this semester. Using your google scholar skills (remember the Third Directed Exercise), look for articles that address this claim. Choose three of these articles that look particularly interesting to you, and read their abstracts. Provide a two-sentence summary of two of these articles. (You’ll be providing a more detailed summary of the third.)

Your answer to this part of the assignment should include:

- The claim that served as the impetus for your google search
- The titles of the three articles you have selected
- Your two-sentence summaries of the two articles that you will not be summarizing in detail.

(2 points)

- (2) Choose one of the three articles and read through the entire article. (If the article is longer than 10 pages, you may focus your attention on a few of the studies. Regardless of the length, you do not need to read that statistical sections in detail.)

Using the QALMRI method (see page 3 of this handout), provide a 300-500 word summary of the article. **(3 points)**

Note:

Your sixth directed exercise (which will be due the week after March break) will ask you to design your own experiment to test one a claim related to your selected topic. You may want to choose your articles accordingly.

© Yale University 2012. Most of the lectures and course material within Open Yale Courses are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 license. Unless explicitly set forth in the applicable Credits section of a lecture, third-party content is not covered under the Creative Commons license. Please consult the Open Yale Courses Terms of Use for limitations and further explanations on the application of the Creative Commons license.

Example:

Suppose, for example, that you were intrigued by Haidt's claim (on page 28 of *The Happiness Hypothesis*) that "one's like-o-meter is triggered by one's own name."

You might begin your google scholar search by looking at the article that Haidt cites in footnote 11: "Why Susie Sells Seashells by the Seashore: Implicit Egotism and Major Life Decisions."

Using this as your google scholar seed, you might then look down the list of the 139 articles that cite this article, settling on "How Do I Love Thee? Let Me Count the Js: Implicit Egotism and Interpersonal Attraction" and "Moniker Maladies: When Names Sabotage Success."

The first part of your exercise would then include:

- The claim from Haidt
- Citation information for these three articles
- A two-sentence summary of each of the two articles that you will not be discussing in detail

You might then select as the article to discuss in detail the "Moniker Maladies" piece.

The second part of your exercise would then include:

- A 300-500 word QALMRI summary of that piece (see QALMRI guide)

Using QALMRI for Reading/Summarizing/Writing Research Articles

QALMRI is an acronym that stands for “Question, Alternatives, Logic, Method, Results, Inferences.” It provides a framework for directing your attention when reading, summarizing or writing psychology research articles.

Please use this handout to assist you in writing your article summary and your research proposal (Directed Exercises 5 & 6). It defines each item in the QALMRI acronym and applies it to the Batson (2008) article we read for class on 01/13/11. (Note that not all of the information in the Batson article appears in the summary. A short summary cannot include all information, and you will have to choose, based on your topic, the most relevant information for your summaries.)

Question: What is the broad question being addressed?

Batson (2008) was interested in the question “Why do people act morally?”

Alternatives: What are the plausible alternatives (answers) to this question?

It could be that people show “moral integrity” and act morally out of a goal to act morally, or it could be that people show “moral hypocrisy” and act morally only in order to appear moral.

Logic: What would we expect to be true if each alternative was true? (i.e., “If X, then...”)

If people are moral hypocrites, then there will be some situations where they will strive to appear to act morally but not be willing to follow through with taking the costs of actually acting morally. If people show complete moral integrity, then they will act in accordance with morality even when doing so is personally costly.

Method: What is the exact method being used to test for each alternative?

Batson allowed participants to flip a coin to decide who (themselves or another participant) would be assigned to an unwanted task. If participants merely wish to *appear* moral (moral hypocrisy), then they would flip the coin but assign the other participant to the unwanted task regardless of the coin’s outcome. If participants wished to *be* moral (moral integrity), then they would either immediately assign themselves the unwanted task or flip the coin and follow its outcome regardless of whether it was personally favorable or not. (If they do not care about either being or appearing moral, they will not flip the coin and will simply assign the other to the unwanted task.)

Results: What actually occurs?

Batson found that about half the participants did not flip the coin, and of these 90% assigned the other participant to the unfavorable task. Of the participants who did flip the coin, an identical 90% assigned the other participant to the unfavorable task.

Inferences: What does this tell us about the alternative answers to the original question?

Although some participants showed no desire to be or appear moral, many participants chose to flip the coin to appear moral but then did not follow through with being moral when the coin flip was in the other participant’s favor. This suggests that a sizeable portion of people in this setting showed some level of moral hypocrisy.

[Prepared by Mark Sheskin, following Kosslyn, S.M. & Rosenberg, R.S. (2001)]