

KEY TERMS

construct (p. 49)
 construct validity (p. 51)
 counterbalancing (p. 43)
 debriefing (p. 59)
 ethical (p. 56)

experiment (p. 48)
 external validity (p. 55)
 informed consent (p. 58)
 institutional review board
 (IRB) (p. 61)

internal validity (p. 41)
 random assignment (p. 45)
 random sampling (p. 56)

EXERCISES

1. Match the concept to the type of validity.

— construct validity	a. generalize
— external validity	b. cause-effect
— internal validity	c. mental states

2. The professor asks a student, "Do you have any questions?" The student says, "No." Consider the following conclusions that the professor might make from the student's response.

- If the professor concludes that the student understood the lecture perfectly, which validity (construct, internal, or external) should be questioned?
- If the professor concludes that none of the students would have a question, which validity (construct, internal, or external) should be questioned?
- If the professor concludes that the student is saying "no" because of the new way the professor explained a concept, which validity (construct, internal, or external) should be questioned?

3. Match the threat to the type of validity.

— construct validity	a. measure was poor
— external validity	b. treatment and no-treatment groups were unequal before the study began
— internal validity	c. sample of participants was not representative

4. Match the threat to the type of validity.

— construct validity	a. no random assignment
— external validity	b. no random sampling

— internal
 validity

- c. participants figured out the hypothesis

- An author tells of a case in which a person got much better after receiving a new treatment. The author then concludes that the treatment would work for everyone. How good is the author's evidence for this conclusion in terms of
 - internal validity?
 - external validity?
- Is it ethical to treat a patient with a method that has not been scientifically tested? Why or why not? Is it ethical to withhold a treatment that is believed to work in order to find out if it does indeed work? Why or why not?
- Imagine you were doing a study to see whether people, when frustrated, would be more aggressive toward another person, especially if that person was of a different ethnic group.
 - How might informed consent hurt the construct validity of your study?
 - How might a full debriefing of your participants lead to harm?
- For one of the following television shows—*Survivor*, *Candid Camera*, or *America's Funniest Home Videos*—state which of the nine APA ethical principles listed in Box 2.1 are violated and explain—or provide an example of—how those principles are violated.
- Two of the most ethically questionable studies in the history of psychology are Milgram's obedience study (in which participants were told to deliver dangerous shocks to an accomplice of the experimenter)

and Zimbardo's prison study (in which well-adjusted students pretended to be either prisoners or guards). In both of these studies, there would have been no ethical problems at all if participants had behaved the way common sense told us they would; that is, no one would have obeyed the order to shock the accomplice, and none of the "guards" would have mistreated the prisoners.

- a. Does the inability to know how participants will react to a research project mean that research should not be done?
 - b. Does people's inability to know how they and others will react in many situations mean that certain kinds of research should be performed so we can find out the answers to these important questions?
 - c. What ethical principles, if any, were violated in Milgram's shock experiment? (See Box 2.1.)
 - d. What ethical principles, if any, were violated in Zimbardo's prison study? (See Box 2.1.)
10. Assume that a participant in a study in which you were involved suffered intense distress. According to the APA ethical guidelines, none of the following is a legitimate excuse that would relieve you of responsibility. For each "excuse," state the principle that is violated (see Box 2.1) and explain how it applies.
 - a. "I was just following orders."
 - b. "My assistant conducted the session and behaved inappropriately, not me."
 - c. "I didn't notice that the participant was upset."
 - d. "I just didn't think that we had to tell participants that they would get mild electrical shocks."
 - e. "I didn't think that asking questions about suicide would be upsetting—and for most of my participants it wasn't."
 - f. "When the participant got upset, it surprised me. I just didn't know what to do and so I didn't do anything."
 - g. "Our subjects were mice. We can cause mice whatever distress we want." (See Box 2.4.)



WEB RESOURCES

1. Go to the Chapter 2 section of the book's student website and
 - a. Look over the concept map of the key terms.
 - b. Test yourself on the key terms.
 - c. Take the Chapter 2 Practice Quiz.
 - d. Do the interactive end-of-chapter exercises.
2. To learn more about IRBs, getting IRB approval for research, and the ethical issues in conducting research, use the "Ethics" link.