

Alex kurz



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Alex Kurz Fricano Psych 240-A 24 April 2013 Analysis of the Accuracy of a Textbook This paper will discuss the accuracy in textbooks. Everyone believes what they read in a school text book is real, but that is simply not the case. In the textbook Life-Span Human Development by Carol Sigelman and Elizabeth Rider, it was found that not all what you read is true. The first instance of this is in accordance to physical punishment. The book begins by describing how Skinner did not believe in physical punishment but positive reinforcement. The text then goes into a study done by a website called Child Trends Databank saying how parents believe that physical punishment like spanking actually helps the child learn (Sigelman and Rider 44). This section is interesting because it is not likely that most people are in favor of physically punishing a child. In truth, most people would be against spanking. After over looking the study done by Child Trends Databank, what is written in the textbook is not exactly what the article is trying to convey. First off, the article is not even for corporal punishment. It is in fact in favor of Skinners point of view. The textbook states that, according to the article " in a 2004 national survey, 77% of men and 69% of women that sometimes a child needs ' a good hard spanking'" (Sigelman and Rider 44). But the article did not say that at all. The article says " In 2010, according to a nationally representative survey, 75 percent of men, and 64 percent of women 18 to 65 years old agreed that a child sometimes needs a " good hard spanking" (Child Trends Database). These numbers are completely different and the study was done at a completely different time. Also, this article does not even agree with what the book says. The book is trying to say that people do believe that spanking is good, when in fact the article states " use of corporal punishment is linked to negative outcomes for children" (Child Trends

Databank). Therefore, this fact is completely false and should not have been put in this section of the book. Surprisingly, the next quote the textbook used from the article was true. The textbook states that according to the study, " more than 90% of parents of children 3 to 4 year olds had spanked their child in the previous year" (Sigelman and Rider 44). This according to the article was in fact true. This quote actually agrees with what the book is saying. The book is saying that physical punishment will make children comply. But, this article is not trying to establish that with its audience. They are trying to enforce that physical punishment will lead to problems later in your child's life. They say that spanking in the long run can cause delinquency, drug and alcohol abuse, and even antisocial disorder. Though the first quote was not very reliable, this article does actually seem to support the textbook. However, this article is not at all trying to say they condone physical punishment. The article states that " Positive child outcomes are more likely when parents refrain from using spanking and other physical punishment, and instead discipline their children through communication that is firm, reasoned, and nurturing" (Childs Trends Databank). The article then goes on to show percentages of people that believe spanking is sometimes necessary. Though the percentages of people still seem high (75% of males, 64% female), the article is showing that over time less people are starting to believe this to be true. In accordance the article states that between 1986 and 2010 the percentage of women dropped 22 percent and the men 10 percent. This does support the text because over half of the men and women surveyed believe that children sometimes do deserve a " good hard spanking. " Therefore, though accuracy was not 100 percent, the article did supply the authors and editors of the <https://assignbuster.com/alex-kurz/>

textbook with some good information to make their claim. The next portion that seemed interesting is about socioeconomic status and health. The text says health and wellness is affected negatively in children whose parents have less education. This is seen especially in black and white children but not in Hispanic and Asian children (Sigelman and Rider 153). This is interesting because a person would not normally think that their parents' education may affect their own personal health. But, it is reasonable because the less educated a person is, the fewer options a person has in careers. Then this person is living below standards, may struggle to eat sometimes, cannot afford medications, and may have other hardships. Not only does that affect them economically but it affects them on basic knowledge as well. One that only has an 8th grade education may not know how to take care of a child or know when to take a child to a doctor. The study that supports this claim is called *Understanding Health Disparities: The Role of Race and Socioeconomic Status in Children's Health* written by Edith Chen, Andrew Martin and Karen Matthews. This article strongly believes that the socioeconomic status of parents will affect children's health negatively. The article states "children are less likely to receive vaccinations and have contact with physicians at early ages" (Chen Martin Andrews). This causes the child to be more susceptible to illnesses. The book then explains that "Childhood is unfortunately marked by numerous unintentional injuries..." (Sigelman and Rider 153). This is supported by the article when it states, "Lower-SES children have poorer health behaviors, including higher injury rates..." (Chen Martin Andrews). According to the text, a lot of these injuries come from car accidents. They occur because the parents are not educated in properly safety issues (Sigelman And Rider 153). They may ignore that the

child is not wearing a chest strap or even let them sit up front when they are too small. These are both very hazardous to a child's health. In Fact, both the article and book say that accidents are the leading cause of children deaths. Though that statement has a lot of truth behind it, the rest of the reasons in text are not supported in the article. Also the text does not go deep into the race issue that was previously brought up. The text that states " This is particularly true for black children and white children, but less for Hispanic families and Asian Children..." (Sigelman and Rider153). Yet, that is all the book really touches on that issue. It only talks about nutrition and limited physical activity. The study really focuses on how race affects a child's health. It goes way into depth about how Hispanic and Asian cultures are very close knit within family and community which has more parental education within groups (Chen Martins Matthews). Therefore, this fact had little reason to be in the text if the book was not going to elaborate on it. The final topic that seemed appealing was about radiation to prenatal babies. The book talks about the bombings in Japan and how the children of pregnant mothers at that time had a higher rate of mental retardation (Sigelman and Rider 111). This statement is supported by the article written by the CDC. The CDC wrote "...babies who receive a large dose of radiation during the more sensitive stages of development the health consequences can be severe, especially to the brain" (CDC). It is very understandable that large doses of radiation like from cancer treatments and x-rays, but the book should have clarified the amount of radiation that is harmful. The CDC article says anything " less than 500 chest x-rays" is not harmful at any given point during pregnancy (CDC). The final appealing part of this statement is that exposure to radiation can cause leukemia and other cancers later in life if

the prenatal fetus is exposed (Sigelman and Rider 111). The article kind of supports this. The CDC writes " Unborn babies are especially sensitive to the cancer-causing effects of radiation" (CDC), which supports the text. But, it then goes on to explain it depends on certain factors. These factors include: the amount of radiation and the amount of time it was exposed. They say that the increase in lifetime cancer risk would be less than 2 percent if the radiation does to fetus was equal to 500 chest x-rays (CDC). This is very logical and made a lot of sense. Radiation is very toxic and it is good to know how much is harmful to an unborn child. The CDC provided the public with good information on what is harmful and how it will affect your child if it is exposed. In conclusion, textbooks are full of information. Assuming everything is used correctly does not seem too illogical. But, even authors and editors make mistakes or use information improperly. Through examining just a few quotations from this class's textbook, it was evident that you cannot always believe what you read. Though all of the information was cited correctly, it was not always accurate or used properly. In instances like this it makes readers believe something that is not exactly true. This completely defeats the purpose of the text even using the information. Overall, it makes people wonder if everything a textbook tells us can be reliable. Through research it was clear that authors take things out of context and editors do not catch it or do not care to replace it.

Works Cited "

Attitudes Toward Spanking." Child Trends DataBank. N. p., Apr. 2012. Web. 23 Apr. 2013.

Chen, Edith, PhD, Andrew Martin, PhD, and Karen Matthews, PhD. " Understanding Health Disparities: The Role of Race and Socioeconomic Status in Children's Health." American Journal of Public Health 96. 4 (2006): 702-08. American Public Health Association. Web. 23

<https://assignbuster.com/alex-kurz/>

Apr. 2013. " Radiation and Pregnancy: A Fact Sheet for the Public." CDC Radiation Emergencies. Centers for Disease Control and Pervation, 14 Nov. 2011. Web. 23 Apr. 2013. Sigelman, Carol K., and Elizabeth A. Rider. Life-span Human Development. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2011. Print.