

Common criticisms in psychology paper

[Science](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The artificiality of inventive conditions in experimental environments is a repeated concern. How real can laboratory-based research be? This paper will explain the criticism of artificiality in the discipline of psychology and apply this criticism to at least three sub disciplines within psychology. This paper will also compare and contrast the breakthrough model of scientific research and the principle of connectivity in explaining events and outcomes; finally ending with comparing and contrasting the concepts of the single cause explanation and the principle of multiple causation in explaining events and outcomes.

Criticism of Artificiality Long gone are the days of William Wundt but what remains at the fore front is the expostulation of experimentation from critics that confining psychology to the laboratory spontaneously confines the mental phenomena it can analyze. An appropriate estimation of the artificiality criticism requires distinctively several intentions experimentalists follow. The discipline of psychology's laboratory studies are seen by some as bizarre. Viewing psychology as an inadequate science by the public stems from belief that evidence cannot be acquired unless natural circumstances are examined (Stanovich, 2007).

Social Psychology The college sophomore problem and criticisms of representativeness are most often aimed at social psychology, which makes frequent use of college subjects in laboratory paradigms in an attempt to develop theories of social interaction, group behavior, and information processing in social situations" (as cited in Stanovich, 2007, page 114). Bio-medical research is correspondent in today's state of social psychology, and

many of times founded on problem searching and very well may be funded on the footing of the problem it intends to alleviate (Krueger, 2003).

Popular and political interest plays a role in the search for a particular cure of disease. More over it is the methodical, theory based research of fundamental physiology that deciphers the operations of the human body's functions as well as how under certain conditions it malfunctions (Fields, 1994; Skalka, 1993). In a correlating style, fundamental, " theory driven research on social psychological processes" will completely enlighten the distinctive defects and the adaptable successfulness of the social creature (Krueger, 2003).

Abnormal Psychology In discussing the artificiality criticism within abnormal psychology, it has been shown that as a laboratory science, it has many times had to deal with solitary and maybe abnormal section of human behavior, more specifically college students; therefore inefficient of considering any ample warmth, richness, and inventiveness of human behavior. More concerns include the kind or representativeness of subjects participating in academic research.

A quote taken from William Robinson (2007) sums up the artificiality criticism saying " If our interpretation of the human mind is based on the behavior of American college sophomores in artificially contrived situations and interpreted in terms of laws derived from domesticated rats and pigeons, then our psychology is truly culture bound" (Robinson, 2007).

Organizational Psychology As the field of Organizational psychology has

evolved and grown, so has the array of topics and important research questions needing answers.

A common systematic approach implemented to start understanding work related psychological issues can be investigated. “ Theory-driven and research-based human resource and organizational improvement efforts can be evaluated using state-of-the-art evaluation science approaches, and evaluation findings can be used to continually improve and institutionalize positive change efforts” (Donaldson & Bligh, 2006). Connectivity and Convergence When a new theory in science touches upon previously verified empirical facts, this is definitive of the connectivity principle (Stanovich, 2007).

Consideration as an advance is contingent upon explaining new facts while accounting for old ones. It makes no difference if the theory explains old facts differently from the earlier theory, just that they are explained. This necessity guarantees the accumulative development of science. Despite a new theory explaining new facts, if there is no explanation for the old ones then there are no considerations of finalized advancement and no immediate replacement of them (Stanovich, 2007). What will occur will be both the old and new theory coexisting as probable ideas until a new theory abdicates them null and void?

Leading us astray is the breakthrough model of scientific research by suggesting that new findings violate the principle of connectivity (Stanovich, 2007). This suggestion deems risky because by abandoning the connectivity principle, the primary beneficiaries are purveyors of counterfeit science and

incredulous theories. Notorious are headlines that lead off with “ New Breakthrough. ” Theories such as these acquire most of their interest and publicity by claims that they are astoundingly new. The next deception is to cast out past information by asserting them impertinent.

The reason being given, that such information does not yet exist due to the newness of the theory. This breeds an environment of pseudoscience. Better explained is by the evolutionary theory the ghost of creationism, with its connectivity display of such different areas of science as morphology, biogeography, paleontology and many more. With the universe and earth estimating at around 10 thousand years in age, then many modern sciences of physics, chemistry, astronomy, cosmology, paleontology and beginning human history are entirely abolished (Unspoken Bible, n. .). Darwin’s theory called pangenesis, abandons the principle of connectivity to illustrate the means heredity correlating with natural selection (Unspoken Bible, n. d.). Where the problem lies is creationism proving no connectivity among any other things in science like in geology, genetics, ecology, chemistry and biology (Unspoken Bible, n. d.). The utmost connectivity is proven with all the other sciences by evolution (Unspoken Bible, n. d.).

Single Cause Explanation and Principle of Multiple Causation

Even though a cause of behavior may be determined does not imply the only or most important cause of behavior (Stanovich, 2007). Causal analysis stems from the event explained as extreme, negative or unexpected. Preferences in single cause explanations may happen, such as when not enough time has been made looking for other possibilities, or a lack of cognitive resources. On the other hand, where constraints are lacking

<https://assignbuster.com/common-criticisms-in-psychology-paper/>

consideration in real effort may be given on a multitude of feasible causes for the event in question (Chu & Shaw, 2005).

In providing a complete abdication of a specific behavior the weight of many different variables must be studied by the researcher as well as mixing the results of the studies in order to give a thorough snapshot of all the causal associations (Chu & Shaw, 2005). Despite an outcome having numerous different variable determinants this does not minimize the significance of a causally related outcome by one variable, this being the case for variables accounting for a mere percentage of the outcome. In considering multiple causes, explanations are often based on past experiences or intuitive theories (Chu & Shaw, 2005).

This resulting in the accepted explanation that is most approachable or believable. Even though individuals understand and credit the existence of multiple causes they many times conduct themselves more along the lines of unitary beliefs (Stanovich, 2007). Complex behaviors are multiply determined. A multitude of factors perform to generate their occurrence. Mitigating a difference in the effect of acting together variables than what can be due easily studying them separately. Don't fall prey to thinking that there is a single cause to a particular behavior.

Conclusion In conclusion this paper has explained events and outcomes through compare and contrasts of both the breakthrough model of scientific research and the principle of connectivity and the concepts of single cause and the principle of multiple causation. A mutual consensus because psychology experiments are not like real life, this should be looked upon as a

strength and not a weakness. No lone experiment is conclusive but instead gives leave of some alternative explanations, perpetuating the ability of zeroing in on the truth.

References

Chu, Y. & Shaw, J. (2005). Causal chaining: Effects of behavioral domain and Outcome valence on perceived causal structure. Retrieved August 10, 2009 from [http://www. uiowa. edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp10_14. pdf](http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp10_14.pdf)

Donaldson, S. I. & Bligh, M. C. (2006). Rewarding careers applying positive psychological science to improve quality of work life and organizational effectiveness. In Donaldson, S. , Berger, D. & Pezdek, K. (Eds.) Applied sychology: New frontiers and rewarding careers. (pp. 277 - 295). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fields, B. N. (1994). AIDS: Time to turn to basic science. Nature 369: 95 – 96.

Krueger, J. (2003). Towards a balanced social psychology: Causes, consequences and cures fro the problem-seeking approach to social behavior and cognition. Retrieved August 10, 2009 from [http://www. scribd. com](http://www.scribd.com)

Robinson, W. (2007). Is 531: Psychology. Retrieved August 10, 2009 from [http://www. web. utk. edu](http://www.web.utk.edu)

Skalka, A. M. (1993). Lobbying for research dollars: as moremoneygoes into specific diseases available for basic research diminish. Washington Post (June 22)

WH6 Stanovich, K. (2007). How to think straight about psychology. (8th ed.). Allyn & Bacon: PearsonEducationCompany. The Unspoken Bible. (n. d.). The scientific method. Retrieved August 10, 2009 from [http://www. usbible. com](http://www.usbible.com)