

Christina H. Bejjani

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
September 2020

Table of Contents

Summary of Course Evaluations

As Instructor

Introduction to Cognitive Psychology (Summer 2019) 2-4

As Section Instructor

Introduction to Statistical Methods in Psychology (Spring 2019) 5-6

Introduction to Cognitive Psychology (Fall 2018) 7-8

As Teaching Assistant

Distinction Thesis Workshop (Spring 2018) 9

Introduction to Cognitive Neuroscience (Fall 2017) 9

Mentorship Reference from Former Student

Ziwei Zhang, Undergraduate Honors Thesis Student, Duke University 10-11

Sample Syllabi and Assignments

Introduction to Cognitive Psychology (Summer 2019) 12-25

Summary of Course Evaluations

Full evaluations available upon request

Introduction to Cognitive Psychology

Duke University, Summer Term 1 2019

Instructor of Record (independently taught course)

Daily, May 15 – June 24, 11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. (9 enrolled students)

At the **end of the semester**, students filled out an “unofficial” survey that probed their thoughts on course design components as well as the “official” Duke course evaluation survey.

Unofficial end of semester survey (N = 8/9 students):

Class Average

Ratings from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| <i>Overall the instructor was</i> | 4.88 |
|-----------------------------------|------|

Ratings from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree)

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>My class was interesting and engaging.</i> | 6.75 |
|---|------|

| | |
|--|------|
| <i>My class went into depth about the topics we covered.</i> | 6.25 |
|--|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>My class was an appropriate level of difficulty.</i> | 6.75 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>My class had an appropriate level of interactive components.</i> | 6.63 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>My class challenged and developed my thinking.</i> | 6.50 |
|---|------|

| | |
|--|------|
| <i>My class felt like a community.</i> | 7.00 |
|--|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>I felt comfortable participating in class.</i> | 6.89 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor was prepared for class.</i> | 6.89 |
|---|------|

| | |
|--|------|
| <i>The instructor made class interesting and engaging.</i> | 6.75 |
|--|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor presented material clearly.</i> | 6.50 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor answered questions clearly and concisely.</i> | 6.50 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor was effective at getting students thinking.</i> | 6.75 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor had a positive and encouraging attitude towards students.</i> | 6.89 |
|---|------|

| | |
|--|------|
| <i>The instructor was available and responsive when I needed help.</i> | 6.89 |
|--|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor cared about supporting my learning.</i> | 6.89 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor provided helpful feedback on the writing assignments.</i> | 7.00 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor evaluated my work fairly.</i> | 6.89 |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>The instructor made positive improvements to the course based on student feedback at the mid-semester.</i> | 7.00 |
|---|------|

| | |
|--|------|
| <i>The instructor created an inclusive environment for students.</i> | 6.89 |
|--|------|

Official Duke final evaluation ratings (N = 4/9 students):

| | Class Average | University Average | Social Sciences Average |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)</u> | | | |
| <i>Overall the course was</i> | 4.75 | 4.37 | 4.44 |
| <i>Overall the instructor was</i> | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.56 |
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)</u> | | | |
| <i>The course has clearly defined student learning objectives.</i> | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.22 |
| <i>The course had clear expectations for assignments and other work.</i> | 5.00 | 4.44 | 4.44 |
| <i>The course had a welcoming and inclusive classroom environment.</i> | 5.00 | 4.65 | 4.11 |
| <i>This course helped me gain factual knowledge.</i> | 5.00 | 4.45 | 4.75 |
| <i>This course helped me understand fundamental concepts and principles.</i> | 4.75 | 4.53 | 4.56 |
| <i>This course helped me to apply knowledge, concepts, principles, or theories to a specific scenario.</i> | 5.00 | 4.47 | 4.22 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to analyze ideas, arguments, and points of view.</i> | 4.50 | 4.21 | 4.33 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to synthesize and integrate knowledge.</i> | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.22 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to conduct inquiry through methods of the field.</i> | 5.00 | 4.19 | 3.50 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to evaluate the merits of ideas and competing claims.</i> | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.89 |
| <i>This course helped me to effectively communicate ideas orally.</i> | 4.50 | 4.15 | 3.88 |
| <i>This course helped me to effectively communicate ideas in writing.</i> | 4.75 | 4.20 | 4.38 |

Representative student comments:

- ✚ "I enjoyed the discussions we had as a class since it made me actively think about the material."
- ✚ "[The class] is very welcoming and the class atmosphere is conducive to participating."
- ✚ "I liked the structure of the class and the interactive/participatory component that it involved. I think that while it was a small class, that helped foster a positive learning environment for the students to feel comfortable sharing their thoughts."
- ✚ "I loved the community-feel and discussion oriented lectures of the class. Everything

tied back to our readings, SciComm, and Cognitive Psychology which was nice as well.”

✚ “I loved the community and the topics we covered.”

✚ “[I liked] the active discussion we had regarding current research in the field. The class was very fairly constructed and fun and engaging.”

✚ “I liked that we focused on research instead of only book chapters.”

✚ “I liked that we had a lot of freedom to take our learning in whatever direction we wanted.”

✚ “Great course. A lot of reading, but totally worth it.”

✚ “[Christina] did everything she could to support [my learning]. Very happy with her performance.”

✚ “[Christina] was great.”

**Introduction to Statistical Methods in Psychology
Duke University, Spring 2019**

Section Instructor

Monday, 1:40-2:30 p.m. (18 enrolled students)

Tuesday, 8:45-9:30 a.m. (17 enrolled students)

Sections are combined below.

Midterm Feedback Survey (N = 31/35 students):

| | Section Average | University Average | Social Sciences Average |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)</u> | | | |
| <i>Overall the instructor was</i> | 4.19 | n/a | n/a |

Bonus Points Feedback Survey (04/14/19):

31/35 students completed a survey administered ~1 week before official course evaluations.

| | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| <i>Did you feel that the TAs took your midterm feedback into account and improved the lab sections?</i> | 30 | 1 |

Official Duke final evaluation ratings (04/22/19, N = 10/35 students):

| | Section Average | University Average | Social Sciences Average |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)</u> | | | |
| <i>Overall the course was</i> | 4.30 | 4.01 | 4.10 |
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)</u> | | | |
| <i>The course has clearly defined student learning objectives.</i> | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.19 |
| <i>The course had clear expectations for assignments and other work.</i> | 4.60 | 4.16 | 4.14 |
| <i>The course had a welcoming and inclusive classroom environment.</i> | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.40 |
| <i>This course helped me gain factual knowledge.</i> | 4.70 | 4.30 | 4.32 |
| <i>This course helped me understand fundamental concepts and principles.</i> | 4.80 | 4.35 | 4.41 |
| <i>This course helped me to apply knowledge, concepts,</i> | 4.70 | 4.28 | 4.33 |

| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| <i>principles, or theories to a specific scenario.</i> | | | |
| <i>This course helped me learn to analyze ideas, arguments, and points of view.</i> | 4.78 | 4.03 | 4.27 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to synthesize and integrate knowledge.</i> | 4.89 | 4.18 | 4.28 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to conduct inquiry through methods of the field.</i> | 4.78 | 4.01 | 4.08 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to evaluate the merits of ideas and competing claims.</i> | 4.67 | 3.98 | 4.20 |
| <i>This course helped me to effectively communicate ideas orally.</i> | 4.29 | 3.80 | 3.93 |
| <i>This course helped me to effectively communicate ideas in writing.</i> | 4.78 | 3.99 | 4.18 |

Representative student comments:

- ✚ "Christina is always super positive and helpful in the mornings... It makes it a bit easier to attend an 8:45 lab."
- ✚ "I like my ta Christina and how open she is with her communication. I feel very comfortable talking to her."
- ✚ "I love Christina.... she has been extremely helpful and is always so quick to answer my questions."
- ✚ "Lab section was incredibly useful and helped explain and practice examples from confusing topics from class."
- ✚ "Attending Labs each week was really helpful. It helped me understand how to clearly state my arguments/answers for homework assignments and tests. I'm thankful we had labs to clarify lecture content."
- ✚ "Attending lecture and labs goes a long way to understanding the material for assignments and exams. Professor Samanez-Larkin and the TAs do a great job of making sure that everyone in the course is on the same page."
- ✚ "I wish the lab section period was even longer!"
- ✚ "I like being able to collaborate with my peers! I have the opportunity to discuss what I've been learning in class."
- ✚ "I love that we apply what we've learned in lecture in a space where I feel more comfortable asking questions."
- ✚ "I like that the instructions on the handouts are very clear and are helpful for homeworks and on the midterm."

Introduction to Cognitive Psychology

Duke University, Fall 2018

Section Instructor

Tuesday, 8:45-9:30 a.m. (7 enrolled students)

Tuesday, 1:40-2:30 p.m. (18 enrolled students)

Sections are combined below. 18/25 students completed their evaluation.

| | Section Average | University Average | Social Sciences Average |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)</u> | | | |
| <i>Overall the instructor was</i> | 4.44 | 4.27 | 4.35 |
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)</u> | | | |
| <i>The course has clearly defined student learning objectives.</i> | 4.26 | 4.20 | 4.18 |
| <i>The course had clear expectations for assignments and other work.</i> | 4.53 | 4.20 | 4.11 |
| <i>The course had a welcoming and inclusive classroom environment.</i> | 4.53 | 4.34 | 4.37 |
| <i>This course helped me gain factual knowledge.</i> | 4.42 | 4.30 | 4.32 |
| <i>This course helped me understand fundamental concepts and principles.</i> | 4.37 | 4.36 | 4.42 |
| <i>This course helped me to apply knowledge, concepts, principles, or theories to a specific scenario.</i> | 4.16 | 4.26 | 4.32 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to analyze ideas, arguments, and points of view.</i> | 3.89 | 4.01 | 4.28 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to synthesize and integrate knowledge.</i> | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.26 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to conduct inquiry through methods of the field.</i> | 4.17 | 3.98 | 4.03 |
| <i>This course helped me learn to evaluate the merits of ideas and competing claims.</i> | 4.22 | 3.95 | 4.21 |

Representative student comments:

- ✚ "Christina is one of the most helpful and caring TAs I have ever had. She took the time to meet with me almost every other week after class to answer any of my questions, and if she did not know the answer immediately, she took the time to find the answer and email me later. Personality wise, she is very kind and welcoming, and I feel very comfortable sharing any questions and concerns with her."
- ✚ "She goes in depth about the topics and readings that we are supposed to do. I never

leave her discussion class confused about any topics. She makes sure that we all understand what we did for homework as well as the lectures.”

- ✚ “Christina was talented at lecturing and keeping the discussion engaging and interactive. She was knowledgeable and could also answer nearly any specific question that we could present to her on the spot.”
- ✚ “I really appreciate how approachable she is! She is always open to questions about anything (lecture, textbook, discussion sections) and explains concepts clearly.”
- ✚ “She does a great job of breaking down papers and their complex concepts and connecting them to real life situations to make them understandable.”
- ✚ “She is very thorough in covering the material and going over information again at the next discussion section. This really helped me remember the different articles and their main concepts. She's also very available to students and strives to find useful information for us based on the questions we ask and what we're learning.”
- ✚ “Christina is very nice and always creates a comfortable environment for discussion. I like how discussion is laid back and really serves to summarize what we have been doing in class.”
- ✚ “She is very kind and obviously very willing to help students understand. She is also very knowledgeable about the material and can answer most questions clearly. our section activities were very well organized.”

Distinction Thesis Workshop
Duke University, Spring 2018
Teaching Assistant

Wednesday, 1:40-4:10 p.m. (29 enrolled students)

TAs at Duke University are not given official evaluation feedback. Below are the results from an end of semester survey the instructor of record sent to students. 18/29 filled out the survey.

| | TA Average | University Average* | Social Sciences Average* |
|---|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u>Ratings from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)</u> | | | |
| <i>Overall the TA was</i> | 4.72 | 4.27 | 4.41 |

*Taken from official Duke ratings of instructors in Spring 2018.

Representative Student Comments:

- ✚ "Christina offered exceptionally detailed feedback. I truly appreciated how she explained how she interpreted what I read, and how she thought that might differ from what I was actually trying to convey. I also loved how genuinely interested she seemed in my topic, and that she always had a concrete recommendation for what she identified as an area in which I could improve."
- ✚ "She gave incredible, detailed feedback on all of my drafts! Her feedback really improved my writing. Plus, she was super approachable."
- ✚ "I thought her feedback on assignments was so thorough, and she made me feel like she really knew me and my topic."
- ✚ "Her feedback on my written sections was fantastic and super detailed. It was more helpful than the feedback I got from my actual thesis advisors!"
- ✚ "Very very kind and supportive while still providing constructive criticism!"
- ✚ "gives the best feedback possible on assignments. sososososos thorough and helpful"
- ✚ "she was very approachable and her feedback was helpful."
- ✚ "Christina always had really great feedback for both the presentation and written assignments."
- ✚ "She gave very detailed comments on the assignments and seemed friendly and approachable."

Introduction to Cognitive Neuroscience
Duke University, fall 2017

Teaching Assistant – No official feedback available
Tuesday & Thursday, 3:05-4:20 p.m. (80 enrolled students)

Mentorship Reference from a Former Undergraduate Student

From: Ziwei Zhang, B.A.

Former Undergraduate Honors Thesis student in the Egner lab at Duke University

Currently: Doctoral Student at University of Chicago with Dr. Monica Rosenberg

**Ziwei submitted this letter to the committee evaluating nominations for the Dean's Award for Excellence in Mentoring. She has since released the letter to me for inclusion in this document.*

Dear Evaluation Committee,

It is my honor to nominate my graduate student mentor, Christina Bejjani, for the Dean's Award for Excellence in Mentoring. Her distinct qualities and commitment to mentoring that I see in her in our three-year mentoring relationship make her very qualified for this award. She genuinely invested her time, emotion and professional knowledge to build strong bonds with her mentees and to effectively help them develop through their research career. In the past three years, she helped me grow through every stage of my research journey - from familiarizing me with the research topics, developing my own independent project, to my Ph.D. application.

She first guided me through the very start of my research career by helping me set clear goals and providing resources. I am an honor thesis student in the Egner Lab and will be applying to a Ph.D. degree in cognitive neuroscience this fall. I would not have become a researcher like I am today without having Christina as my mentor. When I joined the Egner Lab at the start of my sophomore year, I had little research experience and knowledge about where the field of cognitive neuroscience is heading. Christina created both detailed short-term plans and broad long-term goals for me, which not only gave me direction but also helped me form healthy mentality that research career is a long-term accumulation of knowledge and skills. She provided a list of resources to get me familiar with the classic literature in our field and we discussed the readings weekly to track my progress, during which she was always very patient to explain the concepts. I think this process is extremely important to a new scientist because it helped me form my initial research interest.

Moving on to the next stage, she encouraged me to discover my own specific research interests. She strategically changed her mentoring style from providing hands-on guidance to encouraging me to bring forward original study ideas. We would email each other back and forth or meet weekly in the lab to discuss my hypothetical research concept or design. Once we decided on an idea, she would also provide resources to help me learn the skills necessary for conducting the project I proposed. For example, my honor thesis project requires analyzing functional magnetic resonance imaging data in a new software that I have never used before. She provided plenty of resources for me so that I can teach myself and we would also discuss the best approach to conduct the analyses in great detail. One of the projects that we worked on together was actually published at *Psychological Science* and during this process, she showed me how publishing a paper works in terms of timeline, correspondence with editors and writing skills, all of which are extremely important for my career. At this stage, she helped

me realize my full potential. I felt for the first time that my research ideas had great values, which is the hope for someone who is starting her own independent research.

Even though I cherished this mentor-mentee relationship so much, I am applying to graduate schools to continue my research career. At this career development stage, she also provided great resources to help me net-work with other PIs that I want to work with. She introduced me to many of them when we were at the Cognitive Neuroscience Society Annual Conference so I had the chance to share my research experience and interest with potential future PIs. She also shared her personal stories during her application season and told me things that she wished she had known before in terms of selecting the right PI, interview tips, time management, etc.. She also provided very constructive feedback on both my statement of purpose for graduate school application and my senior thesis, which greatly improved my competence in this coming application season. Her advice was extremely valuable for my research career development in graduate school.

Growing as a mentor is fundamental to her professional development. Everyone can see her passion for teaching and mentoring others just by the time, energy and effort she put into different mentoring opportunities that she sought out herself. For example, she taught Introduction to Cognitive Psychology during summer 2019, while I was also staying in the lab for summer research. She worked on her lecture slides so carefully to make sure that she made the concepts clear and interesting for students who are just starting to learn psychology. Nothing generates more fruitful results when you genuinely care about the work that you are doing, the person that you are working with and when you are putting in the best efforts you can. For Christina, she accomplished all of these points in her mentoring journey. She always motivated me simply by setting a good standard.

My gratitude for her mentorship is beyond words. I think her efforts and excellence in mentoring deserves more recognition. I am certain that she will continue to inspire so many new scientists and help them grow in science until they become successful as well.

Sincerely,
Ziwei Zhang

Introduction to Cognitive Psychology

PSY 102, Term I, Summer 2019

MTuWThF, 11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m., Allen 226

May 15th to June 24th

<http://cogpsychduke2019.github.io/>

Course Instructor:

Christina Bejjani

Email: christina.bejjani@duke.edu

Office Hours: By appointment, LSRC B241

What is this course about?

How do psychologists today study the mind and how it works? This is a course for anyone interested in what the mind is, how contemporary researchers study the mind, and what researchers have discovered about how the mind works.

In our first module, we will examine what constitutes engaging story-telling and scientific knowledge (Science Communication), why some methods are better for investigating specific research questions than others as well as current methodological issues within psychology (Cognitive Methods), and how you construct the world you see and feel around you (Perception). We will begin to critically consume academic journal articles and science communication pieces.

Next we will consider how our brain prioritizes and processes information in a world that bombards our senses (Attention), in addition to how we feel and construct emotions (Emotion) and how these constructs shape and are shaped by perception. The third module will consider how we communicate (Language), remember information over varying durations (Working Memory), conjure possible and impossible scenarios as well as past events (LTM: Structure, Processes & Mechanisms). We will evaluate how to convey these core cognitive psychology concepts to a broad audience with science communication pieces.

We will then apply our theories and skills to understanding more complex feats of the human mind, such as how we construct our own life stories (Autobiographical Memory) and make decisions (Decision-Making, Motivated Reasoning). In our final modules, we will think about how we take shortcuts when making choices (Cognitive Biases), how our memory and mind can be tricked and shaped by external events (False Memory, Misinformation, Collective Memory), how our mind processes information (Imagery) and solves problems (Creativity & Problem-Solving), and what factors promote better learning (Education, Learning & Motivation).

The first half of the course is primarily focused on basic science concepts within cognitive psychology, while the second half considers how these concepts are interlinked and directly applicable to other aspects of life (e.g., policy, education, history). Through weekly quizzes and several writing assignments, you will have many opportunities to reflect on course material and receive prompt feedback on your learning. The bulk of your grade will be determined by (1) your ability to identify and apply rigorous concepts in cognitive psychology, as assessed with class discussion, reading worksheets, and quizzes, and (2) the clarity and ingenuity with which you can

explain scientific findings to a broad and academic audience, as assessed by your science communication and summary pieces.

The only prerequisite for this course is Introductory Psychology (or some equivalent). Because our time is abbreviated during Summer Term, this course is intensive in its pace through material. You should expect to spend between 2 and 4 hours daily outside of meeting time on course materials.

What are the goals of this course?

The first goal of this course is for you, students, to develop skills as critical consumers of empirical findings within cognitive psychology through academic and news readings as well as facilitated discussions. You will learn to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of various research methods, and to judge whether the conclusions drawn from using particular methods and obtaining specific findings are justified. You will also learn to identify common behavioral results and paradigms within the field.

The second goal is to develop your skills as communicators of empirical research within cognitive psychology. Through science communication and summary pieces, peer feedback, and reading responses to empirical articles, you will hone your ability to communicate effectively about cognitive psychology and learn how to synthesize academic findings.

The third goal is to apply your skills as critical consumers of cognitive psychology to current issues in psychology and neuroscience, such as open science, good pedagogical practices, and diversity. For example, you will write a Wikipedia page for a current female or underrepresented cognitive scientist, including their biography and three of their most cited findings, to promote a more visibly inclusive face of cognitive psychology (e.g., [project first started by Jess Wade](#)). At the end of the course, the instructor will email the scientist who you profiled, with you CC'd and your profile attached, so that you can continue to belong to the cognitive psychology community.

What will I do in class, and how will I learn?

To achieve our course goals, there are five required elements of this course: (1) class meetings, (2) readings, (3) weekly quizzes, (4) science communication pieces, and (5) a science summary piece.

1. Class Meetings

Please arrive no later than 11:00 am and stay until 12:15 pm. There are many excellent reasons why you may need to excuse yourself from a class meeting, both personal and professional. However, in this time-constrained summer course, our time together is the most precious resource we have. Even a single absence from the course will significantly affect your ability to be successful. Thus, if you anticipate attending class regularly to be a difficulty for you, I ask that you do not take this course and consider completing it at another time. I would be happy to help you brainstorm alternative strategies to learn more about the wonderful world of psychological research.

To take this course, you must plan to be able to attend each class session in full. While attendance is required, my expectations for your presence in class are much higher. In addition to your physical presence in class, you should prepare for class by reading and reflecting on assigned material; engaging in small group discussions; helping peers understand tricky concepts; significantly contributing to class discussions; and more.

Each class, you will evaluate your own contributions to the discussion by scoring yourself on a discussion rubric that I will email. I will factor these self-evaluations into a participation score for each class. At the end of the semester, your two worst scores will be dropped before I calculate your final Participation grade. Absences will be counted as a dropped score.

2. Readings

We do not have a formal textbook for this course, although we will on occasion read a few chapters. Mostly, we will explore readings and media drawn from many sources, including podcasts and articles from the popular media and primary scientific literature. These are posted on our website.

3. Weekly Quizzes

We will have six weekly quizzes consisting of multiple-choice and short answer questions. These quizzes are designed to review the material and give you ongoing feedback about how well you are learning in the course. Your two lowest quiz scores will be dropped from your grade. You will also have the opportunity to correct your mistakes and receive half credit on answers you got wrong.

4. Science Communication Pieces

The science communication pieces (Duke research blog post, science communication pitch, Wikipedia project) are designed to help you learn how to discuss what you are learning with friends and loved ones, and to consume media summaries of psychological research with a critical eye. You will apply what you are learning from your weekly readings into these pieces, which are also aimed towards making you feel a part of the Duke and general cognitive psychology research communities. Along the way, you will complete several mini assignments designed to guide you through the processing of finishing these projects. Detailed guidelines are available on our course website, and we will discuss grading rubrics in class.

5. Science Summary Piece

Finally, you will apply what you are learning from your weekly readings into a piece summarizing an article for academic audience. Taken together, the science communication and summary pieces will help you think more critically about the role of the audience in discussing science findings broadly.

How will you be graded?

This course will be graded on a 100-point scale using standard cutoffs for letter grades (A,B,C,D,NP with +/-). Detailed grading rubrics will be provided on Sakai. Your final course grade will be determined in the following way:

- ✚ Participation: 20%
- ✚ Quizzes: 15%
- ✚ Science communication pitch: 5%
- ✚ Duke research blog post: 20%
- ✚ Science summary piece: 20%
- ✚ Wikipedia project: 20%

What are the class policies?

Laptops and Classroom Technology

We will have the opportunity to learn about potential influences of technology on our psychology. For this reason, laptops are only allowed if you must take notes or cannot print the readings that we will discuss in class. Outside of specific class activities, cell phones should be dark and silent during

our class meetings. If you are expecting an important message during class that requires you to check your phone, speak to me. Feel free to step out for brief breaks to check texts, emails, etc.

You will need access to a personal computing device, such as a laptop, for accessing class readings, listening to podcasts, and completing and submitting class assignments. You can find available machines at the Duke University Libraries (hours: <https://library.duke.edu/about/hours>). I am committed to providing an equitable learning environment. If access to technology is a hardship for you, please reach out and you will be supported confidentially.

Missed class or work

If you are unable to attend class or meet an assignment deadline, please contact me as soon as possible, but no later than 48 hours, to discuss your missed work. More than two absences will require a conversation with me to discuss your progress and continued ability to succeed in the course. We may discuss options such as resources to support missed content, revised timelines for turning in assignments, or withdrawing from the course so you can learn this content at another time. You should seek support from your academic dean if you are experiencing long-term illnesses or personal emergencies. See [Trinity's illness policies](#) for details.

Commitment to Diversity and Equity

Adapted from <https://www.brown.edu/sheridan/teaching-learning-resources/inclusive-teaching/statements> by Brenda Yang

Our classroom does not exist in a vacuum: historical and systemic forces powerfully shape our beliefs, interactions with each other, and even the content of the course. It is my intent that students from diverse backgrounds and perspectives be served by this course, that students' needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that diversity be viewed as a resource, strength, and benefit. It is my goal to present materials and activities celebratory of diversity in multiple forms: gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, culture, disability, age, veteran status, and socioeconomic status. I will encourage us as a community of learners to operate from a place of cultural humility and to assume best intent. Your suggestions are appreciated and encouraged.

Changes to the syllabus

I may make minor changes to the syllabus, such as eliminating or changing a reading assignment, or adjusting a deadline. Such changes will be made in consultation with the class to ensure that sufficient notice is given and that changes are fair and favorable.

Academic accommodations

I am committed to ensuring that students have every opportunity to succeed in our course. Students who have a disability, which may necessitate an academic accommodation or the use of auxiliary aids and services in a class, should initiate the request with the Student Disability Access Office (SDAO). The SDAO will evaluate the request with required documentation, recommend appropriate accommodations, and prepare a verification letter dated in the current academic term in which the request is being made. Please contact the SDAO as soon as possible.

Academic integrity

Students are expected to adhere to [Duke's Community Standard](#) and are responsible for understanding the University rules regarding academic integrity. In brief, conduct prohibited includes all forms of academic dishonesty: e.g., unpermitted collaboration, representing another's work as one's own, or helping or allowing someone else to do any of these things. The *minimum* penalty for academic dishonesty is receiving zero credit on the assignment in question.

| Week | Day | Date, Day # | Topic | Feedback | Readings Due | Assignments Due |
|---|-----|-------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | W | May 15, #1 | Science Communication | -- | -- | Get to Know You Qualtrics survey |
| 1 | Th | May 16, #2 | Cognitive Methods Chpt 2, Gazzaniga | -- | Chapter on Methodology from Gazzaniga Ted Talk: Bad Science Lab Manual, Darling (2017) | -- |
| 1 | F | May 17, #3 | Perception, Chpt 3, Goldstein | -- | Gruters et al. (2018) Science News: Yong (2018), Dean (2018) | -- |
| 2 | M | May 20, #4 | Attention Chpt 4, Goldstein Chpt 6/7, Purves | Worksheet feedback | Kang and Wheatley (2017), Middlebrooks et al. (2017) Podcast: Hidden Brain (Buying Attention) | Tweet summary of SciComm article Reading worksheet |
| 2 | Tu | May 21, #5 | Attention Chpt 4, Goldstein Chpt 6/7, Purves | Quiz & Worksheet feedback | Wechsler et al. (2018), Seli et al. (2018) Podcast: Hidden Brain (Life, Interrupted) | Headline of SciComm article Reading worksheet |
| 2 | W | May 22, #6 | Emotion Chpt 10, Purves | Tweet & Worksheet feedback | Kragel et al. (2016) , Siegel et al. (2018) Podcast: All in the Mind (The Creation of Emotions) | -- |
| 2 | Th | May 23, #7 | Emotion Chpt 10, Purves | Headline feedback | D'Arbeloff et al. (2018) , MacCormack and Lindquist (2019) Science News: Chen (2018), Strickland (2016) | Opening paragraph SciComm article |
| 2 | F | May 24, #8 | Review | -- | Chapters 1 & 2 in Goldstein textbook | -- |
| May 27, Memorial Day – no class, readings, or assignments | | | | | | |
| 3 | Tu | May 28, #9 | Language Chpt 11, Goldstein | Quiz | Bergelson and Aislin (2017) , Yu et al. (2019) Science News: Gutman (2017), Hayakawa & Marian (2019) | Choose scientist for Wikipedia profile |
| 3 | W | May 29, #10 | Working memory / cognitive training Chpt 5, Goldstein Chpt 13, Purves | Opening paragraph feedback | Kable et al. (2017), Yin et al. (2019) Science News: Noë (2017), Duong (2019) | Science pitch of Scicomm piece |
| 3 | Th | May 30, #11 | LTM: Structure Episodic Memory Chpt 6, Goldstein | -- | Uitvlugt and Healey (2019) Ben-Yakov and Henson (2018) Scientist summary: Williams et al. (2019) Science News: Shute (2014) | -- |
| 3 | F | May 31, #12 | LTM: Processes & Mechanisms Chpt 7, Goldstein | Pitch feedback | Vaz et al. (2019), Chapter 7 in the Goldstein textbook, Scientist Summary: Gelinias (2019) | Multiple paragraph SciComm article |
| 4 | M | June 3, #13 | Autobiographical Memory Chpt 8, Goldstein | Quiz | Rubin et al. (2019) , Stanley et al. (2017) Science News: Leung (2019) Podcast: All in the Mind (A Highly Superior Memory) | -- |
| 4 | Tu | June 4, #14 | Knowledge / Categorization Chpt 9, Goldstein | Reverse outline of paragraphs | Chapter 9 in the Goldstein textbook | Opening paragraph of scientist audience summary article Midsemester Qualtrics survey |
| 4 | W | June 5, #15 | Review | -- | Scientist Summary: Frankland & Josselyn (2018), Ramirez (2018), Hutter & Wilson (2018) | Biography of Wikipedia profile |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|----|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Podcast: Hidden Brain (Looking Back) | |
| 4 | Th | June 6, #16 | Decision-making Chpt 13, Goldstein Chapt 14, Purves | Opening paragraph feedback | Pryor et al. (2019), Pearson et al. (2018) Science News: Lombrozo (2014) | -- |
| 4 | F | June 7, #17 | Motivated Reasoning Chpt 13, Goldstein Chapt 14, Purves | Biography feedback Quiz | Pennycook and Rand (2018), Stanley et al. (2019) Podcast: Hidden Brain (I'm Right, You're Wrong) | -- |
| 5 | M | June 10, #18 | Cognitive Biases Chpt 13, Goldstein Chapt 14, Purves | -- | Levari et al. (2018), Optional: Klein and O'Brien (2018) Podcast: You Are Not So Smart (Active Information Avoidance) Oatmeal comic: Believe | Outline of Duke Research Blog |
| 5 | Tu | June 11, #19 | False Memory Chpt 8, Goldstein | Outline feedback | Frenda et al. (2016), Zhu et al. (2019) TED Radio Hour: Can Eyewitnesses Create Memories? | Multiple paragraphs scientist article |
| 5 | W | June 12, #20 | Misinformation Chpt 8, Goldstein | Multiple paragraph feedback | Fazio et al. (2015) , Vosoughi et al. (2018) Play computer game ncase.me/crowds Scientist summary: Lazer et al. (2018) | -- |
| 5 | Th | June 13, #21 | Review & Karl Bates visiting class | -- | Grinberg et al. (2019), Lombrozo (2018) | Draft of Duke Research Blog |
| 5 | F | June 14, #22 | Collective Memory Wertsch & Roediger (2008), <i>Memory</i> | Quiz | Optional: Maswood et al. (2019), Abel et al. (2019) Science News: Stix (2018), Cummins (2018) | Outline of research for Wikipedia profile |
| 6 | M | June 17, #23 | Creativity & Problem- Solving Chpt 12, Goldstein | Draft feedback | Podcast: Scott Barry Kaufman (Creativity with Constraints) | Outline scientist audience summary article |
| 6 | Tu | June 18, #24 | Learning & Motivation Chpt 14, Purves Charpentier et al. (2018) & more | Outline feedback | Optional: Marvin and Shohamy (2016), Lydon-Staley et al. (2018) Scientist summaries: DiMenichi & Tricomi (2016) | -- |
| 6 | W | June 19, #25 | Imagery Chpt 10, Goldstein | Outline feedback | Chapter 10 of Goldstein textbook Optional Podcast: The Psych Files (How to Make Study Groups Effective) | Final Duke Research Blog |
| 6 | Th | June 20, #26 | Education Chpt 7, Goldstein | -- | Smith et al. (2016), Hard et al. (2019) Scientist summary: Dunlosky et al. (2013) | Scientist summary article |
| 6 | F | June 21, #27 | Education | Quiz | Ravizza et al. (2017), Sana et al. (2013) Science News: Lombrozo (2013), Supiano (2019) | -- |
| 7 (3) | M | June 24, #28 | Overview | Review | None | Wikipedia profile |

Bibliography

Science Communication (#1/28 of class):

- None

Cognitive Methods (#2/28 of class):

- Gazzaniga, M., Ivy, R.B., Mangum, G.R. (2008). Methods of Cognitive Neuroscience. In: Cognitive Neuroscience: The Biology of the Mind, pp. 110-162. New York City: W.W. Norton & Company Third Edition.
- Goldacre, B. (2011). *Battling bad science*. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/ben_goldacre_battling_bad_science
- Lab manual (<https://cogpsychduke2019.github.io/files/LabManual.pdf>)
- Darling, N. (2017). Attracting WEIRD Samples. Retrieved from Psychology Today website: <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/thinking-about-kids/201710/attracting-weird-samples>

Perception (#3/28 of class):

Article:

- Gruters, K. G., Murphy, D. L. K., Jenson, C. D., Smith, D. W., Shera, C. A., & Groh, J. M. (2018). The eardrums move when the eyes move: A multisensory effect on the mechanics of hearing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(6), E1309–E1318. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717948115>

Science News:

- Yong, E. (2018, January 23). When Your Eyes Move, So Do Your Eardrums. Retrieved from The Atlantic website: <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/01/when-your-eyes-move-so-do-your-eardrums/551237/>
- Dean, S. (2018, January 25). Our Eye Movements Also Move Eardrums, And Nobody Knows Why. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencealert.com/eye-movements-cause-vibrations-eardrums-hearing-weird-brain>

Attention, Day 1 (#4/28 of class):

Articles

- Kang, O., & Wheatley, T. (2017). Pupil dilation patterns spontaneously synchronize across individuals during shared attention. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 146(4), 569–576. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000271>
- Middlebrooks, C. D., Kerr, T., & Castel, A. D. (2017). Selectively Distracted: Divided Attention and Memory for Important Information. *Psychological Science*, 28(8), 1103–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617702502>

Podcast

- Vedantam, S., Shah, P., & Boyle, T. (2018). *Buying Attention | Hidden Brain* : NPR. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2018/01/01/574073721/our-mental-space-under-attack>

Attention, Day 2 (#5/28 of class):

Articles:

- Wechsler, K., Drescher, U., Janouch, C., Haeger, M., Voelcker-Rehage, C., & Bock, O. (2018). Multitasking During Simulated Car Driving: A Comparison

of Young and Older Persons. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00910>

- Seli, P., Carriere, J. S. A., Wammes, J. D., Risko, E. F., Schacter, D. L., & Smilek, D. (2018). On the Clock: Evidence for the Rapid and Strategic Modulation of Mind Wandering. *Psychological Science*, 29(8), 1247–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618761039>

Podcast

- Vedantam, S. (2017). *Radio Replay: Life, Interrupted* | *Hidden Brain* : NPR. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2017/12/01/567834281/radio-replay-life-interrupted>

Emotion, Day 1 (#6/28 of class):

Articles

- Kragel, P. A., Knodt, A. R., Hariri, A. R., & LaBar, K. S. (2016). Decoding Spontaneous Emotional States in the Human Brain. *PLoS Biology*, 14(9), e2000106. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2000106>
- Siegel, E. H., Wormwood, J. B., Quigley, K. S., & Barrett, L. F. (2018). Seeing What You Feel: Affect Drives Visual Perception of Structurally Neutral Faces. *Psychological Science*, 29(4), 496–503. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617741718>

Podcast:

- Malcolm, L. (2017, July 5). *The creation of emotions* | *All in the Mind*. Retrieved from <https://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/allinthemind/the-creation-of-emotions/8576540>

Emotion, Day 2 (#7/28 of class):

Articles

- d'Arbeloff, T. C., Kim, M. J., Knodt, A. R., Radtke, S. R., Brigidi, B. D., & Hariri, A. R. (2018). Microstructural integrity of a pathway connecting the prefrontal cortex and amygdala moderates the association between cognitive reappraisal and negative emotions. *Emotion*, 18(6), 912–915. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000447>
- MacCormack, J. K., & Lindquist, K. A. (2019). Feeling hangry? When hunger is conceptualized as emotion. *Emotion*, 19(2), 301–319. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000422>

Science News

- Chen, A. (2018). How Hunger Pangs Can Make Nice People “Hangry.” Retrieved from NPR.org website: <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2018/06/11/618395072/how-hunger-pangs-can-make-nice-people-hangry>
- Strickland, A. (2016). This is what emotions look like in your brain. Retrieved from CNN website: <https://www.cnn.com/2016/10/06/health/spontaneous-emotions-brain-scans/index.html>

Review (#8/28 of class):

Textbook Chapter

- Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 from the 4th edition of Bruce Goldstein’s Cognitive Psychology textbook <https://www.cengage.com/c/cognitive-psychology-connecting-mind-research-and-everyday-experience-4e-goldstein/9781285763880>

Language (#9/28 of class):

Articles

- Bergelson, E., & Aslin, R. N. (2017). Nature and origins of the lexicon in 6-mo-olds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(49), 12916–12921. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1712966114>
- Yu, C., Suanda, S. H., & Smith, L. B. (2019). Infant sustained attention but not joint attention to objects at 9 months predicts vocabulary at 12 and 15 months. *Developmental Science*, 22(1), e12735. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12735>

Science news:

- Gutman, R. (2017, November 20). The Connected Vocabularies of Six-Month-Olds. Retrieved from The Atlantic website: <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/11/babies-language-vocabularies/546320/>
- Hayakawa, S., & Marian, V. (2019). How Language Shapes the Brain. Retrieved from Scientific American Blog Network website: <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/how-language-shapes-the-brain/>

Working Memory / Cognitive Training (#10/28 of class):

Articles

- Kable, J. W., Caulfield, M. K., Falcone, M., McConnell, M., Bernardo, L., Parthasarathi, T., ... Lerman, C. (2017). No Effect of Commercial Cognitive Training on Brain Activity, Choice Behavior, or Cognitive Performance. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 37(31), 7390–7402. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2832-16.2017>
- Yin, S., Sui, J., Chiu, Y.-C., Chen, A., & Egner, T. (2019). Automatic Prioritization of Self-Referential Stimuli in Working Memory. *Psychological Science*, 30(3), 415–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618818483>

Science News

- Noe, A. (2017). More Bad News For Brain-Training Games. Retrieved from NPR.org website: <https://www.npr.org/sections/13.7/2017/07/14/536759455/more-bad-news-for-brain-training-games>
- Duong, Y. (2019). It's Not Your Fault -- Your Brain is Self-Centered. Retrieved from <https://today.duke.edu/2019/03/its-not-your-fault-your-brain-self-centered>

LTM Structure (Episodic Memory) (#11/28 of class):

Articles

- Uitvlugt, M. G., & Healey, M. K. (2019). Temporal Proximity Links Unrelated News Events in Memory. *Psychological Science*, 30(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618808474>
- Ben-Yakov, A., & Henson, R. N. (2018). The Hippocampal Film Editor: Sensitivity and Specificity to Event Boundaries in Continuous Experience. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 38(47), 10057–10068. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0524-18.2018>

Scientist Summary:

- Williams, A. N., Postans, M., & Hodgetts, C. J. (2019). How the Human Brain Segments Continuous Experience. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 39(17), 3172–3174. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3041-18.2019>

Science News

- Shute, N. (2014). Our Brains Rewrite Our Memories, Putting Present In The Past. Retrieved from NPR.org website: <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2014/02/04/271527934/our-brains-rewrite-our-memories-putting-present-in-the-past>

LTM Processes & Mechanisms (#12/28 of class):

Articles

- Chapter 7 from the 4th edition of Bruce Goldstein's Cognitive Psychology textbook <https://www.cengage.com/c/cognitive-psychology-connecting-mind-research-and-everyday-experience-4e-goldstein/9781285763880>
- Vaz, A. P., Inati, S. K., Brunel, N., & Zaghoul, K. A. (2019). Coupled ripple oscillations between the medial temporal lobe and neocortex retrieve human memory. *Science*, 363(6430), 975–978. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau8956>

Scientist Summary

- Gelinas, J. (2019). Ripples for memory retrieval in humans. *Science*, 363(6430), 927–928. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaw6767>

Autobiographical Memory (#13/28 of class):

Articles

- Rubin, D. C., Deffler, S. A., & Umanath, S. (2019). Scenes enable a sense of reliving: Implications for autobiographical memory. *Cognition*, 183, 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.10.024>
- Stanley, M. L., Parikh, N., Stewart, G. W., & De Brigard, F. (2017). Emotional intensity in episodic autobiographical memory and counterfactual thinking. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 48, 283–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2016.12.013>

Science News

- Leung, W. (2019). Record and replay: How a Canadian-made app is aiming to help Alzheimer's patients improve their daily lives - The Globe and Mail. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-toronto-teams-hippocamera-a-high-tech-memory-aid-for-alzheimers/>

Podcast

- Malcolm, L. (2019). *A highly superior memory | All in the Mind*. Retrieved from <https://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/allinthemind/a-highly-superior-memory/11021088>

Knowledge / Categorization (#14/28 of class):

Textbook Chapter:

- Chapter 9 from the 4th edition of Bruce Goldstein's Cognitive Psychology textbook <https://www.cengage.com/c/cognitive-psychology-connecting-mind-research-and-everyday-experience-4e-goldstein/9781285763880>

Review Day (#15/28 of class):

One of the following Science Summaries

- Hutter, S. A., & Wilson, A. I. (2018). A Novel Role for the Hippocampus in Category Learning. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 38(31), 6803–6805. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1085-18.2018>

- Frankland, P. W., & Josselyn, S. A. (2018). Facing your fears. *Science*, 360(6394), 1186–1187. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau0035>
- Ramirez, S. (2018). Crystallizing a memory. *Science*, 360(6394), 1182–1183. <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.duke.edu/10.1126/science.aau0043>

Podcast:

- Vedantam, S. (2018). *Looking Back | Hidden Brain : NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2018/06/21/622298227/radio-replay-looking-back>

Decision-making (#16/28 of class):

Articles

- Pryor, C., Perfors, A., & Howe, P. D. L. (2019). Even arbitrary norms influence moral decision-making. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3(1), 57–62. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0489-y>
- Pearson, J. M., Law, J. R., Skene, J. A. G., Beskind, D. H., Vidmar, N., Ball, D. A., ... Skene, J. H. P. (2018). Modelling the effects of crime type and evidence on judgments about guilt. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(11), 856–866. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0451-z>

Science News

- Lombrozo, T. (2014). Blame Your Brain: The Fault Lies Somewhere Within. Retrieved from NPR.org website: <https://www.npr.org/sections/13.7/2014/06/16/322556750/blame-your-brain-the-fault-lies-somewhere-within>

Motivated Reasoning (#17/28 of class):

Articles

- Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2018). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.06.011>
- Stanley, M. L., Henne, P., Yang, B. W., & De Brigard, F. (2019). Resistance to Position Change, Motivated Reasoning, and Polarization. *Political Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09526-z>

Podcast

- Vedantam, S., & Penman, M. (2017). *When It Comes To Politics and "Fake News," Facts Aren't Enough | Hidden Brain: NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2017/12/25/572162132/enter-title>

Cognitive Biases (#18/28 of class):

Articles

- Levari, D. E., Gilbert, D. T., Wilson, T. D., Sievers, B., Amodio, D. M., & Wheatley, T. (2018). Prevalence-induced concept change in human judgment. *Science*, 360(6396), 1465–1467. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap8731>
- Klein, N., & O'Brien, E. (2018). People use less information than they think to make up their minds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(52), 13222–13227. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1805327115>

Podcast

- McRaney, D. (2018, March 26). *YANSS 123 – Active Information Avoidance*. Retrieved from: <https://youarenotsmart.com/2018/03/26/yanss-123-active-information-avoidance/>
- Inman, M. (2017). Believe. Retrieved from The Oatmeal website: <https://theoatmeal.com/comics/believe>

False Memory (#19/28 of class):

Articles

- Frenda, S. J., Berkowitz, S. R., Loftus, E. F., & Fenn, K. M. (2016). Sleep deprivation and false confessions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(8), 2047–2050. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521518113>
- Zhu, B., Chen, C., Shao, X., Liu, W., Ye, Z., Zhuang, L., ... Xue, G. (2019). Multiple interactive memory representations underlie the induction of false memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(9), 3466–3475. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1817925116>

Ted talk (part of TED Radio Hour podcast):

- Fraser, S. (2013). *Can Eyewitnesses Create Memories?* Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2013/11/29/182671574/can-eyewitnesses-create-memories>

Misinformation (#20/28 of class):

Articles

- Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N. M., Payne, B. K., & Marsh, E. J. (2015). Knowledge does not protect against illusory truth. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144(5), 993–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000098>
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>

Science Summary

- Lazer, D. M. J., Baum, M. A., Benkler, Y., Berinsky, A. J., Greenhill, K. M., Menczer, F., ... Zittrain, J. L. (2018). The science of fake news. *Science*, 359(6380), 1094–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2998>

Computer Game

- Social networks, wisdom of the crowds, groupthink, and idea propagation: <https://ncase.me/crowds/>

Review Day (#21/28 of class):

Articles

- Grinberg, N., Joseph, K., Friedland, L., Swire-Thompson, B., & Lazer, D. (2019). Fake news on Twitter during the 2016 U.S. presidential election. *Science*, 363(6425), 374–378. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau2706>

Science News

- Lombrozo, T. (2018). The Psychology Of Fake News. Retrieved from NPR.org website: <https://www.npr.org/sections/13.7/2018/03/27/597263367/the-psychology-of-fake-news>

Collective Memory (#22/28 of class):

Articles

- Optional: Maswood, R., Rasmussen, A. S., & Rajaram, S. (2019). Collaborative remembering of emotional autobiographical memories: Implications for emotion regulation and collective memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 148(1), 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000468>
- Abel, M., Umanath, S., Fairfield, B., Takahashi, M., Roediger, H. L., & Wertsch, J. V. (2019). Collective Memories across 11 Nations for World War II: Similarities and Differences Regarding the Most Important Events. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2019.02.001>

Science News

- Stix, G. (2018). A Math Function Describes How Whole Societies Remember--and Forget. Retrieved from Scientific American website: <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/a-math-function-describes-how-whole-societies-remember-and-forget/>
- Cummins, E. (2018). How long can an event hold humanity's attention? There's an equation for that. Retrieved from Popular Science website: <https://www.popsci.com/how-collective-memories-decay>

Creativity and Problem-Solving (#23/28 of class):

Podcast

- Kaufman, S. B. (2018). *Creativity from Constraints with Patricia Stokes*. Retrieved from: <https://scottbarrykaufman.com/podcast/creativity-constraints-patricia-stokes/>

Learning & Motivation (#24/28 of class):

Articles

- Optional: Marvin, C. B., & Shohamy, D. (2016). Curiosity and reward: Valence predicts choice and information prediction errors enhance learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145(3), 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000140>
- Lydon-Staley, D. M., Zurn, P., & Bassett, D. S. (2018). Inconsistent curiosity: Augmentation and blunting of curiosity in daily life and implications for well-being. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/2vf94>

Scientist summary

- DiMenichi, B. C., & Tricomi, E. (2016). Are You Smarter Than a Teenager? Maybe Not When It Comes to Reinforcement Learning. *Neuron*, 92(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.09.043>

Imagery (#25/28 of class):

Textbook Chapter

- Chapter 10 from the 4th edition of Bruce Goldstein's Cognitive Psychology textbook <https://www.cengage.com/c/cognitive-psychology-connecting-mind-research-and-everyday-experience-4e-goldstein/9781285763880>

Podcast

- Optional: Britt, M. (2016). *Ep 265: How To Make Study Groups Effective | The Psych Files*. Retrieved from <http://www.thepsychfiles.com/2016/10/ep-264-how-to-make-study-groups-effective/>

Education, Day 1 (#26/28 of class):

Articles

- Smith, A. M., Floerke, V. A., & Thomas, A. K. (2016). Retrieval practice protects memory against acute stress. *Science*, 354(6315), 1046–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah5067>
- Hard, B. M., Lovett, J. M., & Brady, S. T. (2019). What do students remember about introductory psychology, years later? *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 5(1), 61–74. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000136>

Science News

- Dunlosky et al. (2013). What works, what doesn't. *Scientific American Mind*, 24(4), 47 – 53

Education, Day 2 (#27/28 of class):

Articles

- Ravizza, S.M., Uitvlugt, M.G., and Fenn, K.M. (2017). Logged in and zoned out: How laptop internet use relates to classroom learning. *Psychological Science*, 28, 171-180.
- Sana, F., Weston, T., & Cepeda, N. J. (2013). Laptop multitasking hinders classroom learning for both users and nearby peers. *Computers & Education*, 62, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.10.003>

Science News

- Supiano, B. (2019, February 6). Should You Allow Laptops in Class? Here's What the Latest Study Adds to That Debate. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Should-You-Allow-Laptops-in/245625>
- Lombrozo, T. (2013, August 19). Stop Multitasking! It's Distracting Me (And You). Retrieved from NPR.org website: <https://www.npr.org/sections/13.7/2013/08/19/213439794/stop-multitasking-it-s-for-other-people-s-good>