

June 12, 2010

**Evidence
Psychology is Not Scientific
Smoking Gun**

At some moment around 1990, can't remember exactly, I went to the buffalo library and the library in the University of Buffalo in Amherst N.Y., having a hunch and questions, seeking answers. I found a couple of articles, and an article in the buffalo news. I thought answered my questions. A short time after my research, I put them together as a paper, included some secular psychology of Christianity and a solution..

“among religions in this country which do not teach.... A belief in the existence of God...[are] Buddhism, Ethical Culture, secular Humanism, and others.” See *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 397 U.S. 488, 495, n.11 (1961)

**Clarifying the Federal Definition of Severely Emotionally Disturbed
Sharon R. Morgan, The University of Texas El Paso**

Currently there is controversy in the field of special education concerning the Federal definition of emotion disturbance in school age children. Those from the Behavior point of view do not accept the label emotional disturbance and believe the definition is too restrictive. Those from other points of view accept the label emotional disturbance and believe the definition is too restrictive. Those from other points of view accept the label of emotional disturbance but have some difficulty interpreting what the Federal definition actually means in regards to the school setting. The term Serious emotional Disturbed under the Educational of the handicapped Act is different from the term Seriously Emotionally Disturbed as it is normally used by psychologist and psychiatrists. The paper is an attempt to clarify the Federal definition as it applies to the schools.

In 1962 Kanner conducted a review and found that there was no discreet definition of emotional disturbance. He found that the term included children with behavior problems to children with psychotic conditions. More recently Morgan (1987) and Morgan and Wholeben (1984) found that deferent professional groups that work with children could not agree on the characteristics that indicated emotional disturbance. Regular teachers without having taken even one special education class and school counselors identified certain behaviors as indicators of emotional disturbance but these were predominantly behaviors representative of conduct disorders and behaviors which were most disturbing to others. Teachers prepared to teach emotionally disturbed children and clinical psychologists agreed on the behaviors that were indicative of emotional disturbance and put less emphasis on conduct disorder behaviors. Regular teachers who had some training in special education were in a somewhat better position to identify behaviors indicating emotional disturbance. Overall, the groups were divided into those who could and those would not distinguish between disturbing and disturbed behaviors.

In reality, a person is deviant if a society says they are. That is , if an individual deviates from the norm or what people expect then they will be negatively labeled. There is very little room for differences in our society. For example you simply, cannot be “overweight” in this society, and by the looks of some of the models, there is not such a thing as being too thin. This is a strange contradictory message to young girls who are emotionally disturbed and manifest their disturbance through anorexia nervosa. It is also a good example of the arbitrariness of defining emotional disturbance. Some of those models may have jobs that require extreme thinness and are highly paid for this very characteristic they are not considered emotionally disturbed. Girls and young woman who are not in the business of modeling but

who may be just as thin and who are anorexic are considered emotionally disturbed.

Societies and cultures will differ in what they consider aberrant behavior. In other words, certain behaviors are tolerated in some societies and cultures but not in others. For example, in certain Latin American countries noisier and more active children are tolerated to a greater extent than in the United States, and Latin American children are allowed to be more dependent longer than children are in this country. Noisy, active children in the United States will receive close scrutiny and probably become candidates for referral to some type of special education class. European countries differ in their expectations of children also. Certain behaviors, in this country, would be cause for concern and the individual would be labeled mentally ill or insane. And yet, in other countries the same behaviors may result in the individual being thought of as being blessed with special powers, and they might achieve a prestigious place in that society.

What all of this means is that deviance is a subjective concept and it cannot be defined to fit all children all over the globe.

The Stability of Behavior
II. Implications for psychological Research
Seymour Epstein, University of Massachusetts- Amherst

“Abstract: Psychological research is rapidly approaching a crisis as the result of extremely infant procedures for establishing replicable generalizations. The traditional solution of attempting to obtain a high degree of control in the laboratory is often ineffective because much human behavior is so sensitive to incidental sources of stimulation that adequate control cannot be achieved. An alternative proposal--- to investigate higher order interactions--- has been no more successful because the number of relevant interactions is often beyond the capacity of experimental investigation, one solution lies in aggregating behavior over situations and/or occasions, thereby canceling out incidental factors. Since such a procedure increases reliability without introducing excessive restraints into the experimental situation, it contributes to the generality as well as the replicability of findings. The value of such aggregation was demonstrated in five studies that examined variety of data, including the subjective and objective measurement of behavior in the field and the laboratory. Four kinds of aggregation that is required varies inversely with the degree to which the events studied are ego-involving, implicitly, or explicitly include an adequate sample of behavior observation, or have been demonstrated to robust over incidental sources of variation.”

“ Lest I be misunderstood at the outset, let me fore shadow some of my arguments and note that I do not claim there are no reliable generalizations in psychology. Everyone can probably identify a few to his or her satisfaction. My position is that the overall yield of meaningful information, particularly information that cumulative is discouraging low considering the total amount of research that has been conducted to date. The difficulty with the typical laboratory experiment is not that it cannot yield meaningful generalizations, but that there is no way of establishing within the confines of the experiment that it is likely to of done so. At the same time, there is an unfortunate dearth of replication studies. Moreover, as is demonstrated shortly, the very nature of the paradigm of the single -session experiment is such that very few findings, no matter what their level of statistical significance are apt to be replicated. Further, in the event that the result is replicated, there is little likelihood that it will be sufficiently general across minor variations in stimulus conditions to identify scientifically useful relationships.”

Reasons for the Widespread Acceptance of a Questionable Paradigm

“The question may be raised that if the psychological experiment as normally conducted is in fact as poor a procedure for establishing replicable generalizations as I have claims, how is it possible that this observation has been ignored for so long? There are at least two reasons. One is that personal and social factors support the paradigm, the other is failure to distinguish between concurrent and temporal reliability has led researchers to believe they could establish the conditions for assuring replicability without having to replicate.

Personal and social factors.

“There is no more fundamental requirement in science that that the replicability of findings be established. Yet, in psychology few replication studies are attempted, and of these only a small proportion are published (see N. C. Smith, 1970, for a more extensive discussion of this issue and for other arguments that experimental method as normally practiced has serious limitations). Some journals state that they do not accept replication studies, and others implicitly follow a similar policy. Replication studies are particularly apt to be rejected when cast doubt on accepted conclusions. As Greenwald (1975) has observed, findings in psychology often have a faddish quality about them. At one point, studies that support a particular phenomenon are favored, and at another point, studies that refute the phenomenon are favored. Greenwald has also provided evidence of a general bias against studies that support null hypothesis. Accordingly, it is impossible to interpret correctly levels of statistical significance in the studies that are accepted.”

“As for personal factors, the psychologist who invest his or her time and energy in replication studies runs the risk of being considered uncreative. If he or she persists, there may be difficulty in getting the work published, The personal consequences in a university setting are then anything but subtle, for a low rate of publication jeopardizes promotion and tenure. Moreover, for the person who makes no attempt to replicate his or her own findings, there is little danger that others will demonstrate that the findings are unreplicable because in the rare event that the replication is undertaken by someone else, discrepant results can almost always be dismissed as the result of minor procedural differences.”

“A further reward associated with the psychologist experiment as normally conducted is that it has an aura of scientific respectability about it because it uses the same paradigm as the physician sciences, with emphasis on manipulation, control, objectivity, precision, mathematics, at least in the form of statistics. Since experimental in the physical sciences that investigate a single stimulus on a single occasion produce results that are replicable and generically, it seems reasonable that the same should be true for psychology. As a result, the single-event experiment that examines a narrow range of stimuli is highly popular in psychological research and enjoys a high priority for publication. Moreover, there are practical advantages to such experiments. They fit into the schedules of researchers and college-students subjects alike, and they can be run at greater rate than multistimulus, multioccasion experiments”

“ The failure to distinguish concurrent from temporal reliability. Perhaps the most important reason for the widespread belief in the replicability of psychological experiments in the absence of replicability is that experimentalist often fail to distinguish between concurrent and temporal reliability.”

**The Needs of Other
J.M. Innes, University of Adelaide South Australia**

Science is generally regarded as being conducted by a community of scholars who cooperate and collaborate with each other in order to solve problems, regarded as significant (Ziman, 1968)

Part of the support for individual efforts comes from publication by others of reports of their work in journal form, giving not only the results of their research but also the details of their methods and procedures. Typically there is not sufficient detail for readers to fully reconstruct what was done in a particular experiment, **“especially given the lack of agreement within psychology about the methods to be used.”** A complete replication is not usually possible if the author or authors of the original study do not supply more extensive information. As members of a community of scholars, individual researchers can expect to receive requests for information about instructions, materials, and so forth, just as they can expect to provide raw data for later reanalysis by other people (Greenwald, 1976)

So why it is that on the several occasions I have written to other investigators asking for information about materials used in an experiment, I have received no acknowledgement of receipt of the request, no information, or informational late as to be of no use? Other items of mail either to or from the Northern hemisphere seem to get through the U.S. and the Australian Post Services, but why not the information considered necessary for the cumulative growth of the discipline.

I hope this Comment may alert people to the needs of others in this regard.

Religion and Public Education **William D. Valente, Professor of Law**

The Supreme Court dicta in the bible reading cases (34) strongly indicate the bible could be used in schools to teach students about religion or to study the bible as a source of literature and historical reference. Comparative study of various religions in the study of world cultures is also apparently constitutional. Similarly, the study of religion in the context of political history dose not offend the establishment clause. The study of the parables of Jesus in the study of fables and parables as methods of teaching was permitted. Study of the biblical account of the rise of the kingdom of Israel was also allowed.

34. School District of Abington Twp.v.Schempp, 374 U.S. 374 U.S.203,225 (1963)

35. Wwiley v. Franklin, 475 F. Supp. 390 (D. Tex 1910)

Are Universities Biased in Favor of Liberal Faculties? **Hans Tirpak, Director, Law Student Bar Association, university of Buffalo, Amherst**

There appears to be a trend in American universities, including the University of Buffalo, toward hiring and awarding tenure preferentially and in some case exclusively to professors who are on the left of the political spectrum.

In 1991 Civil Rights act (which is essentially no different from the 1964 act) states. “ it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge and individual, or otherwise discriminate against any individual... because of such individuals’ race, color, religion, sex or national origin.” note this provision includes the word religion.”

It might be stretching things a bit to assert that UB and/or similarly situation colleges or

universities do not hire conservative professors, I hear UB has some in it's political science department. I even met one about a year ago. I was quite surprised. With that exception, every professor I have met at UB in the 2 1/2 years I've been a student has seemed leftist.

In the conscientious -objector case, the Supreme court defined a religious belief as a " sincere and meaningful belief which occupies in the life of its possessor a place parallel to that filled by God of those admittedly qualifying for exemption" The court later expanded the definition to include ethical and moral beliefs that assumed the function of a religion in the registrant's life.

Given this, if colleges and universities have been and are in the practice of hiring and awarding tenure to liberal professors over equally qualified conservative professors, then people devoted to religions based on conservative values have been and will continue to be disfavored in employment because of their beliefs. Is this not " fail(ing)... to hire any individual.... because of such individual's religion? It would be a stretch to say it isn't.

I must in all fairness point out that at the present time I have no hard evidence showing that UB or any other, college or university has discriminated based upon religion. But the growing awareness that most of America's colleges and universities, including UB, have become dominated by leftist professors and administrators strongly support the inference.

I wrote down a solution.

Solution

State schools, courts, police, military, and prisons must end state sponsored psychology, sociology and philosophy.

- 1) State schools can open class rooms and hall for freedom of speech and discussion. Individuals must not be discriminated against because of non-enrollment in college, education, income, secular religion, race, color, sex, or nation origin.
- 2) Courts cannot force people into any secular organized religion, human behavior groups, or special interest group.
- 3) State hospitals and prisons must have an open door policy to human behavior groups and individuals for ample opportunity to treat and counsel, only upon request from patients, clients.



In 1991, sent it to congressmen.

John Jerome Nowak
356 P.O. Box
Lackawanna, NY, 14218

Thank you for your time and consideration

My personal website Christjustified.com Copyright © 2003-2010 All Rights Reserved