

particularly in an area as dynamic as psychology, demands constant updating and serious continuing education. I welcome these challenges.

Third, I am now more willing to help others without expecting anything in return. (I work as an inmate counselor, so the opportunity to help people is always available.) The successful psychology student needs to have a genuine concern for others and the desire to further the health and development of humankind. Osberg (1986), a psychology instructor with 10 years experience teaching in prison, observed: "Many students [in prison], particularly social science majors, show an interest in careers that involve working with disadvantaged youth. These students have a strong desire to steer youths away from the paths that lead to prison" (p. 17). It is just as important for students to apply their newfound psychological knowledge in their daily behavior and in their relationships with family, friends, and associates.

Learning psychology can make all people more human and happier, and this is probably needed in prison more than any other setting in society. There is a definite place for psychology in prison college programs, and psychology can greatly benefit inmate students who take advantage of the opportunity. I agree to a great extent with Tope and Warthan (1986), prisoners at the Westville Correctional Center in Indiana, who stated: "In today's society, the concept of attempting to rehabilitate the criminal has all but vanished as a viable means to change those who have displayed contempt for society's moral rules and a blatant disrespect for the rights of others" (p. 75). Greater efforts by prison administrators will succeed only to the extent that individual inmates are motivated to change. Learning psychology is an opportunity for us to change ourselves without waiting for correctional philosophy to change. As my personal experience makes clear, prison inmates can pursue their own rehabilitation in the study of psychology. They can learn to accept and value themselves and to overcome guilt and the sense of failure. Learning psychology is not a panacea; it will not make every criminal a decent, law-abiding citizen. However, I believe that the recidivism rate would drop from the present 70% (in New York state) if more inmates learned some of the subtleties of human behavior offered by psychology.

### References

- Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.
- Freud, S. (1947). *The ego and the id*. London: Hogarth. (Original work published 1923)
- Freud, S. (1975). *Beyond the pleasure principle* (J. Strachey, Ed. and Trans.). New York: Norton. (Original work published 1920)
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1971). *The farther reaches of the human mind*. New York: Viking.
- Osberg, T. M. (1986). Teaching psychology in a prison. *Teaching of Psychology*, 13, 15-19.
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children* (M. Cook, Trans.). New York: International Universities Press.
- Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child* (M. Cook, Trans.). New York: Basic Books.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. R. (1970). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Skinner, B. F. (1985). Cognitive science and behaviourism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 76, 291-301.
- Tope, E. R., & Warthan, R. J. (1986). Correctional education: Igniting the spark of moral maturation. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 37, 75-78.
- Wortman, C., & Loftus, E. (1988). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Knopf.

### Notes

1. I thank Timothy M. Osberg for suggesting that I write this article and for his editorial assistance.
2. Requests for reprints should be sent to Stephen E. Fraley (82-A-3166), P.O. Box 149, Attica, NY 14011.

---

## Teaching of Psychology: A Required Course for All Doctoral Students

Henry C. Rickard  
Steven Prentice-Dunn  
Ronald W. Rogers  
Forrest R. Scogin  
Robert D. Lyman  
*University of Alabama*

*The development and content of a Teaching of Psychology course required for doctoral students is described. Graduate students take full responsibility for a section of introductory psychology and participate in a weekly 2-hr seminar covering a variety of practical and theoretical issues. Two separate evaluations have found that undergraduates rate graduate student instructors and faculty instructors similarly. Faculty and graduate students report a high degree of satisfaction with the course.*

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching examined the roles and priorities of college professors (Boyer, 1990). Among other recommendations, teacher preparation was urged as a part of all graduate education. The report noted that such training should occur in a credit-yielding seminar taught by a ranking, knowledgeable professor. However, preparing graduate students to become competent teachers is neither widespread nor systematic. Lumsden, Grosslight, Loveland, and Williams (1988) surveyed 447 graduate psychology programs concerning, among other topics, the preparation of doctoral students for classroom teaching. They found a wide disparity among departments in respect to levels of responsibility and involvement of graduate students, ranging from clerical tasks to complete responsibility for a course. The present article describes a required course, Teaching of Psychology (PY695), which was established in the Psychology Department at the University of Alabama in 1974. The course has weathered well; in the current environment of attention to college teaching, its description may be of general interest.

PY695 originated in response to two concerns. First, the faculty was debating the elimination of the comprehensive

written examination as a requirement in the doctoral program. However, we all recognized a need for a vehicle through which students could integrate their knowledge of the general areas of psychology. Teaching an introductory psychology course promised to fulfill that need. Second, a number of graduate students wished to increase their marketability through teaching experiences. Thus, initiation of the teaching course was in response to two issues—one pedagogic and one economic. To control for a degree of content mastery, graduate students enrolled in the course were required to have either a master's degree or three semesters of graduate coursework. To ensure proper recognition, PY695 was designated a 3-hr course and assigned to a respected faculty member who received the usual teaching credit.

Eighteen graduate students were enrolled the first year, and a study was devised to assess their effectiveness as teachers (Ellis & Rickard, 1977). Among other conclusions, we reported that undergraduates in the supervised graduate instructors' classes exhibited higher levels of test performance on standard departmental tests than did undergraduates in classes taught by two PhD psychologists. After our first year's experience, faculty reviewed results of that study and solicited feedback from the student-teachers and the PY695 instructor. Based on those data, the course was designated as a requirement for all doctoral students.

Initially, the course consisted of responsibility for an introductory psychology section of 25 to 30 students plus irregularly scheduled supervisory meetings with the PY695 instructor. Practical classroom problems were the main topics addressed. In 1976, the format of the course was changed to include a weekly 2-hr seminar, which provided for more formalized information dissemination and for problem solving. In addition, it included a focus on the theory and ethics of teaching.

Over the years, appropriate instructional materials have been added. McKeachie's (1986) classic text, *Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher* (8th ed.), provides a variety of practical suggestions for the course. Benjamin, Daniel, and Brewer's (1985) *Handbook for Teaching Introductory Psychology* makes readily available a collection of research articles and demonstrations. Although not specific to psychology, readings from Neff and Weimer's (1990) *Teaching College: Collected Readings for the New Instructor* are assigned. Seminar topics include course organization, instructor roles, and misconceptions of introductory psychology students. In addition, readings cover (a) lectures, discussions, and supplements; (b) testing and grades; (c) evaluation of teaching; (d) motivating students; (e) ethics in teaching; and (f) the role of psychology in a liberal arts education.

In addition to conducting the weekly seminar, the instructor attends two of each student's classes during the semester and videotapes at least one class. The videotaped feedback has been especially valuable because it allows graduate instructors to see themselves as their students see them. Undergraduate student evaluations of the instructor's performance also provide a written source of feedback. We devised a 25-item course and instructor questionnaire that is administered twice each semester. Norms compiled for each item enable the faculty member to provide data-based comparisons of graduate instructors' performances. A factor analysis revealed that four broad dimensions are tapped:

teaching skill, rapport, organization, and course difficulty (cf. Kulik & Kulik, 1974). A student's grade for PY695 is determined by (a) how well the student meets the responsibilities of a college instructor (ranging from mundane clerical tasks to difficult intellectual challenges), (b) the student's mastery of assigned readings tested through exams, and (c) level of participation in the seminar discussions.

Our college requires instructors in all departments to administer a two-item questionnaire requesting that graduate and undergraduate students (a) rate their teacher, and (b) rate the course on a 5-point scale (5 = A, 1 = F). For the years 1986–1990, 65 graduate student instructors enrolled in PY695 received on the teacher item a mean rating of 4.17 ( $SD = .40$ ); the faculty mean was 4.27 ( $SD = .37$ ). This comparison produced a nonsignificant difference,  $t(53) = 1.22$ ,  $p > .05$ . A similar item rating of the course also resulted in nearly identical means ( $M_s = 4.04$  and  $4.05$  for graduate student instructors and faculty, respectively). Thus, on these global ratings the teaching performances of graduate students taking PY695 are indistinguishable from those of faculty members in our department. Other investigators have reported the equivalence of graduate and faculty feedback from undergraduates (e.g., Ellis & Rickard, 1977; Marsh, 1982; Nevill, Ware, & Smith, 1978).

For 10 consecutive semesters (1986–1990), graduate students enrolled in PY695 provided ratings of PY695 and their instructor on the two-item questionnaire described earlier. The mean course rating was 4.81 ( $SD = .23$ ). For the four instructors who taught the course, the mean rating was 4.93 ( $SD = .15$ ). Both of these means are well above departmental averages for graduate courses ( $M$  course rating = 4.4,  $SD = .5$ ;  $M$  instructor rating = 4.5,  $SD = .5$ ). They also exceed the college norms for graduate courses ( $M$  course rating = 4.5,  $SD = .5$ ;  $M$  instructor rating = 4.6,  $SD = .5$ ). Clearly, these graduate students hold positive views of the course and its instructors.

Each faculty review of our graduate curriculum has resulted in unanimous support for PY695 as a required course. Feedback from our doctoral graduates indicates that some form of teaching occupies a substantial portion of their professional duties. It seems probable that few courses offered in graduate psychology departments have such direct and frequent application. McKeachie (1987) argued that one's experiences during the first few months of teaching can determine whether or not a promising teaching career is realized. We believe that PY695 provides this beneficial start for our doctoral students.

## References

- Benjamin, L. T., Jr., Daniel, R. S., & Brewer, C. L. (1985). *Handbook for teaching introductory psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ellis, N. R., & Rickard, H. C. (1977). Evaluating the teaching of introductory psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 4, 128–132.
- Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. L. (1974). Student ratings of instruction. *Teaching of Psychology*, 1, 51–57.
- Lumsden, E. A., Grosslight, J. H., Loveland, E. H., & Williams, J. E. (1988). Preparation of graduate students as classroom

- teachers and supervisors in applied and research settings. *Teaching of Psychology*, 15, 5–9.
- Marsh, H. W. (1982). Validity of students' evaluation of college teaching: A multitrait-multimethod analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 264–279.
- McKeachie, W. J. (1986). *Teaching tips: A guidebook for the beginning college teacher* (8th ed.). Lexington, MA: Heath.
- McKeachie, W. J. (1987). Tips on teaching. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Darley (Eds.), *The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist* (pp. 87–113). New York: Random House.
- Neff, R. A., & Weimer, M. (1990). *Teaching college: Collected readings for the new instructor*. Madison, WI: Magna.
- Nevill, D. T., Ware, W. B., & Smith, A. B. (1978). A comparison of student ratings of teaching assistants and faculty members. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15, 25–37.

### Notes

1. We thank Norman Ellis for playing a major role in the development and initial evaluation of the course.
2. Requests for reprints or materials related to the course described in this article should be sent to Henry C. Rickard, Department of Psychology, University of Alabama, Box 870348, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487–0348.

---

## Using Psychologists' Letters to Teach About Introspection

C. James Goodwin  
*Wheeling Jesuit College*

*In the history and systems course, psychologists' letters can be used to facilitate an understanding of the introspective way of thinking and of the historical era in which introspection flourished. Excerpts from two letters illustrate how the "introspective attitude" characterized the everyday cognition of experimentalists.*

Reflecting the findings of recent scholarship, instructors have begun to teach what Furumoto (1989) called a new history of psychology. Instead of seeing the past merely as a prelude to the present and evaluating the past only with reference to present values, instructors are beginning to realize that a particular historical era must be understood on its own terms and that an understanding of psychology's history requires a knowledge of the historical context. Students, however, often have difficulty imagining what psychology was like in earlier times. They have special problems understanding psychological thought during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when psychology was the science of mental life and introspection was a standard method for analyzing conscious experience.

Students are invariably perplexed about the introspective method, and instructors are often at a loss when teaching about it. This confusion is not surprising when one considers that early experimentalists disagreed about proper introspective procedures (Danzinger, 1980) and that the introspective way of thinking is essentially nonexistent in modern experimental psychology. Although descriptions of some simple introspective exercises can be found (e.g., Caudle, 1979), trying to teach students to introspect in the brief class

time available is usually an exercise in futility, especially when one considers the extensive training once believed necessary for valid introspective results. Another approach is to assign articles that include actual introspective accounts, many of which appeared in the *American Journal of Psychology* between 1900 and 1920 (e.g., Dallenbach, 1913). Unfortunately, these articles tend to be long and tedious. Slogging one's way through one or two of these sheds some light on the appeal that Watsonian behaviorism must have had!

An approach to teaching about introspective thought that I have found effective is to have students read correspondence written by psychologists to their contemporaries. These letters are a rich source of information about the issues of the time, they provide insight into the character and personality of the writers, and they allow a glimpse into the thought processes of the writer. These letters will not teach students how to introspect, but they can show how an introspectionist's mind worked.

Although a modern experimental psychologist might think in behavioral or operational terms, the turn-of-the-century experimentalist, reflecting the "introspective attitude," usually thought about what was happening in consciousness as some event was experienced. Hence, psychologists' letters containing an introspective account of some recent event can be instructive for students. For example, consider a letter written in 1910 to Cornell University's E. B. Titchener from his close friend at Clark University, Edmund Sanford. Sanford had just returned from vacationing in New Hampshire and was writing about thunderstorms. He wrote that he had:

... observed enough this summer to find that I cannot find anything in it but organic and other sensations unpleasantly colored and, on the cognitive side, a cramp of apperception toward a small group of ideas related to the thing dreaded with certain resultants in instinctive act and thought.

... But to describe the emotion would be to tell how I scanned the clouds on days that might develop thunderstorms, how I thought out the most likely course of the bolt should the house be struck, what I should need to do in case Mrs. Sanford were injured at such a time, whether there were any place in the world where one could get to get away from such storms, etc. etc. etc. When the storm became imminent there would be cardiac and visceral symptoms to describe, etc. etc.—though when the thing was actually present these were as a general thing not so marked as in anticipation—i.e. as the storm approached. . . . [The fear] was more intense when I was in bed in the house than when I was outside where I could see more, and it was less intense in the morning—even when a morning thunderstorm seemed likely. This also was easily observed: that the emotion stirred up a whole lot of instincts usually dormant or at least covered up, instincts superstitious and almost fetishistic. (Sanford, 1910)

This letter does not discuss introspection directly, but it is quite revealing to students because it gives them a glimpse of how the method influenced psychologists' everyday observations. In another letter to Titchener, Sanford (1922) even provided an introspective account of a mild heart attack he endured!

A more dramatic example of how the introspective attitude suffused the thinking of experimentalists is an excerpt