CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

_____ (suggested length of 1-2 pages)

A.

List all your PLO in this box. Indicate for each PLO its alignment ith one or more institutional learning outcomes (ILO). !or example" #PLO 1. $pply ad%anced computer science theory to computation problems (ILO 2 & ').(

1. Identify key concepts, principles, and applications of psychology's content domains.
2. Apply scientific reasoning to interpret psychological phenomena and to design and conduct basic psychological research (ILO 1 ! ritical "hinking#.
$. %&aluate the ethics of psychological science and practice.
'. ( emonstrate effecti&e communication skills (ILO 2 ) ritten ! ommunication#.
*. ( escribe career options +ithin psychology.

, .

List the PLO(s) assessed. Pro%ide a brief bac)ground on your program*s history of assessing the PLO(s) (e.g.+ annually+ first time+ part of other assessments+ etc.)

( uring the 2-1./2-10 school year, +e assessed 1LO ' using the !23%, ILO ) ritten ! ommunication 4ubric +ith our ad&anced research classes (125 ! '617'6$#. ( uring the 2-10/2-18 school year, +e created a 1*/9uestion online multiple/choice test to e&aluate 1LOs 1 and 2 in beginner and ad&anced students. ( uring the 2-18/2-16 school year, +e further de&eloped the online multiple/choice test to assess a broader range of content areas under 1LO 1 and added 9uestions to assess 1LO $ (28 9uestions#. "his year (2-16/2-2-#, +e used an empirical article analysis assignment to e&aluate 1LO 2. ) e also submitted our student assignments to assist the uni&ersity's assessment of ILO 1.

! .

,ummari-e your assessment process briefly using the follo ing sub-headings.

(include if ne or old instrument+ ho de%eloped+ description of content)

2tudents read a short empirical article and ans+ered eight 9uestions that assessed their critical thinking ability. =irst, +e e&aluated students' understanding of the article content by asking 9uestions about the theory underlying the research pro›ect, the operationali?ation of &ariables in the study, the researchers' hypotheses and rationale, and the results. ; e<t, +e e&aluated +hether students could recogni?e pros and cons to the researchers' approach and identify possible alternati&e e<planations for the results. Lastly, +e asked students to design a follo+/ up study that operationali?ed the key &ariable in a different +ay. 2ee Appendi< A for complete assignment.

"he assessment committee ( ( rs. @orne, Layous, and Little# e&aluated student responses (each student e&aluated by t+o raters#. =or each student, e&aluators pro&ided ratings on the Institutional Learning Outcome ! ritical "hinking 4ubric (appro&ed by Academic 2enate Aarch 2-1.# and also pro&ided ratings on more specific 9uestions of interest to the psychology department (e.g., @o+ +ell did the student design their o+n study o&erallB#. 2ee Appendi< , for complete e&aluation.

Our sample ( .

across students for items on the ILO !ritical "hinking rubric. "able 2 includes the mean and standard de&iation across students for the 1sychology (epartment's more specific 9uestions.

"able 1

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| %<planation of Issues | 2.'$ | -..* |
| 3se of %&idence | 2.6- | -.8$ |
| !onte<t, assumptions | 2.$1 | -.61 |
| Alternati&e &ie+points | 2.10 | -..2 |
| 2tatement of position | 2.2' | -..1 |
| !onclusions, implications, and conse9uences | 2.21 | -..2 |

"able 2

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| @o+ +ell did the student e<plain sociometer theoryB | $.1. | 1.'$ |
| @o+ +ell did the student state the hypothesisB | $..6 | 1.-1 |
| @o+ +ell did the student e&aluate the design of the studiesB | 2.60 | 1.1$ |
| @o+ +ell did the student design their o+n study o&erallB | 2..' | 1.-8 |
| @o+ +ell did the student operationali?e social inclusionB | 2.** | 1.2$ |
| @o+ +ell did the student state the implications7importance of their ne+ly designed studyB | 2.26 | 1.1. |

(.

,ummari-e your assessment results briefly using the follo ing sub-headings

On the ILO rubric ('/point scale, +ith higher scores indicating better responses#, all a&erages e<cept D3se of %&idenceE +ere closer to 2 than $, indicating that students pro&ided some e&idence of skill in the area (scores +ere not 1#, but perhaps missed important points or did no

more specific 9uestions, students scored near the midpoint (*/point scale, +ith higher scores indicating better responses#. "hey scored highest +hen asked to state the authors' hypotheses, but the lo+est +hen asked to design their o+n study and pro&ide the reasons +hy this study +ould be important.

(changes in course content+ course se/uence+ student ad%ising)

Although +e had some promising e&idence that students can e<tract research hypotheses and results from a professional empirical article in their field, +e also found e&idence that students struggled to go beyond the basic facts of the presented study. 2pecifically, they +ere not able to pro&ide strong alternati&e &ie+points to the findings or implications of the research. =urthermore, they struggled to design a ne+ study and pro&ide rationale for +hy their ne+ study +ould be important. "hus, students may understand research that has been conducted, but not necessarily ha&e the skills to 9uestion it or impro&e upon it. Additionally, another surprising finding +as that most students did not understand +hat an operational definition is, and this likely affected responses to se&eral 9uestions. Our suggestions for program impro&ement +ould be to encourage instructors teaching courses in the 1sychology (epartment to pro&ide more opportunities for students to +ork on these skills, e&en in courses

In the future, it +ould be nice to compare our ad&anced students (125 ! '617'6$# to our ne+er students (e.g., in 125 ! 2--# to see +hether ad&anced students scored better on this assignmen than ne+er students like +e ha&e done on the online sub›ect matter assessment (2-10/2-18 and 2-18/2-16#. "hat gro+th +ould indicate success in our research classes that +e cannot presently infer based on mean scores from ad&anced students alone. "he results of this assessment are positi&e in that students seemed to understand the presented research, but also lea&e room for impro&ement in students' critical e&aluation of the research and potential contribution to ne+ kno+ledge.

%.

,ummari-e your assessment plans for the next year+ including the PLO(s) you plan to assess+ any re%isions to the program assessment plan presented in your last fi%e-year plan self-study+ and any other rele%ant information.

( uring spring semester of 2-21, +e plan to e&aluate 1LO $ (understanding of ethics# +ith four

Article Analysis Assignment

As part of the ongoing commitment to improve our instructional programs, CSUEB periodically conducts secondary reviews of randomly selected student work on key assignments. This is only to help faculty improve the curriculum and will NOT affect your grade. The purpose of this particular assignment is to assess your critical thinking skills, including your ability to interpret scientific findings and design studies to test psychological phenomena. Faculty from the Psychology Department and from other departments at CSUEB will evaluate your work to guide future changes to our curriculum and teaching methods. Please complete the assignment to the best of your ability to represent your knowledge accurately

To complete this assignment, please follow these instructions carefully. Download the Burr and Rainone (2017) article (PDF) and WKH ³$UWLFOH $QDO\VLV´ :RUG GRFXPHQW DQG 5DLQRQH DUWLFOH DQG W\SH \RXU DQVZHUV WR Word document. Once finished, SOHDVH XSORDG \RXU FRPSOHWHG ³$UWLFOH document to the designated assignment in Blackboard. Please DO NOT include your name inside the document (simply uploading the assignment on Blackboard will let your instructor know tor k(il)-3(l

to have your name.

1. What theory were these studies testing? Briefly explain the theory.

6RFLRPHWHU WKHRU\ 6RFLRPHWHU WKHRU\ is related to the perceptions that of their social value. As they receive indications that they are valued by others, their self-esteem should go up. As they receive cues of rejection, their self-esteem should go down.

2. :KDW ZDV WKH UHVHDUFK HUV¶ K\SRWKHVLV"

Their hypothesis was WKDW SHRSOH ZKR UHFHLYHG PRUH ³OLNHV´ [C

would

and how many likes their profile pictures tend to receive on average. Researchers used the average number of likes as a predictor of self-esteem.

Study 2 ± Researchers manipulated number of likes received. They stated that they were piloting a new social media site and they needed to take a selfie to upload to their personal profile. After taking the selfie, the experimenter claimed to upload the picture to the site and leave it displayed for five minutes. After the five minutes had passed, participants were told that, compared to other pilot testing, their selfie had received either average, below average, or above average likes.

5. Please summarize the results from Study 1 and Study 2. Also note whether these results supported the author's hypothesis.

In both studies, authors found support for their prediction that a sense of purpose moderated the relationship between social media likes and self-esteem. In both studies, the number of likes received was only related to self-esteem among those with a lower sense of purpose. In other words, if one had lower sense of purpose, their self-esteem was contingent on social media likes. Astute students may notice that number of social media likes was not related to self-esteem overall (or in the regression model). The authors glazed over that point. However, in Study 2, researchers did find a main effect of social media likes, as well as the hypothesized interaction.

6. Evaluate the design of Study 1 and Study 2, listing both pros and cons about each study. Which hypothesis was best supported?

Study 1 ± Self-reporting number of likes on profile pictures is not ideal due to potential for social desirability or memory biases to affect accurate reporting. Also, Study 1 is a correlational design, so we cannot infer that likes affected self-esteem. For example, it is possible that people with higher self-esteem garner more likes due to other aspects of their personality (e.g., extraversion), rather than the number of likes affecting their self-esteem.

Study 2 is an experiment, so addresses some of the shortfalls of Study 1. Because people were randomly assigned to receive a certain number of likes, we can be more sure that number of likes is what accounts for their differences in self-esteem. Although the hypothesized relationship between likes and self-esteem was found, I wondered how believable the cover story was to participants. The findings in the real world might be even stronger as people would be able to experience the dynamic nature of the likes (who they are from, how much time passes before getting a like, etc. Thus, just being told the number of likes with no other information may have actually undermined/attenuated the true relationship between likes and self-esteem. In addition, in both studies, purpose was self-reported. It would have been nice if purpose could have also been manipulated (perhaps through a writing activity) so that we could have inferred causality. In both studies, self-reported purpose was very highly related to self-reported self-esteem, so would have been nice to have purpose operationalized in a different way to reduce common method variance and to infer causality.

I could see students saying Study 1 was stronger because it was more externally valid, but I

2YHUDOO , WKLQN WKH DXWKRUV¶ FRQFOXVLRQV ZHUH DSS
discuss the nonsignficant relationship between likes and self

because they are already guided by a sense of connection with and service to others. This hypothesis is further supported by previous studies that have found that individuals with strong civic and prosocial orientations tend to use Facebook for informational reasons rather than status enhancement or socialization ( Park, Kee, & Valenzuela, 2009), and emo-

## 2.1. Methods

### 2.1.1. Participants and procedure

Participants were 102 undergraduate students (74% female) aged 18 to 31 ( $M_{age}$ = 20.14, SD= 1.84) at a large northeastern university. Six respondents were omitted because they failed an attention check. Based on an anticipated small effect size (Cohen's $f^2$ = 0.1), a power analysis determined a sample size of 114 would be required to reach adequate power of 0.80. Data collection did not depend on any analysis of results.

Participants began the study by completing a demographics form, a measure of purpose in life ( = 0.84; same as described in Study 1), and a personality inventory that was not included in present analysis because it was administered pre-manipulation and, as a covariate, was found not to account for the hypothesized effects in Study 1. After completing the survey, an experimenter explained to participants that the aim of the study was to pilot test a new social media site that resembled Facebook (in actuality no new site had been created). Participants were told that in order to test some of the features of the interactive features of site, they would need to create a new personal pro le by taking a photograph of themselves to be uploaded by the experimenter. The experimenter then provided participants with a digital camera and asked them to take a sel e. After taking the sel e, the experimenter ostensibly uploaded the photograph to the site by connecting the camera to a computer with a monitor that was not visible to participants. Participants were told their photograph was being displayed for 5 min and that other users would have the chance to view and like their picture. While they waited for their results, participants completed a word- nd task designed as a distraction. After 5 min had passed, participants were given randomized feedback about their sel e. Speci cally, they were told that compared to pilot testing, their sel e had received the average number of likes (27 likes; n = 32), above the average number of likes (48 likes; n = 30), or below the average number of likes (6 likes; n = 34). Finally, participants completed a post-manipulation measure of self-esteem ( = 0.91; same as Study 1).

## 2.2. Results and discussion

Across participants, both purpose ( M = 4.11, SD= 0.63) and self-esteem ( M = 3.84, SD= 0.72) were above the midpoint on both scales, and were positively correlated, r = 0.58, p b 0.001.

To establish that our manipulation operated in a manner consistent with sociometer theory, we rst examined whether self-esteem was in- uenced by condition. An omnibus ANOVA revealed that participants in the high likes condition ( M = 4.12, SD= 0.55) reported signi cantly higher self-esteem than those who received a low ( M = 3.74, SD= 0.79) or average ( M SDSDSD

accomplish aims they believe are of signi cant social value. However, it is important to note that while purposeful individuals may be less reactive to the number of likes they receive on a sel e, such feedback on content intended to be more representative of their life pursuits (e.g., status updates about one's future goals, or shared video clips detailing

3RZHUHG E\ 4XDOWULFV