

| EARLY CLUSTER | |
|--|--|
| Reflection on Mass Media Student A, September 23 rd at 4:15 pm | |
| <p>I think mass media (pop culture, fashion industry, advertising) is one of the most, if not most powerful influences on women and their sense of self. The culture of looking to the media for entertainment (t.v., web, magazines, movies) has given a normalcy and even mode of acceptance to women for ways in which to relate to each other. The danger though, is the power these images carry. Consciously and unconsciously they are implanted into a common ideology. We are trained to believe that money, "beauty" (of a very specific kind), and sexual allure are worthy of being "goals". Goals that are believed lead to happiness and well-being. Imbedded in anthems of "women power" is the message that this can be obtained through superficial means, albeit indirectly. For example, it is models, actresses, and pop stars who are often the "faces" of such messages. The old adage never fades, "image is everything". How is it possible to feel good about oneself in a society that honors such ideals?</p> | |
| Mass Media's Power Over Us Student B, September 26 th at 6:30 pm | Re-Envisioning Femininity Student D, September 24 th at 10:25 am |
| <p>Student A, I definitely agree with you when you said that you thought mass media is one of the most powerful influences on women and their sense of self. There are advertisements and messages for being skinny EVERYWHERE! So much so that I think we don't even really consciously realize that we are looking at an ad that's for losing weight or we see pictures of stars that we idolize and they are almost always super skinny and we relate that to beauty and wishing we could be more like them. I think it's really crazy what a hold mass media has on our attention when it comes to body image.</p> | <p>Student A's point about "women power" is related to the point in the Hesse-Biber paper about the necessity of re-visioning femininity in our culture. Striving to obtain respect or acceptance through the cultivation of a perfect body is immensely disempowering to women. Re-visioning femininity and the way it is presented in our media is crucial if we are to find a solution to this problem. But just how much have these ideas of femininity as "beauty" become integrated into our society's thinking and how long will they take to change?</p> |
| All I See Student C, September 30 th at 6:45 pm | Yes! Student A, September 30 th at 4:45 pm |
| Going off your opinion, the ubiquitousness of skinny models and celebrities emphasizes one of | Perhaps not how long will change take to occur rather than change MUST occur! Think of where |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>the points raised in the Hesse-Biber article -"the American ideal of female body image is that thinness is an indicator of success, health and control over one's body."</p> <p>However, it is important to note that mass media's influence over men isn't as strong as it is over women. Thereby, highlighting cultural messages of traditional gendered roles that women need to match up to men's "ideal."</p> | <p>women were 20 years ago, 50, 100, and so on. Like the article suggests, re-visioning femininity, media literacy, and empowerment education are solutions to the problem, we can start now if time is an issue ;)</p> |
| <p>LATER CLUSTER</p> | |
| <p>Difference between Internal and Construct Validity Student A, December 13th at 10 am</p> | |
| <p>Okay, T&D is really confusing me. It says that "internal validity is whether observed changes can be attributed to your program and not to other causes" and all it means is that there is evidence what you did caused what happened. They then go on to say, it doesn't tell you what you did was what you wanted, only that you did something. Okay I get that. But then, why would 3rd or missing variables be an issue? If you're only trying to show that SOMETHING happened, isn't the issue regarding other variables a construct validity one? And all the single-group threats are said to be essential to internal validity but they seem like construct validity to me. So confused!!!!</p> | |
| <p>Difference Student B, December 13th at 3:30 pm</p> | |
| <p>Hey, Student A, deep breaths,</p> <p>Third variables are problematic, if they are not controlled for. This is because you are not just trying to show that something happened, but that one thing CAUSED another. Construct validity is more about having legitimate inferences based on legitimate operationalizations, while internal validity has more to do with if your results/inferences are truly as a result of your IV manipulation.</p> <p>For instance, I think our null hypothesis on body dissatisfaction was supported because we did not control for history of body dissatisfaction. If based on our pretest scores, we had split those with high EDI scores into one group and those with low EDI scores into another group, then we would have controlled for that 3rd variable. However, since we had all of them in one group, the effect of our IV manipulation might have been obscured.</p> | |
| <p>What about random assignment then? Student C, December 13th at 5:30 pm</p> | |
| <p>But, Student B, if you separate those two groups based on the pre-test scores then you are not doing a random assignment of participants, so you wouldn't have a true experiment.(T&D)</p> | |
| <p>Bias Student B, December 13th at 6 pm</p> | |
| <p>That is true, but you can decide before the experiment what would be the cutoff score so as to avoid bias. For instance, Posav et al. (1998) decided before the experiment that participants who scored below 5 would be placed in the group of participants who had low body dissatisfaction before the experiment, and vice versa. That way systematic bias is avoided.</p> | |
| <p>Selection-regression threat</p> | <p>Another way to solve it</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Student C, December 13 th at 7 pm | Student A, December 14 th at 9 am |
| <p>Student B, I understand that in your example you would be avoiding bias, but you still lack random assignment which is the main problem with our study.</p> <p>Now, if you put participants with low scores in the same group aren't you setting up conditions for selection-regression threat to internal validity? According to T&D, "this might happen if one group is more extreme on the pretest than the other". It sounds to me like their body dissatisfaction can't get any worse, so their scores would reflect that. Or maybe since we have a formula to correct that threat then we don't have to worry about it. Is that your thinking?</p> <p>ps. Thanks for your patience.</p> | <p>Hmm, I think this is kind of a predicament. Both books (T&D and Stanovich) emphasize the random assignment for a true experiment. Perhaps the Posav et al. would not be considered one? Would a control group solve this?</p> <p>That way effects in the manipulated group could be compared with those in the control and the 3rd variables and systematic bias would be balanced out (probabilistic equivalence).</p> |
| Value of true experiment Student A, December 14 th at 9:45 am | |
| <p>Hi Ladies,</p> <p>So if now we're talking about setting up a different experiment, using multiple groups then there would be a new set of strengths and weaknesses, such as selection-regression threat and others. If we were to use Student B's model it wouldn't be a true experiment (lack of random assignment) but that makes me wonder, is a true experiment more "valuable" than a quasi-experiment? Stanovich says that non true experiments give us valuable information too. Is a true experiment the most scientifically sound and therefore stands up to critiques better?</p> | |
| Certainty Student D, December 15 th at 12 pm | |
| <p>Student A, that is such an interesting question. It makes me think about what we were discussing in class about how experiments don't prove people right- they can only bring us closer to the truth. Maybe it's a bit like small effects. And it seems like a quasi-experiment, which is used most often for social research for a reason, has just as much potential to keep bringing us closer to the truth,</p> | |



because even a true experiment only tells you so much and doesn't really come with guarantees.
The quote I was thinking of in class is:

No amount of experimentation can ever prove me right; a single experiment can prove me wrong. - Albert Einstein

And I love this next one, because it sort of softens the blow of the Einstein one:

When one admits that nothing is certain, one must, I think, also add that some things are more nearly certain than others. -Bertrand Russell

So, every quality experiment (meaning not totally flawed) brings us something helpful...



Knowledge Building Principles¹

- 1. Working at the cutting edge**
 - a. Identify knowledge gaps, inconsistencies and ask productive questions
 - b. Pose problems that extend the edge of the understanding of the community
 - c. Pose problems with potential for continual discussion and inquiry
 - d. Connect theories to real world issues, problems, and examples

- 2. Progressive problem solving**
 - a. Show continual efforts to grapple with problems posed by classmates
 - b. Pose notes that address the original problems and questions arising from them
 - c. Show sustained inquiry: identify the problem, solve the problem, and keep asking questions
 - d. Reinvest efforts to keep solving new problems and improving ideas

- 3. Collaborative effort**
 - a. Summarize different ideas and viewpoints and put them together as a better theory
 - b. Help classmates to extend and improve their understanding
 - c. Encourage classmates to write notes that follow the other principles

- 4. Monitoring own understanding**
 - a. Explain what you did not know and what you have learned
 - b. Recognize discrepancies, misconceptions, and new insights; trace your own paths of understanding
 - c. Show your new ways of looking at questions, ideas, and issues after examining other Knowledge Forum notes

- 5. Constructive uses of authoritative sources**
 - a. Use information from different sources (e.g., class readings, empirical and theoretical articles, newspapers, internet) to support, explain, and refute ideas
 - b. Bring together classroom learning, information from different sources, and Knowledge Forum notes
 - c. Provide contrasting or conflicting information to what is printed in the class readings or other referenced materials and/or critique information as presented

¹ Adapted from Lee, Chan, & Aalst (2006)



How to Use Knowledge Forum

1. From any internet browser, link to:
<http://128.100.72.137:8080/kforum/home.xhtml>
2. You need to register as a new user.
3. Once you are registered, you will be back at the login page. Use the username / password you just created to login.
4. You will be on a page asking for an access code. The code is **12mSS15**. Click register.
5. You should see **Bryn_Mawr_Conference_May_2015** with an option to enter community. Click **Enter community**. This should put you on our welcome page.