Each of the following contributes to inaccurate perception, cognition, or conclusion.

The afterimage effect contributes to inaccurate perception. It is explained by the opponent process theory of colored vision. The theory proposes that sensory neurons for color come in pairs. When a person stares at the image of a blue and red British flag for a prolonged time and then immediately switches his view to a blank area, he will perceive a green and yellow British flag. This is because the red and blue neurons are overstimulated and become insensitive to the red and blue light in the white light, leaving the yellow and green light to make a dominant impression on sensation.

The availability heuristic contributes also to inaccurate perception. Vivid events such as a plane crash leave a dominant memory. Because the memory is easily retrieved, the person often perceives the event as occurring more frequently than it actually does.

Ethnocentrism contributes to inaccurate perception as well. People in a particular group tend to view their group as better and more diverse while other groups are not as good and more uniform. For example, students often perceive their school as better than all the other schools.

Groupthink contributes to inaccurate cognition. When differing viewpoints are not encouraged, each person in a group perceives the other group members to be in agreement in a decision and consequently suppresses his or her own different opinion. For example, at the beginning of the Kennedy presidency, the administration approved a CIA operation that later proved a failure and resulted in a large scandal. When reviewing how the administration could have unanimously approved such a flawed plan, everyone claimed they gave in to the affirmative opinion of the other people.

Lack of object permanence contributes to inaccurate conclusion. When a small child sees water being poured from a tall, thin glass to a short, wide glass, a child without object permanence often conclude there is now less water than before.

Random assignment of research participants can lead to inaccurate conclusion. For example, if a researcher wants to see if ginkgo tea has a beneficial effect on memory
and performs an experiment in a school. He gives the ginkgo tea to an AP class and the regular water to a regular class. Later he finds the AP class did better on a memory test. But the conclusion the ginkgo helps memory is wrong because the AP class had inherently better memory to start with.

Optimistic explanatory style contribute to false conclusion. For example, an extremely optimistic student repeated attributes his poor performances in concerts to a lack of practice, even though he practices many hours a day. But the truth may be the student simply lack musical talent (maybe even an ear defect). A perpetually optimistic explanatory style would prevent the student from moving on to areas where he is more suited.

Proactive interference contributes to inaccurate cognition. For example, in remembering a list of words, a person may need to remember car, truck, Toyota, and forth (a list concerning automobiles). However, the person would have a difficult time in remembering a different list of automobiles at a later time because the previous memory interferes.
The Trinachthic Theory of vision doesn't accurately explain the concepts of both color blindness and after-images (combination of colors red, green, and blue). Opponent Process Theory does allot for such concepts through due to the theory's acknowledgment of color pairs (red-green, blue-yellow, black-white). In case of after-images, when a person stares at a red spot and looks away, he or she will see an after-image of green due to this theory.

Availability heuristics is a concept which allows people to make quick judgments based on information which often is not statistically accurate but accurate to their schema. For example, a woman might be terrified of planes because of her knowledge of plane crashes based on disaster movies but drives everyday without fear of a car crash, despite the greater likelihood of a car crash.

Group think is characteristic of a group of people who come together to make an important decision that they end up all agreeing on despite opposing ideas. This is because the ideas were not voiced because of discouragement of opposing ideas. An example might be that of Kennedy's advisors on the Bay of Pigs decision. Some advisors may have actually felt opposed to the action but agreed in order.
to conform with the group's decision.

Piaget's sensorimotor stage of infancy—2 years old—says that at this stage children haven't developed object permanence due to the lack of logic and the presence of a visual cliff. A young child therefore incorrectly assumes that when he can't see an object anymore it no longer exists.

When a researcher fails to randomly assign test subjects the researcher is working under biased conditions which will not create reliable results. A researcher in order to make the experiment accurate and reliable must be blind to the assignment of his patients so he can not see results to favor his purpose.

A person who is overly optimistic (positive in expectations of outcomes) will inaccurately be able to judge the likeliness of situations results with the reality principle. A person who is overly optimistic perhaps has an under-developed ego.
An availability heuristic can lead to an inaccurate perception, cognition, or conclusion because a heuristic is a rule of thumb. Because it is a rule of thumb, it is not always accurate. Using this can lead to a wrong assumption or conclusion about a problem. The afterimage effect is when a subject is shown a group of objects, pictures, or words for a matter of seconds and then asked to recall them later. For example, a group of students are flashed a series of words for a matter of seconds and then asked to recall them. The accuracy of such a test is not very high because students do not all have the same encoding capacity. Group think is when a group of people are asked their opinion on a particular topic. They are advised to give one side of a specific problem, even though everyone might have a different opinion. This is not accurate because many groups will vote to see which side they will support. It does not take into consideration the group as an individual past but only takes into account the group as a whole. Lack of object permanence in a child can lead to confusion. For example, if you give a child a ball and the ball rolls under the couch, out of sight. The child will become distressed because it thinks the ball has disappeared into thin air. It no longer exists to the child. Nonrandom assignment of research participants leads to too many confounding variables. A group of students are asked to participate in an experiment.
They are asked whether they like action movies or romance movies. The ones who responded to liking the action movies are put in that group and same goes those who answered romantic movie as their favorite. This non-random assignment will skew the results. The experiment will not be valid because after, each group watches their respective movies and asked if they enjoyed it they will have answered yes and your experiment will not be valid and also unable to be replicated. It is better to have a double or single blind experiment. There will be less of a chance for confounding variables. Optimistic explanatory style can be misleading because if a teacher says 80% of my students pass this class what he really means is I have a 20% pass rate. This could be misleading seeing as you could be included in that 20%. That statement could persuade you to stay in that class when in fact you might be better off not taking it at all and eliminating the risk of failure. Proactive interference can screw up your results. Any interference could screw them up because most experiments do not warrant such a disturbance.
Diagnostic labeling has its advantages. For one, it allows psychologists and psychiatrists to label their patients with certain conditions and disorders, making it easier for them to prescribe a treatment. However, diagnoses are not always correct, and a false or inaccurate diagnosis could lead to ineffective or worse yet, more harmful treatments. Some believe that we should not be so quick to "label" patients with a certain disorder. I disagree. For the most part, diagnostic labeling is effective, not only providing doctors with a more helpful and accurate picture at the disorder, but patients as well. The only disorders where it is harder to see the value of diagnostic labeling is with diseases such as schizophrenia, where it is harder to tell
exactly what is wrong.

While some believe that children's acquisition of language must occur during a "critical period" that ends at a very young age, others believe that the ability to learn a language can occur at any time. Some, like psychologists who use the biological approach would argue that certain connections in the brain die when not used, which is what would occur when children did not speak a language before the age of about 12. However, a psychologist who took a "learning" approach would say that the learning of language could be based on rewards and punishments, it has nothing to do with biological factors. However, it seems that there is a proven "critical period" in which it is easier for children's "sponge-like" minds to learn a
Language: it has nothing to do with their learning capabilities; it just so happens that the brain loses connections after a certain age.

There are several theories of hypnosis, such as the role theory (which says that the hypnotized person is listening to the "hypnotizer" and feels social pressure to conform), and the state theory (which states that the hypnotized is in an altered state of consciousness). I think that the explanation lies in both: hypnosis does not take control of your mind, and you can "snap out of it" if you feel the need to do so. However, it is a state of extreme relaxedness, and so in that respect, it is an altered state consciousness.
If I had to choose, however, I would say that the state theory is more accurate because people are able to come back from their hypnotic trance refreshed, relaxed, and altered.
People favor diagnostic labels because it puts a
label and definition of psychological disorders,
making them easy to understand and treat.
Opponents to diagnostic labeling believe that many
psychological disorders such as bipolar and anxiety
disorders can overlap, making it difficult to label
and treat. They also feel that labels dehumanize the
clients.

Some believe that children are born with
a language acquisition device, that Chomsky
described in his research. This device allows children
to learn language independently from their parents
and culture. Others believe that children learn
language from reinforcement and modeling.

Some supporters of hypnosis believe it to be an
accurate way of exploring repressed, Freudian desires
and emotions. They believe that hypnosis really
works. Those that oppose hypnosis as a psycholo-
gical treatment see it as a form of pop
psychology, or psychology for fun or that has
no scientific basis.

I believe that diagnostic labels should be used
simply because combining, classifying, and treating
such an array of combined disorders would be
too difficult. Also, there are many success stories
to be found in the annals of psychology to
prove that diagnostic labeling and treatment
are helpful and do work.
I believe that Noam Chomsky was correct in his assumption that children have a language acquisition device. Language learning is a complex process that children seem to find easy until the age of 7 or 8. Even if children are raised in unloving homes that do not teach language, their mastery of the language still comes easily.

I support the idea that hypnosis is false and cannot be used as a treatment of psychological disorders. Those that do find success in hypnosis already believed in hypnosis and its abilities to begin with. This is a priming effect: they already believe it will work, so they believe and experience it to work for them. Whereas those who have doubts and speculate the validity of hypnosis do not experience its effects.
Children can be taught language skills through example as well as experience. Studies show that children learn best by example. Just as they learn things such as object permanance, they learn to communicate their desires to those who have the power to fulfill them, namely their parents. At this point in a child's life, they have not had enough experience to learn such a vital thing. Hypnosis is a very controversial issue because sometimes the way these experiments are conducted, ethics are questioned. Hypnosis has been under scrutiny before due to the validity of such a procedure. The patients, if they expect to go in there and be changed (go in as a smoker and come out a non-smoker) most likely the change will work. If a skeptic goes in more than likely their suspicions will be confirmed. With hypnosis it is all in the way your mind perceives things. I personally do not think hypnosis works.