

Start WITH A Story

The Case Study Method of
Teaching College Science

Edited by Clyde Freeman Herreid

NSTApress
NATIONAL SCIENCE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
Arlington, Virginia



Claire Reinburg, Director
Judy Cusick, Senior Editor
J. Andrew Cocke, Associate Editor
Betty Smith, Associate Editor
Robin Allan, Book Acquisitions Coordinator

ART AND DESIGN, Will Thomas, Jr., Director

PRINTING AND PRODUCTION, Catherine Lorrain, Director
Nguyet Tran, Assistant Production Manager
Jack Parker, Electronic Prepress Technician

NATIONAL SCIENCE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
Gerald F. Wheeler, Executive Director
David Beacom, Publisher

Copyright © 2007 by the National Science Teachers Association.
All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.
09 08 07 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Herreid, Clyde Freeman.

Start with a story: the case study method of teaching college science / by Clyde Freeman Herreid.

p. cm.

ISBN-13: 978-1-933531-06-9

1. Science--Study and teaching (Higher)--United States. 2. Science--Study and teaching--Case studies.

3. Teachers--Training of--Case studies. I. Title.

Q183.3.A1H44 2006

507.1'173--dc22

2006027392

NSTA is committed to publishing quality materials that promote the best in inquiry-based science education. However, conditions of actual use may vary and the safety procedures and practices described in this book are intended to serve only as a guide. Additional precautionary measures may be required. NSTA and the author(s) do not warrant or represent that the procedure and practices in this book meet any safety code or standard or federal, state, or local regulations. NSTA and the author(s) disclaim any liability for personal injury or damage to property arising out of or relating to the use of this book, including any recommendations, instructions, or materials contained therein.

Permission is granted in advance for photocopying brief excerpts for one-time use in a classroom or workshop. Permissions requests for coursepacks, textbooks, electronic reproduction, and other commercial uses should be directed to Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Dr., Danvers, MA 01923; fax 978-646-8600; www.copyright.com.

This material is based upon work supported by NSF under Grants #0341279, #0618570, and #9752799 and a Higher Education Reform Grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and editor and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF or The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Contents

FOREWORD.....	xii
INTRODUCTION	xiii
SECTION I: THE CASE FOR CASES: WE NEED A NEW APPROACH.....	1
Chapter 1 Chicken Little, Paul Revere, and Winston Churchill Look at Science Literacy	3 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
Chapter 2 The Maiden and the Witch: The Crippling Undergraduate Experience	15 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
Chapter 3 Saint Anthony and the Chicken Poop: An Essay on the Power of Storytelling in the Teaching of Science	19 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
Chapter 4 Storyteller's Box: Opening the Doors to Science Case Studies	25 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
SECTION II: WHAT ARE CASE STUDIES?.....	27
Chapter 5 Case Studies in Science: A Novel Method of Science Education	29 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
Chapter 6 What Is a Case? Bringing to Science Education the Established Teaching Tool of Law and Medicine	41 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
Chapter 7 What Makes a Good Case? Some Basic Rules of Good Storytelling Help Teachers Generate Excitement in the Classroom.....	45 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
Chapter 8 The Business End of Cases	49 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>
SECTION III: TYPES OF CASE STUDIES	53
Chapter 9 Sorting Potatoes for Miss Bonner: Bringing Order to Case Study Methodology Through a Classification System	55 <i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>

SECTION IV: HOW TO TEACH WITH CASE STUDIES: AN OVERVIEW.....61

- Chapter 10 Can Case Studies Be Used to Teach Critical Thinking? 63
Clyde Freeman Herreid
- Chapter 11 Naming Names: The Greatest Secret in Leading a Discussion Is
Using Students' Names 67
Clyde Freeman Herreid
- Chapter 12 Opening Day: Getting Started in a Cooperative Classroom 71
Frank J. Dinan
- Chapter 13 Using Students as Critics in Faculty Development 75
Clyde Freeman Herreid and Arnold I. Kozak

SECTION V: WHOLE CLASS DISCUSSION: THE CLASSICAL METHOD.....83

- Chapter 14 Using Novels as Bases for Case Studies: Michael Crichton's *State of Fear*
and Global Warming 85
Clyde Freeman Herreid
- Chapter 15 Journal Articles as Case Studies: The *New England Journal of Medicine* on
Breast Cancer: Promoting Critical Thinking in Science 89
Clyde Freeman Herreid
- Chapter 16 Bad Blood: A Case Study of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project..... 99
Ann W. Fourtner, Charles R. Fourtner, and Clyde Freeman Herreid
- Chapter 17 Case Study Teaching in Science: A Dilemma Case on "Animal Rights"111
Clyde Freeman Herreid
- Chapter 18 Is There Life on Mars? Debating the Existence of Extraterrestrial Life
in a Classroom Dilemma Case..... 119
Bruce C. Allen and Clyde Freeman Herreid

SECTION VI: SMALL GROUP METHODS: AN OVERVIEW125

- Chapter 19 Why Isn't Cooperative Learning Used to Teach Science?127
Clyde Freeman Herreid
- Chapter 20 The Bee and the Groundhog: Lessons in Cooperative Learning—
Troubles With Groups137
Clyde Freeman Herreid

Chapter 21	I Never Knew Joe Paterno: An Essay on Teamwork and Love.....	141
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 22	The Pima Experience: Three Easy Pieces.....	147
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION VII: PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING		151
Chapter 23	The Death of Problem-Based Learning?	153
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 24	AIDS and the Duesberg Phenomenon	157
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 25	The Petition: A Global Warming Case Study	161
	<i>Bruce C. Allen and Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION VIII: INTERRUPTED CASE METHOD		167
Chapter 26	The Interrupted Case Method	169
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 27	Mom Always Liked You Best: Examining the Hypothesis of Parental Favoritism	171
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION IX: INTIMATE DEBATE METHOD		179
Chapter 28	The Intimate Debate Method: Should Marijuana Be Legalized for Medicinal Purposes?.....	181
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid and Kristie DuRei</i>	
SECTION X: TEAM-BASED LEARNING		187
Chapter 29	Larry Finally Wrote His Book: Team-Based Learning Has Its Bible	189
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 30	Using Case Studies in Science—And Still “Covering the Content”	195
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 31	An Application of Team Learning in Dental Education.....	205
	<i>Frank A. Scannapieco and Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	

Chapter 32	Of Mammoths and Men: A Case Study in Extinction.....	211
	<i>Nancy A. Schiller and Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION XI: LARGE CLASS METHODS		219
Chapter 33	“Clicker” Cases: Introducing Case Study Teaching Into Large Classrooms ..	221
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 34	The Case of the Druid Dracula: A Directed “Clicker” Case Study on DNA Fingerprinting.....	227
	<i>Peggy Brickman</i>	
SECTION XII: INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDY METHODS		237
Chapter 35	Dialogues as Case Studies—A Discussion on Human Cloning: Creating Drama and Controversy in the Science Classroom	239
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 36	Student Paper on the Atlantic Salmon Controversy.....	247
	<i>Helena Bokobza</i>	
SECTION XIII: HYBRID CASE METHODS.....		251
Chapter 37	Alien Evolution—A Futuristic Case Study: The Return of the Cambrian Explosion	253
	<i>Shoshana Tobias and Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 38	What to Do About Mother: Investigating Fetal Tissue Research and the Effects of Parkinson’s Disease	265
	<i>Ann W. Fourtner, Charles R. Fourtner, and Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 39	The Galapagos: A Natural Laboratory for the Study of Evolution	271
	<i>Nancy A. Schiller and Clyde F. Herreid</i>	
Chapter 40	Structured Controversy—A Case Study Strategy: DNA Fingerprinting in the Courts	285
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 41	A Word to the Wise? Advising Freshmen	295
	<i>Jessica Dudek, Nigel Marriner, and Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION XIV: THE DIRECTED CASE METHOD.....		299

Chapter 42	The Directed Case Method: Teaching Concept and Process in a Content-Rich Course	301
	<i>William H. Cliff and Leslie Nesbitt Curtin</i>	
Chapter 43	Little Mito: The Story of the Origins of a Cell	307
	<i>Stephanie Vail and Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 44	The Death of Baby Pierre: A Genetic Mystery	313
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 45	The Case of the Dividing Cell: Mitosis and Meiosis in the Cellular Court.....	319
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION XV: HOW NOT TO TEACH WITH CASE STUDIES		331
Chapter 46	Return to Mars: How Not to Teach a Case Study	333
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 47	Why a “Case-Based” Course Failed: An Analysis of an Ill-Fated Experiment...	339
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 48	DON’T! What Not to Do When Teaching Case Studies	343
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION XVI: HOW TO WRITE CASE STUDIES.....		349
Chapter 49	Case Studies and the Media	351
	<i>Frank J. Dinan</i>	
Chapter 50	Cooking With Betty Crocker: A Recipe for Case Study Writing	355
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 51	Too Much, Too Little, or Just Right? How Much Information Should We Put Into a Case Study?	361
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 52	The Way of Flesch: The Art of Writing Readable Cases.....	365
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 53	Twixt Fact and Fiction: A Case Writer’s Dilemma	371
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 54	An Open or Shut Case? Contrasting Approaches to Case Study Design	375
	<i>William H. Cliff and Leslie M. Nesbitt</i>	

Chapter 55	Racism and All Sorts of Politically Correct <i>Isms</i> in Case Studies. What Are We to Do?	381
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION XVII: HOW TO WRITE CASE STUDY TEACHING NOTES.....		385
Chapter 56	And All That Jazz: An Essay Extolling the Virtues of Writing Case Teaching Notes	387
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION XVIII: HOW TO GRADE STUDENTS USING CASE-BASED TEACHING.....		393
Chapter 57	When Justice Peeks: Evaluating Students in Case Study Teaching	395
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
SECTION XIX: ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF THE CASE STUDY PROCESS		401
Chapter 58	Coplas de Ciego	405
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 59	Assessment of Case Study Teaching: Where Do We Go From Here? Part I....	407
	<i>Mary A. Lundeberg and Aman Yadav</i>	
Chapter 60	Assessment of Case Study Teaching: Where Do We Go From Here? Part II...	413
	<i>Mary A. Lundeberg and Aman Yadav</i>	
SECTION XX: THE FUTURE OF CASE TEACHING.....		421
Chapter 61	Paul Seymour, Assistant Professor: A Dilemma Case in Teaching.....	423
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 62	Teaching in the Year 2061.....	429
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Chapter 63	E-Mail From Socrates.....	437
	<i>Clyde Freeman Herreid</i>	
Appendix I	About the Authors	443
Appendix II	Original Chapter References.....	445

Dedication

For Jan

Kimberly, John, Ky, Jennifer

Sierra, Roxanna, Miranda, Phoebe, and Ayden

Teachers and Students All.

Foreword

Clyde (Kipp) Herreid's work in creating and compiling case studies for undergraduate science instruction and developing case methods previously reserved mainly for law and medical students stands as a major contribution to undergraduate science instruction, fulfilling the vision we had when we invited him to write a regular column on case instruction for the *Journal of College Science Teaching* more than a decade ago. The quality of those columns was so high and their content often so innovative that we soon invited him to prepare an extra annual issue devoted exclusively to case instruction.

For many of us who had experienced much of our science preparation through lectures, the cases presented in Kipp's columns were often exciting to read because they gave us a new methodology that clearly had the potential to enrich our own teaching. Instead of only helping students master material in a text, we had to think about the case problem and ways to approach it. In addition, these cases were interesting enough that we would read cases in disciplines other than our own, often finding issues and connections requiring cross-disciplinary approaches. Cases provide ample opportunity for students to think creatively. They can be used as stand-alone activities or in combination with texts and journal articles. Used thoughtfully, they can help instructors convey a sense of scientific inquiry that more traditional approaches might find difficult to match.

Watching Kipp leading NSF Chautauqua short courses on the case method for college faculty was always illuminating because of the way he involved participants. It is not easy to sustain any group's interest during three solid days of instruction, to say nothing of the challenge of motivating experienced instructors, but by using cases, Kipp was able to do so with aplomb. He made it look easy, but he is a master teacher with many years of experience. Now, this special volume will enable us to have at our fingertips Kipp's thoughtful analyses of ways to use cases in many classroom settings. This fine collection deserves a place on the book shelf of all those who want to enrich their own teaching and should surely be standard issue for new faculty and graduate teaching assistants. Our community of teaching scientists has a rare resource here and we have Kipp Herreid, his colleagues at the National Center for Case Study Teaching in Science and the other contributors to this volume to thank for it.

*Les Paldy, Editor Emeritus, Journal of College Science Teaching, Distinguished Service Professor,
Stony Brook University, State University of New York*

INTRODUCTION

I first heard about case study teaching from a neighbor—a lawyer who had taught at Cornell University and had been trained at Harvard. He and I were standing in the middle of our country road talking about teaching and education, as it was in the first few hours of our acquaintance. I asked him how he taught law. He paused and then said the magic words, “I use case studies.”

He explained that lawyers used real cases in their classrooms to teach the principles of law and precedence. They discussed this with their students, teaching law as they used case after case. They had been doing this for a hundred years.

I had been searching for new ways of teaching for a long time. The lecture method had paled for me over time. I didn’t know it then, but well over a thousand studies had demonstrated the inferiority of the lecture method compared to active learning strategies. I had started out my teaching career like so many young PhDs without a shred of training and was thrown into the classroom and told to “teach.” So, I taught like my mentors—I lectured. As I suffered through my first year’s teaching, racing through my lectures, pouring out all of the information that I had gleaned the night before, scrambling to keep ahead of the students, never once did it occur to me that there were other ways to teach. True, I had heard strange rumblings that other methods were being used on the other side of campus. There were rumors that people in “the humanities” actually used something called DISCUSSION. Now here was my neighbor talking about it again.

To be truthful, I had tried holding a discussion with students in my class from time to time with notable failure. Without warning, in the middle of my physiology lectures, I tried asking a few questions in moments of heroic chutzpa, but to no avail. I would ask questions like “What is the simple abbreviation for sodium?” Not a single eye met my inquiring gaze. None of the students dared look at me for fear that their gaze might be misinterpreted as being willing to speak. Pleading for an answer was beneath me, so like so many teachers before me, I started lecturing again. Only later, did I realize that even if someone had answered my sodium question, this would hardly lead to a discussion. But, my quest for different teaching methods was not to be stopped. I could not get over the fact that I, like so many of my colleagues, was giving a large percentage of F, D, and Withdrawal grades in my introductory science classes, 40% to be exact. This hardly seemed like success.

Years later, I ran into a paper discussing an experiment at Arizona State University. The chemistry department was teaching large numbers of introductory students. They had several sections of the course taught by faculty of different abilities. All of the sections had a common exam. When they compared the grades of the students in the different sections, they found to their surprise that there were no differences among the different sections regardless of the teaching reputation of the instructors! Physics teacher Richard Hake reported similar findings in his survey of 6,000 students taking introductory physics: The skill of the lecturer did not appear to make much difference in the student performance on tests. With these results, you can see why I might look for an alternate approach to teaching.

In my quest for the perfect method, I ran into work by Professor James Conant, a chemist at Harvard, who was President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's science adviser during World War II. He returned from his experience convinced that the public did not understand the way science worked and vowed to change his teaching at Harvard as a result. He created a science course using case studies. This was a lecture course where Conant explored the discovery of great principles, such as the second law of thermodynamics. Over a series of lectures he traced the development of the idea as it came to fruition through fits and spurts, good and bad science. The course apparently did not survive him, although his lectures did make it into print.

Then I heard about McMaster University's medical school, in Ontario, Canada. They, too, were using a case study approach to teaching. But no lectures at all! They based their entire curriculum around cases using a method called Problem-Based Learning. They put all of their students in small groups of, say, a dozen students with a faculty facilitator. Students were given a patient's history and asked to diagnose the problem. When this was complete they received another case. And so it went—case after case, small groups learning the subject on a need-to-know basis, receiving the problem in sections.

So, here was my dilemma: In three different situations I had found people using the term *case study teaching*. All were enthusiastic. Yet, plainly they were doing very different things in the classroom: law professors were leading discussions; Conant was lecturing; and the medical professors were using small groups. The conclusion was obvious: The definition of case studies could not depend upon the method of instruction.

So what was the essence of case studies? I decided to make it simple. "Case studies are stories with an educational message." That's it. The moment that I realized this, I was suddenly free to create stories with different formats for different purposes. Moreover, when I started running workshops, many faculty who only knew of the Harvard discussion model and were dreadfully afraid of it suddenly saw that there were other excellent methods that they could capitalize on the use of stories.

What's the magic of stories? People love stories. Stories put learning into context. Lectures often don't do this. They are abstract with mountains of facts. Sheila Tobias, in her book *They're Not Dumb, They're Different*, described the disagreeable nature of the lecture method. She pointed out that science majors are much more tolerant of the dull recitation of facts than non-majors. Even the redoubtable Richard Feynman spoke of his frustration with science education in the preface to his *Lectures in Physics* saying, "I think the system is a failure." He summarized, "The best teaching can be done only when there is a direct individual relationship between a student and a good teacher—a situation in which the student discusses the ideas, thinks about the things, and talks about the things. It is impossible to learn very much simply by sitting in lecture."

Clearly, I agree. And several granting agencies have been willing to give me a chance to find out if the method(s) can be used to teach basic science. For this I thank them most gratefully: The U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education; The Pew Charitable Trusts; and the National Science Foundation. In addition, I thank my colleagues who have helped develop many of the ideas that form many of the essays in this collection, especially my Co-PI on several of these grants: Nancy Schiller.

Together, we have been able to establish the National Center for Case Study Teaching in Science (<http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/projects/cases/case.html>). This center puts on workshops and conferences where we extol the virtues of case study teaching to thousands of faculty over the years. Its website has hundreds of cases and teaching notes written by faculty across the

world and has thousands of visitors each day. This is truly amazing to me and is a remarkable testimony to the fact that faculty are finally trying out different teaching methods. The case study method has come of age.

In this book I have gathered together many of the columns that I have written for the *Journal of College Science Teaching* over the years. Les Paldy, longtime editor of the journal, was kind enough to ask me to start publishing these essays a dozen years ago and indeed it was he who suggested that I put this collection together so that readers could more readily access the articles. This book is the result. I have not attempted to modify the essays themselves. They stand as they were written. As a consequence, there is some redundancy and perhaps some gaps. I have attempted to smooth over the bumps by writing commentary along the way. Also, I have asked several of my colleagues to contribute to this book by including their essays that deal with important aspects of the case study approach. Hopefully, readers will find the essays useful.

It seems fitting to put case study teaching into a larger context. There is no one better able to do this than the late Carl Sagan, whose work in astronomy and relentless search for ways to engage the public resulted in outstanding books and a television special, *Cosmos*. In his last public appearance reported in the *Skeptical Inquirer* (29: 29–37, 2005), knowing he was dying of cancer, he was asked a question: “Do you have any thought on what path might be taken to remedy [the bad name of science]?”

Sagan replied,

“I think one, perhaps, is to present science as it is, as something dazzling, as something tremendously exciting, as something eliciting feelings of reverence and awe, as something that our lives depend upon. If it isn’t presented that way, if it’s presented in very dull textbook fashion, then of course people will be turned off. If the chemistry teacher is the basketball coach, if the school boards are unable to get support for the new bond issue, if teachers’ salaries, especially in the sciences, are very low, if very little is demanded of our students in terms of homework and original class time, if virtually every newspaper in the country has a daily astrology column and hardly any of them has a weekly science column, if the Sunday morning pundit shows never discuss science, if every one of the commercial television networks has somebody designated as science reporter but he (it’s always a he) never presents any science (it’s all technology and medicine), if an intelligent remark on science never has been uttered in living memory by a president of the United States, if in all of television there are no action-adventure series in which the hero or heroine is someone devoted to finding out how the universe works, if spiffy jackets attractive to the opposite sex are given to students who do well in football, basketball, and baseball but none are given in chemistry, physics, and mathematics, if we do all of that, then it is not surprising that a lot of people come out of the American educational system turned off, or having never experienced science.”

Sagan has set us a lofty goal. Case study teaching is a step in the right direction.



Saint Anthony and the Chicken Poop

An Essay on the Power of Storytelling in the Teaching of Science

By Clyde Freeman Herreid

The Garden of Eden must have been in northern New Mexico. In early Christian iconography Adam and Eve were always depicted buck-naked: no fig leaves. As anyone knows, there are no fig leaves in New Mexico—and in fact, covering one's private parts with pine needles is painful to even contemplate—hence, the nudity of the first couple is easy to explain.

They lived in northern New Mexico, and Bethlehem is a little south of Albuquerque. With that insight, tongue in cheek, anthropologist Charles Carrillo began his New Year's lecture in Santa Fe.

On two occasions in my life I have heard lectures that were completely structured around a series of stories. Only two! That's quite remarkable when you consider I have lived long enough to hear literally thousands of lectures.

The first occasion was shortly after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the country had opened its doors to tourists. There, on a ship floating down the Volga River, I heard a lecture from a Russian government



A 16th-century painting of the Virgin Mary with St. Anthony of Padua (left) and St. Roch. St. Anthony, the subject of this chapter's "Case Study," is known in the Catholic Church as the "finder of lost objects."

3 Saint Anthony and the Chicken Poop

tour guide who told us about her country through a series of stories. She believed she could best capture the spirit and essence of her homeland with tales from the past. I was not only captivated by her stories, but also intrigued by the method of conveying information. I have often reflected upon this approach to teaching.

The second occasion was right after New Year's. I happened to be in Santa Fe, New Mexico, at a luncheon meeting. The speaker for the day was an anthropologist, Charles Carrillo. Although he had earned his PhD at the University of New Mexico, he was making his living as a santero, carving and painting icons of Christian saints.

As a Hispanic who could trace his ancestry back to the arrival of the Spanish conquistadors, he had long been impressed with the fact that anthropologists had oft analyzed Indian pottery, but the Hispanic ceramic tradition had been virtually neglected. This was a source of distress to him and ultimately led to his dissertation and the inspiration for his life as a santero. His lecture was about three unassuming pots—a bean pot, a coffee mug, and a tiny cosmetic pot. But before that he had to tell us about St. Anthony and the chicken poop.

Holding a small statuette of St. Anthony of Padua, Carrillo told us that he had discovered it was made by a santero in the early 1800s. Although apparently carved of wood, he had discovered using x-rays that only the core of the statue was made of wood and that layers of gypsum had been applied on top of the wood to build up the features of the saint. This discovery was to serve as part of his PhD thesis.

To his sorrow, the statue was missing a tiny figurine of the baby Jesus, who traditionally was held in the arms of the saint. Carrillo related how he had discovered a solitary Christ child figurine in an antique shop in California. There, lying in a forgotten corner of a doll collection, was the baby Jesus. Careful exami-

nation revealed it had come from the same santero's workshop where his St. Anthony had been crafted. It looked like a perfect fit. Perhaps it was not the missing Jesus, but it made a nice story and became another part of his thesis.

I doubt that the chicken poop story got into his thesis. Carrillo told us that Hispanic homes invariably had saint statuettes. St. Anthony was clearly his favorite for familial reasons, if no other. His grandmother revered St. Anthony because he had figured significantly in her life.

Chili peppers are a staple of every meal in Hispanic households. Even during the Thanksgiving dinner, turkey, cranberries and pumpkin pie are garnished with green and red chilies. Many Hispanic families of New Mexico raise their own crop of garden chilies. The best are raised with a rich mixture of manure.

The recipe in Grandmother Carrillo's time consisted of mixing a pail of chicken poop with an equal amount of cow dung and adding to that a bit of water to make a slurry. Then dried seeds of chili peppers were added. The housewife would take the concoction and, stepping through the garden, poke a hole in the ground. With three fingers she would reach into the mixture to obtain a pinch of seeds and manure.

One year as Grandma was following the ancient tradition, stooping to the earth and depositing the seed and manure mixture one step at a time, she discovered that a terrible thing had happened. She had lost her wedding ring! Somewhere in the garden the ring had slipped from her finger.

What to do? Like any God-fearing woman of the 1930s, Grandma went back to the house for her St. Anthony. Returning to the garden with the statuette in hand she implored St. Anthony to find the ring. This petition was totally appropriate, for the Roman Catholic Church depicts St. Anthony as "a finder of lost objects" and reveres him as a patron saint of

miracles. Grandma Carrillo needed a miracle for sure. She placed St. Anthony in a hole in a nearby tree overlooking the garden, admonishing him that he would not gain reentrance to the house until the ring was recovered.

There St. Anthony stayed day after day. But this year the usual dry conditions familiar to residents of the Southwest didn't come to pass. No, this was the best growing season in memory. The rains came frequently. The chilies grew profusely. With each rain not only was the soil moistened but also water dripped steadily on St. Anthony's head, wearing away his plaster countenance.

One day, as Grandma was tending the garden, she looked in on St. Anthony. She discovered to her dismay that the water had worn away his head. Realizing the futility of leaving St. Anthony to suffer further climatic indignities, she retrieved the statuette from the tree. After all, St. Anthony no longer had eyes to search for the ring, and "What good is a man without a brain, anyway?" she reasoned.

As she lifted St. Anthony from the tree she got the surprise of her life: There, sticking to the bottom of the statuette's feet, was her ring. St. Anthony had indeed produced the demanded miracle! Thanks be to God. A family legend was born, one that would be told for generations of Carrillos.



What good are such stories of pots and saints?

Carrillo answered it this way: Stories are a way to connect to the past—to hold on to the memories of who we were and are. He encouraged his audience to "Go home and write about yourselves, not just your genealogy, but your personal history and where you come from."

I have often been struck with how little scientists care about history. It is today that matters. Indeed, researchers' publications seldom note a reference more than 10 years old. This

same temporal provincialism exists in Americans collectively, for we seldom know or care much about our ancestors prior to Grandpa or Grandma. Surely, there is more to know. After all, our lineage stretches back over 3.5 billion years.

Scientists are as fond of stories as the next person. Experimentalists tell them all the time, though their stories are stilted tales of lab and field studies in journal articles of research. Those are still stories. Astronomers, paleontologists, and evolutionary biologists spin grand Homeric tales of the universe and Earth. Yet, in spite of our obvious concern that "history matters," we seldom convey this connection to our students. Where are the stargazers, the lab workers, the diggers of fossils in our classroom lectures? A Charles Darwin or Richard Feynman gets a pat on the head, but the rest of our "artwork" is unsigned.

It is often said that the field of science is impersonal and objective. That is its strength, we are told. We scientists are out to seek and reveal "truth," which is independent of the observers. This has led to the god-awful writing style that has permeated our journals for decades where the use of the personal pronoun "I" is shunned and the use of the passive voice praised. We scientists are to remain in the background, above the fray—as mere observers and recorders, scientific voyeurs; peeping toms, prying out nature's secrets.

As teachers, we scientists are supposed to just deliver "the facts, ma'am, just the facts" (as Joe Friday in TV's *Dragnet* was fond of saying). As a result, we have sucked the life out of science, as a student of mine recently said to me about a professor who was teaching ecology. I wouldn't have believed it possible to do that to ecology—a field filled with wonderful tales of adventurous discoveries. But it happened because the teacher filled each lecture with non-stop equations, modeling this and that. What a shame. Now this may appeal to some types of learners, but certainly not to most. I have nothing against equations and models.

3 Saint Anthony and the Chicken Poop

I can appreciate the argument that it is a sign of maturity when a field of science can express its principles mathematically (even though, as is in the case of ecology, most of these heuristic models have little empirical basis). But to have reduced the personas of the lynx and the snowshoe hare to nothing more than squiggles on graph paper or symbols in a Lotka-Volterra equation is indeed sucking the life out of the field.

Storytelling even in the field of science is not entirely dead. Jane Goodall and other notable field biologists (many of whom are women) studying animal behavior have chosen to present many of their findings in narrative form. The life in their science is still there—vibrant and alive. We do still see the scientist as a human being even as we can see the abstract architecture of their science. Compelling stories do that for us.

Donald McCloskey, professor of economics and history at the University of Iowa, made some interesting comments in an essay in the February 1995 issue of *Scientific American*. Economics has trod its own path away from the narrative style of Adam Smith to become extraordinarily mathematical and abstract. He pointed out that “the notion of ‘science’ as divorced from storytelling arose largely during the last century. Before then the word—like its French, Tamil, Turkish, and Japanese counterparts—meant ‘systematic inquiry.’ The German word for the humanities is *Geistwissenschaft*, or ‘inquiry into the human spirit,’ as opposed to *Naturwissenschaft*,” which is our inquiry into nature.

McCloskey goes on:

Most sciences do storytelling and model building. At one end of the gamut sits Newtonian physics—the *Principia* (1687) is essentially geometric rather than narrative. Charles Darwin’s biology in the *Origin of Species* (1859), in contrast, is almost entirely historical and devoid of mathematical models. Nevertheless, most scientists and economists among

them hate to admit to something so childish-sounding as telling stories. They want to emulate Newton’s elegance rather than Darwin’s complexity. One suspects that the relative prestige of the two methods has more to do with age than anything else. If a proto-Darwin had published in 1687, and a neo-Newton in 1859, you can bet the prestige of storytelling versus timeless modeling would be reversed.

Storytelling in science is largely verboten. We seldom hear of the passion, emotion, or personal matters of a Newton, Einstein, Lavoisier, Lyell, or Pasteur—such things are regarded as asides or diversions from truth, the grand structure of the universe that exists separate from the observer. So, many students sit in class waiting for the suffering to be over, or they change majors to other more human-centered fields where the subjective, the individual, matters.

Some years ago, I read about someone who was asked what one thing he would most like to keep in his possession if he had to fly off to another planet to start another civilization—a copy of Newton’s *Principia*, Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, Einstein’s papers on relativity, or Shakespeare’s plays. He answered, Shakespeare’s plays. All of the other works could be regenerated. They were objective. Other scientists would duplicate them. Only Shakespeare’s plays were unique and personal.

Even if we accept that science is objective, must we suck the life out of our teaching by neglecting our roots? James Conant, chemist, science adviser to President Franklin Roosevelt, and eventually president of Harvard University, thought we must not. He responded by pioneering the use of storytelling case studies within the lecture method framework. He built an entire course around this approach that he described in his book, *The Growth of the Experimental Sciences* (1949).

Case study teaching, whether it is done via the lecture method, the discussion method, or small group Problem-Based Learning method, puts a

An Essay on the Power of Storytelling in the Teaching of Science

3

human face on science. It is not that case teachers deny the ultimate reality of the universe or refuse to accept that the universe will some day be described by a set of mathematical models. But the case study approach using stories gives us a context within which to learn.

Not only are stories captivating, they make it easier to learn and recall facts, figures, and yes, equations. Moreover, stories tell us who we are as a people—the problems we face,

the values we cherish, the barriers we must surmount, whether personal or societal. They help tie us with an umbilical cord of DNA to our heritage—to those who have gone before us and to those who struggle in today's world in ways we would not otherwise know.

So what value are pots and saints? They represent the mundane and spiritual. They can put the life back into teaching, where it was sucked dry before.

Bad Blood

A Case Study of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project

By Ann W. Fournier, Charles R. Fournier, and Clyde Freeman Herreid

Syphilis is a venereal disease spread during sexual intercourse. It can also be passed from mother to child during pregnancy. It is caused by a corkscrew-shaped bacterium called a spirochete, *Treponema pallidum*. This microscopic organism resides in many organs of the body but causes sores or ulcers (called chancres) to appear on the skin of the penis, vagina, mouth, and occasionally in the rectum, or on the tongue, lips, or breast. During sex the bacteria leave the sores of one person and enter the moist membranes of their partner's penis, vagina, mouth, or rectum.

Once the spirochetes wiggle inside a victim, they begin to multiply at an amazing rate. (Some bacteria have a doubling rate of 30 minutes. You may want to consider how many bacteria you might have in 12 hours if one bacterium entered your body, doubling at that rate.) The spirochetes then enter the lymph circulation that carries them to nearby lymph glands, which may swell in response to the infection.

This first stage of the disease (called primary syphilis) lasts only a few weeks and usually causes hard red sores or ulcers to develop on the genitals of the victim who can then pass the disease on to someone else. During this primary stage, a blood test will not reveal the presence of the disease, but the bacteria can be scraped from the sores. The sores soon heal and some people may recover entirely without treatment.

Secondary syphilis develops two-to-six weeks after the sores heal. Then flu-like symptoms appear with fever, headache, eye inflammation, malaise, joint pain, a skin rash, and mouth and genital sores. These symptoms are a clear sign that the spirochetes have travelled throughout the body by way of the lymph and blood systems where they now can be readily detected by a blood test (for example, the Wassermann test). Scalp hair may drop out to give a "moth-eaten" type of look to the head. This secondary stage ends in a few weeks as the sores heal.

Signs of the disease may never reappear even though the bacteria continue to live in the person. But in about 25% of those originally infected, symptoms will flare up again in late or tertiary stage syphilis.

Almost any organ can be attacked, such as the cardiovascular system, producing leaking heart valves and aneurysms, balloon-like bulges in the aorta which may burst leading to instant death. Gummy or rubbery tumors filled with spirochetes may develop on

16

Bad Blood

the skin covered by a dried crust of pus. The bones may deteriorate, as in osteomyelitis or tuberculosis, and may produce disfiguring facial mutilations as nasal and palate bones are eaten away. If the nervous system is infected, a stumbling, foot-slapping gait may occur or, more severely, paralysis, senility, blindness, and insanity.

THE HEALTH PROGRAM

The cause of syphilis, the stages of the disease's development, and the complications that can result from untreated syphilis were all known to medical science in the early 1900s. In 1905, German scientists Hoffman and Schaudinn isolated the bacterium that causes syphilis. In 1907, the Wassermann blood test was developed, enabling physicians to diagnose the disease. Three years later, German scientist Paul Ehrlich created an arsenic compound called salvarsan to treat syphilis. Together with mercury, it was either injected or rubbed onto the skin and often produced serious and occasionally fatal reactions in patients. Treatment was painful and usually required more than a year to complete.

In 1908, Congress established the Division of Venereal Diseases in the U.S. Public Health Service. Within a year, 44 states had organized separate bureaus for venereal disease control. Unfortunately, free treatment clinics operated only in urban areas for many years. Data, collected in a survey begun in 1926 of 25 communities across the United States, indicated that the incidence of syphilis among patients under observation was "4.05 cases per 1,000 population, the rate for whites being 4 per 1,000, and that for Negroes 7.2 per 1,000."

In 1929, Dr. Hugh S. Cumming, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS), asked the Julius Rosenwald Fund for financial support to study the control of venereal disease in the rural South. The Rosenwald Fund was a philanthropic organization that played a key role in promoting the welfare of African Americans. The fund agreed

to help the U.S. PHS in developing health programs for southern African Americans.

One of the fund's major goals was to encourage their grantees to use black personnel whenever possible as a means to promote professional integration. Thus, the mission of the fund seemed to fit well with the plans of the PHS. Macon County, Alabama, was selected as one of five syphilis-control demonstration programs in February 1930. The local Tuskegee Institute endorsed the program. The institute and its John A. Andrew Memorial Hospital were staffed and administered entirely by African American physicians and nurses. "The demonstrations would provide training for private physicians, white and colored, in the elements of venereal disease treatments and the more extensive distribution of antisyphilitic drugs and the promotion of wider use of state diagnostic laboratory facilities."

In 1930, Macon County had 27,000 residents, 82% African American, most living in rural poverty in a shack with a dirt floor, with no plumbing and poor sanitation. This was the target population, people who "had never in their lives been treated by a doctor." Public health officials arriving on the scene announced they had come to test people for "bad blood." The term included a host of maladies and later surveys suggest that few people connected that term with syphilis.

The syphilis control study in Macon County turned up the alarming news that 36% of the African American population had syphilis. The medical director of the Rosenwald Fund was concerned about the racial implications of the findings, saying, "There is bound to be danger that the impression will be given that syphilis in the South is a Negro problem rather than one of both races." The PHS officer assured the fund and the Tuskegee Institute that demonstrations would not be used to attack the images of black Americans. He argued that the high syphilis rates were not due to "inherent racial susceptibility" but could be explained by "differences in their respective

social and economic status.” However, the PHS failed to persuade the fund that more work could break the cycle of poverty and disease in Macon County. So when the PHS officers suggested a larger scale extension of the work, the Rosenwald Fund trustees voted against the new project.

Building on what had been learned during the Rosenwald Fund demonstrations and the four other sites, the PHS covered the nation with the Wassermann tests. Both blacks and whites were reached with extensive testing, and in some areas mobile treatment clinics were available.

THE EXPERIMENT

As the PHS officers analyzed the data for the final Rosenwald Fund report in September of 1932, and realizing that funding for the project would be discontinued, the idea for a new study evolved into the Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male. They would convert the original treatment program into a nontherapeutic human experiment aimed at compiling data on the progression of the disease on untreated African American males.

The precedent existed for such a study. One had been conducted in Oslo, Norway, at the turn of the century on a population of white males and females. An impressive amount of information had been gathered from these patients concerning the progression of the disease. However, questions of manifestation and progression of syphilis in individuals of African descent had not been studied. In light of the discovery that African natives had some rather unique diseases (for example, sickle cell anemia—a disease of red blood cells), a study of African males could reveal biological differences during the course of syphilis. (Later, the argument that supported continuation of the study may even have been reinforced in the early 1950s when it was suggested that native Africans with the sickle cell trait were less susceptible to the ravages of malaria.)

In fact, Dr. Joseph Earle Moore of the Venereal Disease Clinic of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine stated when consulted, “Syphilis in the negro is in many respects almost a different disease from syphilis in the white.” The PHS doctors felt that this study would emphasize and delineate these differences. Moreover, whereas the Oslo study was retrospective (looking back at old cases), the Macon Study would be a better prospective study, following the progress of the disease through time.

It was estimated that of the 1,400 patients in Macon County admitted to treatment under the Rosenwald Fund, not one had received the full course of medication prescribed as standard therapy for syphilis. The PHS officials decided that these men could be considered untreated because they had not received enough treatment to cure them. In the county, there was a well-equipped teaching hospital (John A. Andrew Memorial Hospital at the Tuskegee Institute) that could be used for scientific purposes.

Over the next months in 1932, cooperation was ensured from the Alabama State Board of Health, the Macon County Health Department, and the Tuskegee Institute. However, Dr. J. N. Baker, the state health officer, received one important concession in exchange for his approval. Everyone found to have syphilis would have to be treated. Although this would not cure them—the nine-month study was too short—it would keep them noninfectious. Dr. Baker also argued for the involvement of local physicians.

Dr. Raymond Vonderlehr was chosen for the fieldwork that began in October 1932. Dr. Vonderlehr began his work in Alabama by spreading the word that a new syphilis control demonstration was beginning and that government doctors were giving free blood tests. Black people came to schoolhouses and churches for examination—most had never before seen a doctor. Several hundred men over 25 years old were identified as Wasser-

16

Bad Blood

mann-positive who had not been treated for “bad blood” and had been infected for over five years. Cardiovascular problems seemed particularly evident in this population in the early days, reaffirming that blacks might be different in their response. But nervous system involvement was not evident.

As Dr. Vonderlehr approached the end of his few months of study, he suggested to his superior, Dr. Clark, that the work continue for 5–10 years because “many interesting facts could be learned regarding the course and complications of untreated syphilis.” Dr. Clark retired a few months later and in June 1933 Dr. Vonderlehr was promoted to director of the Division of Venereal Diseases of the PHS.

This promotion began a bureaucratic pattern over the next four decades that saw the position of director go to a physician who had worked on the Tuskegee Study. Dr. Vonderlehr spent much of the summer of 1933 working out the study’s logistics that would enable the PHS to follow the men’s health through their lifetime. This included gaining permission from the men and their families to perform an autopsy at the time of their death that would give the scientific community a detailed microscopic description of the diseased organs.

Neither the syphilitics nor the controls (those men free of syphilis, who were added to the project) were informed as to the study’s true objective. These men knew only that they were receiving treatment for “bad blood” and money for burial. Burial stipends began in 1935, funded by the Milbank Memorial Fund.

The skill of the African American nurse, Eunice Rivers, and the cooperation of the local health providers (most of them white males), were essential in this project. They understood the project details and the fact that the patients’ available medical care (other than valid treatment for syphilis) was far better than that for most African Americans in Macon County. The local draft board agreed

to exclude the men in the study from medical treatment when that became an issue during the early 1940s. State health officials also cooperated.

The study was not kept secret from the national medical community. Dr. Vonderlehr in 1933 contacted a large number of experts in the field of venereal disease and related medical complications. Most responded with support for the study. The American Heart Association asked for clarification of the scientific validity, then subsequently expressed great doubt and criticism concerning the tests and procedures. Dr. Vonderlehr remained convinced that the study was valid and would prove that syphilis affected African Americans differently than those of European descent. As director of the PHS Venereal Disease Division, he controlled the funds necessary to conduct the study, as did his successors.

Key to the cooperation of the men in the Tuskegee study was the African American PHS nurse assigned to monitor them. She quickly gained their trust. She dealt with their problems. The physicians came to respect her ability to deal with the men. She not only attempted to keep the men in the study, she many times prevented them from receiving medical care from the PHS treatment clinics offering neoarsphenamine and bismuth (the treatment for syphilis) during the late 1930s and early 1940s. She never advocated treating the men. She knew these treatment drugs had side effects. As a nurse, she had been trained to follow doctor’s orders. By the time penicillin became available for the treatment of syphilis, not treating these men had become a routine that she did not question. She truly felt that these men were better off because of the routine medical examinations, distribution of aspirin pink pills that relieved aches and pains, and personal nursing care. She never thought of the men as victims. She was aware of the Oslo study. “This is the way I saw it: that they were studying the Negro just like they were studying the white man, see, making a com-

parison.” She retired from active nursing in 1965, but assisted during the annual checkups until the experiment ended.

By 1943, when the Division of Venereal Diseases began treating syphilitic patients nationwide with penicillin, the Tuskegee study men were not considered patients. They were viewed as experimental subjects and were denied antibiotic treatment. The PHS officials insisted that the study offered even more of an opportunity to study these men as a “control against which to project not only the results obtained with the rapid schedules of therapy for syphilis but also the costs involved in finding and placing under treatment the infected individuals.” There is no evidence that the study had ever been discussed in the light of the Nuremberg Code, a set of 10 ethical principles for human experimentation developed during the trials of Nazi physicians in the aftermath of World War II. Again the study had become routine.

In 1951, Dr. Trygve Gjustland, then the current director of the Oslo study, joined the Tuskegee group to review the experiment. He offered suggestions on updating records and reviewing criteria. No one questioned the issue of contamination (men with partial treatment) or ethics. In 1952, the study began to focus on the study of aging, as well as heart disease, because of the long-term data that had been accumulated on the men. It became clear that syphilis generally shortened the lifespan of its victims and that the tissue damage began while the young men were in the second stage of the disease (see Tables 1–3).

In June 1965, Dr. Irwin J. Schatz became the first medical professional to object to the study. He suggested a need for PHS to reevaluate its moral judgments. The PHS did not respond to his letter. In November 1966 Peter Buxtin, a PHS venereal disease interviewer and investigator, expressed his moral concerns about the study. He continued to question the study within the PHS network.

In February 1969, the PHS called together

a blue ribbon panel to discuss the Tuskegee study. The participants were all physicians. Not one had training in medical ethics. None was of African descent. At no point during the discussions did anyone remind the panel of PHS’s own guidelines on human experimentation (established in February 1966).

According to records, the original study had been composed of 412 men with syphilis and 204 controls. In 1969, 56 syphilitic subjects and 36 controls were known to be living. A total of 373 men in both groups were known to be dead. The rest were unaccounted for. The age of the survivors ranged from 59 to 85, one claiming to be 102.

The outcome of this meeting was that the study would continue. The doctors convinced themselves that the syphilis in the Tuskegee men was too far along to be effectively treated by penicillin and that the men might actually suffer severe complications from such therapy. Even the Macon County Medical Society, now made up of mostly African American physicians, agreed to assist the PHS. Each was given a list of subjects.

In the late 1960s, PHS physician Dr. James Lucas stated in a memorandum that the Tuskegee study was “bad science” because it had been contaminated by treatment. PHS continued to put a positive spin on the experiment by noting that the study had been keeping laboratories supplied with blood samples for evaluating new blood tests for syphilis.

Peter Buxtin, who had left the PHS for law school and was bothered by the study and the no-change attitude of the PHS, contacted the Associated Press. Jean Heller, the reporter assigned to the story, did extensive research into the Tuskegee experiment. When interviewed by her, the PHS officials provided her with much of her information. They were men who had nothing to hide. The story broke on July 25, 1972. The study immediately stopped.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Carefully analyze this case. When you

16

Bad Blood

examine the paper and the appendices, what information appears to have been gained from this study? That is, what kind of argument can be made for the benefits of the study?

2. What do you believe were the motives for the people to become involved in the study, specifically: The subjects? The PHS personnel? The Tuskegee staff? The Macon County physicians? Nurse Rivers?
3. What kind of criticisms can you offer of this study?
4. What were the factors underlying the cessation of the project?
5. Could this project (or one similar to it involving AIDS or radiation effects) be conducted today?

INTRODUCTION

This case is a synopsis of events described by James H. Jones in his book *Bad Blood: The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment*. (All direct quotes in the case study are from this book.) It was first published in 1981 and later updated in 1993 with the addition of a chapter called "AIDS: Is it genocide?" The book has led to a play, a motion picture, and a PBS Nova special. The Tuskegee study became an instant classic on the ethics of human experimentation once the Kennedy congressional hearings in 1973 occurred.

This case is an example of a "historical" case in the sense that it happened sufficiently long ago that there are few of the major participants alive and there are no more major decisions or actions to be made. The story is largely finished. Further, the social and ethical climate is significantly different today than when the events in the case transpired. Many of the key decisions could not be made today in light of present legal and moral guidelines.

Why do we study such a case? The answer is simple: to understand the evolution in our thinking on issues of science, human experimentation, and race and to see how they are

colored by our culture. In addition, we can emphasize certain long-standing principles of science that have not changed over the century; for example, proper controls are still seen as essential. Also, there are clear parallels in dealing with disease conditions within special segments of the population today (for example, breast cancer, AIDS) that lead to special research projects, with political and legal overtones.

TEACHING THE CASE

This case seems ideally suited for the classical case discussion format used for decades in business schools, although it can easily be adapted for small group cooperative learning teams.

It is divided into three parts: *the disease*, *the public health program*, and *the experiment*.

- The section on the disease is a straightforward account of the symptoms of syphilis, and it normally figures only in a modest way in the discussion except as a backdrop to the case. The instructor can highlight the disease by an early focus on the disease symptoms, perhaps with graphic photos and review of included data and readings from original papers.
- The section on the public health program should be viewed from the perspective of concern regarding the extent of disease in rural southern America, the need to establish a health vehicle to address the problems of disease, and the concern of an expanding civil rights movement regarding health care and health care professionals.
- The section on the experiment itself leads to several lines of inquiry that should be pursued in discussion.
 1. Rationale for loss of funds.
 2. Rationale for study on untreated African American males and societal acceptance of such experimentations.

A Case Study of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project

16

3. The medical importance of longitudinal studies.
4. Rationale for continuing study after penicillin was discovered.
5. The use or inappropriate use of “control” groups.
6. The meaning of “informed consent.” That is, can you ever be fully informed?
7. What is the Nuremberg Code and does it really pertain to this study?
8. Of what use are the data collected from this study? Do there appear to be any significant conclusions? Review the contamination aspect of various degrees of treatment.
9. Can scientists become so intimately associated with their projects that they lose objectivity?
10. Why was the consistent care provided by one person throughout the study so necessary?

There are a myriad of other questions that the discussion could develop by reading the case study. If small groups are used, these questions and others can be divided among them to provide different perspectives on the case. These views would be shared in a general group discussion. However, our remaining comments about teaching will emphasize the group discussion technique.

In writing this case we have kept the account relatively straightforward, eschewing emotion-laden phrases, keeping in mind the science and ethics earlier in the century. It has a documentary feel to it; that is intentional. As a result, we hope to accomplish two things: (1) To keep the reader focussed on the science first; and (2) To avoid the easy criticism that comes from second guessing events that took place over 50 years ago. It helps to dampen the tendency of some individuals to use this case as a platform to deride racism without serious analysis. There is always a risk of polemics when we deal with scientific cases that im-

TABLE 1.**1963 Viability data of Tuskegee group.**

	Dead		Alive		Unknown	
	number	%	number	%	number	%
Syphilitics	242	59	85	21	85	21
Controls	78	45	66	34	39	20

From Rockwell, Yobs, and Moore (1964)

TABLE 2.**Abnormal findings in 90 syphilitics and 65 controls.**

Abnormality	Syphilitics		Controls	
	number	%	number	%
Electrocardiographic	41	46	21	32
Cardiomegaly via x-ray	37	42	22	34
Peripheral neuropathy	12	13	5	8
Hypertension d.b.p.>90	38	43	29	45
Cardiac murmurs	24	27	20	31
Urine	28	36	21	33

From Rockwell, Yobs, and Moore (1964)

TABLE 3.**Aortic arch and myocardial abnormalities at autopsy.**

	Aortic arch		Myocardial	
	number	%	number	%
Syphilitics (140)	62	44	48	34
Controls (54)	8	15	20	37
	X ² P<0.005		X ² P>0.25 not different	

From Caldwell et al. (1973)

16

Bad Blood

pinge on the public welfare. These moments are seldom enlightening. Careful preparation on the part of the instructor can help head off such events.

BLOCKS OF ANALYSIS

Every case has its major points for discussion; these vary with the teacher and audience. In this instance, we have identified three major issues for analysis: the science; the ethics of human experimentation; and the racial issue. We choose to start with the least volatile of the issues just as we would in the classroom.

The Science

Basically, was this good science? Questions that illuminate this issue include: What was the purpose of the project? How did the purpose shift through time? Was the experimental design adequate? What were the contributions of the study? On one side of the argument we have the view that many of the so-called untreated men were in fact treated and this invalidated all conclusions that might be drawn. Furthermore, one might argue that there was no need to repeat a study on untreated people since the Oslo data were adequate.

Clearly, physicians involved with the project did not agree, for they thought it likely the black population might differ, especially in their cardiovascular and neurological response to syphilis. Also, we have statements that the blood from these men was used to develop standardized blood tests, that the project served as a training ground for many PHS and other medical staff, and that the project led to several scientific publications. The Tuskegee data still serve as the reference for understanding syphilis.

Ethics of Human Experimentation

Our view of human experimentation has changed markedly over the past century. There are numerous examples of soldiers, prisoners, and citizens who have unwillingly or unknowingly participated in life-threatening “experi-

ments” (Barber 1976). The 1993 revelation that Americans were unwillingly exposed to potentially harmful doses of nuclear radiation during tests of the 1940s and 1950s is only the most recent example.

Historically, one might think that development of the Nuremberg Code would have prevented such work. This does not seem to be the case. The notorious Nazi medical experiments, which were brought to light after World War II during the war crimes trials, led to the development of a code of ethics called the Nuremberg Code. This set of 10 principles asserts “the subjects’ right to decide whether or not to become research subjects.” It defines what physicians may or may not do even with the permission of the subject. An investigator must take all precautions to avoid the remote possibility of injury, and the degree of risk involved to the subject must be commensurate with the “humanitarian importance of the problem.” In spite of the widespread publicity of the Nuremberg trials there appears to be no suggestion that any of the physicians in the Tuskegee syphilis experiment thought the Nuremberg Code applied to them. Nor for that matter has it appeared to have had any impact on the development of our own ethical framework in the United States (Annas and Grodin 1992).

Not until the thalidomide scandal of the 1960s did the U.S. scientific community seriously engage on the question of human experimentation. Only in the past few years have we seen universities and the National Institutes of Health establish guides for human experimentation.

How much of this checkered past needs to be part of the discussion is up to the instructor, but it might be useful to give students your school’s or a local drug company’s guidelines on human experimentation or ask them to develop their own principles. Certainly, any discussion on these issues will include the “right” of people to choose whether they will be part of an experiment. Also, there will be questions

of whether it is possible to truly inform a person about the consequences of an experiment and whether this knowledge will influence the results of the work itself. Lawsuits have been won on the basis that even if a person signs a release, he or she cannot be held accountable; he or she may be acting under coercion or stress and without proper understanding of the work. For example, how much would you accept as adequate compensation in such an experiment: \$5, \$50, \$500, \$5,000?

The Racial Issue

This is potentially the most volatile issue in the case. If terms such as *genocide* can be applied to the AIDS crisis, so might they be applied to the syphilis epidemic and the Tuskegee study. Here is a documented case of a government agency withholding medical treatment from an ethnic minority.

If an instructor wishes to explore this issue, he or she would presumably focus on how it is possible to view the same event from different perspectives. There is evidence that the Rosenwald Fund had a long history of helping black Americans and one of its concerns about funding the second phase of the Tuskegee project was that its motives could be misconstrued. Furthermore, there is documented evidence that the prime motive for early work was to see if the progress of syphilis in the black male was similar to that first studied in the European male in Oslo. Also, we have clear cooperation of black physicians, nurses, and administrators of Macon County and the Tuskegee Institute. Yet evidence of this type can be viewed through another lens. The perspective of a person arguing the genocide scenario is captured simply with this question: Would this study have occurred (especially once penicillin was discovered) if it involved white middle-class Americans as subjects? Speculation will not provide sure answers, yet the recent revelation that such citizens have been exposed to life-threatening radiation by our government is worth considering as a model.

For instructors using the small group approach to teaching, these issues can be assigned to separate groups to discuss. Also, it is helpful to assign one group to take the affirmative side of the issue and another group to take the negative side.

THE FIRST QUESTION

The opening question to the class is one of the most critical features of case teaching. It determines the entry point into the case, and if one chooses the wrong question or wrong person to respond, the instructor may have difficulty getting back on track. Your question will depend upon your goals in teaching the particular case. Nonetheless, good opening questions share several characteristics in that they:

- (1) Encourage participation.
- (2) Move toward a specific goal.
- (3) Set up a discussion of the facts.
- (4) Elicit different perceptions of the case.
- (5) Help formulate (define) a problem.
- (6) Get personal involvement.

Consider three examples of questions for the Tuskegee case:

- (1) *Some people have argued that there are racial overtones in this project, yet Eunice Rivers, a black nurse, was an important participant in the experiment. Are these two points of view compatible?* This question will likely catapult the class squarely into the racial issue. It meets many of the goals of a good opening question, but it will probably not suit the tastes of most scientists as the best entry point into the discussion.
- (2) *As we look at this study, one cannot help but wonder if it was ethical, given that the men were simply informed that the doctors were studying "bad blood." How important is it to have informed consent?* This question launches the class into the ethics of human experimentation and once again meets many of the qualifications of a good opening question, but if the scien-

16

Bad Blood

tific data are of prime concern, the next question may be better.

- (3) *The Tuskegee experiment has been criticized because its experimental design was inherently flawed. Is that really so? And even if it is true that the study was not ideal, were there valuable results to emerge from this 40-year study?* This question, although less exciting than the previous two, starts the class on an exploration of the scientific issues and facts of the case. Below we have identified some of the questions that might be addressed under each issue.

BLACKBOARD WORK

Practitioners of the Case Study Discussion almost invariably make extensive use of the blackboard or flip charts. This provides a tangible structure to the discussion. If instructors do not use the board, they are throwing away one of their most important tools in teaching. Discussion has the inherent problem that it often seems aimless. Good board work provides students with a sense that something valuable is being accomplished. When the instructor writes a brief phrase on the board summarizing a student's thoughts, he or she shows that he or she values this contribution to the discussion. This encourages other students to participate, especially if the instructor is able to use the student's name. For instance, the teacher might comment: "If I understand Kimberly's point correctly, she is arguing that we do not have an adequate control population to make the claim that the men actually suffered in this study. She's arguing that men not in the study in any way probably had much poorer health than either the experimental subjects or the official controls." As this point is summarized, the instructor might note on the board "Inadequate control for claim that men suffered in study," perhaps even jotting Kimberly's name or initials next to the writing.

The final board outline is seldom neat and tidy; rather it has phrases, arrows, circles,

and lines connecting ideas from different parts in the discussion. Yet a clear pattern should emerge leaving students with a sense of "Look what we have accomplished!" To bring about order out of the emerging discussion is part of the art of case study. It not only requires practice but it requires preparation. In the current case it is logical to arrange the board around the major issues. For example if the instructor were to begin the discussion with the science issue, he or she might label it as such on the left side of the board, jotting down notes and phrases as they are developed. When other ideas pop up, the instructor might momentarily move over to other places on the board to write down these ideas, only to return to the science issue later. The teacher might set up the center of the board to develop the human experimentation theme, adding notes to other places on the board as they appear appropriate. The instructor might then shift to the right hand side of the board to develop the racial issue, making connections with previous points by moving back and forth among the issues as neglected points emerge. Thus the board has given structure to the discussion regardless of how freewheeling it might have been.

CLOSURE

How to finish a class discussion has different answers. Some case teachers simply stop when class time runs out. They feel no obligation to give their perspective on the discussion. "Life is messy," they argue. "There are no simple solutions. It is counterproductive to the development of higher-level critical thinking to give an instructor-biased viewpoint."

Other case teachers seriously disagree. Instead, they recognize the value of a good two- or three-minute summary of the class's discussion, and some instructors turn to the students themselves for assistance, asking one or two bold souls to wrap it up. A summary,

Suggested Question Outline

A. THE SCIENCE

1. What kind of disease is syphilis?
2. What did we know about the disease in 1930?
3. What was the original purpose of the study? Was the goal accomplished?
4. How did the goals of the project change over time?
5. What was the logic behind the choice of subjects?
6. What kinds of data were collected in the project and what conclusions resulted from the work?
7. What kind of scientific criticisms of the research can we offer?

B. HUMAN EXPERIMENTATION

1. What benefits did the men gain from the experiment?
2. What evidence do we have that the men were harmed by their participation in the project?
3. Was it possible to inform the men about the true goals of the experiment, given their educational status?
4. Given that men who participated in this study received health benefits, status, attention, and money, could they reasonably be expected to exercise good judgment about their participation in this project?

5. Are there circumstances that you could imagine where informed consent would interfere with an experiment?

6. Are there any circumstances where the overall good of an experiment to society overrides the harm done to a small group?

C. THE RACIAL ISSUE

1. What evidence do we have that race might have been a factor in the experiment?
2. What motivated the PHS investigators to choose Macon County as one of its study sites?
3. What differences were present in the experimental designs of the Tuskegee and Oslo studies?
4. If the Tuskegee and Oslo studies had shown racial differences, how would that information have been used?
5. Is it reasonable to conclude that the administrators of the Rosenwald Fund failed to fund the second PHS project because they identified racial bias in the work?
6. Is there any way to fund research on special groups in the U.S. population without running the risk of being accused of bias?
7. Given that certain segments of the population have special health problems, is there any way not to fund research on these groups without running the risk of being accused of bias?

16

Bad Blood

of course, does not imply that you have solved the problems, it merely identifies some of the signposts along the way.

REFERENCES

- Annas, G., and M. Grodin, eds. 1992. *The Nazi doctors and the Nuremberg Code*. Oxford University Press.
- Barber, B. 1976. The ethics of experimentation with human subjects. *Scientific American* 234 (2):25–31.
- Caldwell, J. G. et al. 1973. Aortic regurgitation in the Tuskegee study of untreated syphilis. *J. Chronic Dis.* 26: 187–199.
- Jones, J. H. 1993. *Bad blood: The Tuskegee experiment*. Free Press.
- Rockwell, D. H., A. R. Yobs, and M. B. Moore. 1964. The Tuskegee study of untreated syphilis: The 30th year of observation. *Arch. Inter. Med.* 144: 792–798.

Index

Page numbers in **boldface** type refer to tables and figures.

A

Accountability, in cooperative learning groups, 128, 143

Active learning strategies, 205, 221, 222, 301, 421

superiority over lecture method, 402–403

Advanced Placement (AP) exams, 4

Advising freshman case study, 295–298

classroom management of, 295–297

outcome of, 297–298

purpose of, 295

student profiles and issues for, **296, 297**

Aesop, 1, 438

AIDS, 372

clicker case on viral replication, 225

Duesberg phenomenon and, 157–160

Alien evolution futuristic case study, 253–263

background on, 253–254

discussion questions for, 256–257

role-playing characters for, 257–263

situation of, 254–255

teaching notes for, 257

Allen, B., 333, 334

Allen, D., 144, 154

Allington, R., 409

Alzheimer's disease, 352, 385

Amar, M. B., 184

American Association for Higher

Education, 41

American Association for the Advancement

of Science, 8, 29, 429

Project 2061, 8, 29, 429

Science for All Americans, 29

American Civil Liberties Union, 183

American Educator, 4

American Federation of Teachers, 4

American Geophysical Union, 164

American Heart Association, 102

American Museum of Natural History, 7

Analysis cases. *See* Appraisal (analysis) cases

Andersen, H., 4

Andromeda Strain, The, 85

Angelo, T. A., 77, 341, 405

Animal rights dilemma case, 111–118

applications of, 116

blackboard work for, 117, **117**

blocks of analysis for, 114–116

closure of, 117–118

opening question for discussion of, 116–117

student objection to dissection labs, 112–113

Anna Karenina, 368

Appraisal (analysis) cases, 33, 83

questions asked by, 83

sample journal article on breast cancer and insurance coverage, 90–98, **95–97**

teaching of, 83

Aristotle, 365

Armstrong, L., 87, 372, 388

Art of Readable Writing, The, 365

Ashe, A., 372

Asimov, I., 430

Assessment of case-based teaching, 401–403, 407–411, 413–418, 415

classroom-based experiments for, 408–409

example of good study, 410

future questions for, 417–418

internal validity criteria for, 409

research design for, 408, **408**, 409–410

coplas de ciego, 405–406

how and what should be measured, 410–411, 413–414

how not to do a study, 414–416

principles of, 408

purpose of, 407–408

“reactive,” 413

research questions for, 408, 409

self-report bias in, 414–415

using grade comparisons for, 415

- using too weak or too brief interventions
 - in, 415–416
 - what is known from, 416–417

Astaire, F., 434

Astin, A. A., 8

Atlantic salmon controversy, student paper
on, 237, 247–250

Avogadro, A., 352

B

Bacon, F., 85

Bad Blood: The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment,
104

Baker, J. N., 101

Balanchine, G., 387

Barrows, H. S., 36

Beak of the Finch, The, 280, 358

Beecher, L., 181

Bell Curve, The, 10

Bennett, J., 46

Benveniste, J., 32

Berliner, D. C., 408

Bernard, C., 430

Bible stories, 1, 55, 68

Bieron, J., 352, 353

Billions and Billions, 365

Blackboard work for cases, 344–345, 390

Blattner, W., 158

Blocks of analysis for cases, 389

Bloom, B. S., 31, 91, 224

Bogart, H., 434

Bonk, J., 339, 341

Boyle, R., 181

Brailowsky, S., 269

Brain Repair, 269

Breast cancer and insurance coverage case
study, 90–98, **95–97**

Brickman, P., 225

Brighton Rock, 368

*Bringing Problem-Based Learning to Higher
Education: Theory and Practice*, 151

Burdick, D., 361, 362

Bush, G. H. W., 8

Business cases, 42–43, 49–52, 57, 83
definition of, 50
requirements for, 50–51

selling of, 50, 51

structure of, 51, **51**

teaching of, 50–51

Buxtin, P., 103

C

Cambrian Explosion, 255–256

Cannabinoids. *See* Marijuana

Capuana, J., 67

Carbon dioxide emissions, 162, **162**, 164–166

Careers in science, 5

Carillo, C., 19–21

Carnegie, D., 68

Carroll, L., 156

Case(s)

based on journal articles, 89–98, 349, 353

based on newspaper articles, 351–353

based on novels, 85–87, 349

based on television news programs, 353

blackboard work for, 344–345, 390

characteristics of a good case, 45–48, 356

clicker, 224–225, 227–234

closed- and open-ended, 43, 375–379,
376–378

closure of, 390–391

conflict provoked by, 46

contemporary, 46, 83

coplas de ciego, 405–406

decision forced by, 46

definitions of, 27, 41, 43, 50

educational objectives of, 376–377,
388–389

empathy created by, 46

factual vs. fictional, 371–374

first-person oral narratives, 148

futuristic, 253–263

general applicability of, 46–47

generic, 373

goals of, 84

historical, 83

how much information to include in,
361–364

interactive, 441

interest of, 46

length of, 47, 389

pedagogic utility of, 46

- pedagogically rich, 378–379
- progressive disclosure of, 144, 169
- quotations in, 46
- racial stereotyping in, 381–383
- relevance of, 46
- selling of, 50, 51, 57
- sequencing of, 378–379
- story told by, 46
- study questions for, 389–390
- that support and challenge students, 363
- types of, 32–33
- unresolved, 84, 368
- writing of, 31–33, 349, 355–359 (*See also* Writing case studies)
- Case Difficulty Cube, 362–363, **363**
 - analytical dimension of, 362–363
 - conceptual dimension of, 363
 - presentational dimension of, 363
- Case histories, 33
- Case study teaching technique, xiv, 12, 19, 29–38, 147–150
 - applications of, 30, 41–43
 - assessment of, 401–403, 407–411, 413–418 (*See also* Assessment of case-based teaching)
 - avoiding mistakes with, 331
 - analysis of failure of case-based course, 339–341
 - existence of life on Mars case, 333–337
 - what not to do, 343–347
 - background of, xiv, 12, 22, 29–30, 41–42, 49, 155–156
 - benefits of, 12, 22–23, 38, 401–403
 - in business, 42–43, 49–52, 57, 83
 - choosing cases for, 12
 - class size for, 219, 222
 - clicker cases for large classes, 224–225, 227–234
 - connecting to real-world experience, 16
 - for cooperative learning, 131, 135, 138, 144
 - directed case method, 299
 - eukaryotic cell origin story, 307–312
 - mitosis and meiosis, 319–330
 - pedigrees and genetic disorders, 313–317
 - renal function study, 301–305
 - expert witnesses, 148–149
 - faculty assessment of, 401–402
 - faculty preparation for, 344
 - first-person oral narratives, 148
 - flexibility of, 30
 - formats for, 33–38, 55–59
 - future of, 421
 - dilemma case on teaching, 423–427
 - e-mail from Socrates, 437–441
 - teaching in year 2061, 429–435
 - future research on, 417–418
 - grading using, 393, 395–399, 401
 - how students learn from, 417–418
 - hybrid case methods, 251
 - advising freshman, 295–298
 - alien evolution, 253–263
 - evolution in Galapagos Islands, 271–283
 - Parkinson’s disease and fetal tissue transplantation, 265–270
 - structured controversy on DNA fingerprinting, 285–294
 - for individuals, 237
 - dialogue on human cloning, 239–245
 - student paper on Atlantic salmon controversy, 247–250
 - interrupted case method, 65, 167, 169–170, 362
 - clicker cases, 224–225, 228
 - parental favoritism among coots, 171–177
 - intimate debate method, 149–150, 179
 - legalization of medicinal marijuana, 181–186
 - in law, xiii, 41, 43, 57, 83, 179
 - limitations of, 38
 - in medicine, xiv, 32, 36, 42, 43, 51, 59, 151, 153–154, 169
 - opening question for, 84, 344, 390
 - peer evaluation in, 393, 397–399, 424
 - Problem-Based Learning method, xiv, 23, 36, 42, 43, 50, 59, 132, 138, 144, 151–156, 362 (*See also* Problem-Based Learning)
 - on public policy issues, 13
 - purpose of, 30–31
 - in science, 43

- student acceptance of, 30, 401–402
- student product creation in, 347, 397
- to teach critical thinking, 63–66
- Team-Based Learning method, 37–38, 57–59, 129, 132, 187, 189–193, 195–203
(*See also* Team-Based Learning)
- in dental education, 205–210, **207, 209**
- extinction of woolly mammoth, 211–218
- types of cases for, 32–33
- workshops on, 15, 147–150
- Case Workbook in Human Genetics*, 33
- Cell division directed case study, 319–330, **321, 322, 325–327**
- questions for, 323, 329–330
- Chakravarthy, B., 46
- Change*, 34, 190
- Charles Darwin Research Station, 272, 273, 275, 276, 358
- Chat rooms, 430
- Cheating case study, 47–48
 - racial stereotyping and, 381–383
- Chemical & Engineering News*, 339
- Christensen, C. R., 43
- Chromosomes and mutations, 320–330
- Churchill, W., 11, **11**, 13
- Clark, D. J., 77
- Classroom Assessment Techniques*, 77, 341
- Classroom management of cases, 389–391
- Classroom response systems. *See* Clickers in the classroom
- Classrooms
 - seating arrangement in, 346
 - of today, 430
 - virtual, 431
- Clickers in the classroom, 219, 221–225, 228
 - applications of, 223
 - for case study teaching, 224–225
 - Druid Dracula case on DNA fingerprinting, 227–234, **230–232**
 - cost of, 224
 - disadvantages of, 224
 - faculty training for use of, 224
 - future of, 224
 - learning theories and, 223
 - standardization of, 224
 - student responses to, 223–224
 - suppliers for, 224
 - technology for, 222–223, 224
 - use by individuals or small groups, 223, 228
- Clickers in the Classroom: How to Enhance Science Teaching Using Classroom Response Systems*, 223
- Cliff, W. H., 402
- Clinton, B., 33, 46, 243, 285, 432
- Clinton, H., 367
- Cloning, human, dialogue on, 241–245
- Closed-ended case design, 375–379
 - benefits and applications of, 377–378
 - building pedagogically rich cases, 378–379
 - educational objectives of, 376–377
 - features of, **376**
 - focus on content, 376
 - pedagogical properties of, **377**
 - spectrum of case study architecture, **378**
- Closure of cases, 390–391
- Cold fusion, 38, 46, 89, 199, 333
- Cole, S., 43
- Coleridge, S. T., 181
- Collaborative learning, 424. *See also* Cooperative learning
- Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research, 408
- Computer-assisted learning, 430–435
 - benchmarks from present to 2061, 431–432
 - future of computers, 431–432
 - virtual classrooms and distance learning, 431
 - virtual reality, 433–434
 - implications for teaching, 434–435, 440–441
- Conant, J. B., xiv, 12, 22, 29–30, 42, 43, 51, 56, 156, 340
- ConcepTests, 222
- Conceptual learning, 416–417
- Conflict provoked by cases, 46
- Constructive controversy, 150
- Contemporary cases, 46, 83
- Cooper, J., 135
- Cooperative learning, 13, 37–38, 47, 125, 127–136, 142–146

- benefits of, 127–128, 129, 142–143, 145
 - improved class attendance, 134
 - for racial minority students, 125, 128
 - for women, 128
 - case study teaching for, 57–59, **58**, 131, 135, 138, 144
 - class size for, 132, 133, 135
 - classroom initiation of, 71–74
 - coverage of course content by, 131–132, 145, 187
 - definition of, 128
 - dilemma case on teaching using, 423–427
 - elements of, 128–129, 143–144
 - face-to-face interaction, 128, 143
 - group processing, 129, 144
 - individual and group accountability, 128, 143
 - interpersonal skills, 128–129, 133, 143–144
 - positive interdependence, 128, 143
 - grading of, 71, 130–131, 134, 139, 145
 - peer evaluation, 134, 140, 398
 - groups for, 72–74
 - communication and trust within, 72–74
 - formation of, 72
 - problems within, 137–140, 200
 - meta-analysis of, 127, 133
 - obstacles to implementation of, 130–135, 196
 - for administrators, 133
 - for faculty, 130–132
 - overcoming barriers, 133–135
 - for students, 132–133
 - peer evaluation of, 134, 140
 - preparing lessons for, 131, 134–135
 - Problem-Based Learning format for, 151–156
 - sequence of activities for, 145
 - skills for implementation of, 130, 134
 - strategies for, 129
 - cooperative base groups, 129
 - formal groups, 129
 - informal groups, 129
 - student evaluations of, 132, 135
 - syllabus for, 71–72
 - Team-Based Learning format for, 37–38, 57–59, 129, 132, 187, 189–193, 195–203
 - Cooperative Learning and College Teaching Newsletter*, 135
 - Copyright laws, 371
 - Correspondence courses, 431
 - Cosmos*, xv, 365
 - Creationism, 273
 - Crichton, M., 7, 32, 85–87, 245, 349
 - Crick, F., 372
 - Critical thinking, 30–31, 89, 144, 199
 - case studies for teaching of, 63–66
 - definitions of, 63
 - discipline-specific, 64
 - measurement of, 416–417
 - skepticism and, 64–65
 - skills required for structured controversy, 286
 - Cross, K. P., 77, 341, 405
 - Cultural biases, 10
 - racial stereotyping in case studies, 381–383
 - Cumming, H. S., 100
 - Curie, M., 371, **372**
 - Curriculum reform, 76
- ## D
- Dali, S., 333
 - Darwin, C., 21, 22, 171, 272, 273, 275, 279, 280, 357, 358
 - Darwin Foundation, 278
 - DDT ban and malaria, 353
 - de Mille, A., 387
 - Debate format, 34, 57
 - alien evolution futuristic case study, 257–263
 - DNA fingerprinting in forensic medicine case study, 285–294
 - intimate debate, 149–150, 179
 - legalization of medicinal marijuana, 181–186
 - Decision cases. *See* Dilemma (decision) cases
 - Decision Cases for Agriculture*, 33
 - Definitions of a case, 27, 41, 43, 50
 - Dental education, team learning in, 205–210, **207**, **209**, 402
 - Dialogue(s), 239–245

- on controversial topics, 240
 - definition of, 240
 - evaluation as teaching method, 240
 - history of, 240
 - on human cloning, 237, 241–245
 - incomplete, 240–241
 - techniques for use of, 240–241
 - unfinished, 240
 - use in writing cases, 367
 - used as traditional cases, 241
 - Dickman, A., 403
 - Dilemma (decision) cases, 32–33, 46, 83
 - in business, 50, 57
 - debating existence of life on Mars, 119–124
 - dissection labs and animal rights, 111–118
 - questions asked by, 83
 - in research on teaching, 423–427
 - objectives of, 424
 - research issues in, 426–427
 - seminar management for, 424–425
 - teaching issues in, 425–426
 - teaching notes for, 424
 - teaching of, 83
 - Dinan, F. J., 57, 131, 145, 189, 196, 349, 402
 - Directed case method, 299, 301–305
 - for content-rich courses, 299, 301, 305
 - definition of, 299, 301
 - in medical education, 301–305
 - mitosis and meiosis, 319–330
 - pedigrees and genetic disorders, 313–317
 - story on eukaryotic cell origin, 307–312
 - student assessment of, 402
 - Discussion format, 33–34, 83–84, 143
 - closure of, 84
 - learning students' names for, 67–69, 345
 - opening question for, 84
 - types of cases for, 83
 - debating existence of life on Mars, 119–124
 - dilemma case on animal rights and dissection labs, 111–118
 - global warming case, 161–166
 - journal articles as appraisal cases, 89–98, 349, 353
 - novels, 85–87
 - whole class discussion, 83–84
 - grading of, 396–397
 - in structured controversy on DNA fingerprinting in courts, 293–294
 - Dissection labs. *See also* Animal rights
 - dilemma case
 - educational value of, 114
 - student objection to, 112–113
 - Distance learning, 430–431
 - Dixon, J., 430
 - DNA computers, 432
 - DNA fingerprinting, 12, 423
 - Druid Dracula clicker case, 227–234, **230–232**
 - Galapagos Islands case study, 273, 275
 - probability theory and, 293
 - structured controversy on use in forensic medicine, 287–294, **293**
 - blocks of analysis for, 292–293
 - classroom management of, 293–294
 - student assignment for, 288–291
 - teaching notes for, 292
 - uses of, 293
 - DNA technology, 7, 12, 32, 89, **285**
 - Dole, B., 285
 - Down syndrome, 320, 329
 - Dreams of Reason, The*, 6
 - Dropout rate of science students, 1, 4–5, 128
 - Drug Policy Alliance, 183, 184
 - Druid Dracula clicker case, 232–234, **230–232**
 - background of, 228–229
 - classroom management of, 229
 - DNA fingerprinting techniques, 229, 232–233
 - DNA structure and PCR, 229, 232–233
 - learning objectives of, 229
 - pre-assessment clicker questions for, **232**
 - wrap-up of, 234
 - Duch, B., 144
 - Duesberg, P., 157–160
 - Duncan, D., 221, 223
- ## E
- Eadie, J., 172
 - Eakin, R., 57
 - Economic status of United States, 1, 4, 29, 128

Ediacaran Period, 255
 Educational objectives of cases, 376–377, 388–389
 Ehrlich, P., 100
 Einstein, A., 22, 243, 435
 El Niño climate shifts, 272, 274–275, 358
 Elders, J., 183
 Electronic bulletin boards, 430
Elements of Argumentation, 287
 Empathy, 46
Emperor Wears No Clothes, The, 183
 Endangered species
 Atlantic salmon, 247–250
 Galapagos Island tortoises, 275–276
 Endangered Species Act (ESA), 237, 247–250
 Environmental Protection Agency, 164, 165
 Equations, 21–22
 Erskine, J. A., 30, 49, 362
 Estes, C. P., 45
 Ethical issues
 genetic engineering, 292–293
 human cloning, 241–243
 human experimentation, 103, 104, 106–107
 human tissue transplantation, 267
 press conference held before data publication, 122–123
 Eukaryotic cell origin story, 307–312
 classroom management of, 309
 objectives of, 309
 questions for, 309
 answers to, 309–312
 teaching notes for, 309
 Evolution, 7, 32, 171
 alien evolution futuristic case study, 253–263
 Endangered Species Act and, 248
 extinction case study, 211–218
 Galapagos Islands as natural laboratory for study of, 271–283
 human cloning and, 244
 Expert witnesses, 149
 Explosion of scientific information, 10–11
 Extinction case study, 211–218
 background of, 211–212
 blocks of analysis for, 215–216
 mammoths, 215

Neanderthals, 215–216
 classroom management of, 217–218
 evolution and extinction, 212–214
 objectives of, 214–215
 teaching notes for, 214
 Extraterrestrial life. *See* Mars, case study of existence of life on

F

Factual vs. fictional cases, 371–374
 copyright laws and, 371
 fictionalizing a true story, 372–373
 generic cases, 373
 libel and consent for use of real cases, 372–373
 naming names in, 373
 pure fantasy, 373–374
 Faculty development, using students as critics
 in, 75–82
 benefits of, 82
 faculty feedback on, 80–81
 outcome of workshop on, 81–82
 student feedback on, 78–80
 Family stories, 20–21
Far Side, 32
 Feedback pedagogy, 222. *See also* Clickers in the classroom
 Feltovich, P. J., 36
 Feminism, 10
 Fetal tissue transplantation, 266–267
 Feynman, R., xiv, 21
 Fictionalizing a true story, 372–373
 Fink, L. D., 189
 First-person oral narratives, 148
 Fleishman, M., 38, 199, 333
 Flemming, A., 333
 Flesch, R., 365–369
 Formats for case teaching, 33–38, 55–59. *See also specific formats*
 debate, 34, 57, 149–150
 discussion, 33–34, 57, 58, 83–84
 individual assignment, 56, 58
 lecture, 56–57, 58
 Problem-Based Learning, 36, 59, 151–156
 public hearing, 34–35
 scientific research team, 36–37

- small groups/Team-Based Learning, 37–38, 57–59, **58**, 129, 132, 187, 189–193, 195–203
 - trial, 35–36
 - Fort Erie (Ontario) Times*, 352
 - Fosse, B., 387, **387**
 - Fossil bacteria in Martian meteorite, 119–124, 333–337
 - Founder effect, 280
 - Fox, M. J., 372
 - Freshman advising case study, 295–298
 - classroom management of, 295–297
 - outcome of, 297–298
 - purpose of, 295
 - student profiles and issues for, **296**, **297**
 - Friedman, T., 1, 71
 - Frontier science, 43–44
 - Frydrychowski, V. A., 131, 402
 - Future of case-based teaching, 421
 - benchmarks for, 432–433
 - dilemma case on, 423–427
 - distance learning, 431
 - e-mail from Socrates, 437–441
 - teaching in year 2061, 429–435
 - virtual reality, 433–434
 - implications for teaching, 434–435, 440–441
 - Future of computers, **431**, 431–432
 - Future research on case-based teaching, 417–418
- G**
- Galapagos Islands evolution case study, 271–283
 - classroom management of, 282–283
 - conservation vs. tourism, immigration, and fishing industry, 276–278, 281–282, 357
 - of finches, 272–275, 280–281, 358
 - instructions to students for, 278–279
 - major issues of, 279–282
 - crisis, 281–282
 - formation and colonization of islands, 279–280
 - species formation in evolution, 280–281
 - objectives of, 279
 - photo identification for, **273**, **274**, **276**, **278**, **279**, **281**, **282**, 283
 - teaching notes for, 279
 - of tortoises and sea cucumbers, 275–278, 357, 358
 - writing case study for, 357–359
 - Galileo, 285
 - Gallo, R. C., 158
 - Gates, B., 430
 - General applicability of cases, 46–47
 - Genetic drift, 280
 - Genetics, 10, 11, 33
 - cell division and mutations directed case study, 319–330
 - DNA fingerprinting clicker case, 232–234, **230–232**
 - forensic DNA fingerprinting structured controversy, 287–294, **293**
 - human cloning dialogue, 241–245
 - pedigrees and genetic disorders directed case study, 313–317
 - George C. Marshall Institute, 162
 - Giovanni, N., 333
 - Gjustland, T., 103
 - Global warming, 86–87, 149, 151, 390
 - case study of, 161–166, **162**, **163**
 - background of, 161–164
 - blocks of analysis for, 165–166
 - objectives of, 164–165
 - running of, 166
 - teaching notes for, 164–165
 - consequences of, 165
 - evidence for, 165
 - Kyoto Treaty on, 162–164, 166
 - responses to, 165–166
 - Goodall, J., 22
 - Goodsen, P., 189
 - Gould, S. J., 10
 - Govier, T., 287
 - Grading
 - in case-based teaching, 393, 395–399
 - asking for a product, 397
 - evaluating class discussion, 396–397
 - peer evaluation, **397**, 397–399
 - of cooperative learning, 71, 130–131, 134, 139, 145

- faculty dislike of, 395–396
- of Team-Based Learning, 191, 192, 199–200, 201
- using grade comparisons in assessment of case-based teaching, 415
- Gragg, C., 30
- Graham, M., 387
- Graham, S., 410
- Grant, P., 272–274, 279, 280–281, 358
- Grant, R., 272–274, 279, 280–281, 358
- Greene, G., 368
- Greenhouse gas emissions, **162**, 162–166
- Group processing for cooperative learning, 129, 144
- Growth of the Experimental Sciences, The*, 22, 56
- H**
- Hake, R., xiii, 221, 403
- Haldane, J. B. S., 139
- Haley's Comet, 429
- Hamilton, L., 172
- Hansen, L., 148
- Harris, K., 410
- Harry Potter*, 373
- Harvard Assessment Seminar Reports, 128
- Harvard Business School Bulletin*, 46
- Heifetz, J., 144
- Hein, P., 337
- Heller, J., 103
- Hereditary tyrosinemia directed case study, 313–317
 - classroom management of, 315–316
 - objective of, 315
 - questions for, 313–315
 - answers to, 316–317
 - teaching notes for, 315
- Herer, J., 183
- Herreid, C. F., 375, 402, 437–441
- Hildebrandt, H. A., 129
- Hinderer, D. E., 287
- Historical cases, 83
 - Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male, 33, 100–110, **105**, 345, 390
- HIV disease, 372
 - clicker case on viral replication, 225
 - Duesberg phenomenon and, 157–160
- Hoag, K. A., 416
- Hoch, E. D., 368
- Holograms, 432
- Holubec, E. J., 128, 286
- Homer, 1
- Hoover, J. E., 371
- Hoppe, R., 416
- Houdini, H., 69
- How to Win Friends and Influence People*, 68
- Howard, J., 140
- Hudecki, M., 31, 385, 351–352
- Human cloning, dialogue on, 241–245
- Human experimentation, ethics of, 103, 104, 106–107
- Human tissue transplantation, 266–267
- Hybrid case methods, 251
 - advising freshman, 295–298
 - alien evolution, 253–263
 - evolution in Galapagos Islands, 271–283
 - Parkinson's disease and fetal tissue transplantation, 265–270
 - structured controversy on DNA fingerprinting, 285–294
- Hybridization, 275, 281
- Hypothetico-deductive method, 37
- I**
- "I Love Lucy" syndrome, 10–11
- Ice Age, 211–218. *See also* Woolly mammoth extinction case study
- Ice Station Sheba project, 161
- Individual assignment format, 56, **58**
- Individual case study methods, 237
 - dialogue on human cloning, 239–245
 - student paper on Atlantic salmon controversy, 247–250
- Inherit the Wind*, 32
- Interactive cases in future, 441
- Interactive feedback, 222. *See also* Clickers in the classroom
- International Assessment of Educational Progress, 4
- Internet, 430. *See also* Computer-assisted learning
- Interpersonal skills, in cooperative learning

groups, 128–129, 133, 143–144
 Interrupted case method, 65, 167, 169–170, 362
 clicker cases, 224–225, 228
 compared with Problem-Based Learning, 169
 for examining parental favoritism among coots, 171–177
 stages in implementation of, 170
 Intimate debate method, 149–150, 179
 legalization of medicinal marijuana, 181–186
Inventing the AIDS Virus, 158
 Issue cases. *See* Appraisal (analysis) cases
It's Not About the Bike, 87

J

Jacobs, J., 3
 Jeffreys, A., 233
 Johnson, D. W., 57, 127, 128, 130, 140, 142, 286
 Johnson, M., 12
 Johnson, R. T., 57, 127, 128, 130, 140, 142, 286
 Johnson Space Center, 120
 Jones, J. H., 104
 Journal articles as bases for case studies, 89–98, 349, 353
 how to use, 90
 reasons for use of, 90–91
 sample article on breast cancer and insurance coverage, 91–98, **95–97**
Journal of Cannabis Therapeutics, 184
Journal of College Science Teaching, xv, 56, 57, 131, 134, 135, 197, 333, 334, 337, 375, 389
Journal of Ethnopharmacology, 184
 Joyner, D., 141
Jurassic Park, 7, 32, 85, 92, 245, 434
 Just-in-Time Teaching, 222

K

Kettering, C., 429
 Knight, A. B., 189
 Koschmann, T. D., 36
 Kuhn, T., 9, 11
 Kurtzweil, R., 431, 432

Kyoto Treaty, 162–164, 166

L

Lancet, 183
 Large class methods, 219. *See also* Clickers in the classroom
 Larson, G., 32
 Law cases, xiii, 41, 43, 57, 83, 179
 DNA fingerprinting in forensic medicine, 287–294
 factual, 372
 grading class discussions of, 396–397
 Lawrence, J., 344
 Learning
 active, 205, 221, 222, 301, 402–403, 421
 from case-based teaching, 416
 computer-assisted, 430–435
 conceptual, 416–417
 connected to real-world experience, 16
 cooperative, 13, 47, 125, 127–136, 142–146
 developing higher order skills of, 30–31
 distance, 430–431
 Problem-Based, xiv, 23, 36, 42, 43, 50, 59, 132, 138, 144
 Team-Based, 37–38, 57–59, 129, 132, 187, 189–193, 195–203
 Learning environments, 13
 Learning objectives of cases, 376–377, 388–389
Learning with Cases, 49
 Lecture, 44
 case study method of, 56–57, **58** (*See also* Case study teaching technique)
 cost effectiveness of, 222
 deficiencies of, 205, 221, 222
 in directed case method, 299, 301
 effect of teachers' skills on student performance, 133–134, 143
 familiarity of science faculty with, 130
 superiority of active learning strategies over, 402–403
 traditional method of, 13, 15–17, 21
 Lederman, N. G., 287
 Leenders, M. R., 30, 49, 362
 Length of cases, 47, 389
 Leonardo da Vinci, 429

Lewis, R., 33
 Light, R. J., 128
 Lillie, J. K., 416
 Lincoln, A., 371, 372
 Linneaus, C., 68
 Lippman, W., 333
 Listening and responding to students, 346
 Listservs, 430
 Lombardi, V., 146
 Louganis, G., 12
 Love-hate relationship with science and technology, 7
 Lucas, J., 103
 Lundeberg, M., 149
 Lyon, B., 172

M

MacLaine, S., 421
 Malaria and DDT ban, 353
 Malcolm, Ian, 245
 Marijuana
 as gateway drug, 184, 186
 legalizing for medicinal purposes, 181–186
 arguments against, 184–186
 arguments for, 183–184
 configuring debate on, 182
 student preparation for intimate debate on, 183
 side effects of, 184–185
Marijuana Myths and Facts, 185
 Marinol, 184, 186
 Mars, case study of existence of life on
 debate on, 119–124
 blocks of analysis for, 122–123
 meteorite evidence and, 119–121, 122
 study questions for, 121
 teaching methods for, 123–124
 teaching notes for, 122
 how not to teach, 333–337
 Mathematical models, 21–22
 Mauffette-Leenders, L. A., 30, 49
 Mazur, E., 222, 418
 McCloskey, D., 22
 McMichael, A. J., 158
 McNair, M., 46
 Measurement conversions, 352

Media as source for case studies, 349,
 351–353
 copyright laws and, 371
 journal articles, 89–98, 353
 newspaper articles, 351–353
 novels, 85–87, 349
 television news programs, 353
 Medical cases, xiv, 32, 36, 42, 43, 51
 breast cancer and insurance coverage,
 90–98, **95–97**
 directed case method for, 299, 301
 pedigrees and genetic disorders,
 313–317
 renal function study, 302–305
 DNA fingerprinting in forensic medicine,
 287–294
 ethics of human experimentation, 103,
 104, 106–107
 factual, 372
 generic, 373
 interactive, in future, 441
 interrupted case method for, 169
 Parkinson's disease and fetal tissue
 transplantation, 265–270
 Problem-Based Learning format for, xiv,
 23, 36, 42, 43, 50, 59, 132, 138, 144,
 151, 153–155, 362
 student responses to, 402
 Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in
 the Negro Male, 33, 99–110, **105**,
 345, 390
 Meiosis, 324–330, **325–327**
 Memorization, 13, 15, 407
 Memory loss in mice, 352, 385
 Mendel, G., 430
 Merry, R., 30
 Merseth, K., 41
 Meteorite from Mars, 119–121, 122, 333–337.
 See also Mars, case study of existence
 of life on
 Michaelsen, L. K., 37, 57, 129, 132, 145, 187,
 189, 195, 206, 209, 217
 Miller, J., 3, 6, 8, 29
Mismeasure of Man, The, 10
 Mistakes in case study teaching, 331
 analysis of failure of case-based course,

339–341
 faculty factors, 340–341
 student factors, 341
 existence of life on Mars case, 333–337
 what not to do, 343–347
 dealing with controversial emotional material, 344–345
 failing to prepare, 344
 fretting about unenthralling discussion, 347
 leaving seats in a row, 346
 not allowing enough time for discussion, 347
 not calling on different people, 345–346
 not getting to know students, 345
 not having students produce a product, 347
 not listening and responding to students, 346
 not moving about classroom, 346
 not using blackboard in organized way, 344–345, 390
 starting with closed-ended question, 344
 Mitosis, 319–323, **321**, **322**
Moby Dick, 368
 Molecular computing, 432
 Moore, G., 431
 Moore, J., 7, 158
 Moore, J. E., 101
 Moore's Law of Integrated Circuits, **431**, 431–432
 Morris, D., 403
 Morton, J. R., 388
 Morton, K., 41
 Mostellar, F., 128
Moths to the Flame, 434
 Movies
 as source for case studies, 349
 special effects in, 434
 Mozart, 371, **372**
 Mullins, D. W., 3
 Murphy, H. W., 129
 Mutations and cellular division directed case study, 319–330, **321**, **322**, **325–327**
 questions for, 323, 329–330
 Myers, A. C., 36

N

Names of students, importance of knowing, 67–69, 345
 Nanotubes, 432
 National Academy of Sciences, 8, 29, 38, 157, 162, 198, 382
 National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)
 fossil bacteria in Martian meteorite, 119–124, 333–337
 NASA Game, 72–73
 National Center for Case Study Teaching in Science, xiv, 131, 192, 197, 234, 237, 257, 353, 382, 401, 405
 National Center for Improving Science Teaching, 4
 National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, 183
 National Institute for Science and Technology, 232
 National Institute on Drug Abuse, 185
 National Marine Fisheries Service, 237
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), 164, 237
 National Research Council, 8, 293, 407
 National Science Foundation (NSF), 3, 5, 7, 120, 147, 197, 389, 407
 National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), 4, 8
 National Surveys of American Scientific Literacy, 29
 Natural selection, 274, 280
Nature, 32, 151, 173, 174
 Neanderthals, 211–218. *See also* Extinction case study
 Nelson, R. A., 183
 Neve, R., 352
New England Journal of Medicine, 32, 89, 90, 92, 169
 New York Academy of Science, 6
New York Times, 6, 31, 351, 369, 385
New Yorker, 369
 Newspapers as source for case studies, 351–353
Newsweek, 367, 369

Newton, D., 33
 Newton, I., 22, 68, 243
 Nobel Prize winners in science, 7
 Northern Spotted Owl vs. logging
 controversy, 12, 35–36, 89, 248–249
 Novels as source for case studies, 85–87, 349
 Nowak, M. A., 158
 Nuremberg Code, 103, 105, 106

O

Objectives of cases, 376–377, 388–389
 O'Connor, J., 6
On Being a Scientist, 42
On Understanding Science, 42
 Open-ended case design, 43, 375–379
 building pedagogically rich cases, 378–379
 educational objectives of, 376
 features of, **376**
 pedagogical properties of, **377**
 spectrum of case study architecture, **378**
 as student-directed, 376
 Opening question for case discussion, 84,
 344, 390
 Optical computing, 432
 Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine,
 162, 164
Origin of Species, 22

P

Pagels, H., 6
 Paige, S., 344
 Paired problem testing, 417
 Paldy, L., xv
Paper Chase, The, 33, 41
 Paradigms of science, 11–12
 Paranormal beliefs, 5–6, 29, 128, 199
 Parental favoritism among coots, interrupted
 case study of, 171–177
 background of, 171–173, **173**
 classroom management of, 174–177
 data analysis for, 172–173, **175**
 objectives of, 174
 teaching notes for, 173–174
 Parkinson's disease, 265–270, 372
 case study of, 265–268
 classroom management of, 269–270

key issues in, 269
 objectives of, 268
 teaching notes for, 268–269
 ethics of fetal tissue transplantation for,
 267
 science of, 266, **266**
 treatments for, 266–267
 Pascal, B., 397
 Pastor, A. M., 405
 Paterno, J., 141–142, **141–143**, 146
 Pauling, L., 372
 PBL. *See* Problem-Based Learning
 Pedagogic utility of cases, 46
 Pedigrees and genetic disorders directed case
 study, 313–317
 classroom management of, 315–316
 objective of, 315
 questions for, 313–315
 answers to, 316–317
 teaching notes for, 315
 Peer evaluation
 in case-based teaching, 393, 397–399, 424
 form for, **397**
 of cooperative learning groups, 134, 140
 inconsistency of, 398
 practice evaluations, 398–399
 of Problem-Based Learning, 398
 rules for, 398
 of Team-Based Learning, 199–200
 Peer Instruction, 222
 Perry, W., 65
 model of cognitive development, 9, 65, 91,
 361, 363
 Personal histories, 21
Perspectives, 1
Petition Project, 161
 Piaget, J., 133, 341
 “Pipeline problem,” 1, 4–5, 128
 Plato, **239**, 240, 430, 437, 438–440
 Political correctness and case studies,
 381–383
 Pons, S., 38, 199, 333
 Popoveski, J., 189
 Positive interdependence, in cooperative
 learning groups, 128, 143
 Postlewait, J., 403

- Power of Problem-Based Learning, The*, 151
 Pre-Cambrian Period, 255–256
 Prescott, W., 343
 Pressley, M., 409, 410
Principia, 22
 Problem-Based Learning (PBL), 151–156
 AIDS and Duesberg phenomenon case study, 157–160
 alien evolution futuristic case study, 253–263
 classical method of, 154
 development of, 151, 153–154
 faculty tutors for, 154, 155
 Galapagos Islands evolution case study, 271–283
 global warming case study, 166
 interrupted case method compared with, 169
 in medical schools, xiv, 23, 36, 42, 43, 50, 59, 132, 138, 144, 151, 153–155, 362
 peer evaluation of, 398
 progressive disclosure of case for, 169
 student performance and, 416
 in undergraduate science courses, 151, 154
 variations of, 154
 writing case studies for, 356–357
 Problem solving, 64, 66. *See also* Critical thinking
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 31, 162
 Progressive disclosure of a case, 144, 169
 Project 2061, 8, 29, 429
Providence Journal, 183
 Pseudoscience, 1, 4, 5–6, 29, 128
 Public hearing format, 34–35
 Pure fantasy cases, 373–374
- Q**
 Quantum computing, 432
 Quigley, P. J., 432
- R**
 Racial/ethnic minorities
 benefits of small group learning for, 125, 128
 racial stereotyping in case studies, 381–383
 in science, 4, 128
 Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro Male, 33, 99–110, **105**, 345, 390
 Rankin, C., 148
 Rawlins, G., 432, 434–435
Reader's Digest, 369, 373
 Redmond, M. V., 77
 Relevance of cases, 46
 Relevance of science in society, 9–10, 31
 Renal function directed case study, 301–305
 classroom management of, 304–305
 objectives of, 303
 questions for, 302
 answers to, 303–304
 teaching notes for, 302–303
 Reno, J., 372
Republic, 430, 439–440
 Research
 projects for students, 36–37
 scientific research team teaching format, 36–37
 teaching viewed as interference with, 133
 Revere, P., 7, 8, 10, 13
Revitalizing Undergraduate Science, 29
 Reynolds, J. I., 32
 Richardson, B., 149–150
 Rivers, E., 102, 107
 Robbins, J., 387
 Roberts, E., 352
 Robyn, D., 46
 Rockefeller, J. D., 142
 Role playing
 alien evolution futuristic case study, 257–263
 Galapagos Islands case study, 278–279
 Roosevelt, F. D., xiv, 22, 156
 Rousseau, J.-J., **373**
 Russell, M., 351
- S**
 Sagan, C., xv, 365
 Scannapieco, F. A., 402
 Schatz, I. J., 103
 Schiller, N., 405
 Schulman, L., 63, 156

Science, 5, 151, 157, 158, 248
 Science and Engineering Indicators survey, 7
Science and Social Issues, 33
 Science education
 areas of concern in, 3–7
 deficiencies in, 1, 29
Science for All Americans, 29
 Science literacy, 1, 407
 of American adults, 3, 6–7, 128
 dimensions of, 9
 reasons for low rates of, 3–7
 standards of, 8–9
 teaching to increase rate of, 7–10
Science News, 353
Scientific American, 22, 158
 Scientific information explosion, 10–11
 Scientific process, 9, 36–37
 Scientific research team format, 36–37
Scientist, The, 157
 Seating arrangement in classroom, 346
 Sensenbrenner, J., 166
 Sequencing tactics for cases, 378–379
 Sexual selection, 274, 280
 Seymour, E., 5
 Shakespeare, W., 22
 Shavelson, R. J., 408
 Sherman, L. A., 367
 Simon, J., 339–340
 Simpson, O. J., 12, 287, 292
 Simulation-based training, 433
Skeptical Inquirer, xv
 Skepticism, 64–65, 199
 Small group methods. *See* Cooperative learning
 Smith, A., 22
 Smith, K., 129, 142
 Social skills, in cooperative learning groups, 128–129, 133, 143–144
 Societal issues in case studies, 382
 Societal relevance of science, 9–10, 31
 Socrates, 421, 437–441, **438**
 Socratic questioning, 33, 41, 43, 240
 Spence, L., 190
 Spermatogenesis, 324–328
 Stabler, R., 56
 Standardized science test scores, 1, 4, 127

Standards of science literacy, 8–9
State of Fear, 85–87, 349
 Stein, R., 269
 Stewart, B., 5
 Stories, 19–21, 45. *See also* Case(s); Case study
 teaching technique
 Storyteller's box, **25**, 25–26
 Structured controversy, 285–294
 case study of DNA fingerprinting in
 forensic medicine, 287–294
 critical thinking skills required for, 286
 Johnson and Johnson's model of, 286
 Watters' model of, 286–287
 Student response systems. *See* Clickers in the classroom
 Students
 barriers to cooperative learning, 132–133
 calling on, 345–346
 dislike of science, 221
 dropping out of science studies, 1, 4–5, 128
 freshman advising case study, 295–298
 learning names of, 67–69, 345
 listening and responding to, 346
 preparation for college science courses, 1, 4
 product creation by, 347, 397
 research projects for, 36–37
 standardized science test scores of, 1, 4, 127
 support network for, 5
 using as critics in faculty development, 75–82
 Study questions for cases, 389–390
Survivor, 142
 Syphilis, 33, 99–110. *See also* Tuskegee Study
 of Untreated Syphilis in the Negro
 Male

T

Tarnvik, A., 69
 Taylor, S. C., 287
 Teachers
 barriers to implementation of cooperative learning strategies, 130–132
 importance of learning students' names, 67–69, 345

- training programs for, 13
- using students as critics in faculty development, 75–82
- what not to do in case study teaching, 343–347
- Teaching
 - of better science, 8
 - case-based (*See* Case study teaching technique)
 - in context, 12–13
 - debate format for, 34, 57, 149–150
 - dilemma case in, 423–427
 - discussion format for, 33–34, 57, **58**, 83–84
 - individual assignment format for, 56, **58**
 - interactive techniques for, 13
 - lecture format for, 56–57, **58**
 - limitations of traditional methods of, 13, 15–16, 21, 407
 - of more science, 7–8
 - about nature of scientific process, 9
 - of paradigms of science, 11–12
 - Problem-Based Learning format for, xiv, 23, 36, 42, 43, 50, 59, 132, 138, 144, 151–156
 - public hearing format for, 34–35
 - scientific research team format for, 36–37
 - small group/Team-Based Learning format for, 37–38, 57–59, **58**, 129, 132, 187, 189–193, 195–203
 - about societal relevance of science, 9–10, 31
 - trial format for, 35–36
 - viewed as interference with research, 133
 - in year 2061, 429–435
- Teaching notes for case studies, 385, 387–391
 - reasons for inclusion of, 388
 - writing of, 388–391
 - classroom management, 389–391
 - introduction/background, 388
 - major issues, 389
 - objectives of case, 388–389
 - references, 391
- Teaching with Cases*, 49
- Team-Based Learning, 37–38, 57–59, 129, 132, 187, 189–193, 195–203. *See also* Cooperative learning
 - applications of, 197
 - background of, 190
 - class size for, 197
 - clicker cases for, 225
 - coverage of subject matter with, 192, 196, 402
 - defining learning objectives for, 210
 - in dental education, 205–210, **207**, **209**, 402
 - effect on class attendance, 192, 402
 - faculty preparation time for, 201
 - features of course organized for, 187, 190, 206
 - grades and peer evaluations in, 191, 192, 199–200, 201, 398
 - hints for implementation of, 201–202
 - outcomes of, 192, 200–201
 - Readiness Assurance Process in, 191
 - sample teaching sequence for, 193
 - steps in, 190–191
 - strengths of, 202–203, 210
 - student responses to, 192, 200, 208–210, **209**, 402
 - types of projects for, 197–199
 - woolly mammoth extinction case study for, 211–218
- Team-Based Learning: A Transformative Use of Small Groups*, 189–190
- Technology of future, 431–435, 440–441
- Television
 - courses for distance learning, 431
 - news programs as source for case studies, 349, 353
- Temin, H. M., 158
- THC, 183, 185. *See also* Marijuana
- The Age of Spiritual Machines: When Computers Exceed Human Intelligence*, 432
- The World is Flat*, 1, 71
- Theisman, U., 5, 128
- They're Not Dumb, They're Different*, xiv, 4, 13
- Think-Pair-Share, 222
- Thinking Toward Solutions: Problem-Based Learning Activities for General Biology*, 144
- Thompson, W., 413
- Time*, 367
- Tobias, S., xiv, 4, 5, 13, 29, 77, 128, 132, 221

Tolstoy, L., 139
 Towne, L., 408
 Trial format, 35–36
 Tuskegee Study of Untreated Syphilis in the
 Negro Male, 33, 99–110, **105**, 345
 background of, 99–101
 blackboard work on, 108
 blocks of analysis for, 106–107
 closing discussion of, 108–110
 ethics of human experimentation and,
 103, 104, 106–107
 experiment of, 101–103
 introduction to case study of, 104
 opening question for discussion of, 107–
 108, 390
 question outline for discussion of, 109
 racial issue in, 107
 study questions for, 103–104
 teaching case of, 104–106
 Types of cases, 32–33

U

Udovic, D., 403
 United States
 adult science literacy in, 3, 6–7, 128
 economic status of, 1, 4, 29, 128
 pseudoscience in, 1, 4, 5–6, 29, 128
 standardized science test scores of
 students in, 1, 4, 127
 students' preparation for college science
 courses in, 1, 4
 Unresolved cases, 84
 U.S. Department of Education, 8
 Fund for the Improvement of
 Postsecondary Education, 76
Using Cases to Improve College Teaching, 30

V

Verdon, G., 387
 Videos as source for case studies, 349
 Virgil, 55
 Virology of HIV/AIDS, 157–160
 Virtual classrooms, 431
 Virtual reality, 433–434
 implications for teaching, 434–435, 440–
 441

Vonderlehr, R., 101–102

W

Wall Street Journal, 352
 Walters, J., 185
 Walters, M. R., 402
 Watson, J., 372
 Watters, B., 286
 WebCT, 227, 228
 Webpages, 430
 Weiss, I. R., 7
 Wells, H. G., 429
 Welty, W., 34
 Wetherwax, P., 403
 White, H., 154
 Whitehead, R., 387
 Will, B., 269
 Williams, S. M., 414
 Wilmut, Ian, 242–243, 245
Wizard of Oz, 371, 373
 Women
 benefits of cooperative learning for, 128
 in science, 1, 5, 128
Women Who Run With Wolves, 45
 Woolly mammoth extinction case study,
 211–218
 background of, 211–212
 blocks of analysis for, 215–216
 mammoths, 215
 Neanderthals, 215–216
 classroom management of, 217–218
 evolution and extinction, 212–214
 objectives of, 214–215
 teaching notes for, 214
 Wright, A. W., 402
 Writing case studies, 31–33, 349, 355–359
 approaches to, 356
 art of writing readable cases, 365–369
 beginnings and endings, 368
 conversational style, 367
 dialogue, 367
 human interest, 366–367, **368**, 369
 knowing your audience, 365–366
 not just the facts, 366
 point of view, 366, 373
 reading ease, **367**, 369

- sentence length, 367, 367–368
- simple words, 368–369
- based on preexisting materials, 32, 349, 351–353
 - copyright laws and, 371
 - journal articles, 89–98, 349, 353
 - newspaper articles, 351–353
 - novels, 85–87, 349
 - television news programs, 353
- factual vs. fictional, 371–374
- how much information to include, 361–364
- for Problem-Based Learning, 356–357
- recipe for, 355–359
 - brainstorming principles to teach, 356
 - deciding on topic, 356

- determining discussion topics, 357
- introducing terms/concepts, 357
- listing characters affected, 356
- reviewing/researching topic, 356
- sample case of evolution on Galapagos Islands, 357–359
- writing discussion questions, 357
- writing draft, 356
- from scratch, 32–33
- teaching notes, 385, 387–391
- Writing Cases*, 49

Z

- Zeidler, D. I., 287
- Zimmer, L., 186