Lamont, P. (2007). *Critically Thinking about Paranormal Belief*. New York, NY:

Oxford University Press.

Lamont describes how critical thinking can be applied to a perceived paranormal event. This is relevant by helping me to understand where many paranormal experiences come from and how they can be explained by critical thinking. Lamont uses trustworthy sources for his information so he is accurate. Lamont is also a professor of philosophy at Oxford so he has authority

Pletcher, G. K. (2016). *Philosophy of Science and the Occult*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pletcher goes into detail about how many of the things we think are paranormal may just be coincidences. This source helps to give a scientific reason to paranormal events. The information is only two years old so is current. Pletcher’s purpose is to report the results of a study done on ESP.

Barberia, I., Tubau, E., Matute, H., & Rodríguez-Ferreiro, J. (2018). A Short Educational Intervention Diminishes Causal Illusions and Specific Paranormal Beliefs in Undergraduates. *Plos One,13*(1), 1-3.

This article goes into how many paranormal experiences may just be cognitive biases. The authors explain that with a small amount of education, reports of the paranormal experiences go down. This is relevant to my topic by explaining that many paranormal events may be natural phenomenon that we do not have a proper understanding of. The authors use good information from other peer-reviewed journals. Their purpose is to eliminate cognitive biases through education.

Taylor, J. G., & Balanovski, E. (1979). Is there any scientific explanation of the paranormal? *Nature,279*(5714), 631-633.

The title here is almost the exact same as my topic. This article goes into how we can use science to explain the paranormal. The information is almost 50 yeas old, but I still found the article ideas applied. This article was very relevant to my topic. This article is peer-reviewed so I would consider this a good source.

6 Scientific Explanations for Ghosts. (2015, October 26). Retrieved from http://mentalfloss.com/article/70293/6-scientific-explanations-ghosts

This website lists six reason form mold to carbon monoxide poisoning why a person may feel a presences with them. This website attempts to explain ghost encounters in a scientific way. The webpage is three years old but still current. Mental Floss also has a YouTube channel with videos on a wide range of scientific principals and ideas so there is authority. Though for entertainment purposes, I tend to trust this source.

O'Leary, B. (1994, June). When The Paranormal and Science Meet. *Body Mind Spirit Magazine*, *13*(3), 31-34.

This magazine article takes a pro paranormal stance. O’Leary talks about paranormal phenomenon that can’t be explained and how things we may not understand yet might be the cause. Most sources dispute paranormal events. This article gives a different, pro paranormal, view on my topic.

O’Leary was a professor at Princeton so he has authority. This is a spiritual magazine for entertainment purposes. This is a less trustworthy source but a refreshing view on my topic.

Pappas, S. (2015, October 30). Science of the Paranormal: Can You Trust Your Own Mind? Retrieved from https://www.livescience.com/52641-science-of- paranormal-ghosts.html

This website because it talks about how a certain frequency can cause “spooky sensations”. It goes into some other possible explanations behind paranormal experiences. The author Pappas was a science writer for Stanford University Medical School. The article also uses trustworthy sources and trail research. The source is for entertainment but I believe it is a good source.

Morse, M., & Perry, P. (2001). *Where God lives: The science of the paranormal and how our brains are linked to the universe*. New York: HarperOne.

There is a more religious tone here with this book. This source talks about God and religion and how science applies to these topics. The book is 17 yeas old so some information may need to be updated. The purpose here is to inform people and try to get them to combine science and religion.

Brown, C. (1996, August 11). They Laughed at Galileo too. *New York*

*Times*, *145*(50515), 40-46.

This article from the New York Times discuses Dean Radin who was working to gain credibility for parapsychology. It goes into how he applied the scientific method to his research. I like the title implying that we continue to learn new and sometimes surprising things from science. The information is old (from the 90’s) but still current. The New York Times is not peer-reviewed but the usually use credible sources. This is a decent source but I would not use it for a bulk of my information.

Odling-Smee, L. (2007, February 28). The lab that asked the wrong questions. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/446010a

This online article talks about the PEAR lab at Princeton. The lab was dedicated to parapsychology and mainly focused on seeing if people could control machine though their minds. Nature is a peer-reviewed magazine so I trust the authority of the website as well. The purpose of this article is to inform its audience about the PEAR lab. This is a good source for my topic.