

# Social Psychology

**CLPS0700 (formerly PSYC 0210), CRN 15678**

Fall 2010, Tue, Thu 2:30-3:50 p.m., Hunter Auditorium

Professor Bertram F. Malle

Hunter 291 | (401) 683-6820 | [bfmalle@brown.edu](mailto:bfmalle@brown.edu)

Office hours: Thu 4-5 p.m. & by appointment

## **Teaching assistants:**

Joanna Korman ([joanna\\_korman@brown.edu](mailto:joanna_korman@brown.edu))

Office hours Tues 3:50-4:50 & by appointment, Hunter 266

Sandra Mather ([sandra\\_mather@brown.edu](mailto:sandra_mather@brown.edu))

Mon 10:30-11:30 & by appointment, Hunter 102

Elena Tenenbaum ([elena\\_tenenbaum@brown.edu](mailto:elena_tenenbaum@brown.edu))

Tue 1-2:30 p.m. & by appointment, Hunter 209

---

## Syllabus

- How do people's self-perceptions influence social behavior?
- How do people make sense of human behavior?
- What are the roots of stereotypes, prejudice, and aggression?
- How do social situations influence human thinking and behavior?
- What factors govern attraction and relationships?

In this course you will learn about research and theories in social psychology that help answer these questions. More important, you will learn to think carefully about important social phenomena, and thus about yourself and other people.

You will work hard in this course. This is not a threat but a promise. In return for a considerable amount of reading, thinking, and writing, you will gain insight into social psychology as a science, excitement about the complexities of social behavior, and increased self-awareness of the mechanisms that guide your own behavior and experience.

However, this is not a self-help course, nor primarily an applied course. The focus is on the *science* of social psychology, and both lectures and readings will routinely elaborate on methodological and theoretical challenges. Social behavior is enormously complex, and gaining solid knowledge about how it works requires much more than personal experience, anecdotes, and intuitions—it requires a commitment to the scientific method, to empirical evidence, and to persistent questioning of our ordinary understanding and explanation of social behavior.

### *Course Format*

This course combines multiple activities and sources of learning. You will learn about the field of social psychology in lectures, electronic handouts, the textbook readings, and original

research articles. You will also write multiple short papers. These activities will require constant work from you in order to keep up with the flood of new information, so getting behind will be very costly—both for your success and your enjoyment in the course.

**Lectures.** I have high expectations of my students—that they are intellectually curious, prepared, and eager to be challenged. I also tend to talk fast. Interrupting me with questions is therefore required and absolutely welcomed. To do so, please make yourself seen and heard.

I use electronic slides that will be available after class on MyCourses. For several reasons I don't post slides in advance; however, sometimes outlines will be available. I audio record all my lectures and make them available on the MyCourses site as mp3 files.

**Readings.** The course relies on a textbook (Gilovich, Keltner, & Nisbett, *Social Psychology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) and 1-2 original research articles per class topic (available electronically on MyCourses). The textbook has a very different organization from our course, so you'll need to follow the detailed topic sequence and reading references in our *Reading list* rather than read the textbook from front to back.

Most of the articles are taken from prime research journals and will challenge you with both theory and methodology. Even though I have selected relatively short and readable pieces, authors usually presume considerable theoretical and methodological knowledge. Often you can acquire this knowledge from the lectures and the textbook, but you will benefit from several strategies of reading and background research:

- For empirical articles, first read the Abstract, the beginning of the Discussion, and the Conclusions (if available). Then read the Introduction and the Results. Finally, read the Methodology. The Methodology section is important, but it's much easier to understand as the *tool* that helped the authors answer their questions and back up their conclusions.
- There will be technical terms in every article. Check our textbook's glossary, and Google the terms. Not all internet sites are accurate or helpful; so look for converging information (and credible sites are usually of the .edu variety). Obviously, you can ask me and the TAs as well; but doing your own search first creates a stronger memory trace.
- You can also search (in PsycINFO and Google Scholar) for other articles that cited the target article you are reading. Those articles will probably highlight important aspects of the target article.
- I encourage you to form an informal reading group in which you clarify and discuss the reading material. If you are part of such a reading group, please document it. I don't give explicit extra credit, but participating in a reading group will benefit you in a tough grading decision (when your points are exactly at a letter cutoff).
- I welcome questions about the articles (or the textbook) toward the end of each lecture (again, please don't be shy to make yourself seen and heard). Questions such as "What was the article about?" are usually not productive; try to formulate specific questions that show you have tried to read the article and have holes in your understanding that you are hoping to fill (especially about methodology and statistics). You are welcome to visit, alone or in groups, my office hours to ask about the readings or about lecture material.

On your reading list you will see that several topics have *Extended readings*. You are not obligated to read them, nor will they be tested on the exams (except to the extent that they are covered in the textbook or in lecture). They are opportunities for you to go into depth on topics of particular interest to you.

**Written Assignments.** In addition to learning, thinking about, and discussing social phenomena, you will also write about them. However, you won't compose long papers but five concise and precise responses to individual research articles, as described below.

### *Response Papers*

Over the next 3 months you will make many new observations and have many new ideas about social behavior. I want you to develop these ideas and communicate them. Therefore you will write 4 short "response papers" about some of the research articles on your reading list. This way, you continuously monitor and document your thinking and learn to communicate it. The guidelines for these papers are detailed and the expected standard is very high. We will give you thorough feedback on the first few responses to help you improve as you go along.

**Format.** Each response page must have a **cover sheet** that shows your Banner ID (no names, please) and an APA-style **reference** for the article you are responding to. The response must fit on *one page* and must be between 400 and 600 words long. It has three parts.

- (1) The first paragraph **summarizes** the main point of the article or, if the article has multiple points (e.g., a review), highlights the specific point that you are responding to. Your summary must be clear and concise. Do not assume that the reader of your paper has read the article.
- (2) One or two paragraphs **develop a constructive point** that the article stimulated in you. For example, use the article's concepts or findings to *analyze an everyday situation*; to *develop a possible application* in education, business, clinical, law, etc.; or to *propose an additional study*. Don't vaguely point to several ideas; describe one constructive thought in detail.
- (3) One or two paragraphs **develop a critical point** about the article. For example, critique the clarity of the *theory*, the logic of the main *claim*; the adequacy of the *methods* (if the article is empirical); or the strength of the *empirical support* for the interpretation or conclusion.

All papers must be submitted in electronic format (.doc or .rtf, **not** pdf files), and we will open submission portals on MyCourses for each paper.

**Writing quality.** You will need to write clearly and concisely. Every sentence must be grammatically well-formed and easily understandable, and sentences must be logically connected to each other. Begin each paragraph with a one-sentence précis of what you will say in more detail in the paragraph. Whenever you make a claim (e.g., that the article has a certain shortcoming or can be applied to a certain domain), you must back up your claim with evidence in the paper or in other literature, with logic, or with a compelling example. Don't be vague; be precise; and concise. Re-read and edit your paper multiple times. And don't forget to spell-check. If you speak English as your second language, make sure you have other students or Student Services edit your papers.

**Paper due dates.** The response papers are due **10/5, 10/26, 11/16, and 12/7.**

**Late papers.** Your response pages are due on the date marked in the Schedule. Turning in a paper late leads to point deductions. Within 24 hours of the due date, you lose 3 points; beyond that, you lose 2 additional points per day late. There is one exception: You have a 1-day grace period for *one* of your papers (because perhaps sometimes pets really do eat papers).

If you are an athlete traveling to an official event or if you face a serious difficulty with your health or have a death in the family you must speak to us **in advance** of the due date to arrange for a new due date. If you have a documented disability and anticipate needing accommodations for the response paper assignment, please speak with me.

**Challenges (and how to overcome them).** If you have little practice in writing (especially writing short responses), you will find this assignment difficult at first. Read and edit your papers repeatedly. Put yourself in a reader's perspective and keep asking yourself: Is this clear? Would they know what I mean? And heed our feedback on early papers.

The last of the three parts, the critique, is the most difficult. Keep these guidelines in mind: Never attack the authors; instead, critique the theory, argument, data, or interpretation that the article presents. Do not merely suggest that more data should be collected; say what kind of studies would address your criticism. Do not critique the size of the study sample unless it created real problems for the statistical analysis. Do not critique the composition of the sample unless it seriously undermines the paper's main conclusion. Do not vaguely refer to possible personality differences; describe how such differences provide an alternative explanation of the findings. Do not simply say: "This finding is not true of me" (every finding in psychology is true of many but not all people); if you think that the finding is not true of *most* people, describe your evidence or how one could collect such evidence.

**Original work.** You need to think deeply and independently about your response topics. Ideas that are not your own must be acknowledged by source, and all quotes must be referenced. All writing assignments will be checked with **anti-plagiarism software**.

**Response Grading.** Each response paper earns up to 60 points, and the points breakdown is as follows:

Turned in on time	+3
Within length and page requirement	+3
Correct APA-style reference on cover page	+3
Language:	
No spelling errors	+3
No grammatical errors	+6
Understandable sentences and sentence transitions	+6
Clarity, relevance, backing of claims, and creativity in each of the main three parts:	
Summary	+12
Constructive extension	+12
Critique	+12

## Quizzes and Exams

We will have two brief quizzes (9/23 and 11/4) and two exams (Midterm 10/14 and Final 12/11). All assess your mastery of material in the lectures and required readings; the quizzes contain around 10 questions; the exams contain 40-50 questions.

The exams themselves will not be returned. However, you are welcome to come to office hours to look at and discuss the questions you missed.

We do not write make-up exams, so you will need to take the exams at the scheduled times. Students who face a serious difficulty with their health or a death in the family or athletes traveling to official events **must** speak to us in advance and arrange remote exam administration. If you speak English as your second language or have a documented disability, please provide the official paperwork and speak with me about accommodations you might need.

## Research Participation

In this course you will hear and read about numerous methodologies of psychological research, and there is no better way to get a sense of these methodologies than to participate in research yourself. A requirement in this course is therefore to participate in **120 minutes** of empirical research in the psychology department subject pool. Most studies come at 60min or 30min length, so you will take part in two to four of them. (No paid studies count.)

Your participation is tracked electronically through a system called SONA (see separate handout), but for full class credit you need to provide a **brief written statement** of your study experience, which you submit to your TA by **Dec 7**. This summary includes (a) a brief description (in your own words) of the kinds of studies you participated in and (b) one aspect of the studies that connects or contrasts with some content in our course.

You may opt out of the requirement and instead write a 2-page response paper. Its criteria are similar to the required one-page responses, but the content is expected to be somewhat more extensive and detailed.

## Grading

A perfect grade consists of 1000 points. You can earn points the following way:

Two quizzes	100 each
Midterm exam	200
Final exam	260
Four response papers	60 each
Research participation	100

The translation of points into grades will be *approximately* as follows: A > 900, B > 800, C > 700. I always look for fair cut-offs that separate clusters of scores from one another.

I offer no explicit extra credit opportunities. However, if you are exactly at a grade cut-off point, any additional contributions (reading group, active class participation) will be taken into account.

I do not tolerate any form of cheating and have failed students who have cheated in the past (e.g., copied somebody else's paper, plagiarized paper content).

### *Communication*

Because this course is work-intensive from the start, it is important that we communicate effectively with each other inside and outside the classroom. Come to class and contribute; see me or a TA in office hours; make sure you check MyCourses and your E-mail several times a week. There are few problems that cannot be solved by open and effective communication.

For administrative questions, please first consult the syllabus. However, there is always a chance that I forgot to add some important piece of information to the syllabus (or the reading list), and then it's to everybody's benefit if you ask about it.

Please adhere to posted office hours or make an appointment; please don't show up unannounced at my office. Appointments can be made by email with 48-hour notice.

## Schedule

Thu 9/2	Orientation: Syllabus, Overview	
Tue 9/7	1: Science of Social Behavior	
Thu 9/9	2: Self-Concept and Self-Schema	
Tue 9/14	3: Dissonance and Rationalization	
Thu 9/16	4: Self-Enhancement	
Tue 9/21	5: Self-esteem and Self-Presentation	
Thu 9/23	6: Understanding Other Minds I	<i>1st Quiz</i>
Tue 9/28	7: Understanding Other Minds II	
Thu 9/30	8: Explaining Behavior	
Tue 10/5	9: Moral Judgment	<i>1st Paper Due</i>
Thu 10/7	10: (Social) Emotions	
Tue 10/12	11: Language and Communication	
Thu 10/14	<b>2:30 p.m. MIDTERM EXAM</b>	
Tue 10/19	12: Personality Judgments	
Thu 10/21	13: Stereotypes	
Tue 10/26	14: Stereotypes and Prejudice	<i>2nd Paper Due</i>
Thu 10/28	15: [Film presentation and discussion]	
Tue 11/2	16: Intergroup perception and conflict	
Thu 11/4	17: Interpersonal Aggression	
Tue 11/9	18: Prosocial Behavior	NEW DATE: <i>2nd Quiz</i>
Thu 11/11	19: Persuasion and Compliance	
Tue 11/16	20: Conformity	
Thu 11/18	21: Obedience	NEW DATE: <i>3rd Paper Due</i>
Tue 11/23	22: Group Dynamics	
	<i>Thanksgiving</i>	
Tue 11/30	23: Attraction	
Thu 12/2	24: Affiliation and Relationships	
Tue 12/7	Review	<i>4th Paper Due</i>
Sat 12/11	<b>2:00 p.m. FINAL EXAM</b>	

---

## **Social Psychology, CLPS0700, CRN 15678**

Fall 2010, Tue, Thu 2:30-3:50 p.m., Hunter Auditorium

Professor Bertram F. Malle

Hunter 291 | (401) 683-6820 | bfmalle@brown.edu

Office hours: Thu 4:00-5:00 p.m. and by appointment

## **Schedule and Readings**

Textbook passages in blue font are from:

Gilovich, T., Keltner, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (2011). *Social Psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

Required research articles are in burgundy font. Many of them are good starting points for writing a response paper. Optional readings are in dashed boxes and black font. They are also possible starting points for writing response papers, but many of them are longer and therefore more challenging.

### **Thu 9/2 Orientation: Syllabus, Overview**

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. xviii-xxii, 5-11(middle)✓

### **Tue 9/7 1: Science of Social Behavior**

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 43-63✓

### **Thu 9/9 2: Self-Concept and Self-Schema**

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 65-88 (top); 553-555 [SELF-AWARENESS]; 30-33✓

Malle, B. F. (1994). *The self in philosophy and psychology*. [Overview of the topics in the first few weeks.]

### **Tue 9/14 3: Dissonance and Rationalization**

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 206-233✓

Balcielis, E., & Dunning, D. (2007). Cognitive dissonance and the perception of natural environments. *Psychological Science*, 18, 917-921.

**Extended reading: Classics in dissonance research**

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58, 203-210.

Gazzaniga, M. S. (2006). Leon Festinger: Lunch with Leon. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 88-94.

## Thu 9/16 4: Self-Enhancement

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 88-90; 128-130 [THE SELF-SERVING BIAS]✓

Wood, J. V., Perunovic, W. E., & Lee, J. W. (2009). Positive self-statements: Power for some, peril for others. *Psychological Science, 20*, 860-866.

Pelham, B. W., Carvallo, M., & Jones, J. T. (2005). Implicit egotism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 106 -110.

### Extended reading: Implicit egotism across cultures and life domains

Kitayama, S., & Karasawa, M. (1997). Implicit self-esteem in Japan: Name letters and birthday numbers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 736-742.

Pelham, B. W., Mirenberg, M. C., & Jones, J. T. (2002). Why Susie sells seashells by the seashore: Implicit egotism and major life decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 469-487.

### Body image as exception

Donaghue, N., & Smith, N. (2008). Not half bad: Self and others' judgements of body size and attractiveness across the life span. *Sex Roles, 58*, 875-882.

## Tue 9/21 5: Self-esteem and Self-Presentation

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 91-109✓

Ward, A., & Brenner, L. (2006). Accentuate the negative: The positive effects of negative acknowledgment. *Psychological Science, 17*, 959-962.

### Extended reading: The debate on the value of self-esteem

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4*, 1-44.

Swann Jr., W. B., Chang-Schneider, C., & McClarty, K. L. (2007). Do people's self-views matter? *American Psychologist, 62*, 84-94.

Krueger, J. I., Vohs, K. D., & Baumeister, R. F. (2008). Is the allure of self-esteem a mirage after all? *American Psychologist, 63*, 64-65.

## Thu 9/23 6: Understanding Other Minds I

*1<sup>st</sup> Quiz*

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 26-28, 247-251

Malle, B. F. (2008). The fundamental tools, and possibly universals, of social cognition. In R. Sorrentino and S. Yamaguchi (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition across cultures* (pp. 267-296). New York: Elsevier/Academic Press.

### Extended reading: Social Neuroscience and Evolution

Decety, J., & Jackson, P. L. (2006). A Social-Neuroscience Perspective on Empathy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*, 54-58.

Gallese, V., Keysers, C., & Rizzolatti, G. (2004). A unifying view of the basis of social cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 8*, 396-403.

Miles, L. K., Nind, L. K., & Macrae, C. N. (2010). Moving through time. *Psychological Science, 21*, 222-223.

## Tue 9/28 7: Understanding Other Minds II

---

Birch, S. A. J., & Bloom, P. (2007). The curse of knowledge in reasoning about false beliefs. *Psychological Science*, 18, 382-386.

Gilovich, T., & Savitsky, K. (1999). The spotlight effect and the illusion of transparency: Egocentric assessments of how we are seen by others. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 165-168.

### Extended reading: Intricacies of self-other asymmetries

Malle, B. F. (2007). Actor-observer asymmetries. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krueger, J., Ham, J. J., & Linford, K. M. (1996). Perceptions of behavioral consistency: Are people aware of the actor-observer effect? *Psychological Science*, 7, 259-264.

Malle, B. F. (2005) Self-other asymmetries in behavior explanations: Myth and reality. In M. D. Alicke, D. Dunning, & J. I. Krueger (Eds.), *The self in social perception* (pp. 155-178). New York: Psychology Press.

## Thu 9/30 8: Explaining Behavior

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 116-127, 147-148

Malle, B. F. (2007). Attributions. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (p. 74). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Malle, B. F. (2001). Attribution processes. In N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (Vol. 14, Developmental, social, personality, and motivational psychology; section editor N. Eisenberg, pp. 913-917). Amsterdam: Pergamon/Elsevier.

### Extended reading: Attribution theory and causal explanation

Hilton, D. (2007). Causal explanation: From social perception to knowledge-based causal attribution. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 232-253). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Lombrozo, T. (2006). The structure and function of explanations. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 464-470.

## Tue 10/5 9: Moral Judgment

*1<sup>st</sup> Paper Due*

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 256-258

Guglielmo, S., Monroe, A. E., & Malle, B. F. (2009). At the heart of morality lies folk psychology. *Inquiry*, 52, 449-466.

Killgore, W. D. S., Killgore, D. B., Day, L. M., Li, C., Kamimori, G. H., & Balkin, T. J. (2007). The effects of 53 hours of sleep deprivation on moral judgment. *Sleep*, 30, 345-352.

### Extended reading: Agency and responsibility in moral judgment

Hamilton, V. L., & Sanders, J. (1992). Human action and responsibility. In V. L. Hamilton & J. Sanders (Eds.), *Everyday justice: Responsibility and the individual in Japan and the United States* (pp. 12-20). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Austin, A. (2004). Explanation and responsibility: Agency and motive in lynching and genocide. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34, 719-733.

### Extended reading: Emotion, not reason?

Wheatley, T., & Haidt, J. (2005). Hypnotic Disgust Makes Moral Judgments More Severe. *Psychological Science*, 16, 780-784.

## Thu 10/7 10: Morality and Emotions

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 235-256

Williams, L. A., & DeSteno, D. (2009). Pride: Adaptive social emotion or seventh sin? *Psychological Science*, 20, 284-288.

### Extended reading on emotion recognition

Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2008). The automaticity of emotion recognition. *Emotion*, 8, 81-95.

### Extended reading on emotion regulation

Li, X., Wei, L., & Soman, D. (2010). Sealing the emotions genie. *Psychological Science*, 21, 1047-1050.

### Extended reading on kinship detection and incest aversion

Fessler, D. M. T., & Navarrete, C. D. (2004). Third-party attitudes toward sibling incest: Evidence for Westermarck's hypotheses. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 25, 277-294.

Lieberman, D. (2009). Rethinking the Taiwanese minor marriage data: Evidence the mind uses multiple kinship cues to regulate inbreeding avoidance. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30, 153-160.

Lieberman, D., Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2007). The architecture of human kin detection. *Nature*, 445, 727-731.

## Tue 10/12 11: Language and Communication

---

Wang, C. (2008). Analysis of conversational implicatures in sentences and text. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 5, 58-62. [not recommended as target for response paper]

Malle, B. F. (2002). The relation between language and theory of mind in development and evolution. In T. Givón & B. F. Malle (Eds.), *The evolution of language out of pre-language* (pp. 265-284). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

### Extended reading on conversation and conversational norms

Emberson, L. L., Lupyan, G., Goldstein, M. H., & Spivey, M. J. (2010). Overheard cell-phone conversations: When less speech is more distracting. *Psychological Science*, 21, 1383-1388.

Eskritt, M., Whalen, J., & Lee, K. (2008). Preschoolers can recognize violations of the Gricean maxims. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 26, 435-443.

## Thu 10/14 MIDTERM EXAM

## Tue 10/19 12: Personality Judgments

---

**TEXTBOOK:** pp. 111-116; 131-140; 151-177

Funder, D. C. (2001). Accuracy of person perception. In N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 11243-11246). Amsterdam: Pergamon/Elsevier.

**Extended reading on personality judgment**

Vazire, S., & Gosling, S. D. (2004). e-Perceptions: Personality impressions based on personal websites. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 123-132.

## Thu 10/21 13: Stereotypes

---

**TEXTBOOK:** CHAPTER 12, especially pp. 461-476

Bodenhausen, G. V. (1990). Stereotypes as judgmental heuristics: Evidence of circadian variations in discrimination. *Psychological Science*, 1, 319-322.

Implicit Associations Test Demonstration: <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/demo/>

## Tue 10/26 14: Stereotypes and Prejudice

**2<sup>nd</sup> Paper Due**

**TEXTBOOK:** CHAPTER 12, especially pp. 441-449, 476-480; ALSO 596-600 in CHAPTER 15)

Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, 17, 383-386.

Virginia Valian's resource site on gender inequity: <http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/gendertutorial/>

**Extended reading: Stereotype vulnerability**

Steele, C. M. (1992). Race and the schooling of black Americans. *The Atlantic Monthly*, April, 68-78.

Aronson, J. (2002). Stereotype threat: Contending and coping with unnerving expectations. *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education.*, 279-301.

## Thu 10/28 Film Session

---

## Tue 11/2 15: Intergroup Perception and Conflict

**TEXTBOOK: CHAPTER 12, especially pp. 449-461**

Monteith, M., & Winters, J. (2002). Why we hate. *Psychology Today*, May-June, 44-50, 87.

Vorauer, J. D., Gagnon, A., & Sasaki, S. J. (2009). Salient intergroup ideology and intergroup interaction. *Psychological Science*, 20, 838-845.

**Extended reading: Two views on the Robbers Cave experiment**

[http://www.age-of-the-sage.org/psychology/social/sherif\\_robbers\\_cave\\_experiment.html#sherif\\_robbers\\_cave\\_experiment](http://www.age-of-the-sage.org/psychology/social/sherif_robbers_cave_experiment.html#sherif_robbers_cave_experiment)

<http://www.spring.org.uk/2007/09/war-peace-and-role-of-power-in-sherifs.php>

## Thu 11/4 16: Interpersonal Aggression

**TEXTBOOK: pp. 485-505**

Konrath, S., Bushman, B. J., & Campbell, W. K. (2006). Attenuating the link between threatened egotism and aggression. *Psychological Science*, 17, 995-1001.

**Extended reading: Debate on the effects of violent video games**

Freedman, J. L. (2001). Evaluating the research on violent video games. Paper presented at *Playing by the rules: Video games and cultural policy*, A University of Chicago Cultural Policy Program Conference, Chicago, IL, Oct 26-27, 2001.

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2001). Effects of violent video games on aggressive behavior, aggressive cognition, aggressive affect, physiological arousal, and prosocial behavior: A meta-analytic review of the scientific literature. *Psychological Science*, 12, 353-359.

Powell's 11 myths of video violence. From Powell, W. J. (2003). *The 11 myths of media violence*. Sage.

Anderson, C. A. (2003). *Violent video games: Myths, facts, and unanswered questions*. Science Agenda, American Psychological Association [Responds to Powell, 2003].

Radford, B. (2009). Violent video games have not been proven to harm teens. In C. Watkins (Ed.), *Teens at risk*, Opposing viewpoints® (pp. 35-40). Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press/Gale Cengage Learning.

Cantor, J. (2009). Review of "Grand theft childhood: The surprising truth about violent video games and what parents can do" - by Lawrence Kutner & Cheryl Olson. *Journal of Communication*, 59, 199-200.

## Tue 11/9 17: Prosocial Behavior

*2<sup>nd</sup> Quiz*

**TEXTBOOK: pp. 505-531**

Gentile, D. A., Anderson, C. A., Yukawa, S., Ihori, N., Saleem, M., Ming, L. K., et al. (2009). The effects of prosocial video games on prosocial behaviors: International evidence from correlational, longitudinal, and experimental studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 752-763.

Haley, K. J., & Fessler, D. M. (2005). Nobody's watching?: Subtle cues affect generosity in an anonymous economic game. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 245-256.

## Thu 11/11 18: Compliance

**TEXTBOOK: pp. 327-351, 304-314**

Freedman, J. L., Wallington, S. A., & Bless, E. (1967). Compliance without pressure: The effect of guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 117-124.

**Extended reading: Applications to Environmental Issues**

Cialdini, R. B. (2003). Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, 105-109.

## Tue 11/16 19: Conformity

**TEXTBOOK: pp. 275-293**

Cialdini, R. B. (1993). Social proof: Monkey me, monkey do. Excerpt from R. B. Cialdini, *Influence*. New York: HarperCollins (3rd ed.).

Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 31-35.

## Thu 11/18 20: Obedience

**3<sup>rd</sup> Paper Due**

**TEXTBOOK: pp. 293-304**

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 371-378.

**Extended reading: Social Psychology and Torture**

Gibson, J. T., & Haritos-Fatouros, M. (1986, November). The education of a torturer. *Psychology Today*, 20, 50-58.

Wallis, C. et al. (2004). Why did they do it? Are those charged with abuse a few bad apples, or are they just like the rest of us? *Time* (May 17, 2004). Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,994178,00.html>

Saletan, W. (2004). Situationist ethics: The Stanford Prison experiment doesn't explain Abu Ghraib. *Slate.com* (May 12, 2004). Retrieved from <http://www.slate.com/id/2100419/>

*Not suitable for response papers:*

How psychology can help explain the Iraqi Prisoner abuse <http://www.apa.org/topics/iraqiabuse.html>

A talk with Philip Zimbardo in *Edge*, January 19, 2005 <http://www.prisonexp.org/edge/>

Further *Stanford Prison Experiment* resources: <http://www.prisonexp.org/links.htm>

## Tue 11/23 21: Group Dynamics

**TEXTBOOK: CHAPTER 14**

Goldstone, R. L., Roberts, M. E., & Gureckis, T. M. (2008). Emergent processes in group behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17, 10-15.

**Extended reading:**

Van Vugt, M., & Spisak, B. R. (2008). Sex differences in the emergence of leadership during competitions within and between groups. *Psychological Science*, 19, 854-858.

## Thu 11/26 Thanksgiving

**Tue 11/30 22: Attraction****TEXTBOOK: CHAPTER 10**

Dutton, D. G., & Aron, A. P. (1974). Heightened sexual attraction under conditions of high anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 510-517.

**Extended reading: Physiology and evolution**

Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Apgar, C. E. (2005). Adaptations to ovulation: Implications for sexual and social behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 312-316.

Miller, G., Tybur, J. M., & Jordan, B. D. (2007). Ovulatory cycle effects on tip earnings by lap dancers: Economic evidence for human estrus? *Evolution and Human Behavior, 28*, 375-381.

Gangestad, S. W., Simpson, J. A., Cousins, A. J., Garver-Apgar, C. E., & Christensen, P. N. (2004). Women's preferences for male behavioral displays change across the menstrual cycle. *Psychological Science, 15*, 203-206.

**Thu 12/2 23: Affiliation and Relationships****TEXTBOOK: CHAPTER 11**

IJzerman, H., & Semin, G. R. (2009). The thermometer of social relations: Mapping social proximity on temperature. *Psychological Science, 20*, 1214-1220.

**Extended reading: Getting into relationships**

Meston, C. M., & Frohlich, P. F. (2003). Love at first fright: Partner salience moderates roller-coaster-induced excitation transfer. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32*, 537-544.

Walster, E., Walster, G. W., Piliavin, J., & Schmidt, L. (1973). "Playing hard to get": Understanding an elusive phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26*, 113-121.

Aron, A., Aron, E. N., Tudor, M., & Nelson, G. (1991). Close relationships as including other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 241-253.

**Tue 12/7 Review****4<sup>th</sup> Paper Due****Research Participation Summary Due****Sat 12/11 2:00 p.m. FINAL EXAM**