

University of Toledo
College of Languages, Literature and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology
PSY 6200-001/7200-001: Systems of Personality
Syllabus for Spring Semester 2014*

"The purpose of psychology is to give us a completely different idea of the things we know best."
~ Paul Valery

UT Mission Statement

The mission of The University of Toledo is to improve the human condition; to advance knowledge through excellence in learning, discovery and engagement; and to serve as a diverse, student-centered public metropolitan research university.

UT Vision Statement

The University of Toledo is a transformative force for the world. As such, the University will become a thriving student-centered, community-engaged, comprehensive research university known for its strong liberal arts core and multiple nationally ranked professional colleges, and distinguished by exceptional strength in science and technology.

Time and Place:

4:15 pm – 6:45 pm Wednesdays in UH 1610

Professor:

Dr. M. Tiamiyu

Office: Department of Psychology, UH 1063, Telephone: 419-530-2853; Fax: 419-530-8479

Email: mojisola.tiamiyu@utoledo.edu

Ψ Blackboard course Web site (for syllabus, submitting a special project paper, additional required readings, scores/grades, and other course-related information) through Blackboard 9.1 Login <http://blackboard.utdl.edu>

Ψ My personal Web site (for my CV, interests, useful psychology-related links, etc.): <http://homepages.utoledo.edu/mtiamiy>

P.S. You can leave notes or messages for me at my office (UH1063); slide them under my office door if you do not meet me.

Office Hours:

My office hours are on Tuesdays & Wednesdays from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM, and by appointment. Please visit me during my office hours if you have any questions. You can also talk with me for a few minutes, before and after class in UH 1610.

Course Description:

Catalog Description

“Advanced historical overview of the main systems for understanding human beings: sources of motivation, coping, dysfunction, strengths/virtues. Emphasizes philosophical understandings of personality systems, analysis of major contributions and multi-perspective critiques.”

Expanded Description

In this course, we will engage in an advanced analysis of major traditional and modern systems / theories of human personality and individual differences. We will get to review the philosophical orientations of personality theorists, analyze their major contributions, critique their works from a variety of perspectives, and discuss related empirical research. Applications are made about the role of personality in a variety of

contexts. This course does not deal in depth with assessment and therapeutic techniques that stem from the systems covered (PSY 6230 -- Personality Assessment does this).

Course Objectives:

By the end of this course, students will be better able to:

1. describe the basic tenets and principles of major personality systems
2. appreciate the principal proponents associated with major personality systems
3. elaborate on the concepts and language used by different personality theorists to describe the structure, dynamics, and development of personality
4. evaluate the historical and cultural perspectives of the personality theories and resulting biases
5. understand the development of healthy personality and personality disorders from different theoretical viewpoints
6. identify assessment techniques of theoretical models and implications for therapy
7. discuss empirical research related to major personality systems
8. demonstrate ability to follow directions regarding personality theories and research assignments.

Textbook and Reading Material:

Required Textbook/Reading:

Ryckman, R. (2013). *Theories of Personality* (10th. Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning [ISBN-978-1-111-83066-3]

(This is an advance undergraduate level textbook, which is an overview of personality theories and research, and has received some good reviews.)

Additional Required Readings

I will assign the additional required readings (mostly original journal articles) on personality theories and research (see course calendar provided towards the end of this syllabus for details, including locations of such readings).

Course Requirements:

Class Participation (Max. 120 Points)

This is a graduate level course. A significant part of the course is your participation in class discussions. Everyone in the class will be expected to participate actively, not to sit back passively and let others do the talking. You need to do the readings prior to class and be ready to discuss them. If you are silent during class, arrive to class very late, or miss class altogether, your grade will be adversely affected.

You will get a class participation grade for each class for which you are not a discussion facilitator. **These grades can range from 0 to 10 points.** You will earn a 0 if you are very late or miss class. You will earn a 10 if you participate fully in class discussion, making essential contributions to class that indicate you read, understood and thought about the assigned readings.

It will help class discussions if you critically analyze what you read. Do not read the material in passive mode, akin to watching television with one's critical capabilities disengaged. Every time you read the assigned readings, you should be thinking about the following questions. What are the major themes of the chapters and/or articles? What are the key points and conclusions? How do these differ from the assertions of other theorists/researchers/authors? What data support the points? What ideas/data are inconsistent? What alternative explanations exist for the ideas/findings? How would you test these alternatives? How could this information be applied in community, business, clinical, educational or other real world settings? Also, keep in mind that it will be obvious to me and your course mates when you have not done the readings for class – your grade will be adversely affected if it becomes clear you are not doing all the

required readings each week.

Finally, graduate level classes usually consist of students with varying degrees of prior knowledge and experience in the course area. The feeling of having little prior background in the area can be uncomfortable. Don't worry about this. Everyone can contribute according to his or her unique skills and knowledge. Everyone will be expected to *know the materials in the readings*, but you will not be expected to have identical background knowledge in which to fit the material. Diversity in a course is strength, not weakness. Diverse prior experiences do raise the dilemma of how much background and detail to provide when covering the readings in class. These are always judgment calls. There will be times when I skip over material, unthinkingly assuming that everyone knows about (say) a particular theory, when this is not the case. Feel free to ask questions or indicate that you would like to spend some time going over the basics of a particular theory that we may have skimmed over. We can then either use class time to cover the material or I can refer you to the appropriate materials for more in-depth coverage. One Greek philosopher's quote, "Some people will never ask questions, thinking it will make them look ignorant. But it's the ones who never question anything who show their true ignorance," is always worth considering. So, don't be shy to ask questions because someone else in the class may have the same or a similar question, too.

Weekly Discussion Questions (120 Points)

Every week starting from Week 2, each student will turn in a **minimum of ONE question pertaining to EACH of the assigned readings [e.g., the required textbook chapter(s) and additional readings]**. Each question may have sub-questions, but make it clear as to which of the reading each question/sub-questions relates to (follow the order readings are written in our syllabus). Submissions should be, typed (double-spaced, 1" margins), include your name and week of assignment at the top of the page. Email your submission as an attachment to me by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet to discuss the week's topics. The questions/issues you submit should reflect your thoughts about some aspects of each of the readings for the week.

What kinds of questions should you submit? Questions should be related to the readings and can help to elicit discussions to: further research/theoretical revisions; identify new ways of applying ideas in the readings; compare, contrast/critique, integrate ideas from the readings; etc. ***Do not ask questions that will require the class to summarize the readings***, because everyone is expected to have read them already. In these submissions, I am expecting you to come up with questions, which when addressed in class extends our understanding of the week's topics.

When in doubt, go back to those questions I posed in the previous section on class participation. If you are thinking of these questions each time you do the readings, it shouldn't be too difficult for you to come up with questions that are likely to generate discussions that would be enlightening, engaging and productive for all of us.

Late submissions will not be graded. Your questions are due at me via email by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet to discuss the week's topics, which will typically be the Wednesday of that week. Remember to send your questions as an attachment, NOT typed directly within an email message. Please include in the email subject line: PSY 6200/PSY 7200 DQ (indicate Week number in parentheses). I will not grade late submissions regardless of the excuse. If you are having difficulty with your computer, please use another computer (e.g., one of those in our psychology department computer labs) by the due date.

Grades for your weekly discussion questions can range from 0 to 10 points. You will earn a 0 if you do not submit by the due time. You will earn a score ranging from 1 to 10 points based on the relevance, clarity, logic, and thoughtfulness of your questions and the extent to which you followed the other

submission criteria mentioned in the above paragraphs.

P.S. Students will NOT submit discussion questions the week that they will be the discussion facilitator.

Reflection Papers (120 Points)

Each student will turn in a **total of THREE reflection papers**. You are free to choose from week 2 to week 14 readings, **with the exception of the week that you will be the facilitator**. The expected length of each paper is two full pages, typed (double-spaced, 1" margins, pages numbered), include your name, week of assignment, and a creative title at the top of page 1. Email your submission as an attachment to me by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet to discuss the week's topics. The paper should contain your thoughts about some aspects of the readings for the week. Keep in mind that at minimum I am trying to judge whether you truly understand the readings and how you express your thoughts. More importantly, I am judging whether you can apply what you read and that you understand the ramifications of what you read.

What should you write about in your reflection papers? The reflection papers should be your comments on the research/theory. It can be your ideas for further research/theoretical revisions, new ways of applying some ideas in the readings, criticisms, or an integration or comparison of the readings/articles. **Do not summarize**, because I have done the readings already. In these papers I am expecting you to come up with original ideas that in some way extend our understanding of the topic(s). There are many ways to do this:

If you ask a couple of questions, answer them. It is easy to ask rhetorical questions. If the readings inspire you to pose such questions, let the reflection paper be a chance to address them. By speculating a little, you may come up with ideas that go beyond the material contained in the readings.

If you have methodological criticisms, tell me why they matter. It is easy to critique the sample or methodology of any study / theory. The challenge is to explain why the results of the study for example would be different if the sample and/or methodology were different. So, for example, you might think: "Hmmm, this study was only conducted on white males!" Okay, but we only learn something new if you explain why we should expect that the findings would be different in a sample of more varied population. If you cannot think of any good reason why the results would be different among a different population, then you haven't come up with much of a critique. Occasionally, there may be important methodological concerns that need to be discussed. However, simply critiquing solely the methodology in all your papers will not earn you high scores on the papers. I expect you to dig deeper into the readings and think about them at the theoretical level as well.

If you have many ideas, choose some of your good ones. YOU DO NOT HAVE TO FOCUS EQUALLY ON ALL THE READINGS OF THE PARTICULAR WEEK. You need to read them all to know what the issues are (you do not want to make a point that appears in the article you did not read!). Establish the issues you are addressing, make your points, support them, and explain why they matter. This way, you will have enough to write in two pages.

When in doubt, go back to those questions I posed in the previous section on class participation. If you are thinking of these questions each time you do the readings, it should not be too difficult for you to come up with what to write.

Other issues regarding reflection papers:

Do not exceed two typed pages. Part of learning how to write is learning to write succinctly. I expect every paper to have a beginning, middle, and an ending. Think of these papers as short essays. Sometimes,

it may be difficult to keep the paper to two pages, but you and I know it can be done. Also, conserve paper; do NOT include a cover page/reference page with your paper.

Each paper will be graded for clarity, logic, and thoughtfulness using the following scale:

2 points = You turned in something that bears no relation to the readings. (This is rare)

4 points = You demonstrated some understanding of the readings.

6 points = You understood the readings and made original comments.

8 points = You understood the readings, made original comments and contributed ideas that extend existing theories / research in some ways

10 points = You understood the readings, made original comments and contributed ideas that extend existing theories / research in some ways, and you followed all the instructions for the paper.

Late papers will not be graded. For the three weeks you choose to submit a reflection paper, your papers are due at me via email by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet to discuss the week's topics, which will typically be the Wednesday of that week. Remember to send your paper as an attachment, NOT typed directly within an email message. Please include in the email subject line: PSY 6200/PSY 7200 RP 1, 2 or 3 (indicate Week number in parentheses). I will not grade late submissions regardless of the excuse. If you are having difficulty with your computer, please use another computer (e.g., one of those in our psychology department computer labs) by the due date.

Being a Discussion Facilitator (80 Points)

You are entirely responsible for facilitating at least one class discussion during the semester [I will assign the day each student will be a facilitator via random drawing]. Facilitating a discussion may not be easy, but it can be very rewarding. It requires being extremely prepared in advance. It is not something people can "wing".

As a facilitator, you must arrive in class prepared to lead the class discussion on the day assigned. This means that you need to read the assigned chapter and additional readings, lead the discussion of the topics, and prepare a discussion outline that includes your questions / handout to distribute in class to your course mates. **Email me your discussion outline / handout by 5 pm the Monday before the class meets. If I have any major concerns about it, I'll let you know as soon as possible.**

The best way to facilitate a class discussion is to know in advance the topics you want to cover, the responses you want to elicit, and the discussion questions that specifically elicit those responses. You don't need to know the answers to all the questions you ask, but you should have thought about the questions. A question such as, "What did you think about the article by Smith?" is a poor discussion question and is likely to elicit blank stares or brief, uninformative responses. Your discussion questions should be brief and stated in your own words.

One of the toughest things about being a discussion facilitator is the pause that follows the question. It can take up to 10 seconds between when you ask a question and receive a response. People must digest what you said, think about it, formulate a response, and then speak. Typically, however, the few seconds may seem more like 1 hour. Be patient. If there is a problem with the question, your course mates or I will ask you to rephrase it.

There is a tendency for discussion facilitators to dominate the discussion. This is not surprising. As a discussion facilitator you probably know the topic better than any other student in the class. You have thought about it more and probably have the answer written down in front of you. Avoid the temptation to

dominate the class discussion. The best discussion facilitators pull the answers from others in the class.

This is an opportunity for you to be creative (i.e., produce original, appropriate, and valuable ideas). Feel free to do demonstrations, organize a debate, show brief videos, develop and administer a questionnaire, etc.

You will be graded partly on your preparation, as reflected in the discussion outline / handout you email to me by its due date (20 points), and partly on your organization, presentation of material and ability to facilitate the class discussion (60 points) in the classroom. The class will evaluate each discussion facilitator fairly and anonymously, immediately after the day's discussion. The evaluation of you by your peers, will determine 50% of the allotted 60 points for your class discussion facilitation in the classroom, and my evaluation will determine the remaining 50%. Find towards the end of our syllabus the form that we will use to evaluate class discussion facilitators (facilitator: make copies ahead of time and bring them to the classroom, i.e., one for each student, except you, and one for me, the course professor).

I will be the discussion facilitator on the days that no student has been assigned to be one. In preparing to facilitate those weeks' discussions, I will try to incorporate some of the questions submitted by students in their weekly submissions, paying particular attention to questions/issues with similar themes that several students would like to discuss in class that week.

Finally, we all bear the onus of participating in discussions with respect, responsiveness, and responsibility.

Special Project Paper (280 Points)

Each student will choose a project topic. The topic should be related to one of your research interests. **ONCE YOU HAVE SELECTED A TOPIC, CHECK WITH ME FOR FINAL APPROVAL BEFORE GETTING TOO FAR ALONG!** You must run your topic by me no later than **Wednesday, March 26th**. Email your topic to me as soon as possible or before someone else selects the topic or a similar topic (i.e., one topic per student).

You will be responsible for writing a paper on your chosen topic. The paper must be a Microsoft Word typed document, double-spaced, with 1" margins. Include your name, the course code and title, the semester, and a relevant creative title on a separate title page (begin to number pages of submission on the next page and as page 1). Paper must be in APA format. The paper should present **a theoretical model** you have developed. This type of paper should provide a review of the background literature of the phenomenon you are trying to explain then move into an explanation of the components of the model. Make sure to pay special attention to the articles in *Psychological Bulletin* or *Psychological Review*. This is the style and format that is expected, so use those articles as a type of template.

Remember, the class deals with systems of personality, so theories (from **at least three different theoretical schools**, e.g., psychoanalytic, trait and humanistic; at least one of which we must have covered in this course) and research in the area should be prominently featured in your paper. You can select any topic of interest, but I'd strongly recommend picking a topic that might help in your own research now or in the near future. In an important sense, the paper is for you; it is an opportunity to explore an area that interests and helps you in your own research. Note that I expect you to seek out and read other relevant articles not covered in class. I will not specify a paper length as this will be governed by your topic and approach. I cannot imagine, however, how an acceptable paper could be done in less than eight pages of text. **Your Special Project paper is due as an attachment via our Blackboard course Web site Assignments tool by 5pm on Wednesday, April 23.** Four points will be deducted per day for any late

submission with no acceptable reason. **You can begin to submit your paper as from 5pm on Wednesday, April 9.** Documentation for not making a submission by April 23 must cover the period of April 9 up till the day before paper is submitted.

Grading: The final course grade will be based on the following percentage values

- Class Participation (10 Points / Week.): 120 Points ($\approx 17\%$)
- Weekly Discussion Questions (10 Points / Week.): 120 Points ($\approx 17\%$)
- Reflection Papers (3 x 40 Points): 120 Points ($\approx 17\%$)
- Being a Discussion Facilitator: 80 Points ($\approx 11\%$)
- Special Project Paper: 280 Points ($\approx 39\%$)
- **Total: 720 Points ($\approx 100\%$)**

P.S.: There is no cumulative final exam; however, all the above course requirements must be met in order to get a final grade other than an IN (incomplete)

Final grades will be determined in accordance with the grading system below, which lists category floors (**grades and applicable points**)**:

A 95% = 684	A- 90% = 648	
B+ 85% = 612	B 80% = 576	B- 75% = 540
C+ 70% = 504	C 65% = 468	C- 60% = 432
D+ 55% = 396	D 50% = 360	D- 45% = 324
F 0% = 0		

**The above percentages serve as a guide for students who would like to compute their grades during the semester.

P.S. I reserve the right to discretionary grade adjustments.

FLEXIBILITY CLAUSE: The aforementioned requirements, assignments, policies, evaluation procedures, etc. are subject to change. Students' experiences and needs, as well as emerging knowledge, will be considered in modifying this course syllabus.

Academic Honesty:

The Policy Statement on Academic Dishonesty in the UT Catalog is detailed and explicit. Please consult the catalog for how academic dishonesty is described. Students involved in academic dishonesty should expect to receive a "0" on the specific assignment or an F for the course, depending on the severity of the violation

**PSY 6200/7200 -- SYSTEMS OF PERSONALITY
COURSE CALENDAR -- Spring 2014**
(Subject to modification)

Week 1: January 8 – Introduction

- Complete a Bio-form [i.e., provide name, telephone number, a few things about you (e.g., interests, talents, hobbies, passion, etc.), and information that may help me to meet your academic needs (e.g., career goals, learning style, etc.)]
- Review and discuss the Syllabus
- Assignment of class discussion facilitators (today or in Week 2)

Week 2: January 15 – History of Personality Psychology

Ellis, A., Abrams, M., and Abrams, L. (2009). Personality Theories: Critical perspectives (pp. 25-51). Los Angeles, CA.: SAGE Publications, Inc. [Available on Course Web site]

McAdams, D. & Pals, J. (2006). A new big five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, 61(3), 204-217.

Braslow, M. D., Guerrettaz, J., Arkin, R. M., & Oleson, K. C. (2012). Self-doubt. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(6), 470-482. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2012.00441.x [Available on Course Web site]

Week 3: January 22 – Personality Research

Conner, T., Tennen, H., Fleeson, W., & Barrett, F. (2009). Experience sampling methods: A modern idiographic approach to personality research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3, 1-22. [Available on Course Web site]

McLeod, T. G., Ebbert, J. O., & Lymp, J. F. (2003). Survey assessment of Personal Digital Assistant use among trainees and attending physicians. *Journal of American Medical Information Association*, 10(6): 605–607. doi: 10.1197/jamia.M1313. [Available on Course Web site]

Vazire, S., & Mehl, M., (2008). Knowing me, knowing you: The accuracy and unique predictive validity of self-ratings and other-ratings of daily behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1202-1216. [Available on Course Web site]

Vazire, S., & Carlson, E. N. (2011). Others sometimes know us better than we know ourselves. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 104-108. [Available on Course Web site]

PSYCHOANALYTIC AND NEOANALYTIC PERSPECTIVES

Week 4: January 29 – Freud’s Psychoanalytic Theory (Chapter 2)

Erdelyi, M. H. (2001). Defense processes can be conscious or unconscious. *American Psychologist*, 56, 761-762. [Available on Course Web site]

Grunbaum, A. (2007). The reception of my Freud-critique in the psychoanalytic literature. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 24(3), 545-576. [Available on Course Web site]

Week 5: February 5 – Jung’s Analytical Psychology (Chapter 3) & Adler’s Individual Psychology (Chapter 4)...

Nachman, G. (2009). Clinical implications of synchronicity and related phenomena. *Psychiatric Annals*, 39, 5, 297-308. DOI: 10.3928/00485713-20090424-02 [Available on Course Web site]

Burhn, A. R., & Last, J. (1982). Earliest childhood memories: Four theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 46, 119-127. DOI: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4602_2. [Available on Course Web site]

Week 6: February 12 – Horney’s Social and Cultural Psychoanalysis (Chapter 5) ...

Smith, W. B. (2007). Karen Horney and psychotherapy in the 21st century. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 35 (1), 57-66. DOI: 10.1007/s10615-006-0060-6. [Available on Course Web site]

Bintzler, J. (1978). Diagnosis and treatment of borderline personality organization. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 6 (2), 100-107. [Available on Course Web site]

Cote, J., & Levine, C. (1988). On critiquing the identity status paradigm: A rejoinder to Waterman. *Developmental Review*, 8, 209-218. DOI: 10.3928/00485713-20090424-02. [Available on Course Web site]

TRAIT PERSPECTIVES

Week 7: February 19 – Allport’s Traits Theory (Chapter 8)

Person-Situation Debate

Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2009). If the person–situation debate is really over, why does it still generate so much negative affect? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 146-149. [Available on Course Web site]

Person and Situation Integration

Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B. E. (2010). Honesty-humility and a person-situation interaction at work. *European Journal of Personality*, 24(7), 569-582. [Available on Course Web site]

Jayawickreme, E., & Di Stefano, P. (2012). How Can We Study Heroism? Integrating Persons, Situations and Communities. *Political Psychology*, 33(1), 165-178. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00861.x. [Available on Course Web site]

SOCIAL-BEHAVIORISTIC PERSPECTIVES

Week 8: February 26 – Bandura’s Social-Cognitive Theory (Chapter 17) ...

Upfront: Was ‘Little Albert’ ill during the famed conditioning study. APA Monitor (March 2012; pp. 12 & 13). www.apa.org/monitor/digital/littlealbert.aspx

Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, 20, 158-177. [Available on Course Web site]

Skinner, B. F. (1987). Whatever happened to psychology as the science of behavior? *American Psychologist*, *42*, 780-786. [Available on Course Web site]

Week 9: March 5 – Spring Break (NO CLASS)

HUMANISTIC/EXISTENTIAL PERSPECTIVES

Week 10: March 12 – Rogers’s Person-Centered Theory (Chapter 13)

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 5-14. [Available on Course Web site]

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). If we are so rich, why aren’t we happy? *American Psychologist*, *54*, 821-827. [Available on Course Web site]

McNulty, J. K., & Fincham, F. D. (2012). Beyond positive psychology? Toward a contextual view of psychological processes and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *67*(2), 101-110. doi:10.1037/a0024572 [Available on Course Web site]

COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVES

Week 11: March 19 – Kelly’s Theory of Personal Constructs (Chapter 11) ...

Cantor, N. (1990). From thought to behavior: "Having" and "doing" in the study of personality and cognition. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 735-750. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.45.6.735. [Available on Course Web site]

Mischel, W. & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 246-268. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.102.2.246. [Available on Course Web site]

BIOLOGY, GENETICS, AND THE EVOLUTION OF PERSONALITY

Week 12: March 26

Borkenau, P., Riemann, R., Angleitner, A., & Spinath, F. M. (2001). Genetic and environmental influences on observed personality: Evidence from the German observational study of adult twins. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(4), 655-668. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.80.4.655. [Available on Course Web site]

DeYoung, C. G. (2010). Personality neuroscience and the biology of traits. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*(12), 1165-1180. 10.1111/j. 1751-9004.2010.00327.x [Available on Course Web site]

Nettle, D. (2006). The evolution of personality variation in humans and other animals. *American Psychologist*, *61*(6), 622-631. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.6.622 [Available on Course Web site]

Buss, D. M. (2009). How can evolutionary psychology successfully explain personality and individual differences? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(4), 359-366. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01138.x [Available on Course Web site]

-- Last day to email me your Special Project topic (i.e., by 5 pm)

Week 13: April 2 – Abnormal Personality and Personality Disorders

Clark, L. A. (2005). Temperament as a unifying basis for personality and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 114(4), 505-521. DOI: 10.1037/0021-843X.114.4.505 [Available on Course Web site]

Livesley, W., & Jang, K. L. (2005). Differentiating Normal, Abnormal, and Disordered Personality. *European Journal Of Personality*, 19(4), 257-268. doi:10.1002/per.559. [Available on Course Web site]

Oltmanns, T. F. & Turkheimer, E. (2009). Person perception and personality pathology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(1), 32-36. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01601.x [Available on Course Web site]

Krueger, R. F., Schmutte, P. S., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Campbell, K., & Silva, P. A. (1994). Personality traits are linked to crime among men and women: Evidence from a birth cohort. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103(2), 328-338. [Available on Course Web site]

Welch, S., Klassen, C., Borisova, O., & Clothier, H. (2013). The DSM-5 controversies: How should psychologists respond? *Canadian Psychology*, 54(3), 166-175. doi: 10.1037/a0033841. [Available on Course Web site]

CROSS-CULTURAL APPROACHES TO PERSONALITY

Week 14: April 9

Ziegler, A., Fidelman, M., Reutlinger, M., Vialle, W., & Stoeger, H. (2010). Implicit personality theories on the modifiability and stability of the action repertoire as a meaningful framework for individual motivation: A cross-cultural study. *High Ability Studies*, 21(2), 147-163. doi:10.1080/13598139.2010.528924. [Available on Course Web site]

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S., & Fontaine, J. (2009). Hypocrisy or maturity? Culture and context differentiation. *European Journal of Personality*, 23(3), 251-264. doi:10.1002/per.716. [Available on Course Web site]

Carlo, G., Knight, G. P., Roesch, S. C., Opal, D., & Davis, A. (2014). Personality across cultures: A critical analysis of Big Five research and current directions. In F. L. Leong, L. Comas-Díaz, G. C. Nagayama Hall, V. C. McLoyd, J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *APA handbook of multicultural psychology, Vol. 1: Theory and research* (pp. 285-298). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/14189-015. [Available on Course Web site]

-- You can begin to submit your Special Project paper as an attachment via our Blackboard course Web site Assignments tool as from 5pm on Wednesday, April 9.

NON-WESTERN/EASTERN APPROACHES TO PERSONALITY

Week 15: April 16

Fadiman, J. and Frager, R. (2013). Yoga & Hindu Tradition. *Personality and personal growth* (pp. 328–352). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. [Available on Course Web site]

Fadiman, J. and Frager, R. (2013). Zen & the Buddhist Tradition. *Personality and personal growth* (pp. 353–381). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. [Available on Course Web site]

Course Wrap-up

Week 16: April 23 – NO CLASS

-- Special Project Paper due as an attachment via our Blackboard course Web site *Assignments* tool by 5pm on Wednesday, April 23.

-- Course Evaluation: Department of Psychology Teaching Evaluation form will be available for completion on our Blackboard course Web site as of 5 pm today (April 23) till Friday, May 5. Kindly let me know what worked for you and suggestions for improvement – thanks!

Student Discussion Facilitator Feedback Form

Name of Discussion Facilitator: _____ Date: _____

Topic: _____

1 = Strongly Disagree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1. The facilitator seemed organized & prepared. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The facilitator asked good questions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. The questions posed challenged my thinking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. The discussion helped me understand topics better. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I enjoyed the discussion today. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Indicate your overall evaluation of the discussion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | Poor | | | | Excellent |

Please describe what you liked about today's discussion. That is, in what ways did the discussion facilitator do a good job?

Please describe what you didn't like about today's discussion. That is, what could have been done differently by the facilitator to make this a better discussion?