

University of Toledo
College of Languages, Literature and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology
PSY 6200-001/7200-001: Systems of Personality
Syllabus for Fall Semester 2012*

"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:

3:30 pm – 6:00 pm Tuesdays 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, scores/grades, & 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 Mondays and Tuesdays 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

Textbook and Reading Material:

Required Textbook/Reading:

Ellis, A., Abrams, M., and Abrams, L. (2009). *Personality Theories: Critical perspectives*. Los Angeles, CA.: SAGE Publications, Inc. ISBN: 978-1-4129-7062-4

(This is a graduate level textbook, which is research focused, links abnormal and normal personality, and has received good reviews.)

Additional Required and Optional Readings

I will assign additional readings (books/book chapters and original journal articles) on personality theories and research to supplement the contents of the required textbook/reading (see course calendar provided towards the end of this syllabus for details).

Course Requirements:

Class Participation (20%)

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 must 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 3. You will earn a 0 if you are very late or miss class. You will earn a 3 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 a chapter/article, you should be thinking about the following questions. What are the major themes of the chapter/article? What are the key points and conclusions? How do these differ from the assertions of other theorists or researchers? What data support the points? What data are inconsistent? What alternative explanations exist for the findings? How would you test these alternatives? Will the effects occur all of the time or only under specific conditions? What are the boundary conditions for the effect (i.e., when will it not hold, or when might the reverse occur)? How would you test these boundaries? What processes might be responsible for the effects? How would you distinguish these processes from other possibilities? How could this information be applied in community, business, clinical, 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. Please 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 give a condensed interpretation and 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, please don't be shy to ask questions because someone else in the class may have the same or a similar question, too.

Reflection Papers (30%)

Each student will turn in a **total of THREE reflection papers** based on the topics with three asterisks indicated on the course calendar. The expected length of each paper is two full pages, typed (double-spaced, 1" margins), include your name and 4-digit #, week of assignment, and a creative title at the top of page 1. Email your paper to me by 6 pm the Sunday before the class will meet to discuss the topic on Tuesday. 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. 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 answer 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 didn't read!). Establish the issues you are addressing, make your points, support them, and explain why they matter. This way, you'll 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 shouldn't 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 I assure you it can be done. Also, please conserve paper; do NOT include a cover page/reference page with your paper.

The papers will be graded for clarity, logic, and thoughtfulness on a five-point scale:

- 1 = You turned in something that bears no relation to the readings. (This is rare)
- 2 = You demonstrated some understanding of the readings.
- 3 = You understood the readings, and made original comments.
- 4 = You understood the readings, and contributed ideas that extend existing theories/research in some ways
- 5 = You contributed outstanding, original and completely new ideas, and followed all the instructions for the paper.

Late papers will not be accepted. Your papers are due at me via email by 6 pm the Sunday before the class we'll meet to discuss topic, which will be a Tuesday. Please send the paper as an attachment, NOT typed directly within an email message. I will not accept late papers regardless of the excuse. If you are having difficulty with your computer and cannot email a paper, print a hard copy of your paper and slide under my office door (if I am not in) by the due date. If you are sick and/or have a computer problem, you may have someone else turn in your paper for you by the due date.

Being a Discussion Facilitator (10%)

You are entirely responsible for facilitating 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".

You will meet with me to help you prepare your discussion; however, you must arrive prepared for the meeting. After all, YOU are responsible for preparing the discussion. Thus, I will hear and make comments and suggestions regarding your ideas for your discussion. This means that you need to do the readings, discuss the topic, and prepare an outline of what you plan to cover BEFORE we meet. Remember to bring with you an extra copy of your outline for me. Coming to our meeting unprepared makes a bad impression and I am very likely to cancel the meeting. We should meet latest the day before you are the discussion facilitator for the class (i.e. by the Monday before a Tuesday class). However, meeting earlier than the Monday may be better. Kindly schedule a meeting day with me 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 the questions you ask, but you should have thought about the questions. A question such as, "What did you think about the article by McAdams?" 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 10 seconds may seem more like 1 hour. Be patient. If there is a problem with the question, people will ask you to repeat it 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. 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 before meeting with me (10%), and partly on your organization, presentation of material and ability to facilitate the class discussion (90%). 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 45% of your grade, and my evaluation will determine 45%. Find attached to the syllabus the form that we will use to evaluate class discussion facilitators (make copies ahead of time, i.e., one for each student facilitator, except you).

I will be the discussion facilitator on the days that no student has been assigned to be one.

Special Project Paper (40%)

Each student will choose a project topic. The topic should be related to one of the mental health disorders or personality strengths / virtues (i.e., positive psychology-related topics, e.g., hope, happiness, flow, etc.). 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 **Tuesday, November 6th**. Email your topic to me as soon as possible or before someone else selects the topic (i.e., one topic per person).

You will be responsible for writing a paper on your chosen topic. The paper must be typed (double-spaced, 1" margins). Include your name and 4-digit #, the course code and title, the semester, and a creative title on a separate title page (begin to number pages of submission on the next page). Paper must be in APA format. The paper can take one of two forms: First, the paper could 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. If you choose to write a theoretical paper, 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.

Second, you could write a **proposal for a study** that is needed to address an important question left unanswered by the current literature. A proposal consists of an introductory section, containing your thesis

or hypotheses and a review of relevant theory and research, and a method section, containing the description of how you plan to test your hypotheses. An exemplar for such a paper is a thesis or dissertation proposal. In other words, it is the type of paper that could result in a "do-able" research project.

Remember, the class deals with systems of personality, so theories (from different theoretical schools) and research in the area should be prominently featured in your paper. You can select any topic related to one of the mental health disorders or personality strengths / virtues you want, and I'd strongly recommend picking a topic that might help in your own research. 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. However, do not focus just on your own research area with only passing references to a personality-relevant theory, as if your paper was a summary of a thesis proposal with a few mentions of course themes. Note that no matter which paper form you choose, 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 ten pages of text. **Your Special Project paper (HARDCOPY) is due by 5pm on Tuesday, December 4, in my office (UH 1063).** Four points will be deducted per day for a late submission.

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

- Class Participation: 20%
- Reflection Papers (3): 30%
- Being A Discussion Facilitator: 10%
- Special Project Paper: 40%
- **Total: 100%**

P.S.: There is no cumulative final exam; however, all the above course requirements must be met in order to get a passing grade

- Final grades will be determined in accordance with the grading system below, which lists category floors:

	A 95%	A- 90%
B+ 85%	B 80%	B- 75%
C+ 70%	C 65%	C- 60%
D+ 55%	D 50%	D- 45%
F 0%		

I reserve the right to discretionary grade adjustments.

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 -- FALL 2012**
(Subject to modification)

For a topic marked “Ψ,” the class discussion is to be facilitated by one student (assigned facilitator to meet with me latest the day before the class meets to discuss topic; however, meeting with me earlier is strongly recommended)

For a topic marked, “*”** all students to e-mail me a reflection paper latest by 5 pm the Sunday before the class meets (I will facilitate the class discussion for these weeks). I will also facilitate class discussions for weeks not assigned to a student.

Week 1: August 21 – Introduction

-- Complete Bio-forms (i.e., provide name, telephone number, 4-digit number to be used for all assignments and for me to post your scores/grades on our Blackboard course Web site, and a few special things about you that may help me meet your academic needs)

-- Discussion of the Syllabus; Q & A

-- Assignment of class discussion facilitators

Week 2: August 28 – Historical Perspectives on Personality (Chapter 2)

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

<http://edtech.cebs.wku.edu/~rmiller/new%20big%20five.pdf>

Optional

Hogan, R. T. (2006). Who wants to be a psychologist? *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 86, 119-130.

http://www.peterberry.com.au/files/hogan_research_articles/journal_articles/who_wants_to_be_a_psychologist.pdf

Paunonen, S. V., & Jackson, D. N. (2000). What is beyond the Big Five? Plenty! *Journal of Personality*, 68, 821-835. http://www.subjectpool.com/ed_teach/y4person/1_intro/refs/whatsbeyondthebig-5.pdf

Zickar, M. J. (2001). Using personality inventories to identify thugs, malcontents, and agitators: Applied psychology's contribution in the war against labor. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 149-164. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2000.1775

Ψ Week 3: September 4 – Personality Research (Chapter 3)

Beal, D. J., & Weiss, H. M. (2003). Methods of Ecological Momentary Assessment in Organizational Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6 (4), 440-464. DOI: 10.1177/1094428103257361.

<http://orm.sagepub.com/content/6/4/440.full.pdf+html>

Optional

Conner, T., Tennen, H., Fleeson, W., & Barrett-Feldman. (2009). Experience sampling methods: A modern idiographic approach to personality research. *Social and Personality Psychology*

Compass, 3, 292-313. http://www.affective-science.org/pubs/2009/ConnerTennenFleesonBarrett_2009_ESM_Compass.pdf

Lilienfeld, S. O., Wood, J. M., & Garb, H. N. (2000). The scientific status of projective techniques. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 1, 27-66. http://www.psychologicalscience.org/pdf/pspi/pspi1_2.pdf

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. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC264439/>

Stricker, G. (2006). The local clinical scientist, evidence-based practice, and personality assessment. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 86, 4-9. http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/96822_731558331_785038058.pdf

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. <http://dingo.sbs.arizona.edu/~mehl/eReprints/VazireMehlJPSP2008.pdf>

***** Week 4: September 11 – Freud and the Dynamic Unconscious (Chapter 4); Psychoanalysis in Theory and Practice (Chapter 5)**

Miceli, M., & Castelfranchi, C. (2001). Further distinctions between coping and defense mechanisms? *Journal of Personality*, 69, 287-296. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-6494.00146/pdf>

Optional

Baumeister, R. F., Dale, K., & Sommer, K. L. (1998). Freudian defense mechanisms and empirical findings in modern social psychology: Reaction formation, projection, displacement, undoing, isolation, sublimation, and denial. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1081-1124. http://faculty.fortlewis.edu/burke_b/personality/readings/freuddefense.pdf

Erdelyi, M. H. (2001). Defense processes can be conscious or unconscious. *American Psychologist*, 56, 761-762. <http://nro-dd.sagepub.com/lp/psycharticles-reg/defense-processes-can-be-conscious-or-unconscious-uGbSksHVsf>

Grunbaum, A. (2006). Is Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic edifice relevant to the 21st century? *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 23(2), 257-284. http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Grnbaum_Adolf.pdf?issn=07369735&issue=v23i0002&article=257_isfpertt2c

Grunbaum, A. (2007). The reception of my Freud-critique in the psychoanalytic literature. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 24(3), 545-576. http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Grnbaum_Adolf.pdf?issn=07369735&issue=v24i0003&article=545_tromfitpl

Ψ Week 5: September 18 – Freud's Followers (Chapter 6) -- E.g., Carl Jung, Alfred Adler ...

Dowd, E., & Kelly, F. (1980). Adlerian psychology and cognitive-behavior therapy: convergences. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 36, 119-135.

<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?hid=107&sid=931b23b1-fe77-4241-a1ad-611516a07ebf%40sessionmgr111&vid=2>

Optional

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

[http://0-](http://0-search.ebscohost.com.carlson.utoledo.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=6391510&site=ehost-live)

[search.ebscohost.com.carlson.utoledo.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=6391510&site=ehost-live](http://0-search.ebscohost.com.carlson.utoledo.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=6391510&site=ehost-live) [Can access PDF full text]

Jung, C. (1971). Psychological types. In Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2001) (Eds.), *Pieces of the personality puzzle: Readings in theory and research* (pp. 272-276). New York, N. Y.: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. [Available via electronic reserve at the Carlson Library ... search by course code -- PSY 6200]

Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 13, 585-589. <https://webfiles.uci.edu/eloftus/LoftusPalmer74.pdf>

Nachman, G. (2009). Clinical implications of synchronicity and related phenomena. *Psychiatric Annals*, 39, 5, 297-308. DOI: 10.3928/00485713-20090424-02
<http://www.psychiatricannalsonline.com/showPdf.asp?rID=39583>

Tomalski, P., Csibra, G., & Johnson, M.H. (2009). Rapid orienting toward face-like stimuli with gaze-relevant contrast information. *Perception*, 38, 569-578.
<http://www.cbcd.bbk.ac.uk/people/scientificstaff/mark/PDFs/Rapid%20orienting>

Ψ Week 6: September 25 – The Neo-Freudians (Chapter 8) -- E.g., Karen Horney, Melanie Klein, Harry Stack Sullivan, Heinz Kohut, Otto Kernberg, Erich Fromm, Erik Erikson ...

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.

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Smith_Wendy_B.pdf?issn=00911674&issue=v35i0001&article=57_khapit2c

Optional

Bintzler, J. (1978). Diagnosis and treatment of borderline personality organization. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 6 (2), 100-107.

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/x62836006w808465/fulltext.pdf>

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.

<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?hid=111&sid=1f96962a-2a87-4bb0-82ad-40756fa6550e%40sessionmgr113&vid=2>

Horney, K. (1967). The distrust between the sexes. In Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2001) (Eds.), *Pieces of the personality puzzle: Readings in theory and research* (pp. 277-282). New York, N. Y.: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. [Available via electronic reserve at the Carlson Library ... search by course code -- PSY 6200]

Week 7: October 2 – NO CLASS (Fall Break)**Ψ Week 8: October 9 -- Personality and Traits (Chapter 9) -- E.g., Gordon Allport, Ramond Cattell, Hans Eysenck ...**

McAdams, D. P. (1995). What do we know when we know a person? *Journal of Personality*, 63, 365-395.
<http://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/docs/publications/557464623490a3fc35faeb.pdf>

Optional

Allport, G. W. (1966). Traits revisited. *American Psychologist*, 21, 1-10.

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Allport_Gordon_W.pdf?issn=0003066x&issue=v21i0001&article=1_tr

Endler, N. (1975). The case for person-situation interactions. *Canadian Psychological Review*, 16, 12-21.

Fleeson, W. (2001). Toward a structure- and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 1011-1027.

<http://www.personalitytheory.com/revell/syllabi/classreadings/fleeson.2001.pdf>

Kenrick, D. T., & Funder, D. C. (1988). Profiting from controversy: Lessons from the person-situation debate. *American Psychologist*, 43, 23-43.

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Kenrick_Douglas_T.pdf?issn=0003066x&issue=v43i0001&article=23_pfc

Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective systems theory of personality: Re-conceptualizing the invariances in personality and the role of situations. *Psychological Review*, 102, 246-268.

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Mischel_Walter.pdf?issn=0033295x&issue=v102i0002&article=246_acstop

***** Week 9: October 16 – Behaviorist Views of Personality (Chapter 10) -- E.g., Ivan Pavlov, J. B. Watson, B.F. Skinner, John Dollard and Neal Miller (& Social Learning Views of Personality, e.g., Albert Bandura, Julian Rotter)...**

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1963). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 3-11.

<http://library.nhsggc.org.uk/mediaAssets/Mental%20Health%20Partnership/Paper%201%2006th%20November%20Bandura%20Film-1.pdf>

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

Optional

Dollard, J. & Miller, N. E. (1950). *Personality and psychotherapy: An analysis in terms of learning, thinking, and culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Skinner, B. F. (1963). Operant behavior. *American Psychologist*, 18(8), 503-515. Access PDF via OhioLink electronic journal center.

Skinner, B. F. (1987). Whatever happened to psychology as the science of behavior? *American*

Psychologist, 42, 780-786.

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Skinner_B._F.pdf?issn=0003066x&issue=v42i0008&article=780_whtpatsob

Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, 20, 158-177.

<http://pages.pomona.edu/~rt004747/lgcs11read/Watson13.pdf>

Ψ Week 10: October 23 – Humanistic Views of Personality (Chapter 11) -- E.g., Abraham Maslow, Gordon Allport, Ludwig Binswanger and Medard Boss; Rollo May...; Carl Rogers and Humanistic Psychotherapy (Chapter 12)

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

<http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/amp/67/2/101.pdf>

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14. <http://www.ppc.sas.upenn.edu/ppintroarticle.pdf>

Optional

Cramer, D. (1994). Self-esteem and Rogers' core conditions in close friends: A latent variable path analysis of panel data. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 7, 327-337. [Access via Academic Search Complete]

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). If we are so rich, why aren't we happy? *American Psychologist*, 54, 821-827.

<http://education.ucsb.edu/janeconoley/ed197/documents/CsikszentmihalyiIfwearesorich.pdf>

Rogers, C. R. (1947). Some observations on the organization of personality, *American Psychologist*, 2, 358-368. <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Rogers/personality.htm>

Ψ Week 11: October 30 – Early Cognitive Views of Personality (Chapter 13) -- E.g., Gordon Allport, George Kelly, Solomon Asch, Albert Bandura ...

Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social-learning reconceptualization of personality. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283. Access PDF via OhioLink electronic journal center

Optional

Klein, S. B., Loftus, J., & Kihlstrom, J.F. (1996). Self-knowledge of an amnesic patient: Toward a neuropsychology of personality and social psychology. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 125, 250-260. <http://www65.homepage.villanova.edu/patrick.markey/art10.pdf>

Norem, J. K. (1989). Cognitive strategies as personality: Effectiveness, specificity, flexibility, and change. In D. Buss & N. Cantor (Eds.), *Personality Psychology: Recent trend and emerging directions* (pp. 45-60). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ψ Week 12: November 6 – Biology, Genetics, and the Evolution of Personality (Chapter 14) – E.g., Edward Osborne Wilson, Charles Darwin, Chevalierde Lamarck and Gregor Mendel, Leda Cosmides ...

Bem, D. J. (1996). Exotic becomes erotic: A developmental theory of sexual orientation. *Psychological Review*, 103, 320-335. <http://www.atkinson.yorku.ca/~jsteele/files/04082316490115183.pdf>

Optional

Buss, D. M. (1990). Toward a biologically informed psychology of personality. *Journal of Personality*, 58, 1-16.

<http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/homepage/group/busslab/pdf/biology%20of%20personality%201990.pdf>

Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in Jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, 3, 251-255.

<http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/homepage/Group/BussLAB/pdf/SexDifferencesinJealousy.PDF>

Plomin, R. (1989). Environment and genes: Determinants of behavior. *American Psychologist*, 44, 105-111.

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Plomin_Robert.pdf?issn=0003066x&issue=v44i0002&article=105_eag

Wilson, M. I. & Daly, M. (1996). Male sexual proprietariness and violence against wives. *Current*

Directions in Psychological Science, 5, 2-7. http://psych.mcmaster.ca/dalywilson/male_proprietariness.pdf

Zuckerman, M. (2004). The shaping of personality: Genes, environments, and chance encounters. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 82, 11-22. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1207/s15327752jpa8201_3

Ψ Week 13: November 13 – Psychiatric and Medical Models (Chapter 7) – E.g., Wilhelm Griesinger, Emil Kraepelin, Adolf Meyer, Antonio Egas Moniz, William Sheldon, Thomas Szasz ...; Abnormal Personality and Personality Disorders (Chapter 15) -- E.g., Heinz Kohut, Otto Kernberg, Aaron Beck, Albert Ellis, Arnold Lazarus...; Albert Ellis and the Rational Emotive Behavioral Theory of Personality (Chapter 16)

Optional

Clay, R. A. (2011). Revising the DSM. *Monitor on Psychology*, 42, 1, 54-55.

<http://www.apa.org/monitor/2011/01/dsm.aspx>

Kraemer, H. K., Shrout, P. E., & Rubio-Stipec, M. (2007). Developing the diagnostic and statistical manual V: what will “statistical” mean in DSM-V? *Social Psychiatry & Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 42, 259-267. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/r28m630730g58544/fulltext.pdf>

Ψ Week 14: November 20 – Cross-Cultural Approaches to Personality

Allik, J. (2005). Personality dimensions across cultures. *Personality Disorders*, 19:212-232.

<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?hid=107&sid=336b5ec6-1579-4cb9-8e9b-b4c7cf5b07e7%40sessionmgr112&vid=2>

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–253.

http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/pdf.cgi/Markus_Hazel_Rose.pdf?issn=0033295x&issue=v98i0002&article=224_cats

Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 907-924.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-6494.696169/pdf>

Yang, K., & Bond, M. H. (1990). Exploring implicit personality theories with indigenous or imported constructs: The Chinese case. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 1087-1095.

http://learning.nwc.hccs.edu/members/joanne.hsu/global-cross-cultural/indigenous-and-culture-psychology/selected-articles-on-indigenous-psychologies/personality-motivation-and-modernization/Personality_1990a.pdf

Optional

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 70, 945-960. <http://internal.psychology.illinois.edu/~broberts/Cohen%20et%20al.,%201996.pdf>

Markus, H. R. (1994). A collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 568-579.

<http://psp.sagepub.com/content/20/5/568.full.pdf+html>

Murray, C. B., Kaiser, R., & Taylor S. (1997). The O. J. Simpson verdict: Predictors of beliefs about innocence or guilt. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53, 455-475.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1997.tb02122.x/pdf>

Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. *Psychological Review*, 108, 291-310.

http://mit.edu/6.969/www/readings/culture_thought.pdf

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.

http://reference.kfupm.edu.sa/content/s/e/the_self_and_social_behavior_in_differin_91724.pdf

***** Week 15: November 27 – Religious, New Age, and Traditional Approaches to Personality (Chapter 17) – E.g., Chinese, Japanese, Native American medical systems; Christianity (& Judaism); New Age beliefs; & Non-Western/Eastern approaches ...**

Fadiman, J. and Frager, R. (2002). Yoga & Hindu Tradition. *Personality and personal growth* (pp. 465 – 492). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. [I will post copy of reading on our Course Web site]

Fadiman, J. and Frager, R. (2002). Zen & the Buddhist Tradition. *Personality and personal growth* (pp. 498–528). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. [I will post copy of reading on our Course Web site]

Optional

Fadiman, J. and Frager, R. (2002). Sufism & the Islamic Tradition. *Personality and personal growth* (pp. 535–561). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. [Contact me, if you'd like a copy]

Course Wrap-up

Course Evaluation (*evaluation forms to be completed at the end of the day's discussion when I have left the classroom*)

Week 16: December 4 – NO CLASS; Special Project Paper (HARDCOPY) due by 5pm on Tuesday, December 4 in my office (UH 1063); slide under my office door if you do not meet me.

* Acknowledgements: My sincere thanks go to those colleagues here at UT Department of Psychology and other universities such as BGSU for their useful comments and/or contributions to my reading list.

Student Discussion Facilitator Feedback Form

Discussion Facilitator: _____ Date: _____

Topic: _____

1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree

1. The discussion facilitator seemed organized and prepared. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. The discussion facilitator asked good questions. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. The questions challenged my thinking. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. The discussion facilitator made me think critically about the topic. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. The discussion helped me understand the topic better. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I enjoyed the discussion today. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Indicate your overall evaluation of the discussion. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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 to make this a better discussion?