

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 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:

4:15 pm – 6:45 pm Wednesdays in HH 3316

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 Wednesdays from 12:30 pm to 2:30 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 HH 3316.

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 the major contributions of these theorists, critique their works from a variety of perspectives, and discuss related contemporary research. 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. know the principal proponents associated with major personality systems
3. elaborate on the concepts and language used by different theorists to describe the structure, dynamics, and development of personality
4. evaluate the historical and cultural perspectives of the 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 some contemporary 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 get one "free pass" – that is you can miss one class because of illness, religious events or other conflicts without penalty. Thus, there is no need to come to me with an excuse for your one free absence. However, no excuse will be accepted for missing more than one class.

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 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 an article, you should be thinking about the following questions. What is the theme of the paper/chapter? 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 other 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 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 afraid 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 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 #, and a creative title at the top of page 1. Email your paper to me by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet to discuss the topic on Wednesday. The paper should contain a single thought 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 theory or the point of the article. I also 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 a comment on this area of research/theory. It can be an idea for further research/theoretical revision, a new way of applying one of the articles, a criticism, or an integration or comparison between two or more articles. **Do not summarize**, because I have read the articles already. In these papers I am expecting you to come up with an original idea that in some way extends our understanding of the topic. There are many ways to do this:

If you ask a question, answer it. 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 an idea that goes beyond the material contained in the readings.

If you have a methodological critique, tell me why it matters. It is easy to critique the sample or methodology of any study. The challenge is to explain why the results of the study would be different if the sample 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 the methodology in all your papers will not earn you high scores on the papers. I expect you to dig deeper into the material and think about it at the theoretical level as well.

If you have many ideas, choose your best one. YOU DO NOT HAVE TO REFER TO 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 one of the articles you didn't read!). But if you have one good thought about one of the articles, go ahead and make it. Establish the issue you are addressing, make your point, support it, and explain why it matters. That is already a lot to do 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 be a complete thought, with 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 reading. (This is rare)
- 2 = You demonstrated some understanding of the reading.
- 3 = You understood the reading, and made an original comment.
- 4 = You understood the reading, and contributed an idea that extends the existing theory in some way
- 5 = You contributed an outstanding, original, complete new idea.

Late papers will not be accepted. Your papers are due at me via email by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet to discuss topic (i.e., on Wednesday). 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). 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 read the articles, 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 not less than 2 days before you are the discussion facilitator for the class (i.e. by the Monday before a Wednesday class).

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 reword 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 organization, partly on your presentation of material and on your ability to facilitate the class discussion. The class will evaluate each discussion facilitator anonymously immediately after the discussion. The class evaluation of you will determine 50% of your grade. My evaluation will comprise the remaining 50%. Find attached to the syllabus the form that you 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 personality 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 **Wednesday, March 28th**. 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 at the top of page 1, and 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 and research in the area should be prominently featured in your paper. You can select any topic related to one of the personality 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 you and help 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.

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 -- SPRING 2012**
(Subject to modification)

For topics marked "Ψ," a class discussion to be facilitated by one student (assigned facilitator to meet with me no fewer than 2 days before day of discussion)

For topics marked "*,"** all students to e-mail me a reflection paper by 5 pm the Monday before the class meets (I will facilitate the class discussion on this day)

Week 1: January 11 – 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 facilitators for some class discussions

Week 2: January 18 – Historical Perspectives on Personality (Chapter 2)

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

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>

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

Optional

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

***** Week 3: January 25 – Personality Research (Chapter 3)**

[There are some interesting articles demonstrating new methods (e.g. using PDAs to get real-time data) in personality research. The following articles would get you thinking about self reports and other methods]

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>

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

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>

Optional

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

Ψ Week 4: February 1 – Freud and the Dynamic Unconscious (Chapter 4); Psychoanalysis in Theory and Practice (Chapter 5)

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

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

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

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>

Ψ Week 5: February 8 – 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>

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>

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->

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]

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: February 15 – The Neo-Freudians (Chapter 8) -- E.g., Karen Horney, Melanie Klein, Harry Stack Sullivan, Heinz Kohut, Otto Kernberg, Erich Fromm, Erik Erikson ...

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

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

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: February 22 -- Personality and Traits (Chapter 9) -- E.g., Gordon Allport, Ramond Cattell, Hans Eysenck ...**

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

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>

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=24_6_acstop

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
Enderl, 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>

Ψ Week 8: February 29 – 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%206th%20November%20Bandura%20Film-1.pdf>

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

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.

Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, 20, 158-177. <http://pages.pomona.edu/~rt004747/lgcs11read/Watson13.pdf>

Week 9: March 7 – NO CLASS (Spring Break)

Ψ Week 10: March 14 – 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)

(Do you consider the humanistic perspective to be still common? Are there more modern takes on these views?).

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>

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]

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

Tolman, R. (1955). Review of psychotherapy and personality change. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 50(3), 407-408. [Access via QuickSearch at OhioLINK]

***** Week 11: March 21 – Early Cognitive Views of Personality (Chapter 13) -- E.g., Gordon Allport, George Kelly, Solomon Asch, Albert Bandura ...**

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>

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

Optional

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: March 28 – 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>

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>

Optional

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: April 4 – 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: April 11 – 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

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. (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>

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: April 18 – 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. [Available via electronic reserve at the Carlson Library ... search by course code -- PSY 6200]

Fadiman, J. and Frager, R. (2002). Zen & the Buddhist Tradition. *Personality and personal growth* (pp. 498–528). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. [Available via electronic reserve at the Carlson Library ... search by course code -- PSY 6200]

Fadiman, J. and Frager, R. (2002). Sufism & the Islamic Tradition. *Personality and personal growth* (pp. 535–561). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall. [Available via electronic reserve at the Carlson Library ... search by course code -- PSY 6200]

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: April 25 – NO CLASS; Special Project Paper (HARDCOPY) due by 5pm on Wednesday, April 25th 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.

