

Social Psychology, 6700/7700
Tuesday & Thursdays 12:30 to 1:45 (Spring, 2012)

Instructor: Andrew Geers, Ph.D.
Office: 6524 University Hall
Phone: 530-8530 (my office) or 530-2717 (psychology main office)
E-mail: ageers@utnet.utoledo.edu
Office Hours: 2:00 to 4:00 on Tuesdays, or by appointment

Objectives: Social psychology is the scientific study of how our behaviors, thoughts, and emotions are affected by the real or imagined presence of other people. This is a broad definition that encompasses a wide range of phenomena, such as how people form beliefs, how people attempt to persuade and are persuaded by others, how people form close relationships, why people help or harm each other, and how people understand each other and themselves. There are three goals for this course. The first goal is to acquaint you with the major findings and fundamental issues in experimental social psychology. A second goal is to help you critically evaluate psychological research. A third goal is to help you apply social psychology to your everyday lives and your own research enterprise.

Required Reading: The weekly readings for our course are listed in the schedule further on in this syllabus. Our readings will come from the textbook, *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science*, by Baumeister & Finkel (2010) as well as from a wide range of other books and journal articles. You can purchase the textbook from the UT bookstore and the additional readings are available on-line on our course Blackboard page (PSY 6700). I recommend downloading all of the articles at the beginning of the term so that you have them stored on your own computer. Fair warning, there is a lot of reading for this course. But, this amount of reading is needed to give you an introduction to this vast and varied field.

Course Structure and Requirements: We will meet two days a week. Students are expected to attend all class periods and to arrive to class on time. Absences (and late attendance) will result in a substantial reduction of class participation points. Unavoidable absences due to illnesses or critical life events can be excused with proper documentation given to the instructor within two weeks of the absence.

Class Days: Class time will be a mixture of lecture and discussion. For most weeks (though not all), Tuesdays will be lecture days, whereas Thursdays will be discussion days. In discussions we will try to gain a better understanding of the reading and lecture material.

Class Participation/Preparation (20% of course grade). We are all here to increase our understanding of social behavior. This learning will be greatly enhanced if everyone in the class contributes to our academic discussions of the ideas covered. With this in mind, I expect everyone to complete the weekly readings *in advance* of the discussion days so that you will be able to improve our scholarly exchanges. I believe that each of you has something important to say and will add significantly to class discussion. To this end, the quantity and, more importantly, the quality of your class participation/preparation will factor into your grade. As a general rule, if you do not make a noticeable contribution on a discussion day you should expect a lowering of your participation grade. If you are concerned about your ability to contribute in class, let me know the first week of the semester.

I should note that graduate seminars usually contain a mix of students with varying degrees of prior knowledge and experience in the area. The feeling of having little prior background in the area can be uncomfortable. Don't worry about it. 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 a strength, not a weakness. To insure you are prepared for class and earn full participation points, I suggest you take notes and write down many questions and ideas while you read the articles.

Being a Discussion Leader (10% of course grade)

Each of you will be required to lead one discussion day during the semester. This means summarizing the main themes of the readings, developing stimulating discussion questions to pose to the group, and facilitating the discussion of the topic. During the beginning of the discussion day, the discussion leader will provide a brief (5-10 minute) overview of the reading topics to get everyone on the same page. Note that this does not mean re-describing every reading in painstaking detail. Instead, the student should provide a brief *conceptual* overview of the topic and the major findings. Then the discussion leader will help facilitate class discussion involving either broad issues relevant to the readings or specific issues related to a research study or approach. Leading a discussion is not easy, but it can be very rewarding. It requires being extremely prepared in advance. It is not something people can "wing". I am happy to make time to meet with you to help you prepare your discussion if you wish. For such a meeting you will need to arrive prepared (e.g., have read the articles and prepare an outline of what you plan to cover) and we should meet no fewer than 2 days before you are discussion leader.

The week you are discussion leader you will have one additional article to read. This article gives you some novel material to add to the discussion and I expect that you will find a good way to fold it into our conversation. You do not need to give a formal presentation of the additional reading; rather, the paper should be worked into our group discussion.

The best way to lead a 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 answers. Questions like, "What did you think about the article by Smith and Jones?" are poor discussion questions and tend to elicit blank stares or brief, uninformative responses. Your discussion questions should be brief and stated in your own words (examples include, What are the boundary conditions for the effect reported (i.e., when will it not hold, or when might the reverse occur)? How would you test these boundaries? What processes not discussed by the author might be responsible for the effects? How would you distinguish these processes from other possibilities? How could this information be applied in business, clinical, or other real world settings?). One of the toughest things about being a discussion leader 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 seems more like 2 hours. Be patient. If there is a problem with the question, people will ask you to repeat it or I will ask you to reword the question.

There is a tendency for discussion leaders to dominate the discussion. This is not surprising. As a discussion leader you probably know the topic better than any other student in the class. You have

thought about it more and probably have answers written down in front of you. But, remember that the best discussion leaders pull the answers from others in the class. Also, keep in mind that this is an opportunity for you to be creative. Feel free to do demonstrations, organize a debate, show brief videos, assign additional readings, develop and administer a questionnaire, etc.

As the discussion leader you will be graded partly on your organization, partly on your presentation of material, and in your ability to lead the discussion. The class will evaluate each discussion leader immediately after the discussion. I will use the class evaluations in helping me determine your grade for leading the discussion. Attached at the end of the syllabus is the survey that will be used to evaluate class discussion leaders.

Midterm and Final Exam (70% of course grade). Two in-class exams will be given to assess student understanding of the readings, lectures, and discussions. Each exam will be worth 35% of your final course grade. The exam questions will be of the long and short essay variety.

Collegiate Policies

Students with Disabilities. Reasonable accommodations will be made for anyone with a disability that may require some modification of seating, testing, or other class requirements. Students must contact the Office of Accommodations (Rocket Hall 1820) for an evaluation and a form specifying what course accommodations are judged reasonable for that student. Please contact the instructor after class or during office hours so that appropriate arrangements may be made.

The contact information for the Office of Accommodations is as follows:

Campus Address: Rocket Hall 1820, Mail Stop #342

Phone Number: 419.530.4981

Web: <http://www.utoledo.edu/utlc/accessibility/>

University of Toledo Policy Pertaining to Academic Integrity. Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. Among the aims of education are the acquisition of knowledge and development of the skills necessary for success in any profession. Activities inconsistent with these aims will not be permitted. Students are responsible for knowing what constitutes academic dishonesty. If students are uncertain about what constitutes plagiarism or cheating they should seek the instructor's advice. Examples of academic dishonesty include, but are not limited to:

- Plagiarizing or representing the words, ideas or information of another person as one's own and not offering proper documentation;
- Giving or receiving, prior to an examination, any unauthorized information concerning the content of that examination;
- Referring to or displaying any unauthorized materials inside or outside of the examination room during the course of an examination;
- Communicating during an examination in any manner with any unauthorized person concerning the examination or any part of it;
- Giving or receiving substantive aid during the course of an examination;

- Commencing an examination before the stipulated time or continuing to work on an examination after the announced conclusion of the examination period;
- Taking, converting, concealing, defacing, damaging or destroying any property related to the preparation or completion of assignments, research or examination;
- Submitting the same written work to fulfill the requirements for more than one course.

Course Schedule

Week 1: Introduction, history, and basic orientation

Readings

Baumeister, R. F. (2010). Social psychologists and thinking about people. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 5-24).

Reis, H. T. (2010). How we got here from there: A brief history of social psychology. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 25-62).

Day 1/10: Introduction to the course

Day 1/12: Lecture on social construction and construals

Week 2: Methods, theory, and meaning

Readings

Gergen, K. J. (1973). Social psychology as history, *JPSP*, 26, 309-320.

Schlenker, B. R. (1974). Social psychology as science, *JPSP*, 29, 1-15.

Aronson et al. (1998). Chapter 3: Experimentation in social psychology. (99-142). In Gilbert et al., *Handbook of Social Psychology*.

Day 1/17: Lecture on theory construction and refinement in social psychology

Day 1/19: Discussion on social psychology methods, theory, and meaning

Week 3: Social influence

Readings

Cialdini, R. B., & Griskevicius, V. (2010). Social influence. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 383-417).

Asch, S. Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. (177-190).

Milgram, S. (1971). Some conditions of obedience and disobedience to authority. (57-75).

Darley, J., & Batson, C. D. (1973). From Jerusalem to Jericho: A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. *JPSP*, 27, 100-108.

Day 1/24: Lecture on social influence and the personality-situation debate

Day 1/26: NO CLASS

Week 4: Theories of consistency and self-justification

Readings

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *JASP*, 58, 203-210.

Cooper, J., & Fazio, R. H. (1984). A new look at dissonance theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 229-266). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Steele, C. (1990). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. (372-390).

Day 1/31: Lecture on early consistency theories

Day 2/2: Discussion on consistency and self-justification theories

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Sherman, D. K., & Cohen, G. L. (2002). Accepting threatening information: Self-affirmation and reduction of defensive biases, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 119-123.

Week 5: Attribution

Readings

Storms, M. D. (1973). Videotape and the attribution process: Reversing actors' and observers' point of view. *JPSP*, 27, 165-175.

Ross et al. (1977). Social roles, social control, and biases in social-perception processes. *JPSP*, 35, 485-494.

Gilbert (1995). Attribution and interpersonal perception (pp. 99 - 148).

Day 2/7: Lecture on prescriptive theories of attribution

Day 2/9: Discussion on attribution processes

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Ross et al. (1977). The false consensus effect: An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes. *JPSP*, 35, 484-494.

Week 6: Social cognition

Readings

Carlston, D. (2010). Social cognition. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 63-100).

Wegner, D. M., & Erber, R. (1992). The hyperaccessibility of suppressed thoughts. *JPSP*, 63, 903-912.

Liberman, N. et al. (2002). The effect of temporal distance on level of mental construal. *JESP*, 38, 523-534.

Bargh, J. A., & Williams, E. L. (2006). The automaticity of social life. *Current Directions in Psychology Science*, 15, 1-4.

Day 2/14: Lecture on construct activation, priming, and accessibility effects

Day 2/16: Discussion on social cognition

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Hamilton, D., & Gifford, R. (1976). Illusory correlation in interpersonal perception: A cognitive basis of stereotype judgments. *JESP*, 12, 392-407.

Week 7: Affect and emotions

Readings

Manstead, A. (2010). Social psychology of emotion. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 101-138).

Gilbert, D., & Wilson, T. (2000). Miswanting: Some problems in the forecasting of future affective states. *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition*. pp. 178-197.

Kahneman et al. (2006). Would you be happier if you were richer?: A focusing illusion. *Science*, 312, 1908-1910.

Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2008). Explaining away: A model of affective adaptation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 370-386.

Day 2/21: Lecture on the self-regulation and the function of affect

Day 2/23: Discussion on affect and emotions

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Medvec et al. (1995). When less is more: Counterfactual thinking and satisfaction among Olympic medalists. *JPSP*, 69, 603-610.

Week 8: Self-knowledge

Readings

Baumeister, R. (2010). The self. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 139-175).

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *JPSP*, 35, 63-78.

Linville, P. W. (1987). Self-complexity as a cognitive buffer against stress-related illness and depression. *JPSP*, 52, 663-676.

Dweck, et al. (2003). Self-systems give unique meaning to self-variables. *Handbook of Self and Identity*. Guilford Press. pp. 239-252.

Day 2/28: Lecture on the origins and awareness of self-knowledge

Day 3/1: Discussion on self-knowledge

*Extra reading for discussion leader: McGuire & Padawer-Singer (1976). Trait salience in the spontaneous self-concept. *JPSP*, 33, 743-754.

Week 9: Functions of the self and self-esteem

Readings

Harmon-Jones, E., Simon, L., Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & McGregor, H. (1997). Terror management theory and self-esteem: Evidence that increased self-esteem reduces mortality salience effects. *JPSP*, 72, 24-36.

Leary, M. (1999). Making sense of self-esteem. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 32-35.

Ryan, R. & Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.

Day 3/13: Discussion on the function of the self and self-esteem

Day 3/15: MIDTERM EXAM

Week 10: Self-motives

Readings

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psych Bulletin*, 103, 193-210.

Kunda (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psych Bulletin*, 108, 480-498.

Sedikides, C. (1993). Assessment, enhancement, and verification determinants of the self-evaluation process. *JPSP*, 65, 317-338.

Day 3/20: Lecture on the motivation – cognition debate

Day 3/22: Discussion of self-motives

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Campbell & Sedikides (1999) Self-threat magnifies the self-serving bias: A meta-analytic integration. *Review of General Psychology*, 3, 23-43.

Week 11: Attitude structure and change

Readings

Fabrigar, L., R., & Wegener, D. T. (2010). Attitude structure. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 177-216).

Petty, R., & Brinol, P. (2010). Attitude change. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 217-259).

Lord, Ross, & Leeper (1979). Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequent consideration of evidence. *JPSP*, 37, 2098-2109.

Ajzen, L., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Chp 1 (pp 5-10) and Chp 2 (13-27). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior.

Day 3/27: Lecture on dual-process approaches to persuasion

Day 3/29: Discussion of attitudes and persuasion

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Lord et al. (1984). Considering the opposite: A corrective strategy for social judgment. *JPSP*, 47, 1231-1243.

Week 12: Stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination

Readings

Bodenhausen, G. V., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 341-383).

Devine P. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *JPSP*, 56, 5-18.

Bargh, J. A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against the controllability of automatic stereotype effects. *Dual-process theories in social psychology*. (pp. 361-383).

Day 4/3: Lecture on categorization and impression formation processes

Day 4/5: Discussion of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Fein & Spencer (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through negative evaluations of others. *JPSP*, 73, 31-44.

Week 13: Prosocial and aggressive behavior

Readings

McCullough, M. E., & Tabak, B. A. (2010). Prosocial behavior. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 263-302).

Bushman, B. J., & Bartholow, B. D. (2010). Aggression. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 302-340).

Darley, J. & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *JPSP*, 8, 377-383.

Darley et al. (1973). Do groups always inhibit individual's responses to potential emergencies? *JPSP*, 26, 395-399.

Day 4/10: Discussion of prosocial and aggressive behavior

Day 4/12: NO CLASS

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Garcia et al. (2002). Crowded minds: The implicit bystander effect. *JPSP*, 83, 843-853.

Week 14: Attraction, rejection, and intimate relationships

Readings

Finkel, E. J., & Baumeister, R. E. (2010). Attraction and rejection. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 419-459).

Fletcher, G., & Overall, N., C. (2010). Intimate relationships. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 461-494).

Neff, L.A., & Karney, B. R. (2005). To know you is to love you: The implications of global adoration and specific accuracy for marital relationships. *JPSP*, 88, 480-497.

Day 4/17: Lecture on self-esteem and close relationships

Day 4/19: Discussion of attraction, rejection, and intimate relationships

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2003). The dynamic structure of relationship perceptions: Differential importance as a strategy of relationship maintenance. *JPSP*, 29, 1433-1446.

Week 15: Groups and intergroup relations

Readings

Forsyth, D. R., & Burnette, J. (2010). Group processes. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 495-534).

Brewer, M. B. (2010). Intergroup relations. In *Advanced Social Psychology: The state of the science*. (pp. 535-571).

Zajonc, R. B. (1965). Social facilitation. *Science*, 149, 269-274.

Myers, D. G., & Bishop, G. D. (1970). Discussion effects on racial attitudes, *Science*, 169, 778-779.

Day 4/24: Lecture on group decision-making and deindividuation

Day 4/26: Discussion on groups and intergroup relations

*Extra reading for discussion leader: Stasser, G., & Titus, W. (1985). Pooling of unshared information in group decision making: Biased information sampling during discussion. *JPSP*, 48, 1467-1478.

FINAL EXAM: Tuesday, May 1st, from 12:30 to 2:30.

*Please note that the schedule and procedures in this course are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances (e.g., weather cancellations, the judgment of the instructor).

Discussion Leader: _____ Date: _____

Topic: _____

1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree

1. The discussion leaders seemed organized and prepared. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. The discussion leaders 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 leaders 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 leaders 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?