

SOP 5069: Personality and Social Psychology Course Syllabus

Have you thought about another person today? How is your behavior influenced by what others might think of you? Why do people prefer different situations and experiences? Why do people sometimes get along famously, and other times despise one another? Who are people really, deep down inside, and how does that differ from the person they want others to see? How does the ancient evolutionary past interact with lived personal experience to influence who people grow into across human development? We will examine both classic and cutting-edge work that speaks to these timeless questions. In addition to the questions themselves, we will also consider how scientists have attempted answers to such questions, and how can we apply those techniques to answer new questions.

Learning Objectives: Students should become familiar with some theories in social and personality psychology, describe evidence for and criticisms of each theory, and proposing further directions in scientific inquiry in both verbal and written formats.

Course Time: Mondays, 12:30pm-3:15pm online via Canvas & Zoom

Instructor: Dr. Paul Conway

Office: Psychology B333

Email: conway@psy.fsu.edu, pauljosephconway@gmail.com

Cell Phone: 850-688-5525 (we can also set up zoom chats)

Office Hours: Mondays 3:15-4:15 (after class) and by appointment

Canvas Website: The course website is essential for this class as that is where you will find the course syllabus, readings, & announcements, and access zoom.

Grade Breakdown

10% Attendance & Participation

20% Discussion Leader

20% Four Thought papers, 5% each

10% Research Proposal Blitz

40% Written Research Proposal

Grading Scale (Canadian Style) The grading scale for each element of the course and for the course overall is as follows: Final grade percentages ending in a decimal of “.5” or greater will be rounded up to the next whole number. Beware—in Canada they have high standards!

A	100 – 92	B	83 – 80	C	71 – 67	D	58 – 55
A-	91 – 88	B-	79 – 76	C-	66 – 63	D-	54 – 50
B+	87 – 84	C+	75 – 72	D+	62 – 59	F	49 or below

Course Description

This course will examine theories and research relevant to Personality and Social Psychology. A variety of psychological perspectives will be investigated, including perspectives that emphasize sociocultural, cognitive, evolutionary, genetic, and motivational factors. Class time will include both discussion and lecture. Students will be expected to come to class prepared to discuss the readings for the class period. Students should do several things so that they will be adequately prepared for class discussions. For every class meeting, they should consider the most intriguing or puzzling issues in the readings, their perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the theories or studies presented in the readings, their sense of directions for subsequent theoretical or empirical work, etc. These are just suggestions. The point is that students should think about the readings and their implications for furthering our understanding of personality and social psychology.

There will be no textbook for this course. Instead, there will be research articles for each class available on Canvas. Students are expected to complete the relevant reading *before* each class. We will typically examine about four papers before class—a heavy load. Students are expected to invest considerable time going over the readings for class and coming prepared to discuss the material in depth. In addition, students are encouraged to go beyond the assigned reading to incorporate insights from any relevant research. Treat the readings as a jumping off point in your intellectual journey.

Attendance & Participation: Note that to get counted **for first day attendance you MUST complete the attendance quiz on Canvas by midnight Tuesday August 25** or you will be dropped from the course. Otherwise, you are expected to attend all classes on zoom at the assigned time and actively participate by engaging in thoughtful dialogue with your peers, having completed the readings. In these uncertain times, you can miss up to one class with no explanation and still receive a perfect score. To join Zoom sessions, go to our Canvas site --> Zoom (along the left-hand column). This will take you to a list of our class meetings; choose the appropriate date and click Join. Once I begin the meeting, everyone will be able to join. I recommend recreating the atmosphere of a small seminar by keeping your video on and mic set to automatically activate when you talk. Let's try to keep the discussion flowing naturally. The same rules for decorum exist in the Zoom classroom as they do on campus. Discussion should be respectful and limited to course-related material. The academic integrity of our Zoom classroom is of the utmost importance. It is critical that students feel comfortable asking questions and sharing comments. Thus, you may not, under any circumstances, share the Zoom link with individuals not enrolled in the course, photograph or record any aspect of the Zoom meeting, or post any aspect of it to social media or any other site. Doing so would constitute a violation of the student code of conduct.

Thought Papers: All students must complete four thought papers describing a carefully considered thought about some aspect of the readings for that week. **You must email your thought paper to that week's discussion leaders and myself by Friday midnight before the relevant Monday class** so the discussion leaders and the rest of

us have a few days to consider them. You are welcome to choose any four weeks, so long as you complete at least one paper before October 5. Papers should be Times New Roman 12 Point Font, single spaced, in full paragraphs, with no extra spacing after paragraphs. Please send .doc, .docx, or .pdf files.

Your thoughts should primarily address one or multiple papers from the week, but you can incorporate other material if directly relevant. The goal of thought papers is NOT to summarize the research; assume that your reader has read the papers. Instead, focus on developing a thought thoroughly. Multiple approaches are welcomed. Your thought paper can present an idea for further research, a new way of applying or interpreting the ideas or findings from one or more of the articles, a criticism of the research that suggests a new idea or specific study, or an integration or comparison between two or more articles. This is your chance to air your concerns about the issues explored (have the authors missed the big picture), the strengths or weaknesses of methods used, etc. This is an opportunity for you to illustrate that you understood the readings by reflecting on the methodological advances or flaws, valid and invalid arguments, impressive or unsubstantiated leaps of logic, insights and biases, etc., as you see fit. For example, you might develop a theoretical critique of the work, but if so, you should explain clearly what the issues are with the work conceptually. You might what to propose a study or experiment that would help illustrate why they got the results they did but clarify why you think a different mechanism explains them. You might develop a way to apply these findings to a relevant debate in another part of the field. A reaction paper that is simply a summary of the readings or a “gut-reaction” with no critical analysis is not satisfactory and will not receive full credit.

Thought papers should be about one page, give or take a couple lines (but the real goal is not length but *clarity* and *precision*). Try to balance being thorough with being efficient—there should be no unnecessary fluff, and you should cover all the important aspects. Experts call that kind of writing “muscular” and one builds writing muscles much like gym muscles—lots of (pen) lifting. Try to smoothly connect the paragraphs together with transition sentences and frame the entire paper neatly with an introductory sentence and closing sentence. In other words, warm up your reader to the topic before addressing the questions and give them one last statement to chew on at the end. Also, plagiarism is bad. Please do not do it. Bonus challenge: Write the entire thing in rhyme. (Kidding. Mostly).

Leading Class Discussion: Each student will help to lead the discussion and raise questions to share about the readings in one of the classes during the course of the semester. Earlier classes will have two leaders, but later classes just one. We will sign up for slots on the first day of class. Prior to the class, you should consider the readings, any thought papers you get, and potentially chat with me for ideas. Then prepare a series of questions for discussion of the papers. These points of discussion can be questions about the readings or points connecting the readings to each other or to other psychological research or phenomena. You should probe strengths, limitations, future directions of the readings. Be ready to pose questions to the class and provide your thoughts about the question/issue as well. You should NOT summarize the readings for

the class, your role is to get the class to discuss the readings. The discussion questions should be thoughtful and reflect careful consideration of the readings. Your aim is to generate and sustain interesting and relevant dialogue among your peers.

Research Proposal: Each student will complete a research paper on some topic in the domain of personality and social psychology. You should aim for between 8-11 pages of text, using APA format—12-point font, double spaced, etc. In addition, include a title page, abstract, and reference section, and are welcome to swap out 1 page of text with include figures or tables of expected results. You are encouraged to run your ideas by me as early as possible and workshop them with your peers. We will also hold an in-class writing workshop. Papers are Due November 30 at midnight. We will discuss the papers more during the semester.

Research Proposal Blitz Presentation: Students will prepare 5 powerpoint slides to present over 5 minutes describing their research project to the class over zoom. We will discuss the presentations more during the semester.

Course Schedule

#	Date	Topic	Class Discussion Leaders
1	Aug 24	Introduction	Paul
2	Aug 31	Cognition & Dual Process Models	Robin & Isis
	Sept 7	<i>No class</i>	<i>Labour Day</i>
3	Sept 14	Approaches to Personality	Allison & Karl
4	Sept 21	Priming & Bias	Edie & Weifang
5	Sept 28	Self & Social Perception	Roshni & Eric
6	Oct 5	Power & Status	Jose & Shelly
7	Oct 12	Rejection & Aggression	Nicole & Bridget
8	Oct 19	Prejudice & Stereotyping	Vinny
9	Oct 26	Motivation & Regulation	Michelle & Elizabeth
10	Nov 2	Morality	Trisha
11	Nov 9	Relationships	Olivia
12	Nov 16	Culture and Gender	Carolyn
13	Nov 23	Writing Workshop	
14	Nov 30	Proposal Blitz Talks	Research Proposals Due Midnight

University Attendance Policy

Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holy days, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness.

Free Tutoring from FSU

On-campus tutoring and writing assistance is available for many courses at Florida State University. For more information, visit the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) Tutoring Services' comprehensive list of on-campus tutoring options - see <http://ace.fsu.edu/tutoring> or contact tutor@fsu.edu. High-quality tutoring is available by appointment and on a walk-in basis. These services are offered by tutors trained to encourage the highest level of individual academic success while upholding personal academic integrity.

Academic Honor Policy

The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for living up to their pledge to ". . . be honest and truthful and . . . [to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." (Florida State University Academic Honor Policy, found at <http://fda.fsu.edu/academic-resources/academic-integrity-and-grievances/academic-honor-policy>)

FSU Distance Education Site – Help with Resources for Distance Learning

<https://distance.fsu.edu/student-guide>

Case Management Services

Case Management Services (CMS) is one of the offices located within the Dean of Students Department. The Case Manager works with individuals to provide emotional support and counseling and to advocate for students, including contacting professors to petition for accommodations on assignments/exams impacted. CMS seeks to identify immediate needs and make appropriate referrals to campus and community resources. If you would like assistance or more information, please contact Case Management at 850-644-9555 or visit the CMS website at <https://dsst.fsu.edu/cms>.

Title IX Statement

As a recipient of Federal financial assistance for education activities, FSU is required by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 to ensure that all of its education programs and activities are free from discrimination on the basis of sex. Sexual discrimination includes sexual misconduct (sexual violence, stalking, intimate partner violence, gender-based animosity and gender-based stereotyping). If you have questions about Title IX or wish to file a Title IX complaint, please visit the FSU Title IX website: <http://www.titleix.fsu.edu> or call Jennifer Broomfield, Title IX Director 850-644-

6271. Please note that as Responsible Employees, all faculty are required to report any incidents of sexual misconduct to the Title IX Office.

The Victim Advocate Program at FSU has a confidential advocate on call twenty-four hours a day to respond to FSU students, faculty, and staff who are victimized, or any other person who is victimized on our campus, or by an FSU student. Daytime Phone: 850.644.7161, 850.644.2277, or 850.645.0086. Nights, Weekends & Holidays 850.644.1234 (FSUPD) Ask to speak to the on-call advocate.

Americans with Disabilities Act

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should:

- (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center;
- (2) bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type.

This should be done during the first week of class.

This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request. For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact:

Student Disability Resource Center
874 Traditions Way
108 Student Services Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4167
(850) 644-9566 (voice)
(850) 644-8504 (TDD)
sdrc@admin.fsu.edu
<http://www.disabilitycenter.fsu.edu/>

Syllabus Change Policy

"Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice."

Reading Schedule

August 24: Introduction

August 31: Cognition & Dual Process Models

Jordan, C. H., & Zanna, M. P. (1999). How to read a journal article in social psychology. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.) *The Self in Social Psychology* (pp. 461-470). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Cooper, J. (2019). Cognitive dissonance: Where we've been and where we're going. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 32, 7. <http://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.277>

Payne, B. K., & Gawronski, B. (2010). A history of implicit social cognition: Where is it coming from? Where is it now? Where is it going? *Handbook of implicit social cognition: Measurement, theory, and applications*, 1, 1-15.

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39-50.

September 7: Labour Day – No Class

September 14: Approaches to Personality

Goldberg (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.

Bouchard, T. J. (2004). Genetic influence on human psychological traits: A survey. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 148-151.

Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., Goldberg, L. R. (2007). The power of personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 313-345.

(Recommended additional reading) Block, J. (2001). Millennial contrarianism: The five-factor approach to personality description 5 years later. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35, 98-107.

September 21: Priming & Bias

Loersch, C., & Payne, B. K. (2011). The situated inference model: An integrative account of the effects of primes on perception, behavior, and motivation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 234-252.

Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American psychologist*, 35, 603.

Dunning, D., Johnson, K., Ehrlinger, J. & Kruger, J. (2003). Why people fail to recognize their own incompetence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, 83-87.

Taylor, S.E., Lerner, J.S., Sherman, D.K., Sage, R.M., & McDowell, N.K. (2003). Are self-enhancing cognitions associated with healthy or unhealthy biological profiles? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 605-615

September 28: Self & Social Perception

Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 431-441.

Wilson, T.D. & Gilbert, D. T. (2005). Affective Forecasting: Knowing What to Want. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 131-134.

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

Risen, J. L., & Critcher, C. R. (2011). Visceral fit: While in a visceral state, associated states of the world seem more likely. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 100, 777.

October 5: Power & Status

Maner, J. K., (2017). Dominance and prestige: a tale of two hierarchies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26, 526-531.

Galinsky, A.D., Magee, J.C., Inesi, M.E. & Gruenfeld, D.H. (2006). Power and perspectives not taken, *Psychological Science*, 17, 1068-1074.

Smith, P. K., & Trope, Y. (2006). You focus on the forest when you're in charge of the trees: power priming and abstract information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 578.

October 12: Rejection & Aggression

Eisenberger, N.I., (2012). Broken hearts and broken bones: A neural perspective on the similarities between social and physical pain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21, 42 – 47.

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F., (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219-229.

Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., Kashima, Y., & Bain, P. (2008). Attributing and denying humanness to others. *European review of social psychology*, 19, 55-85.

Cameron, C. D., & Payne, B. K. (2011). Escaping affect: how motivated emotion regulation creates insensitivity to mass suffering. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 100, 1.

October 19: Prejudice & Stereotyping

Correll, J., Wittenbrink, B., Park, B., Judd, M., & Goyle, A. (2011). Dangerous enough: Moderating racial bias with contextual threat cues. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 47, 184-189

Cascio, J., & Plant, E. A., (2016). Judged by the company you keep? Exposure to nonprejudiced norms reduces concerns about being misidentified as gay/lesbian. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42. 1164-1176.

Legault, L., Gutsell, J.N., Inzlicht, M. (2011). Ironic effects of antiprejudice messages: How motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 22, 1472-1477.

Devine, P.G., Forscher, P.S., Austin, A.J., & Cox, W.L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 1267–1278.

October 26: Motivation & Regulation

Rattan, A., Good, C., & Dweck, C.S. (2012). "It's ok - Not everyone can be good at math": Instructors with an entity theory comfort (and demotivate) students, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 731-737.

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

78.

March, D. S., Gaertner, L., & Olson, M. A. (2017). In harm's way: On preferential response to threatening stimuli. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*, 1519-1529

(Recommended additional reading) Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 1280-1300.

November 2: Morality

Haidt, J., (2007). The New Synthesis in Moral Psychology, *Science*, *316*, 998-1002.

Gray, K., Young, L., & Waytz, A. (2012). Mind Perception Is the Essence of Morality, *Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory*, *23*, 101-124.

Skitka, L. J., & Conway, P. Morality. In Baumeister, R. F., & Finkel, E. J. (Eds.). (2018). *Advanced Social Psychology: The State of the Science*, Second Edition. OUP USA.

(Recommended additional reading) Ward, S. J., & King, L. A. (2018). Individual Differences in Reliance on Intuition Predict Harsher Moral Judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *114*, 825 - 849.

November 9: Relationships

Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, methods, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *118*, 3-34.

McNulty, J. K., & Fincham, F. D. (2012). Beyond positive psychology? Toward a contextual view of psychological processes and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 101-110.

French, J. E., Altgelt, E. E., & Meltzer, A. L. (2019). The implications of sociosexuality for marital satisfaction and dissolution. *Psychological science*, *30*, 1460-1472.

(Recommended additional reading) Eastwick, P. W., Luchies, L. B., Finkel, E. J., & Hunt, L. L. (2014). The predictive validity of ideal partner preferences: A review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*, 623-665.

November 16: Culture & Gender

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

Buss, D.M. (1995). Psychological sex differences: Origins through sexual selection. *American Psychologist*, *50*, 164-168.

Zell, E., Krizan, Z., & Teeter, S. R. (2015). Evaluating gender similarities and differences using metasynthesis. *American Psychologist*, *70*, 10-20.

Costa, P.T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 322–331.

(Recommended additional reading) Schaller, M., & Murray, D.R. (2008). Pathogens, personality, and culture: Disease prevalence predicts worldwide variability in sociosexuality, extraversion, and openness to experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 212-221.

November 23: Writing Workshop

November 30: Proposal Blitz Presentations; Proposal Papers Due at Midnight