

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND PERSONALITY

PSY 258S, Section 01

Fall 2011

Thursday 1:15-3:45, 319 Soc/Psych

Instructor: Rick Hoyle
Office: 321 Soc/Psych
Contact: 660.5791, rhoyle@duke.edu
Office hours: Tuesdays 2:30-4:00, and by appointment

Course website: <http://www.duke.edu/~rhoyle/teaching/psy258/>

Readings

Baumeister, R. F., & Finkel, E. J. (Eds.) (2010). *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Various articles and chapters will be made available for download at least one week prior to and one week after the class meeting during which they will be discussed.

Description and Goals of the Course

Our goal in this seminar course is to survey major topics in social psychology, including personality and individual difference variables relevant to those topics, at a level appropriate for advanced undergraduates and first-year graduate students. I assume familiarity with the methods of psychological science, including basic statistical methods, as well as some prior exposure to social psychology. The course is structured to promote depth of understanding, integration, and creativity. The major activities of the course are purposeful reading, lively discussion, and original writing. In order to take full advantage of the course, it will be necessary to devote about five hours each week to preparation. Successful students will complete the course with a solid understanding of major themes and methods in social and personality psychology.

Elements of the Course

Readings for Class Meetings

The success of a seminar course hinges on preparation and participation by all class members. The assigned readings provide the foundation for active participation. It is essential that you arrive at each class meeting having thoughtfully completed the readings. For each class meeting, these consist of a chapter from the textbook and several journal articles or book chapters. Each week's readings are divided into three parts, corresponding to three portions of the class meeting. The types of readings and their role in class meetings are as follows.

Background readings. These consist of one chapter from the textbook and one or more short articles of historical significance. We typically will devote the first 50 minutes or so of the class meeting to material covered in these readings. I will take primary responsibility for presenting and encouraging discussion of this material

“Target” readings. For each topic, I have chosen one article (or a matched set of articles) for extended discussion. Target articles are provocative, controversial, or groundbreaking, and should provide the basis for spirited discussions. You and I will share responsibility for promoting discussion of these readings during the second 50 minutes or so of the class meeting.

“Choose-one” readings. Given that you can’t devote all of your academic effort to this one course, I am asking you to choose one additional reading from a list of readings we all would read if time were not an issue. (I encourage graduate students, particularly graduate students in the social psychology program, to read all of the choose-one articles.) During the final 50 minutes or so of the class meeting, *you* will stimulate discussion of the choose-one article you read. I suggest taking notes and preparing in advance a question or idea you think the group might discuss. This is to be a student-led discussion, so avoid long, uncomfortable periods of silence by arriving prepared.

Discussion Questions

To help you to prepare for and contribute to the discussion, you are to prepare and submit one or two discussion questions for each set of readings. These are due each Wednesday by 5:00. Please email your questions to me (rhoyle@duke.edu). Your grade for the discussion questions will begin at 100, with 10 points subtracted for each failure to hand the questions in on time.

The discussion questions are so named because they should promote discussion. Although there are no hard and fast rules for formulating questions, the most successful questions are integrative (i.e., they ask the respondent to relate ideas in different readings to one another). These questions are important to the success of the class; please spend some time on them.

Idea Papers

Over the course of the semester, you are to hand in 10 idea papers. Everyone is required to produce an idea paper for the second class meeting. You may choose the class meetings for which you produce the remaining nine papers. An idea paper is a one-to-two page (double-spaced) document in which you describe in very general terms a study you might do (or believe someone ought to do) given what you read for that week’s class meeting. Your idea must draw on at least two of the readings for the week. Idea papers begin with a reference to the articles that inspired the idea and the particular aspects of the readings from which the proposed study derives. The heart of the paper is a general description of a study or set of studies one might do based on the readings. The idea paper concludes with a statement about how the results of the proposed study would make a significant contribution to the literature represented by the readings. Idea papers are due no later than the beginning of the class meeting for which they are relevant. Each idea paper will receive a score from 0-10, yielding a total of 100 points for the set.

Mid-Term Exam

You will sit for an exam during the September 22 class meeting time. The exam will consist of your choice of a subset of short essay questions from a list based on the readings to that point. These questions may ask you to critique studies; analyze strengths and weaknesses of a theory; integrate or apply ideas from several readings; or propose a new study to test a specific hypothesis raised by the readings. In short, the questions are designed to elicit creative, independent thought rather than a demonstration of your ability to remember facts. As such, the exam will be “open book”; you may bring all the readings as well as any notes you may have prepared beforehand. In preparation for the exam, you should read for comprehension and understanding rather than memorizing specifics from the readings. If you carefully and thoughtfully do the readings and actively participate in discussions, you should not need to do extra preparation for the exam.

Review Manuscript

The culminating assignment is a manuscript that reviews the literature on a topic within social or personality psychology. Your review must be written in APA style and format, comprising a minimum of 20 and a maximum of 40 pages of text (i.e., exclusive of title page, abstract, references, notes, tables, figures, and the like). In addition to consultation with your faculty mentor, you will find useful information about writing a review manuscript in these documents:

Bem, D. (1995). Writing a review article for *Psychological Bulletin*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 172-177.

“Writing a Psychology Literature Review,” University of Washington Psychology Writing Center: <http://web.psych.washington.edu/writingcenter/writingguides/pdf/litrev.pdf>

“The Literature Review,” Deakin University Library:
<http://www.deakin.edu.au/library/findout/research/litrev.php>

“The Writer’s Handbook: Learn How to Write a Review of the Literature,” The Writing Center @ University of Wisconsin-Madison:
<http://writing.wisc.edu/Handbook/ReviewofLiterature.html>

I will provide additional information about the review manuscript toward the middle of the semester. A key issue is that your review must have a point; that is, it must do more than just provide a synopsis of all the published studies on the topic you have chosen. I strongly recommend that you consult with your faculty mentor early in the semester both to identify a topic and to develop an angle that will guide your organization and synthesis of the literature on the topic. You will be asked to hand in several preliminary documents (e.g., topic area, outline) during the latter half of the semester to ensure that you are on course to develop a high quality manuscript by the time it is due, 5:00 on Friday, December 9.

Course Grade

Your grade for the course will be based on the total percentage of points you obtain from four sources, weighted as follows:

Discussion questions: 10%
 Idea papers: 30%
 Mid-term exam: 20%
 Review manuscript: 40%

Grades will be distributed as follows:

Undergraduates

Grade	% Range	Grade	% Range	Grade	% Range
A	93.0-100.0	B-	80.0 - 82.9	D+	67.0 - 69.9
A-	90.0 - 92.9	C+	77.0 - 79.9	D	63.0 - 66.9
B+	87.0 - 89.9	C	73.0 - 76.9	D-	60.0 - 62.9
B	83.0 - 86.9	C-	70.0 - 72.9	F	00.0 - 59.9

Graduate Students

Grade	% Range
A	90.0-100.0
B	80.0 - 89.9
C	70.0 - 79.9
F	00.0 - 69.9

Course Outline¹

September 1 history and background

Background:

Chapter 2 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Triplett, N. (1898) The dynamogenic factors in pacemaking and competition. *American Journal of Psychology*, 9, 507-533.

-or-

Le Bon, G. (1896). *The crowd: A study of the popular mind*. USA: Norman S. Berg. Free pdf: <http://socserv.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/lebon/Crowds.pdf> [Read the first chapter; at least skim the rest.]

Target:

Nisbett, R. E. (1990). The anti-creativity letters. *American Psychologist*, 45, 1078-1082.

Choose one:

Batson, C. D. (2005). Seven possible social-psychological wisdoms. *Psychological Inquiry*, 16, 152-157.

Berscheid, E. (1992). A glance back at a quarter century of social psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 525-533.

House, J. S. (1977). The three faces of social psychology. *Sociometry*, 40, 161-77.

Richard, F. D., Bond, C. F., Jr., & Stokes-Zoota, J. J. (2003). One hundred years of social psychology quantitatively described. *Review of General Psychology*, 7, 331-363.

Swann, W. B., & Seyle, C. (2005). Personality psychology's comeback and its emerging symbiosis with social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 155-165.

September 8 social influence and conformity

Background:

Chapter 11 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 31-35.

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 371-378.

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

Target:

Cialdini, R. B. (1980). Full-cycle social psychology. In L. Bickman (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual* (Vol. 1, pp. 21-47). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Choose one:

Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 1015-1026.

¹ All readings available for download at <http://www.duke.edu/~rhoyle/teaching/psy258/reading.html>

- Cohen, G. L. (2003). Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 808-822.
- Crano, W. D. (2000). Milestones in the psychological analysis of social influence. *Group Dynamics*, 4, 68-80.
- Latané, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 822-832.
- Maass, A., & Clark, R. D. III. (1984). Hidden impact of minorities: Fifteen years of minority influence research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 428-450.
-

September 15 social cognition

Background:

Chapter 3 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Heider, F., & Simmel, M. (1944). An experimental study of apparent behavior. *American Journal of Psychology*, 57, 243-259. View a re-creation of the animated film here: <http://cogweb.ucla.edu/Discourse/Narrative/heider-simmel-demo.swf>

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185, 1124-1131.

Target:

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Flexible correction processes in social judgment: The role of naive theories in corrections for perceived bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 36-51.

Choose one:

Funder, D. C. (1987). Errors and mistakes: Evaluating the accuracy of social judgment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101, 75-90.

Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 21-38.

Gilbert, D. T., Pelham, B. W., & Krull, D. S. (1988). On cognitive business: When person perceivers meet persons perceived. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 733-740.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The process of causal attribution. *American Psychologist*, 28, 107-128.

Lau, R.R., & Russell, D. (1980). Attributions in the sports pages: A field test of some current hypotheses in attribution research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 29-38.

Malle, B. F., Knobe, J., & Nelson, S. (2007). Actor-observer asymmetries in behavior explanations: New answers to an old question. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 491-514.

Miller, J. G. (1984). Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 961-978.

Ross, L., Greene, D., & House, P. (1977). The "false consensus effect": An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13, 279-301.

Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 656-666.

September 22 mid-term exam

September 29 attitudes and behavior

Background:

Chapter 6 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

LaPiere, R. T. (1934). Attitudes vs. actions. *Social Forces*, 13, 230-237.

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58, 203-210.

Target:

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4-27.

Take an IAT or two at <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/demo/takeatest.html>

Choose one:

Ajzen, I., Timko, C., & White, J. B. (1982). Self-monitoring and the attitude-behavior relation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 426-435.

Bem, D. (1965). An experimental analysis of self-persuasion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 199-218.

Eagly, A. H. (1992). Uneven progress: Social psychology and the study of attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 693-710.

Fazio, R. H., Sanbonmatsu, D. M., Powell, M. C., & Kardes, F. R. (1986). On the automatic activation of attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 229-238.

Heider, F. (1946). Attitudes and cognitive organization. *Journal of Psychology*, 21, 107-112.

Nosek, B. A. (2007). Implicit-explicit relations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 65-69.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1984). The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity and quality: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 69-81.

Sherif, M. (1935). A study of some social factors in perception: Chapter 4. *Archives of Psychology*, 27, 1-60. Available online at http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Sherif/Sherif_1935a/Sherif_1935a_4.html

October 6 self and identity

Background:

Chapter 5 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability of the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 858-866.

Target:

Discussion: Does self-esteem matter? (You will be assigned one of the following.)

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier life-styles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 4(Whole No. 1), 1-44.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Chang-Schneider, C., & McClarty, K. L. (2007). Do people's self-views matter? Self-concept and self-esteem in everyday life. *American Psychologist*, 62, 84-94.

Read both of these:

Krueger, J. I., Vohs, K. D., & Baumeister, R. F. (2008). Is the allure of self-esteem a mirage after all? [Comment]. *American Psychologist*, 63, 64-65.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Chang-Schneider, C., & McClarty, K. L. (2008). Yes, cavalier attitudes can have pernicious consequences [Comment]. *American Psychologist*, 63, 65-66.

Choose one:

Baumeister, R.F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D.M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1252-1265.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 63-78.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Griffin, J. J., Predmore, S., & Gaines, B. (1987). The cognitive-affective crossfire: When self-consistency confronts self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 881-889.

October 13 personality and individual differences*Background:*

Chapter 21 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84, 231-259.

Target:

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339-375.

Choose one:

Leary, M. R., & Hoyle, R. H. (2009). Situations, dispositions, and the study of social behavior. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 3-11). New York: Guilford Press.

Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., & Mendoza-Denton, R. (2002). Situation-behavior profiles as a locus of consistency in personality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 50-54.

October 20 social exchange and prosocial behavior*Background:*

Chapter 8 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Target:

Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neuberg, S. L. (1997).

Reinterpreting the empathy-altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 481-494.

Batson, C. D., Sagar, K., Garst, E., Kang, M., Rubchinsky, K., & Dawson, K. (1997). Is empathy-induced helping due to self-other merging? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 495-509.

Choose one:

Darley, J. M. and Batson, C. D. (1973). "From Jerusalem to Jericho:" A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27, 100-108.

Houlden, P., LaTour, S., Walker, L., & Thibaut, J. (1978). Preferences for modes of dispute resolution as a function of process and decision control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14, 13-30.

Isen, A. M., & Levin, P. F. (1972). Effects of feeling good on helping: Cookies and kindness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 21, 384-388.

Morgan, W. R., & Sawyer, J. (1979). Equality, equity, and procedural justice in social exchange. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 42, 71-75.

October 27 antisocial behavior*Background:*

Chapter 9 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 377-383.

Target:

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.

Choose one:

Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2002). Violent video games and hostile expectations: A test of the general aggression model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1679-1686.

Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, A. (2009). Comfortably numb: Desensitizing effects of violent media on helping others. *Psychological Science*, 20, 273-277.

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdlec, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the Southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 945-960.

November 3 prejudice and stereotyping*Background:*

Chapter 10 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 285-290.

Target:

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5-18.

Choose one:

Aronson, E., & Bridgeman, D. (1979). Jigsaw groups and the desegregated classroom: In pursuit of common goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 438-446.

Duckitt, J. Wagner, C., du Plessis, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 75-93.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 28, 280-290.

Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., and Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 808-817.

Payne, B. K. (2006). Weapon bias: Split-second decisions and unintended stereotyping. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 287-291.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test-performance of African-Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797-811.

November 10 attraction and rejection*Background:*

Chapter 12 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62, 713-715.

Zadro, L., Williams, K. D., & Richardson, R. (2004). How low can you go? Ostracism by a computer is sufficient to lower self-reported levels of belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 560-567.

Target:

Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 518-530.

Choose one:

- Berscheid, E., Dion, K., Walster, E., & Walster, W. G. (1971). Physical attractiveness and dating choice: A test of the matching hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7*, 173-189.
- Buss, D. & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review, 100*, 204-232.
- Dutton, D. G., & Aron, A. P. (1974). Some evidence for heightened sexual attraction under conditions of high anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 510-517.
- MacDonald, G., & Leary, M. R. (2005). Why does social exclusion hurt? The relationship between social and physical pain. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 202-223.

November 17 close relationships

Background:

Chapter 13 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Target:

Gottman, J. M., Coan, J., Carrere, S., & Swanson, C. (1998). Predicting marital happiness and stability from newlywed interactions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 5-22.

Choose one:

- Baumeister, R. F., Wotman, S. R., & Stillwell, A. M. (1993). Unrequited love: On heartbreak, anger, guilt, scriptlessness, and humiliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 377-394.
- Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., Wieselquist, J., & Whitton, S.W. (1999). Close partner as sculptor of the ideal self: Behavioral affirmation and the Michelangelo phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 293-323.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987) Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.
- Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., & Griffin, D. W. (1996). The self-fulfilling nature of positive illusions in romantic relationships: Love is not blind but prescient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 1155-1180.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16*, 172-186.

December 1 intergroup processes

Background:

Chapter 15 in Baumeister & Finkel (2010)

Sherif, M. (1956). Experiments in group conflict. *Scientific American, 195*, 54-58.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*, 96-102.

Target:

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.

Choose one:

Ahlfinger, N. R. & Esser, J. K. (2001). Testing the groupthink model: Effects of promotional leadership and conformity predisposition. *Social Behavior and Personality, 29*, 31-41.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271-299.

Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 475-486.

Sanna, L. J., & Parks, C. D. (1997). Group research trends in social and organizational psychology: Whatever happened to intragroup research? *Psychological Science, 8*, 261-267.

December 9 research proposal due by 5:00
