

Course Outline

PSYD15H3-Y-LEC01

Current Topics in Social Psychology – Current Debates

Summer 2017

Course Meets: Mondays from 11am–1pm in MW 223

Instructor: Dr. Shona Tritt
E-Mail: shona.tritt@mail.utoronto.ca
Webpage: <http://portal.utoronto.ca>
Office Hours: Mondays: 10-11am & 1-2pm, office location: Room 123 of PO103

Course Scope and Mission

This course will provide you with an overview of some of the most hotly disputed current issues in the field of Social Psychology. It is designed to provide you with an understanding of the timely debates in our field. The course is structured as an undergraduate seminar, intended to foster your abilities for critical thinking, engagement in academic debate, public speaking, formulating and expressing informed opinions, and academic writing.

In each class, we will survey and debate one topic that is a current controversy in the field of social psychology. The debate topics are as follows:

- Does neuroscience add anything useful to social psychology?
- Does a lack of viewpoint diversity impede scientific process?
- Does emotion get in the way of rationality?
- Is our society on its way to achieving gender equality?
- Are humans inherently pro-social?
- Does money make people happy?
- Do basic emotions exist?
- Is the implicit association test a valid measure of unconscious bias?
- In light of recent alleged replication failures, is social psychology in crisis?

Required & Suggested Readings

Readings for the class come from primary journal or chapter sources. The readings for each class are provided at the end of the syllabus for each week. The University of Toronto has on-line access to the journals through the library. Scholar.google.com is another fast way of finding articles. For your convenience, I have provided links to quickly access each reading at the end of the syllabus for each week.

You are expected to peruse the **required** readings before coming to class each week so as to be prepared to debate the issues at hand. Although you will be provided with a brief summary of the readings at the beginning of each class, you will find it much easier to participate in the class debates if you have had some time to formulate your opinions about the subject matter before class.

Course Webpage/ Blackboard

I will use Blackboard to communicate with you. The syllabus, class announcements, grades, and etc. will all be posted on blackboard. I recommend getting acquainted with Blackboard and checking it on a regular basis throughout the semester for announcements and messages. Also, please make sure to update your Blackboard account so that your correct email address is noted. You do not need to apply for Blackboard access. If you are registered, you will automatically see this class when you log-on. To access Blackboard, log onto <http://www.utoronto.ca/>, scroll to the bottom of the screen and click on the “Portal Login,” on this

next page, again, click on to the “Portal Login,” and here enter your UTORid and password, and voila you have access!

Email Policy

If you have questions or concerns, always check the course syllabus. If you don't find your answer there, please feel free to contact me at shona.tritt@mail.utoronto.ca. My policy is to respond to emails within 2 working days of receipt. I am also available to my students and encourage you to visit me during office hours (Mondays 9am – 11am) for help with the material, or for a casual chat about psychology.

Evaluation and Grades

Grades are a measure of the performance of a student in individual courses. Each student shall be judged on the basis of how well he or she has command of the course materials.

	Marks	Due Dates
Participation	25%	Every class that a debate is hosted
Opinion papers	25%	Every class that a debate is hosted
Hosting a debate	20%	TBA
Final paper	30%	TBA

COURSE FORMAT AND EXPECTATIONS

Participation (25%)

As a special topics seminar, this class is structured primarily around class discussion. Thus, it is imperative that students actively participate. This will make learning more interactive and longer lasting. It will also allow you to enhance your communication and public speaking skills.

I expect you to participate in class debates – making at least one comment per class. Your grade will be based on how well you appear to grasp the course material, think critically about the material, and express your thoughts and opinions on a topic. It is therefore very important that you come to class prepared to debate. The best way to prepare is to read the required readings, formulating your opinions about the articles and about the debate in general, before coming to class. I suggest that you read about the debate of the week at the end of the course syllabus before reading the articles. This will help you to focus on what's important for our purposes while reading. Writing an opinion piece will also help you to formulate your opinions on the debate topic, fostering high-level participation in class.

With this course, I hope to inspire greater cognitive flexibility and openness to new ideas. In service of this goal, you will **not** be permitted to choose the side of the debate that you will be arguing in support of. The “for” and “against” positions will be determined at random during class immediately before the debate. This means that you will sometimes have to argue for a position that you do not personally endorse.

I recognize that many of you may struggle with shyness and social anxiety at the prospect of speaking in class. I encourage you to use this class as an opportunity to push yourselves to speak up. According to the principles of habituation, you should get used to speaking in class with practice and your anxiety should diminish over time. Please feel free to speak with me, and with accessibility services, if you are struggling with serious anxiety about class participation. On a related note, I urge you to please make it easier for your classmates to speak up by being respectful of their opinions and by being supportive of each other.

I will keep a record of participation for each class in which a debate takes place. Your grade will be based upon the following criteria: Arriving on time (10%); speaking at least once per class (20%); demonstrating good understanding of the material (40%); displaying critical thinking and/or original insight (30%).

Please note that I assume that many of you will have to miss a class from time to time, I will therefore not penalize you for missing one class or for being late once. If this happens once, I will omit the lateness or not include the one missed class towards your participation grade. However, if you have already missed one class and do not show up (and you have not submitted appropriate documentation as specified in the “Missed Term Work due to Medical Illness or Emergency” section below), then you will be given a participation mark of 0% for that class.

Please Note: It would help me to learn your name if you would email me a photograph that clearly displays your face. This is not a requirement – just a request. Thank you for your consideration.

Opinion papers (25%)

In order to facilitate participation and high-level discussion, I ask that you prepare a summary of your opinions about the debate topic as they relate to the required readings each week. This assignment is intended to get you thinking about the material, so that you will have something to contribute during class discussions. I suggest that you summarize the main points in the required readings, indicate how they relate to the debate topic of the week, and formulate your opinion about the debate topic.

- Papers should be turned in at the start of class (they will not be accepted late).
- Papers should be 1-2 double-spaced pages (500 words max).
- Papers will be graded on a scale ranging from 5 (excellent) to 0 (fail).

The final grade that you receive on your opinion papers will be composed of the average of the 7 most highly graded opinion papers that you submit. This means that you are only required to submit 7 opinion papers but if you submit more, I will only include your 7 best papers when calculating your final mark.

Hosting a debate (20%)

Every student will be asked to host a debate in teams of 2-3 people. In the first class, I will provide you with a brief overview of all of the topics of debate and will then administer a questionnaire in which I will ask you to indicate your preferred topics. I will do my best to match as many people as possible with their preferred topic. Unfortunately, I cannot guarantee that everyone will get their first choice, but I'll do my best. Your team will be determined by me as I try to match as many people as possible with their preferred topic.

I would like you to host the debate in the following format:

- I would like you to start off with a presentation that introduces the debate, setting us up so that everyone understands the issues at hand.
 - o I would like you to present the historical and/or practical importance of the debate topic, as well as to summarize, briefly, the major themes or findings from the required and the suggested readings.
 - o You don't have to present detailed arguments in favor of one position or another because that's what your classmates are getting participation marks for, and you'll want to leave them time to debate.
 - o This presentation should take approximately 20-minutes.

- You may choose to use visual aids such as a powerpoint presentation, video demonstration, or handouts, for example.
- This presentation will be followed by hosting an informal class debate in which you will ask questions to the class related to their opinions on the issues at hand, and moderate the discussion.
 - For this portion of the debate, half of the class will be randomly assigned to argue in favor of the position and the other half will be randomly assigned to argue against it.
 - Students will raise their hands when they have something to say. The hosts will call on students to speak – try to call on those who haven't yet had a chance to speak to ensure that everyone gets a turn.
 - Feel free to actively moderate the class discussion by summarizing students arguments and turning our attention to relevant, unconsidered issues by asking follow-up questions.
 - If students have nothing more to say and I feel that an important point hasn't been raised, I may jump into the discussion.
- Once there are no further arguments to be made or questions to be asked, I would like the hosts to check-in with the class to inquire about their personal opinions about the debate topic. The hosts will then see if we can come to some kind of consensus or resolution about the debate.
- At the end, I will pose some additional discussion points to encourage you to think about how the debate topic relates to current issues, and to our understanding of Social Psychology and/or to the world.

Your mark for hosting a debate will be based on the following criteria: Demonstrating an in-depth understanding of the topic of debate (40%); putting together a coherent presentation that clearly outlines the issues at hand for the other students (40%); respectfully and effectively hosting the class discussion in a way that promotes critical thought (20%).

You may or may not get the same mark as your teammates in hosting the debate. If it seems as though one person is better prepared than another, the better-prepared individual will obtain a higher mark. I urge you to try to split the work – and presentation time -- into approximately equal proportions among team-members.

If one individual must miss class on the day of their presentation, I will post an announcement to see if another team is willing/able to switch presentation dates. If this happens last-minute and no other team is willing/able to present on that day, then the other team-members will present without the missing student. If the missing student shows appropriate documentation (see “Missed Term Work due to Medical Illness or Emergency” section below), their grade will be re-weighted such that their participation will be worth 30% of their final grade, their opinion papers will be worth 30%, and their final paper will be worth 40% of their final grade.

Final paper (30%)

You will be asked to write a paper (6-7 pages, double-spaced). In this paper, I would like you to summarize one debate that was discussed in class and to propose a novel study that would help to resolve some aspect of the debate. The study that you propose does not have to be easy to run – i.e., feel free to imagine that you have millions of dollars in resources and several decades to work on it. Please make sure to state your expected findings and to explain precisely what each of the possible findings in the proposed study would mean in terms of resolving the aspect

of the debate at hand. Though not required, you will likely want to do some additional research on your topic and on Social Psychology methods, beyond what was presented in class.

You will be expected to use APA style formatting. Additionally, I ask that you strive for coherent, logical, and carefully edited academic writing.

Your mark on the paper will be based upon your ability to 1) propose a novel study that could meaningfully inform a current debate in the field of social psychology (40% of mark), 2) write a clear, well-written, and well-structured paper, using APA style (40%), and 3) originality and level of critical thinking (20%).

Late Assignments: The final paper is due at the start of the final class (11am). Late assignments will be accepted with a penalty of 10% for every day (after 1pm Monday morning counts as a day) that the assignment is late.

Missed Term Work due to Medical Illness or Emergency:

All students citing a documented reason for a late paper, a missed class while scheduled to host a debate, or missing more than 1 class, must bring their documentation to the Undergraduate Course Coordinator, Ainsley Lawson, **within three (3) business days** of the late assignment or missed class. All documentation must be accompanied by the departmental [Request for Missed Term Work form](http://uoft.me/PSY-MTW) (<http://uoft.me/PSY-MTW>).

In the case of missed term work due to illness, only an **original copy** of the [official UTSC Verification of Illness Form](http://uoft.me/PSY-MED) (<http://uoft.me/PSY-MED>) will be accepted. Forms are to be completed in full, clearly indicating the start date, anticipated end date, and severity of illness. The physician's registration number and business stamp are required.

In the case of medical emergency, an original copy of the record of visitation to a hospital emergency room should be provided.

In the case of a death of a family member, a copy of a death certificate should be provided.

In the case of a disability-related concern, an email communication should be sent directly to the Course Coordinator (psychology-undergraduate@utsc.utoronto.ca) from your Disability Consultant at AccessAbility Services. The course instructor should also be copied.

For U of T Varsity athletic commitments, an email communication should be sent directly to the Course Coordinator (psychology-undergraduate@utsc.utoronto.ca) from a coach or varsity administrator should be submitted, in advance of the missed work.

Documents covering the following situations are NOT acceptable: medical prescriptions, anything related to personal travel, weddings/personal/work commitments.

Also, please note that I will assume that most students will be sick at least once per semester. Therefore, if you must miss one class in which a debate is being hosted, I will not deduct marks from your participation grade. However, if you must miss more than one class in which a debate is being hosted, I ask that you provide appropriate documentation to Ainsley Lawson.

Forms should be dropped off in SW427C between 9 AM - 4 PM, Monday through Friday.

Upon receipt of the documentation, you will receive an email response from the Course Instructor / Course Coordinator within three business days. The Course Instructor reserves the right to decide what accommodations (if any) will be made for the missed work.

Failure to adhere to any aspect of this policy may result in a denial of your request for accommodation.

Accessibility:

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcome in this course. In particular, if you have a disability/health consideration that may require accommodations, please feel free to approach me and/or the Accessibility Services Office as soon as possible. I will work with you and Accessibility Services to ensure you can achieve your learning goals in this course. Enquiries are confidential. The UTSC Accessibility Services staff (located in S302) are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals and arrange appropriate accommodations (416) 287-7560 or ability@utsc.utoronto.ca.

Academic Integrity:

Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship in a university, and to ensuring that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of each student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm>) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the processes for addressing academic offences. Potential offences in papers and assignments include, but are not limited to:

- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement.
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor.
- Making up sources or facts.
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.

All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following procedures outlined in the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. If you have questions or concerns about what constitutes appropriate academic behaviour or appropriate research and citation methods, you are expected to seek out additional information on academic integrity from your instructor or from other institutional resources (see <http://www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity/>).

Note:

You may see advertisements for services offering grammar help, essay editing and proof-reading. Be very careful. If these services take a draft of your work and significantly change the content and/or language, you may be committing an academic offence (unauthorized assistance) under the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters.

It is much better and safer to take your draft to the Writing Centre as early as you can. They will give you guidance you can trust. Students for whom English is not their first language should go to the English Language Development Centre.

If you decide to use these services in spite of this caution, you must keep a draft of your work and any notes you made before you got help and be prepared to give it to your instructor on request.

Weekly Schedule

Session/ Date	Topic	Readings
Session # 1: May 1	Overview of the course	<p>In this class, I will provide an overview of the course.</p> <p>I will also briefly outline the debates that will be covered throughout the course.</p> <p>Finally, I will administer a questionnaire, asking you to indicate your preferences for hosting a topic of debate. I will then do my best to match people with topics that interest them.</p> <p>No required readings for this week.</p>
Session # 2: May 8	Intro to scholarly discourse. Question and answer period about the upcoming debates and paper.	<p>In this class, I will provide guidelines for how to read scholarly articles in an effective way, how to write an academic paper, and how to engage in the debates that will be hosted.</p> <p>Please prepare any questions you might have about how to successfully host a debate, how to participate effectively, and how to go about writing the final paper.</p> <p>No required readings for this week.</p>
Session # 3: May 15	<p>Debate topic: Does neuroscience add anything useful to social psychology?</p> <p>For about the last 15-years, social psychologists have been using the methods of neuroscience. Has anything useful come of this very expensive and technologically advanced research? Some would argue yes. In particular, that neuroscience has revealed some of the biological underpinnings of social behavior, buffering our previously exclusively psychological understanding of social behavior, offering a new way of unifying knowledge across multiple levels of analysis. Moreover, proponents of social neuroscience have argued that neuroscience techniques allow us a new way of measuring implicit processes that are impossible to assess with self-report, which is useful as many cognitive operations occur automatically, outside of awareness. Most social psychologists accordingly believe that the integration of neuroscience and social psychology holds unique promise and has been relatively successful. However, the progress that has been made integrating neuroscience with mainstream social psychology has been conspicuously slow. Some have consequently argued that neuroscience findings in social psychology have</p>	<p>Required reading:</p> <p>1) Dovidio, J. F., Pearson, A. R., & Orr, P. (2008). Social Psychology and Neuroscience: Strange Bedfellows or a Healthy Marriage?. <i>Group Processes & Intergroup Relations</i>, 11, 247–263. http://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/22860/ssoar-qpir-2008-2-dovidio_et_al-social_psychology_and_neuroscience_strange.pdf?sequence=1</p> <p>2) Kang, S. K., Inzlicht, M., & Dirks, B. (2010). Social Neuroscience and Public Policy on Intergroup Relations: A Hegelian Analysis. <i>Journal of Social Issues</i>, 66, 585—601. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael_Inzlicht/publication/227517130_Social_Neuroscience_and_Public_Policy_on_Intergroup_Relations_A_Hegelian_Analysis/links/0912f506c683da4e7d000000.pdf</p> <p>Suggested reading:</p> <p>1) Cacioppo, J. T., Berntson, G. G., & Decety, J. (2010). Social Neuroscience and its relationship to social psychology. <i>Social Cognition</i>, 28, 675–685.</p>

	<p>actually taught us very little that we did not already know, are reductionist, and have sometimes even led to misguided conclusions. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate the utility of using neuroscience methods to better understand social psychological topics.</p>	<p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3883133/pdf/nihms-538930.pdf</p> <p>2) Weisberg, D. S. et al. (2008). The Seductive Allure of Neuroscience Explanations. <i>Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience</i>, 20, 470–477.</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2778755/pdf/nihms91893.pdf</p>
May 22	Victoria Day – No class	
Session # 4: May 29	<p>Debate topic: Does a lack of viewpoint diversity impede scientific process?</p> <p>Social psychology lacks political diversity. In particular, a recent survey found that there are only 8 politically conservative professors currently working in the field. Some argue that this lack of viewpoint diversity undermines the validity of social psychological science. For example, liberal values may be embedded into research questions and methods. Political psychology findings about conservatives may be particularly skewed by the liberal bias of those doing the research, creating an unflattering picture of conservatives that is supposedly backed-up by science. In this context, Jonathan Haidt and his colleagues have recently suggested that affirmative action programs that provide spots in Social Psychology graduate programs for political conservatives might be warranted as a means of increasing the political diversity of the field. Others have argued that the homogeneity of the political attitudes of social psychologists is not necessarily problematic. They argue that liberal scientists are capable of overcoming their biases by making a concerted effort to think from others points of views, for instance. Some have additionally pointed out that there's no good evidence to suggest that social science fields with more politically diverse workforces have higher evidentiary standards, or generally produce better research. Some have gone as far as to say that reasonable conservatives are in short supply and therefore would not benefit social psychology in any way. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate about the whether the lack of viewpoint diversity among social psychologists hinders social psychological understanding.</p>	<p>Required reading:</p> <p>1) Duarte et al. (2015). Political diversity will improve social psychological science. <i>Behavioural & Brain Sciences</i>, 1-58. (required reading stops at page 13 – commentaries follow, which you can read if interested).</p> <p>http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~jussim/Duarte%20et%20al,%202015,%20BBS,%20target,%20commentaries,%20reply.pdf</p> <p>Suggested reading:</p> <p>1) Brandt, M.J., et al. (2014). The Ideological-Conflict Hypothesis: Intolerance Among Both Liberals and Conservatives Are most published social psychological findings false?. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 23, 27–34.</p> <p>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jarret_Crawford/publication/256050159_The_Ideological-Conflict_Hypothesis/links/0a85e52f111edd4dca00000.pdf</p> <p>2) Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 96, 1029–1046.</p> <p>http://projectimplicit.net/nosek/papers/GHN2009.pdf</p> <p>3) Haidt, J., Rosenberg, E., & Hom, H. (2003). Differentiating Diversities: Moral Diversity Is Not Like Other Kinds. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>, 33, 1-36.</p> <p>http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/s39058858/Differentiating_Diversities_Moral_Diversity_Is_Not_Like_Other_Kinds.pdf?AWSAccessKey</p>

[Id=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1490204741&Signature=kt3ymKAgKo6%2F3kQAXkEEcuaF%2Fac%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DDifferentiating_Diversities_Moral_Divers.pdf](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4128497/pdf/nihms597965.pdf)

4) Inbar, Y., & Lammers, J. (2012). Political Diversity in Social and Personality Psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 496-503.

http://yoelinbar.net/papers/political_diversity.pdf

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

http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu/document/s/34149497/Jost_et_al._2003_Political_conservatism_as_motivated_social_cognition.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1490204827&Signature=GNTzunJDCUKtUStqsJIQSAkN4W0%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DPolitical_Conservatism_as_Motivated_Soci.pdf

Session # 5:
June 5

Debate topic: Does emotion get in the way of rationality?

For thousands of years, scholars have been debating the relationship between rationality and emotion. The ancient Stoics believed that our emotions represent our base animalistic drives, which lead us astray from our rational thoughts, which were believed to have been bestowed upon us from the Gods. From this perspective, reasoning is conceived as a “cold”, dispassionate, calculating process, whereas emotion represents a “hot”, passionate, automatic process. The notion that emotions such as anger, fear, pride, excitement, etc., are seen as antithetical to rationality continues to prevail in Western thought (e.g., the head versus the heart metaphors), and has been a popular way of conceiving of the mind according to psychologists. In support of this position, much research has shown that human reasoning processes are often undermined by emotional factors. For example, Nobel prize winning economist, Daniel Kahneman, discovered evidence that people have a propensity for loss aversion, which leads them to make more conservative or risky choices depending on whether bets are framed as losses or gains, even when they are statistically exactly the same. This

Required readings:

1) Clore, G.L. (2011). Psychology and the Rationality of Emotion. *Modern Theology*, 27, 325–338.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4128497/pdf/nihms597965.pdf>

2) Slovic, P. et al. (2002). Rational actors or rational fools: implications of the affect heuristic for behavioral economics. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 31, 329–342.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.709.2770&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Suggested readings:

1) Hanoch, Y. (2002). “Neither an angel nor an ant”: Emotion as an aid to bounded rationality. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 23, 1–25.

<http://www.econ.tuwien.ac.at/lotto/papers/Emotions.pdf>

2) Lambie, J. A. (2007). On the irrationality of emotion and the rationality of awareness.

	<p>finding suggests that people’s decision-making processes are biased by their emotional aversion to losses because if people were acting rationally, dollar amounts would lead to the same calculated conclusions no matter how a bet were framed. Other research has shown that emotions get in the way of people’s ability to update their beliefs in light of new information. On the other hand, some psychologists have argued that emotions do not, on average, get in the way of rationality – rather, more often than not, they allow people to make quick decisions that generally serve them well. In support of this notion, Darwin proposed that emotions are the result of evolutionary processes that have helped our ancestors to survive and reproduce. In this vein, neurological studies (including the famous case study of Phineas Gage) have found that people with orbitofrontal cortical lesions appear to lose their ability to experience normal negative emotions such as anxiety, which ultimately impairs their ability to make effective decisions. This provides evidence that emotions may – at least usually -- help rather than hinder rational decision-making. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate about whether emotions facilitate – or impede -- rationality.</p>	<p>Consciousness and Cognition, 17, 946–971.</p> <p>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/John_Lambie2/publication/6376954_On_the_irrationality_of_emotion_and_the_rationality_of_awareness/links/5450acd70cf24e8f7374dd8e.pdf</p> <p>3) Slovic, P. et al. (2004). Risk as Analysis and Risk as Feelings: Some Thoughts about Affect, Reason, Risk, and Rationality. <i>Risk Analysis</i>, 24, 311-322.</p> <p>http://www.paul-hadrien.info/backup/LSE/IS%20490/risk%20as%20analysis%20and%20as%20feelings-slovic.pdf</p> <p>4) Scherer, K. R. (2011). On the rationality of emotions: or, When are emotions rational?. <i>Social Science Information</i>, 50, 330–350.</p> <p>https://www.cs.helsinki.fi/u/ahyvarin/teaching/nisemiinar5/Scherer_rat.pdf</p> <p>5) Thagard, P., & Findlay, S. (2010). Changing minds about climate change: Belief revision, coherence, and emotion. In E. Olsson (Ed.), <i>Science in flux: Belief revision in the context of scientific inquiry</i>. Berlin: Springer.</p> <p>http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/s30747224/thagard.climate.2011.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1490730423&Signature=M95LnpO3p%2BauLDFJzHzBNvj1e30%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DChanging_minds_about_climate_change_Beli.pdf</p>
<p>Session # 6: June 12</p>	<p>Debate topic: Is our society on its way to achieving gender equality?</p> <p>Since the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was instated, prohibiting discrimination against women, overt forms of sexism have declined dramatically in North America. As overt sexism has diminished, gender roles have become more equal. For example, more women work and the number of women in managerial positions have been steadily increasing. Some estimates suggest that women now hold 51% of managerial and professional specialty positions in America (Welle, 2004). In this context, some have argued that we are progressing towards a more egalitarian, non-sexist, society. Others, however, have argued that while overt, hostile sexism (i.e., beliefs that men are more competent and deserving of higher</p>	<p>Required reading:</p> <p>1) Duehr, E.E. & Bono, J. E. (2006). Men, Women, and Managers: Are stereotypes finally changing?. <i>Personnel Psychology</i>, 59, 815–846.</p> <p>http://library.pcw.gov.ph/sites/default/files/men,%20women%20and%20managers.pdf</p> <p>2) Jones, K., et al. (2014). Negative consequence of benevolent sexism on efficacy and performance. <i>Gender in Management: An International Journal</i>, 29, 171-189.</p> <p>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kristen_Jones3/publication/263339913_Negative_consequence_of_benevolent_sexism_on_efficiency_and_performance/links/56d5e23208aeb4638ac689f.pdf</p>

status and power than women) is on the decline, benevolent sexism (an affectionate, chivalrous style of sexism) is still rampant. Benevolent sexism is exemplified by beliefs such as that women should be protected by men and that women are the “better” sex and with superior moral sensibilities. While these representations of women appear subjectively positive, they may perpetuate women’s disadvantaged status in society. Positive stereotypes – though often treated as harmless, flattering and innocuous – may perpetuate inequalities in the perception of men and women. Moreover, several studies have suggested that benevolent sexism negatively impacts females’ performance and sense of self-efficacy. Because benevolent sexism is perceived as flattering, it is less likely to be noticed as prejudice, and it has been found to undermine social change. For these reasons, although sexism appears to be on the decline, some have argued that benevolent sexist beliefs, which often go un-noticed in society, may ultimately undermine the achievement of gender equality. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate about whether our society is on-course to achieving gender equality, or, whether subtle forms of benevolent sexism will ultimately prevent us from ever achieving an egalitarian future.

Suggested reading:

- 1) Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 633–642.
http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/40203431/Barreto_Ellemers_2005_EJSP.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1490557018&Signature=DSJ0yBBDu40B4f23mq%2F7BtDJS6k%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DThe_burden_of_benevolent_sexism_How_it_c.pdf
- 2) Becker, J.C., & Wright, S.C. (2011). Yet Another Dark Side of Chivalry: Benevolent Sexism Undermines and Hostile Sexism Motivates Collective Action for Social Change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 62–77.
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.949.8358&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- 3) Dumont, M., Sarlet, M., & Dardenne, B. (2010). Be Too Kind to a Woman, She’ll Feel Incompetent: Benevolent Sexism Shifts Self-construal and Autobiographical Memories Toward Incompetence. *Sex Roles*, 62, 545–553.
http://orbi.ulg.ac.be/bitstream/2268/6934/1/dumont%20et%20al_sr_10.pdf
- 4) Kay, A.C., et al., (2013). The insidious (and ironic) effects of positive stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 287–291.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b0ba/73b15b23129facef65eb58a757afc1023bb6.pdf>

Session # 7:
June 19

Debate topic: Are humans inherently pro-social?

For the last several decades, most psychologists and evolutionary theorists have assumed that humans are instinctively selfish, but that they often override their basic instinctive selfishness because (unlike other animals) humans have unique capabilities for perspective-taking and reflection, and therefore, higher-order moral values. Recently, however, social psychologists (most notably David Rand and his colleagues) have argued that the converse may be true -- that humans are inherently pro-social, and that with

Required readings:

- 1) Heylighen F. (1992). Evolution, Selfishness and Cooperation. *Journal of Ideas*, 2, 70-76.
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.136.7015&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- 2) Rand, D. G., (2016). Cooperation, Fast and Slow: Meta-Analytic Evidence for a Theory of Social Heuristics and Self-Interested Deliberation. *Psychological Science*, 1–15.
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/51ed234ae4>

	<p>reflection, they may override their basic, instinctual responses in order to act selfishly. This argument is largely based upon the well-established finding that pro-social decisions are typically made faster than anti-social decisions. Theoretically, intuitive decisions should happen quickly, whereas higher-order reflective decisions should take more time. Recent data, then, are generally in line with the notion that pro-social acts may be automatic/intuitive whereas selfish acts may require a reflective overriding of basic intuition. An alternative theory that has more recently been put forward suggests a more complex picture, however. According to the social heuristics hypothesis, intuitive responses are shaped by past experience: behavior that is typically advantageous in daily-life (i.e., that maximizes payoffs in the long run) is automatized as a social heuristic. Deliberation, on the other hand, allows us to adjust to the specific social situation we are facing at any given time, overriding the intuitive response if that response does not maximize payoffs in the current setting. Rather than predicting a universal relationship, this hypothesis suggests that either pro-social or anti-social acts may be most intuitive for individuals, depending on their current and past contexts. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate whether humans are inherently pro-social or whether they are in inherently selfish.</p>	<p>b0867e2385d879/t/578be70fd2b85738b5d6a923/1468786460895/cooperation-fast-and-slow.pdf</p> <p>Suggested reading:</p> <p>1) Bear, A. & Rand, D. G. (2016). Intuition, deliberation, and the evolution of cooperation. PNAS, 113, 936–941. http://www.pnas.org/content/113/4/936.full.pdf</p> <p>2) Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (1996). Altruism in Anonymous Dictator Games. Games and Economic Behaviour, 16, 181–191. http://www.altruists.org/static/files/Altruism%20in%20Anonymous%20Dictator%20Games%20(Eckel%20%26%20Grossman,%201995).pdf</p> <p>3) Fehr E., & Fischbacher, U. (2003). The nature of human altruism. Nature, 425, 785-791. http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/531232</p> <p>4) Rand, D.G., Kraft-Todd, G., & Gruber, J. (2015). The Collective Benefits of Feeling Good and Letting Go: Positive Emotion and (dis) Inhibition Interact to Predict Cooperative Behavior. PLOS ONE. http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0117426&type=printable</p> <p>5) Zaki, J., & Mitchell, J. P. (2013). Intuitive Prosociality. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22, 466 –470. http://jasonmitchell.fas.harvard.edu/Papers/ZakiMitchell(2013).pdf</p>
<p>Session # 8: June 26</p>	<p>Debate topic: Does money make people happy?</p> <p>Most people maintain the belief that more money would lead them to experience more happiness. However, for the last several decades, economists and psychologists alike have noted that there are limits to the amount of happiness that money can buy. Although those with above-average income tend to report more life satisfaction than those with below average income, on a moment-to-moment basis, the differences in happiness have been found to be negligible. Research has furthermore consistently found that increases in happiness that coincide with increases in financial wellbeing do</p>	<p>Required readings:</p> <p>1) Dunn, E. W., Gilbert, D.T., & Wilson, T. D. (2011). If money doesn't make you happy, then you probably aren't spending it right. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 21, 115–125. http://elearning2.uniroma1.it/pluginfile.php/101777/mod_resource/content/1/if_money_doesn_t_make_you_happy.pdf</p> <p>2) Kahneman, D., et al. (2006). Would You Be Happier If You Were Richer? A Focusing Illusion. Science 312, 1908-1910.</p>

not last very long. On the other hand, recent research has suggested that the surprisingly low correlation between income and happiness may have to do with how people spend their money. Dunn and her colleagues have argued that when money is spent on experiences as opposed to material goods and when they spend their money on others rather than on themselves, for instance, they may achieve greater happiness. In this vein, Dunn and colleagues argue that how people spend their money is at least as important as how much they have. Another alternative interpretation of the happiness/income relationship put forward by Boyce and colleagues known as the rank hypothesis suggests that money doesn't directly buy happiness but a higher social rank in comparison to the others around you might. Their research has suggested that the ranked position of an individual's income, relative to their peers, predicts general life satisfaction, while absolute income does not. According to this data and theory, increases in income will only lead to increases in happiness if that person's ranked position also increases. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate whether money makes people happy, or, whether it does not.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Arthur_Stone/publication/6974433_Would_You_Be_Happier_If_You_Were_Richer_A_Focusing_Illusion/links/00b4951ca5a6c60ba8000000/Would-You-Be-Happier-If-You-Were-Richer-A-Focusing-Illusion.pdf

Suggested reading:

1) Becchetti, L. & Rossetti, F. (2009). When money does not buy happiness: The case of "frustrated achievers". *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38, 159–167.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Leonardo_Becchetti/publication/23777015_The_Journal_of_Socio-Economics/links/00463522c2171da589000000/The-Journal-of-Socio-Economics.pdf

2) Boyce, C. J. et al., (2010). Money and Happiness: Rank of Income, not Income, Affects Life Satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 21.

http://storre.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/12866/1/BoyceBrownMoore_PsychScience.pdf

3) Diener, E., Horwitz, J., & Emmons, R. A. (1985). Happiness of the very wealthy. *Social Indicators Research*, 16, 263-274.

http://pages.ucsd.edu/~nchristenfeld/Happiness_Readings_files/Class%206%20-%20Diener%201985.pdf

4) Dunn, E.W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Spending Money on Others Promotes Happiness. *Science*, 319, 1687-1688.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lara_Aknin/publication/5494996_Spending_Money_on_Others_Promotes_Happiness/links/0c960536bc4c368a6900000.pdf

5) Oswald, A. (1997). Happiness and economic performance. *The Economic Journal*, 107, 1815-1831.

http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/335/1/WRAP_Oswald_happiness.pdf

July 3 Canada Day – No class

Session # 9:
July 10

Debate topic: Do basic emotions exist?

The question of whether or not basic emotions exist may seem silly at first glance. It seems obvious that we experience basic emotions – and detect the experience of those emotions in others – on a regular basis. In support of the notion that a handful of basic emotions exist, researchers have noted some distinct neural circuits that control predictable patterns of facial expressions and behaviours, cross-culturally among humans – and even to some extent in non-human animals. On the other hand, emotion researchers who endorse a “constructivist” approach have noted that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between a given behavior and an emotion category in non-human animals. A “fear” circuit, for instance, activated in response to a stressor could elicit fighting, freezing, or fleeing in different people or in the same person at different times. Moreover, the difference between defensive aggression and anger are not entirely clear. In this context, some have argued that it is simplistic to consider there to be a unified basic “fear” circuit, which is distinct from the “anger” circuit. In this vein, constructivists, such as Lisa Feldman Barrett, have proposed that emotions do not exist as natural kinds. Rather, positive and negative core affects are the basic feelings from which emotional concepts are cognitively and socially constructed. Are there basic emotions that exist as natural kinds? Or, is emotion constructed by our top-down appraisals of core affects? Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate.

Required readings:

1) Feldman Barrett, L. (2006). Are Emotions Natural Kinds?. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 28-58.

<http://affective-science.org/pubs/2006/Barrett2006kinds.pdf>

2) Panksepp, J. (2007). Neurologizing the Psychology of Affects: How Appraisal-Based Constructivism and Basic Emotion Theory Can Coexist. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 281-296.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jaak_Panksepp/publication/263190198_Neurologizing_the_Psychology_of_Affects_How_Appraisal-Based_Constructivism_and_Basic_Emotion_Theory_Can_Coexist/links/55edc6df08aef559dc431414.pdf

Suggested readings:

1) Ekman, P. (2002). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 6, 169-200.

<http://server2.docfoc.com/uploads/Z2015/12/01/dki9U2srfd/8bbd3af747461c86a17e9f8be45f191b.pdf>

2) Feldman Barrett, L. (2013). Psychological Construction: The Darwinian Approach to the Science of Emotion. *Emotion Review*, 5, 379–389.

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3ed3/f3102217c164b7d33941b6a9717a7f48deb8.pdf>

3) Feldman Barrett, L., Lindquist, K. A., & Gendron, M. (2007). Language as context for the perception of emotion. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 11, 327–332.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2225544/pdf/nihms37844.pdf>

4) Lindquist, K. A., & Feldman Barrett, L. (2008). Constructing Emotion: The Experience of Fear as a Conceptual Act. *Psychological Science*, 19, 898–903.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2758776/pdf/nihms118174.pdf>

Session
10:
July 17

Debate topic: Is the implicit association test a valid method of assessing unconscious bias?

The Implicit Association Test (IAT) was developed in the hopes of creating a measure that would allow researchers to detect subtle, non-conscious forms of prejudice in a modern society in which explicit prejudice is rampantly discouraged and denied. The IAT measures reaction times while subjects categorize stimuli, supposedly revealing the strength of a person's automatic associations between concepts in memory – e.g., the association between the female sex and mathematical ability, between Black men and danger, between being overweight and competence, etc. The developers of the IAT suggest that the test is invaluable because it informs people about their unconscious biases that they may be unaware of, which may lead to unwanted, discriminatory behaviors, if not kept in check. It has been in use for nearly 20 years and has become the most commonly used measure of implicit bias in the field of psychology and outside of the field of psychology: IAT measures have been used in legal cases to predict discrimination in hiring decisions, performance evaluations, law enforcement decisions, criminal justice decisions, and more. Studies have found that a majority of White Americans who have taken the IAT (even those with strong explicit egalitarian beliefs) have been identified as displaying bias in favor of Whites and discrimination towards Blacks. These findings has sparked heated debate about whether there is an epidemic of unconscious racism (as suggested by the test developers, Greenwald & Banaji) or an epidemic of false positive accusations of unconscious racism (e.g., see Blanton et al., 2009; Oswald et al., 2013). Critics of the IAT have argued 1) that it lacks construct-validity (i.e., it doesn't measure what it's supposed to), and 2) that it doesn't reliably predict discriminatory behaviour. In regards to the former, it has been argued that the IAT measures individual differences in familiarity with test stimuli, cognitive ability, and fears of appearing racist, rather than unconscious prejudice, per se. In regards to the latter, some have argued that studies that have found that the IAT predicts discriminatory behavior may be due to outliers and statistical artifacts, rather than to unconscious prejudice. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate whether the IAT measures unconscious bias, as it's

Required readings:

1) Blanton, H., et al. (2009). Strong Claims and Weak Evidence: Reassessing the Predictive Validity of the IAT. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 567–582.

http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2533&context=faculty_scholarship

2) Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2015). Statistically Small Effects of the Implicit Association Test Can Have Societally Large Effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108, 553–561.

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ea21/3aa3a9a6da68ac104a0cec8974d178156656.pdf>

Suggested readings:

1) Greenwald, A. G., et al. (2009). Understanding and Using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-Analysis of Predictive Validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 17–41.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/T_Poehlman/publication/26655629_Understanding_and_Using_the_Implicit_Association_Test_III_Meta-Analysis_of_Predictive_Validty/links/55ad090208aed614b0964bd0/Understanding-and-Using-the-Implicit-Association-Test-III-Meta-Analysis-of-Predictive-Validity.pdf

2) Cunningham, W.A., Nezlek, J.B., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). Implicit and Explicit Ethnocentrism: Revisiting the Ideologies of Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1332-1346.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/William_Cunningham2/publication/8248281_Implicit_and_Explicit_Ethnocentrism_Revisiting_the_Ideologies_of_Prejudice/links/02bfe513e27c7565cc000000.pdf

3) Olson, M. A. & Fazio, R. H. (2004). Reducing the Influence of Extrapersonal Associations on the Implicit Association Test: Personalizing the IAT. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 653–667.

[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Russell_Fazio/publication/8545826_Reducing_the_Influence_of_Extrapersonal_Associations_on_the_Implicit_Association_Test/links/55ad090208aed614b0964bd0/Reducing-the-Influence-of-Extrapersonal-Associations-on-the-Implicit_Association_Test.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Russell_Fazio/publication/8545826_Reducing_the_Influence_of_Extrapersonal_Associations_on_the_Implicit_Association_Test/links/55ad090208aed614b0964bd0/Reducing-the-Influence-of-Extrapersonal-Associations-on-the-Implicit-Association-Test.pdf)

	intended to, or not.	<p>ation Test Personalizing the IAT/links/0912f509bba13129af000000/Reducing-the-Influence-of-Extrapersonal-Associations-on-the-Implicit-Association-Test-Personalizing-the-IAT.pdf</p> <p>4) Oswald, F.L., et al. (2013). Predicting Ethnic and Racial Discrimination: A Meta-Analysis of IAT Criterion Studies. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 105, 171–192.</p> <p>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Frederick_Oswald/publication/239732934_Predicting_Ethnic_and_Racial_Discrimination_A_Meta-Analysis_of_IAT_Criterion_Studies/links/0a85e53a9a75e2ec00000000.pdf</p> <p>5) Uhlmann, E. L. et al. (2006). Are members of low status groups perceived as bad, or badly off? Egalitarian negative associations and automatic prejudice. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 42, 491–499.</p> <p>http://www.socialjudgments.com/docs/Uhlmann%20Brescoll%20and%20Paluck%202006.pdf</p>
Session # 11: July 24	<p>Debate topic: In light of recent alleged replication failures, is social psychology in crisis?</p> <p>A recent study published in <i>Science</i> – the most prestigious and highest impact academic journal in the sciences – suggested that the empirical basis of social psychology may have cracks in its foundation. A group of researchers at the University of Virginia attempted to replicate 100 experiments published in the top three psychology journals. Their study found that only about 36% of Social Psychology findings could be replicated. The lack of reproducibility was attributed to a variety of questionable research practices, including a file-drawer problem, low statistical power, researcher degrees of freedom, and prioritizing surprising results, among other factors. Does the lack of replication mean that most published social psychological findings are false (and should therefore be in crisis)? Some have argued yes. If findings cannot be replicated in the laboratory, then there may be no basis to consider them real phenomenon that impact the lives of individuals in the real world. On the other hand, others have argued that concerns about replicability are overblown. For instance, mass replication may not allow for general conclusions to be made about the validity of social</p>	<p>Required Articles:</p> <p>1) Open Science Collaboration (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. <i>Science</i>, 349 (6251).</p> <p>http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/65159/1/_lse.ac.uk_storage_LIBRARY_Secondary_libfile_shared_repository_Content_Kappes,%20H_Estimating%20reproducibility_Kappes_Estimating%20the%20reproducibility_2016.pdf</p> <p>2) Pashler, H., & Harris, C. R. (2012). Is the Replicability Crisis Overblown? Three Arguments Examined. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 7, 531-536.</p> <p>http://www3.nd.edu/~ghaefel/Overblown_Pashler.pdf</p> <p>Suggested articles:</p> <p>1) Stroebe, W. (2016). Are most published social psychological findings false?. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 66, 134–144.</p> <p>http://ac.els-cdn.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/S002210315001274/1-s2.0-S002210315001274-</p>

	<p>psychological research because there could be important differences that have been neglected in the replication studies. For example, Van Bavel and his colleagues (2016) analyzed 100 replication attempts and found that the extent to which the research topic was likely to be contextually sensitive (i.e., varying in time, culture, or location) predicted replication failure versus success. This suggests that many replication failures may make sense, given important differences between the original and replication studies, which therefore may suggest that the field is not in crisis. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate whether the alleged lack of replication of social psychology findings means that our field is in crisis, or not.</p>	<p>main.pdf? tid=8672eda4-149f-11e7-867d-00000aacb362&acdnat=1490806284_f66c781a832d8018a1cc311690c88292</p> <p>2) Koole, S.L., & Lakens, D. (2012). Rewarding Replications: A Sure and Simple Way to Improve Psychological Science. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 7, 608-614.</p> <p>http://emilkirkegaard.dk/en/wp-content/uploads/Rewarding-Replications-A-Sure-and-Simple-Way-to-Improve-Psychological-Science.pdf</p> <p>3) Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2012). Why Science Is Not Necessarily Self-Correcting. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 7, 645–654.</p> <p>https://www.ida.liu.se/~729A94/mtrl/Why_science_is_not_necessarily_self-correcting.pdf</p> <p>4) Van Bavel, J. J., et al. (2016). Contextual sensitivity in scientific reproducibility. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i>, 1-6.</p> <p>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Diego_Reinero/publication/303505033_Contextual_sensitivity_in_scientific_reproducibility/links/5754c0e608ae02ac1281166a.pdf</p>
<p>Session # 12: July 31</p>	<p>Last class – Summary discussion</p>	<p>We will have a casual discussion of the papers that we have written, which are due at the beginning of class.</p>