

Course Outline

PSYD15H3F L01

Current Topics in Social Psychology – Current Debates

Fall 2024

Course Meets: Wednesdays from 11am – 1pm in AC 332

Instructor: Dr. Shona Tritt
E-Mail: shona.tritt@utoronto.ca
Webpage: <http://portal.utoronto.ca>
Office Hours: Office hours will be held on Wednesdays from 8:30am-10:30am. My office hours are *not* drop-in. 15-minute appointments must be booked at least 24-hours in advance. Please read the “office hours” section below for details about how to book office hours appointments.

Course Scope and Mission

This course will provide you with an overview of some of the most hotly disputed 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?
- Does implicit bias training improve implicit bias?
- Are humans inherently pro-social?
- Does money make people happy?
- In light of alleged replication failures, is social psychology in crisis?
- Do basic emotions exist?
- Is the implicit association test a valid measure of unconscious bias?

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course, students should be able to do the following:

1. Understand the major debates in the field of social psychology.
2. Understand the most important methods that are used in the scientific study of social psychology.
3. Express one’s thoughts on the major debates in social psychology in writing.
4. Respectfully and clearly communicate one’s thoughts on the major debates in social psychology to others.
5. Write a study proposal.

Required & Suggested Readings

The required and suggested readings for this class come from primary journal or chapter sources. The readings for each class are provided at the end of the syllabus for each week. For your convenience, I have provided links to quickly access each reading at the end of the syllabus for each week. However, you also have online access to these articles through the University of Toronto library and Scholar.google.com.

You are expected to read 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/ Quercus

I will use Quercus to communicate with you and to post course materials such as the course syllabus, lecture slides, and etc. Quercus is also the place you go to log-on to submit your opinion papers and final papers. I recommend getting acquainted with Quercus and checking it on a regular basis throughout the semester for announcements and messages. You do not need to apply for Quercus access. If you are registered, you will automatically see this class when you log-on.

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. You may also book an appointment to visit with me during office hours for help with the material, or for a casual chat about psychology.

Office hours

I welcome you to book a 15-minute appointment to visit me during office hours, either in-person or virtually. My office hours appointments can be booked on Wednesdays from 8:30-10:30am. I am happy to use this time to address any of your questions or concerns, to offer feedback on your performance in the course, to discuss strategies for improvement, or to have a casual chat about psychology or about career prospects. However, I ask that you **please send me an email at least 24-hours before office hours to book an appointment, and to give me a heads up about the issue(s) that you would like to address.** This will allow me to prepare for our appointment, when necessary, and it will also serve to prevent line-ups from forming during office hours as **I will book students into 15-minute uninterrupted time-slots.** Given that my office hours tend to get very busy and the 15-minute time-slots are often fully filled, I ask that you please let me know if you would like to cancel your appointment with me, giving as much notice as you can so that I can offer the time-slot to another student. My office hours will take place either in-person in room HW 507A or on Zoom at this link: <https://utoronto.zoom.us/j/86830902095> (passcode: 891820). **When you email me to book an appointment, you can feel free to let me know if you would prefer to meet virtually or in-person.**

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 they have command of the course materials.

	Marks	Due Dates
Participation	20%	Every class that a debate is hosted
Opinion papers	30%	Due before every class that a debate is hosted
Hosting a debate	20%	TBA
Final paper	30%	11am on November 27 th

COURSE FORMAT AND EXPECTATIONS

Participation (20%)

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 and to articulate your thoughts. 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 at the prospect of speaking in class. If so, I encourage you to try to use this class as an opportunity to push yourselves to become more comfortable and confident speaking in front of others. According to the principles of habituation, you should get used to speaking in class with practice and any nerves or discomfort should diminish over time. Please feel free to speak with me, and with accessibility services, if you are struggling with significant 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 (10%); demonstrating good understanding of the material (50%); displaying critical thinking and/or original insight (30%).

Please do not come to class if you are feeling unwell or if you have had close contact with someone who has recently developed COVID19. If you are sick, please follow the protocol outlined in the “missed term-work” section of the syllabus. I will then allocate your participation points for the class that you missed to your opinion paper for that week.

Opinion papers (30%)

In order to facilitate participation and high-level discussion, I ask that you prepare a short essay, which summarizes 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 briefly 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.

Your responses will be graded. Your mark will be based upon your ability to: 1) show that you understand the required readings and their relation to the debate topic (40% of your mark), 2) write a clear, well-written, and well-structured response (35% of your mark), and 3) demonstrate critical thinking (25% of your mark).

- Papers should be turned in on Quercus (you will be able to access the submission site by clicking on the “assignments” tab before 11am on the day of class (*they will not be accepted late*)).
- If there is any uncertainty as to whether your paper has been properly submitted, please also email it to me before the deadline at shona.tritt@mail.utoronto.ca
- Papers should be a maximum of **500 words**. I will deduct marks if your paper is over the word limit. *I will deduct 1% per extra word*. In-text citations will count towards the word limit but out-of-text citations in a separate reference list will not.

The final grade that you receive on your opinion papers will be composed of the average of the 5 most highly graded opinion papers that you submit. This means that you are only required to submit 5 opinion papers but if you submit more, I will only include your 5 best papers when calculating your final mark.

*You should not submit an opinion paper the week that you are hosting a debate.

**Opinion papers should be submitted on Quercus before class begins on the day that they are due. They will not be accepted late.

The Writing Centre supports student learning at any stage in the writing process, from planning an outline to polishing a final draft. Their services include online resources, virtual drop-in hours, one-on-one consultations, and writing workshops. Information can be found at: <http://ctl.utsc.utoronto.ca/twc/main>

The Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is also available to support you in your writing, English language, and professional development needs. It offers online tutoring and consultations and has a variety of helpful online resources. For more information, please visit CTL’s Academic Learning Support site at <http://uoft.me/AcademicLearningSupport>

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 on Quercus 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 should not 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.
 - o 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 a 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.
 - You should 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 in psychotherapy, and to our understanding of clinical 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.

Please note that tardiness to your own presentation is unacceptable as it will have a negative impact on the whole class. Starting your presentation late will therefore have a powerfully negative impact on your ability to do well, and this will be reflected in your mark.

You are welcome to work together using any means convenient to you and your group members. If you'd like, you are welcome to use the University of Toronto zoom account, which can be accessed at this link: <https://utoronto.zoom.us/>

A note about social loafing on group work:

This course assumes that you will have the maturity and the good faith to engage group work with a positive attitude, a respect for your colleagues, and a willingness to pull your weight. A failure to adopt one or more of those features can result in a compromised group situation, which may have deleterious effects on all group members. Consider some of the tips below to reduce the likelihood of social loafing.

1. Don't wait until the last minute to prepare. Quality, well-coordinated presentations take time and given that everyone has different demands on their time, you need to plan ahead and plan accordingly.
2. Everyone needs to have a say. When group members feel unheard or disrespected, they disengage and produce less than their potential. Ensure that everyone's voice is heard and is part of the process. This doesn't mean everyone gets their way, but rather that the process is fair and inclusive.

3. Discuss each other's interests and work to reasonably accommodate those interests (wherever possible). People tend to work harder and perform better when they are motivated to take something on, something incredibly useful and important to harness when relying on others for produce an elevated product.

However, despite very good intentions, there are cases where people refuse to reasonably pull their weight. In the event that this is happening and you have already made clear and reasonable efforts to address it, you should contact Dr. Tritt. Be prepared to produce documentation showing your group's attempts to coordinate and work with the individual (i.e., multiple meetings scheduled but not attended, failure to produce promised work on a fair timeline). Such cases will be dealt with on a one-by-one basis and various outcomes are possible, including meeting with Dr. Tritt, a mediation by Dr. Tritt with the entire group, a complete reassessment of group work to more accurately reflect the effort given, a mark penalty commensurate to the infraction, and/or expulsion from the group and the assignment of a comparable assignment to make up that part of the grade.

What happens if a presenter is sick?

If one member of the group that is presenting is sick, they may choose to host the debate virtually over zoom instead of in-person if they are feeling well enough to proceed. In this, the entire class would be hosted over zoom. If the presenter is feeling too unwell to present at all, then the other group members will be asked to present without the individual who is feeling unwell. In this case, the individual who is sick, should follow the protocol outlined in the "missed term-work" section of the syllabus. This individual will then have their grade re-weighted such that their participation will be worth 23% of their final grade, their opinion papers will be worth 33%, and their final paper will be worth 44% of their final grade.

What happens if the professor is sick?

If I am feeling unwell or find out that I've had exposure to COVID19 then I will host the class synchronously over zoom instead of in-person.

Final paper (30%)

You will be asked to write a paper (a 6-7 paged, double-spaced, word document). 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, several decades to work on it, etc. 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 paper should include the following sub-sections: introduction, overview of proposed study, study methods, possible results, and conclusion.

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 clinical 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 class begins counts as a day) that the assignment is late.

You should submit your paper on Quercus in the assignments tab before 11am on the day of our last class.

The Writing Centre supports student learning at any stage in the writing process, from planning an outline to polishing a final draft. Their services include online resources, virtual drop-in hours, one-on-one consultations, and writing workshops. Information can be found at: <http://ctl.utoronto.ca/twc/main>

The Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is also available to support you in your writing, English language, and professional development needs. It offers online tutoring and consultations and has a variety of helpful online resources. For more information, please visit CTL's Academic Learning Support site at <http://uoft.me/AcademicLearningSupport>

For both the Opinion Papers and the Final Essay, we will be utilizing the Turnitin.com system. Please be careful not to plagiarize your work.

Use of Generative AI in Assignments:

The use of generative artificial intelligence tools or apps for assignments in this course, including tools like ChatGPT and other AI writing or coding assistants, is prohibited.

- The knowing use of generative artificial intelligence tools, including ChatGPT and other AI writing and coding assistants, for the completion of, or to support the completion of, an examination, term test, assignment, or any other form of academic assessment, may be considered an academic offense in this course.
- Representing as one's own an idea, or expression of an idea, that was AI-generated may be considered an academic offense in this course.
- Students may not copy or paraphrase from any generative artificial intelligence applications, including ChatGPT and other AI writing and coding assistants, for the purpose of completing assignments in this course.
- The use of generative artificial intelligence tools and apps is strictly prohibited in all course assignments unless explicitly stated otherwise by the instructor in this course. This includes ChatGPT and other AI writing and coding assistants. Use of generative AI in this course may be considered use of an unauthorized aid, which is a form of cheating.
- This course policy is designed to promote your learning and intellectual development and to help you reach course learning outcomes.

University's Plagiarism Detection Tool

Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to the University's plagiarism detection tool for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the tool's reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of this tool are described on the Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation web site (<https://uoft.me/pdt-faq>).

Sharing/distributing test content & other course content

Please be aware that you are strictly prohibited from sharing or distributing the content of this course in any way. Lectures and course materials prepared by the instructor are considered by the University to be an instructor's intellectual property covered by the Copyright Act, RSC 1985, c C-42. Course materials such as PowerPoint slides and lecture recordings are made available to you for your own study purposes. These materials cannot be shared outside of the class or "published" in any way. Posting recordings or slides to other websites without the express permission of the instructor will constitute copyright infringement.

Asking for Increased Grades, Extra Credit Assignments, “rounding-up”, or Other Extenuating Circumstances:

While I understand and empathize with the extreme pressures that students are under to achieve certain grades in order to meet their goals in life, please note that it would be unethical to offer extra credit assignments, increased grades, rounded-up grades, etc. to some students and not others. For this reason, I am not permitted by the University to manipulate certain individual student's grades, or to stray from the course syllabus in any way when allotting grades or extra credit opportunities. Please do not ask me to offer you any special opportunities or increased grades that are not offered to all students in the class and indicated in the course syllabus as I will not respond to such requests.

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

The University of Toronto is committed to equity, human rights and respect for diversity. All members of the learning environment in this course should strive to create an atmosphere of mutual respect where all members of our community can express themselves, engage with each other, and respect one another's differences. U of T does not condone discrimination or harassment against any persons or communities.

The University of Toronto is a richly diverse community and as such is committed to providing an environment free of any form of harassment, misconduct, or discrimination. In this course, I seek to foster a civil, respectful, and open-minded climate in which we can all work together to develop a better understanding of key questions and debates through meaningful dialogue. As such, I expect all involved with this course to refrain from actions or behaviours that intimidate, humiliate, or demean persons or groups or that undermine their security or self-esteem based on traits related to race, religion, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, marital status, family status, disability, receipt of public assistance or record of offences.

University Land Acknowledgement

I wish to acknowledge this land on which the University of Toronto operates. For thousands of years, it has been the traditional land of the Huron-Wendat, the Seneca, and the Mississaugas of the Credit. Today, this meeting place is still the home to many Indigenous people from across Turtle Island and we are grateful to have the opportunity to work on this land.

Accommodations

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 AccessAbility Services Office as soon as possible.

AccessAbility Services staff (located in Rm AA142, Arts and Administration Building) are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals and arrange appropriate accommodations 416-287-7560 or email ability.utsc@utoronto.ca. The sooner you let us know your needs the quicker we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course.

Academic Integrity

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 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. On tests and exams, cheating includes using or possessing unauthorized aids, looking at someone else's answers during an exam or test, misrepresenting your identity, or falsifying or altering any documentation required by the University.

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.

Department of Psychology Missed Term Work Policy

For missed term work (assignments and term tests) due to illness, emergency, or other mitigating circumstances, please follow the procedure outlined below.

Procedure:

1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#) ("MTW Form").
2. Email **BOTH** your MTW Form and Supporting Documentation to shona.tritt@utoronto.ca according to the instructions specified below.

Supporting Documentation Requirements and Deadlines:

Reason for Missed Work	Documentation required for a first absence in the term	Documentation required for subsequent absences in the term	Deadline for submitting MTW form and supporting documentation
Illness or Injury	ACORN Absence Declaration	UofT Verification of Illness Form	<u>WITHIN 2 BUSINESS DAYS</u> of the missed work
Bereavement	ACORN Absence Declaration	A death certificate or funeral announcement	<u>WITHIN 2 BUSINESS DAYS</u> of the missed work
University-sponsored athletic or artistic obligation at the varsity/provincial/national level	ACORN Absence Declaration	A note from a university staff member (advisor, coach, residence staff, etc.) who can	<u>10 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE</u> of the missed deadline

		substantiate the obligation, sent directly to the course email	
Disability-related reasons for students registered with AccessAbility Services	<p>For missed TERM TESTS,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contact your AccessAbility consultant and have them write to the course email detailing the accommodations needed. <p>For missed ASSIGNMENTS,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If your desired accommodation is within the scope of your Accommodation Letter (e.g. your letter includes “extensions of up to 7 days” and you need 3 days), send your Accommodation Letter to the course email and specify how many days extension you are requesting. - If your desired accommodation is outside the scope of your Accommodation Letter (e.g. your letter includes “extensions of up to 7 days” but you need more time than that), contact your AccessAbility consultant and have them write to the course email detailing the accommodations needed. 		<u>PREFERABLY IN ADVANCE OF THE MISSED WORK, OR AS SOON AS POSSIBLE</u>
Academic Conflict (e.g. two midterms at the same time)	Screenshot from Quercus demonstrating the conflict.		<u>10 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE</u> of the missed work
Religious Conflict	None required		

Notes:

- The following reasons are not considered sufficient for missed term work: social activities, recreational travel, technological issues, avoidance of assessments or deadlines, work commitments
- [Missed Final Exams](#) are handled by the Registrar’s Office and should be declared on eService.
- For ACORN absence declarations, the date you declare the absence is required to fall within the seven-day declaration period (i.e.) the absence cannot be submitted proactively or retroactively.
- Instructors cannot accept term work any later than five business days after the last day of class. Beyond this date, accommodations are only possible via the Registrar’s Office [petition process](#).
- If you are unable to submit your request within the specified number of business days, you must still email your instructor within that window to explain the nature of the delay. Exceptions to the deadlines are made only under exceptional circumstances.
- Multiple assignments due on the same day are not considered academic conflicts. Students are expected to manage their time effectively to meet assignment deadlines.
- Back-to-back tests/quizzes are not considered academic conflicts. Only overlapping activities are conflicts.

- Students are responsible for keeping their course timetables conflict-free. Students who register in two courses with overlapping lecture/tutorial/lab schedules will not be accommodated.

Next Steps:

After submitting your documentation, you will receive a response from your instructor or TA. The course instructor reserves the right to decide what accommodations will be made. Failure to adhere to any aspect of this policy may result in a denial of your request. **You are responsible for checking your official U of T email and Quercus course announcements daily**, as accommodations may be time-critical.

For missed assignments, **do not wait for the instructor's response to resume work on your assignment**. Extensions may be as short as one business day, depending on the nature of the illness/emergency. Complete your assignment as soon as you're able, and email it to your instructor.

If an accommodation is granted but a continued illness/emergency prevents you from meeting its requirements, you must repeat the missed term work procedure to request additional accommodations. **Please make it clear in your subject line that you are requesting a second accommodation**. Examples: If you were granted an extension for a paper but are still unable to meet the new deadline, or if you miss a make-up term test, you must submit *another* MTW form and supply documentation according to the "subsequent absences" column in the chart above. *Note: In the case of a missed make-up test, an opportunity to write a second make-up test may not necessarily be provided.

Weekly Schedule

Session/ Date	Topic	Readings
Session # 1: Sept. 11	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: Sept. 18	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 that 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: Sept. 25	<p>Debate topic: Does neuroscience add anything useful to social psychology?</p> <p>For about the last 25-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.</p> <p>http://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/22860/ssoar-gpir-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.</p> <p>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> <p>3) Nicolaou, N., Lockett, A., & Ucbasaran, D., & Rees, G. (2019). Exploring the Potential and Limits of a Neuroscientific Approach to Entrepreneurship. <i>International Small Business Journal</i>, 37, 1-44.</p> <p>https://spssi.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01664.x</p>
<p>Session # 4: Oct. 2</p>	<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</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>https://sites.rutgers.edu/lee-jussim/wp-content/uploads/sites/135/2019/05/Duarte-et-al-2015-Political-Diversity-BBS-target-commentaries-reply.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>

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.

3) Haidt, J., Rosenberg, E., & Hom, H. (2003). Differentiating Diversities: Moral Diversity Is Not Like Other Kinds. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 1-36.

http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/39058858/Differentiating_Diversities_Moral_Diversity_Is_Not_Like_Other_Kinds.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1490204741&Signature=kt3ymKAgKo6%2F3kQAXkEEcuaF%2Fac%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DDifferentiating_Diversities_Moral_Divers.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.documents/34149497/Jost_et_al._2003_Political_conservatism_as_motivated_social_cognition.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1490204827&Signature=GNTzunJDCUKtUStgsJIQSAkN4W0%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DPolitical_Conservatism_as_Motivated_Soci.pdf

Session # 5:
Oct. 9

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

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

	<p>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 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>ant”: Emotion as an aid to bounded rationality. <i>Journal of Economic Psychology</i>, 23, 1–25.</p> <p>http://www.econ.tuwien.ac.at/lotto/papers/Emotions.pdf</p> <p>2) Lambie, J. A. (2007). On the irrationality of emotion and the rationality of awareness. <i>Consciousness and Cognition</i>, 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/nisemi/nar5/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/30747224/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: Oct. 16</p>	<p>Debate topic: Does implicit bias training improve implicit bias?</p> <p>Implicit bias is a pernicious and insidious problem that is rampant in societies across the world. Non-conscious stereotypes are implicitly and automatically activated in a myriad of contexts of social interaction, inadvertently affecting how people of color and others of minority or stigmatized status are perceived and treated.</p>	<p>Required readings:</p> <p>Forscher, P. S., Mitamura, C., Dix, Em L., Cox, W. T. L., & Devine, P. G. (2017). Breaking the prejudice habit: Mechanisms, timecourse, and longevity. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 72, 133- 146.</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5720145/pdf/nihms876925.pdf</p>

There has been a particularly strong public outcry to address such implicit bias in North American society over the last several years, which has led to the proliferation of implicit bias training policies in workplaces of all kinds. The hope is that, with proper training, people can learn to recognize and correct this damaging form of bias. Implicit bias training has been increasingly mandated in workplaces in Canada over the last several years. In these contexts, it is intended to reduce bias in attitudes and behaviors at work. For instance, in hiring and promotion decisions, as well as in interactions with customers and colleagues. Unfortunately, some studies suggest that implicit bias training doesn't work. For instance, a 2019 meta-analysis found that implicit bias training did not effectively change behaviour. In fact, a 2006 review even found that some types of implicit bias training can even make people *more* biased. On the other hand, some researchers argue that certain types of implicit bias training can and do work. Devine and colleagues propose that implicit bias training that trains individuals to develop "prejudice habit-breaking" strategies are often successful. These specific types of implicit bias trainings teach people what implicit bias is, how it's measured, and how it harms people. After being educated, participants take the Implicit Association Test, and then get feedback on their level of bias. Participants are then taught strategies for overcoming bias such as noticing stereotyped views, searching for more individualized information about people, reflecting on counter-stereotypical examples, adopting the perspectives of others, and increasing interactions with different kinds of people. Participants are then asked to think of ways in which they might implement these strategies in their own lives and encouraged to practice them. Please read the required (and suggested) readings to prepare to debate whether implicit bias training actually improves bias.

Forscher, P. S., Lai, C. K., Axt, J. R., Ebersole, C. R., Herman, M., Devine, P. G., & Nosek, B. A. (2019). A Meta-Analysis of Procedures to Change Implicit Measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 117, 522-559.

<https://psycnet.apa.org/manuscript/2019-31306-001.pdf>

Suggested reading:

- 1) Carter, E. R., Onyeador, I. N., & Lewis, N. A., Jr. (2020). Developing & delivering effective anti-bias a: Challenges & recommendations. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 6, 57–70.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/237946152000600106>

- 2) Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Cox, W. T. L., Kaatz, A., Sheridan, J., & Carnes, M. (2017). A Gender Bias Habit-Breaking Intervention Led to Increased Hiring of Female Faculty in STEMM Departments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 73, 211-215.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5729935/pdf/nihms900706.pdf>

- 3) Kaley, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 589-617.

https://web.cfa.harvard.edu/cfawis/Dobbin_best_practices.pdf

- 4) Onyeador, I. N., Hudson, S. T., & Lewis, N. A. (2021). Moving Beyond Implicit Bias Training: Policy Insights for Increasing Organizational Diversity. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 8, 19-26.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epub/10.1177/2372732220983840>

<p>Session # 7: Oct. 23</p>	<p>Debate topic: Are humans inherently pro-social?</p> <p>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 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>Required readings:</p> <p>1) Heylighen F. (1992). Evolution, Selfishness and Cooperation. <i>Journal of Ideas</i>, 2, 70-76. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.136.7015&rep=rep1&type=pdf</p> <p>2) Rand, D. G., (2016). Cooperation, Fast and Slow: Meta-Analytic Evidence for a Theory of Social Heuristics and Self-Interested Deliberation. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 1–15. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/51ed234ae4b0867e2385d879/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. <i>PNAS</i>, 113, 936–941. http://www.pnas.org/content/113/4/936.full.pdf</p> <p>2) Lengersdorff, L. I., Wagner, I. C., Lockwood, P. L., & Lamm, C. (2020). When Implicit Prosociality Trumps Selfishness: The Neural Valuation System Underpins More Optimal Choices When Learning to Avoid Harm to Others Than to Oneself. <i>The Journal of Neuroscience</i>, 40, 7286–7299. https://www.jneurosci.org/content/jneuro/40/38/7286.full.pdf</p> <p>3) Poulin, M. J., Ministero, L. M., & Naidu, E. (2021). Minding Your Own Business? Mindfulness Decreases Prosocial Behavior for People With Independent Self-Construals. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 32, 3-27. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epub/10.1177/09567976211015184</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. <i>PLOS ONE</i>. http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?id=10.13</p>
---------------------------------	--	--

		<p>71/jurnal.pone.0117426&type=printable</p> <p>5) Zaki, J., & Mitchell, J. P. (2013). Intuitive Prosociality. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 22, 466–470.</p> <p>http://jasonmitchell.fas.harvard.edu/Papers/ZakiMitchell(2013).pdf</p>
Oct. 30	No class – reading week!	
<p>Session # 9: Nov. 6</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 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</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. <i>Journal of Consumer Psychology</i>, 21, 115–125.</p> <p>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. <i>Science</i> 312, 1908-1910.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Suggested reading:</p> <p>1) Becchetti, L. & Rossetti, F. (2009). When money does not buy happiness: The case of “frustrated achievers”. <i>The Journal of Socio-Economics</i>, 38, 159–167.</p> <p>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Leonardo_Becchetti/publication/23777015_The_Journal_of_Socio-Economics/links/00463522c2171da589000000/The-Journal-of-Socio-Economics.pdf</p> <p>2) Boyce, C. J. et al., (2010). Money and Happiness: Rank of Income, not Income, Affects Life Satisfaction. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 21.</p> <p>http://storre.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/12866/1/BoyceBrownMoore_PsychScience.pdf</p>

	<p>it does not.</p>	<p>3) Diener, E., Horwitz, J., & Emmons, R. A. (1985). Happiness of the very wealthy. <i>Social Indicators Research</i>, 16, 263-274.</p> <p>http://pages.ucsd.edu/~nchristenfeld/Happiness_Readings_files/Class%206%20-%20Diener%201985.pdf</p> <p>4) Dunn, E.W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Spending Money on Others Promotes Happiness. <i>Science</i>, 319, 1687-1688.</p> <p>https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lara_Aknin/publication/5494996_Spending_Money_on_Others_Promotes_Happiness/links/0c960536bc4c368a69000000.pdf</p> <p>5) Oswald, A. (1997). Happiness and economic performance. <i>The Economic Journal</i>, 107, 1815-1831.</p> <p>http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/335/1/WRAP_Oswald_happiness.pdf</p>
<p>Session # 8: Nov. 6 at 6pm on zoom</p>	<p>Final essay preparation class</p> <p>Please join at 6pm on Nov. 6th at this zoom link: https://utoronto.zoom.us/j/83364720481 Password: 954452</p>	<p>In this class, I will ask each of you to tell me about your progress in writing your final essay. I will provide each of you with feedback and suggestions to make sure that you're on the right track. Participation will not be graded for this class. However, it's highly recommended that you are prepared to talk about your progress on the final paper so far so that I can give you feedback. It will also be helpful for you to hear the feedback that I give to your fellow classmates and to hear about what they're doing.</p>
<p>Session # 10: Nov. 13</p>	<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</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) 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/5754c0e608ae02ac12</p>

	<p>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 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>81166a.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/S0022103115001274/1-s2.0-S0022103115001274-main.pdf?_tid=8672eda4-149f-11e7-867d-00000aacb362&acdnat=1490806284_f66c781a832d8018a1cc311690c88292</p> <p>2) 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>3) 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/~ghaeffel/Overblown_Pashler.pdf</p> <p>4) Korbmacher, M. et al., (2023). The replication crisis has led to positive structural, procedural, and community changes. <i>Communications Psychology</i>, 1,</p> <p>https://www.nature.com/articles/s44271-023-00003-2.pdf</p>
<p>Session # 11: Nov. 20</p>	<p>Debate topic: Is the implicit association test a valid method of assessing unconscious bias?</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Required readings:</p> <p>1) Blanton, H., et al. (2009). Strong Claims and Weak Evidence: Reassessing the Predictive Validity of the IAT. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 94, 567–582.</p> <p>http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2533&context=faculty_scholarship</p> <p>2) Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2015). Statistically Small Effects of the Implicit Association Test Can Have Societally Large Effects. <i>Journal of Personality and Social</i></p>

danger, between being overweight and competent, 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 intended to, or not.

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) Brownstein, M., Madva, A., & Gawronski, B. (2020). Understanding Implicit Bias: Putting the Criticism into Perspective. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, 101, 276-307.

<https://philpapers.org/archive/BROUIB.pdf>

4) Oswald, F.L., et al. (2013). Predicting Ethnic and Racial Discrimination: A Meta-Analysis of IAT Criterion Studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105, 171–192.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Frederick_Oswald/publication/239732934_Predicting_Ethnic_and_Racial_Discrimination_A_Meta-Analysis_of_IAT_Criterion_Studies/links/0a85e53a9a75e2ec00000000.pdf

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. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 491–499.

		http://www.socialjudgments.com/docs/Uhlmann%20Brescoll%20and%20Paluck%202006.pdf
<p>Session # 12: Nov. 27</p>	<p>Debate topic: Do basic emotions exist?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Required readings:</p> <p>1) Feldman Barrett, L. (2006). Are Emotions Natural Kinds?. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 1, 28-58.</p> <p>http://affective-science.org/pubs/2006/Barrett2006kinds.pdf</p> <p>2) Panksepp, J. (2007). Neurologizing the Psychology of Affects: How Appraisal-Based Constructivism and Basic Emotion Theory Can Coexist. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 2, 281-296.</p> <p>http://journals.sagepub.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00045.x</p> <p>Suggested readings:</p> <p>1) Ekman, P. (2002). An argument for basic emotions. <i>Cognition & Emotion</i>, 6, 169-200.</p> <p>http://server2.docfoc.com/uploads/Z2015/12/01/dkj9U2srfd/8bbd3af747461c86a17e9f8be45f191b.pdf</p> <p>2) Feldman Barrett, L. (2013). Psychological Construction: The Darwinian Approach to the Science of Emotion. <i>Emotion Review</i>, 5, 379–389.</p> <p>https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3ed3/f3102217c164b7d33941b6a9717a7f48deb8.pdf</p> <p>3) Feldman Barrett, L., Lindquist, K. A., & Gendron, M. (2007). Language as context for the perception of emotion. <i>Trends in Cognitive Science</i>, 11, 327–332.</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2225544/pdf/nihms37844.pdf</p> <p>4) Lindquist, K. A., & Feldman Barrett, L. (2008). Constructing Emotion: The Experience of Fear as a Conceptual Act. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 19, 898–903.</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2758776/pdf/nihms118174.pdf</p>

