

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY I

Course Overview

This course is designed to give a broad overview of social psychology to graduate students. How do other people influence our thought processes, behaviors, and identities? How do social situations shape our perceptions of reality? And finally, what are the socio-cognitive mechanisms underlying these processes? The primary objective of this course will be to provide you with the relevant literature, theoretical background, methodological proficiency, and critical thinking and communication skills to articulate your own answers to these questions, and to propose innovative future studies in the field.

Course Objectives

My goal is for you to learn to *think like a social psychologist* and become a more critical consumer of social psychological science. Students will learn to:

1. *Talk about social psychology*
 - a. Gain a broad theoretical understanding of topics related to social psychology
 - b. Constructively discuss relevant literature in class
 - c. Develop their communication skills, both oral and written
2. *Think critically about social psychology*
 - a. Critically evaluate theoretical approaches and research methods in the field
 - b. Critique specific social psychology papers
3. *Innovate in social psychology*
 - a. Draw on course content to develop their own original hypotheses and experimental paradigms
 - b. Design & write a research proposal empirically testing one of these hypotheses
 - c. Collaborate with others to develop ideas

Course Grading & Requirements

30%	1. Class participation
10%	2. Thought papers
12%	3. Hypotheses (Mini-Proposals)
18%	4. Discussion leading
30%	5. Research proposal (10% presentation, 20% written paper)

1. Class participation: 30%

You are expected to attend and actively participate in every class. You should not only share your own thoughts on the readings throughout the class, but also raise questions encouraging your peers to share theirs. Additionally, you will be expected to give your peers constructive

feedback on their hypotheses. Your participation will be evaluated after every class – as such, you will be penalized for any unexcused absences. Feel free to come see me anytime throughout the course to ask for feedback or suggestions regarding your class participation (or of course, to further discuss an idea that was raised in class!). I aim help you develop your communication and critical thinking skills throughout the course. Participating in class can be more difficult for some students, and if that's the case, I encourage you to come see me at the beginning of the semester so that we can work out ways you can contribute. In these cases, later participation will be weighed more heavily to reward improvement.

2. Thought papers: 10%

By **1 hour before each class**, you will be required to post a thought paper to the Discussion Board (roughly 150-200 words in length, single-spaced). The goal of these thought papers is to promote active reading and critical thinking, and to stimulate thoughts to discuss in class: you can raise theoretical or methodological questions related to the readings, share insights or comment on the implications of empirical findings, or relate the readings to previous class discussions. Generally, these should answer the question, “What did you find interesting about the readings, and why?” Integrate *at least two* readings into each thought paper. Bring a copy of these to class (electronic is fine) and prepare to share your thoughts with your peers. These will *not* be formally graded but will be checked for completion/effort (each worth 1 point [those completed but without fully connecting to the readings will get half credit]). Discussion leaders will not be required to post thought papers for the class they lead, but they will be encouraged to read their peers’ before class, with the goal of integrating some of these into the class discussion. *Students can miss one thought paper during the semester at no penalty.*

3. Hypotheses (Mini-Proposals): 12%

Four times throughout the course (Sessions 4, 8, 12, and 16), you will present “mini research proposals” or “Hypotheses”, in which you (1) *propose an original hypothesis and study design to test an empirical question raised by the readings in that section*, (2) *informally share this hypothesis with your peers in class*, and (3) *discuss each other’s hypotheses and workshop these as a group*.

For each assignment, you will propose a mini-hypothesis drawing on the readings from that section. Roughly **250-400 words**, these will briefly outline the *purpose, design, and predictions of a potential study one could run to answer a question inspired by the readings*. At the top of the paper should be the **hypothesis**: a bolded, testable prediction, stated succinctly (it should not be more than 2 sentences in length). In addition to the hypothesis, you should briefly describe the method of the study and the results you expect in 1-2 short paragraphs. These will be uploaded as a pdf assignment (due before the start of class), and then briefly presented and discussed during that class. We will informally workshop these hypotheses in class in pairs, small groups, and through broader class discussions to give each other feedback. I will provide some examples to give an overview of the types of ideas and methodologies you can propose. These will be graded out of **3 points for research logic and clarity, originality, and relevance to the readings**. Throughout our discussions in class, we will be talking about how to best present scientific proposals in a clear way and how to constructively discuss and critique scientific ideas. The overall goal of these assignments is to develop this skill-set to gear up for the final Research Proposal and Presentation.

4. Discussion leading: 18%

Multiple times during the semester, you will lead the class discussion (a google form will be posted after the first class so that each student can select topics of interest).

Come up with a list of **6-8 discussion questions** and moderate a stimulating and constructive class discussion. I encourage you to try integrating your peers’ thought papers when relevant. It will be your role to sustain a constructive discussion involving (ideally) all of your classmates. I will lead the first class discussion to give you an example of what types of discussion questions and moderation styles can be used, along with class activities that you can use to stimulate discussion. Discussion questions might include: *What is the hypothesis that is tested in this article? What are the implications/ the meaning of the findings? What are the causal*

mechanisms underlying the phenomena? What alternative explanations did the researchers rule out (or not!) in their studies? What boundary conditions might exist? How does the paper balance internal vs. external validity? How do the papers in this section relate to each other?

5. Research Proposal: 30% (10% presentation, 20% written paper)

On the last day of class, you will submit a research proposal (approximately 12-15 double-spaced pages in length, not including references) to me. Inspired by content covered in class, this proposal can build on a previous hypothesis you posted, or an entirely new idea. I am here to help! I will also provide you with tips for conducting literature searches, and we will discuss the proposal in greater detail throughout the semester.

Proposal Breakdown:

- a. Introduction (4-5 pages): Research question & relevant literature review
- b. Proposed Method (2-3 pages): Experimental procedure & measures
- c. Predicted Results (2-3 pages): Description & illustration of anticipated results
- d. Discussion (3-4 pages): Implications, limitations, & future directions
- e. References (1-2 pages): ideally 10+ references (most of which should be beyond class readings)

Your papers will be graded based on creativity and originality of the proposed theoretical idea (15%), thoroughness of the literature review (20%), integration of relevant and empirically valid methodology (20%), logic of the predicted results (20%), thoughtfulness of discussion (20%), and overall presentation (grammar, spelling, APA formatting, etc.) (5%). See the rubric for more specific grading details. We will also discuss each of these components throughout the term. In addition, you will present your research proposal to your classmates on the last day of class. I will discuss these presentations in more detail throughout the term.

Philosophy of Doctoral Coursework

All major assignments in every class should be used to benefit your own research. Use the proposal to design new research projects that you *plan to actually carry out*.

Course Policies

Masking:

All students will be strongly encouraged to wear non-cloth masks for every session. I will bring KN95 masks the first class that you are welcome to use throughout the term.

Attendance:

If you are feeling sick (even if just cold or cough symptoms), please let me know as soon as possible and do NOT come to class. If you feel well enough to attend virtually, I will have a zoom link available so that you can join the conversation. You will still be responsible for completing the work due that particular class session within the next 7 days (unless we agree differently via email). Unexcused absences will result in points deducted from your class participation grade.

Late work (unless I excuse the absence via email):

- Hypotheses: 33% of your grade will be deducted per day late.
- Research proposal: 5% of your grade will be deducted per day late.

Class Etiquette:

Cell phones are not allowed to be taken out in class and should be kept on silent (not vibrate). Please do not use laptops as these create a physical and psychological barrier between you and your peers. Tablets may be used for anything course related. However, out of courtesy to your classmates and respect for your own learning, please refrain from using these for any other purpose.

If found guilty of cheating or plagiarism, you will receive a zero for that assignment and follow the standard IESE disciplinary procedures.

Citation should follow APA guidelines: <http://www.apastyle.org/>. If you have any doubt throughout the semester about how to cite something, or whether it would constitute as plagiarism, feel free to ask me.

DEADLINES:

Thought Papers	Due 1 hour before every Session
Hypotheses	Due Sessions 4, 8, 12, & 16
Research Proposal & Presentation	Due Session 20

Schedule of Reading and Assignments

These articles will be available to download as pdf's. This list remains subject to revision

I. SESSIONS 1 & 2: SOCIAL INFLUENCE

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

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

Cialdini, R., Reno, R.R., & Kallgren, C.A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(6), 1015-1026

Albayrak-Aydemir, N., & Gleibs, I. H. (2021). Measuring global bystander intervention and exploring its antecedents for helping refugees. *British Journal of Psychology*, 112(2), 519-548.

Supplement:

Kundu, P., & Cummins, D. D. (2013). Morality and conformity: The Asch paradigm applied to moral decisions. *Social Influence*, 8(4), 268-279.

Le Texier, T. (2019). Debunking the stanford prison experiment. *American Psychologist*, 74(7), 823

II. SESSIONS 3 & 4: DISSONANCE & THE SELF

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *The journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 58(2), 203.

Norton, M. I., Monin, B., Cooper, J., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). Vicarious dissonance: attitude change from the inconsistency of others. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(1), 47.

Bem, D. J. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological review*, 74(3), 183.

Swann Jr, W. B. (1997). The trouble with change: Self-verification and allegiance to the self. *Psychological Science*, 8(3), 177-180.

HYPOTHESIS 1 DUE in SESSION 4 (can draw from Sessions 1-4)

III. SESSIONS 5 & 6: SOCIAL COGNITION

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological review*, 84(3), 231.

Higgins, E. T. (1996). Activation: Accessibility, and salience. *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*, 133-168.

Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54, 462-479.

Cesario, J., Plaks, J. E., & Higgins, E. T. (2006). Automatic social behavior as motivated preparation to interact. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 90(6), 893.

Supplement:

Gilovich, T., Medvec, V. H., & Savitsky, K. (2000). The spotlight effect in social judgment: an egocentric bias in estimates of the salience of one's own actions and appearance. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 78(2), 211.

Higgins, E. T., & Chaires, W. M. (1980). Accessibility of interrelational constructs: Implications for stimulus encoding and creativity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16(4), 348-361.

IV. SESSIONS 7 & 8: ATTRIBUTION & LAY THEORIES

Jones, E. E., & Harris, V. A. (1967). The attribution of attitudes. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 3(1), 1-24.

Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(1), 21.

Brooks, A. W. (2014). Get excited: reappraising pre-performance anxiety as excitement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(3), 1144.

Yeager, D. S., Hanselman, P., Walton, G. M., Murray, J. S., Crosnoe, R., Muller, C., ... & Dweck, C. S. (2019). A national experiment reveals where a growth mindset improves achievement. *Nature*, 573(7774), 364-369.

HYPOTHESIS 2 DUE in SESSION 8 (can draw from Sessions 5-8)

V. SESSIONS 9 & 10: MOTIVATION

Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic reward: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 129-137.

Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280–1300.

Gollwitzer, P. M., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 38, 69-119.

VI. SESSIONS 11 & 12: CONVERSATION

Yeomans, M., Schweitzer, M. E., & Brooks, A. W. (2022). The Conversational Circumplex: Identifying, prioritizing, and pursuing informational and relational motives in conversation. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 44, 293-302.

Boothby, E. J., Cooney, G., Sandstrom, G. M., & Clark, M. S. (2018). The liking gap in conversations: Do people like us more than we think?. *Psychological science*, 29(11), 1742-1756.

Schroeder, J., Lyons, D., & Epley, N. (2022). Hello, stranger? Pleasant conversations are preceded by concerns about starting one. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 151(5), 1141.

Huang, K., Yeomans, M., Brooks, A. W., Minson, J., & Gino, F. (2017). It doesn't hurt to ask: Question-asking increases liking. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 113(3), 430.

HYPOTHESIS 3 DUE in SESSION 12

VII. SESSIONS 13 & 14: BELONGING & SOCIAL COHESION

Reis, H. T., Regan, A., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2022). Interpersonal chemistry: What is it, how does it emerge, and how does it operate?. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 17(2), 530-558.

Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E. N., Vallone, R. D., & Bator, R. J. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(4), 363–377.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117 (3), 497-529.

Tarr, B., Launay, J., & Dunbar, R. I. (2016). Silent disco: dancing in synchrony leads to elevated pain thresholds and social closeness. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 37(5), 343-349.

VIII. SESSIONS 15 & 16: CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS

Finkel, E. J., Slotter, E. B., Luchies, L. B., Walton, G. M., & Gross, J. J. (2013). A brief intervention to promote conflict reappraisal preserves marital quality over time. *Psychological Science*, 24(8), 1595-1601.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). Boosting attachment security to promote mental health, prosocial values, and inter-group tolerance. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(3), 139-156.

Rossignac-Milon, M., Bolger, N., Zee, K. S., Boothby, E. J., & Higgins, E. T. (2021). Merged minds: Generalized shared reality in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(4), 882.

Fitzsimons, G. M., Finkel, E. J., & Vandellen, M. R. (2015). Transactive goal dynamics. *Psychological review*, 122(4), 648.

Supplement:

Feeney, B. C. (2004). A secure base: responsive support of goal strivings and exploration in adult intimate relationships. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 87(5), 631.

Clark, M. S., & Aragón, O. R. (2013). Communal (and other) relationships: History, theory development, recent findings, and future directions. *The Oxford handbook of close relationships*, 255-280

HYPOTHESIS 4 DUE IN SESSION 16

IX. SESSIONS 17 & 18: STEREOTYPES & INTERGROUP DYNAMICS

Hogg, M. A. (2016). Social identity theory. In *Understanding peace and conflict through social identity theory* (pp. 3-17). Springer, Cham.

Daumeyer, N. M., Onyeador, I. N., Brown, X., & Richeson, J. A. (2019). Consequences of attributing discrimination to implicit vs. explicit bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 84, 103812.

Spencer, S. J., Logel, C., & Davies, P. G. (2016). Stereotype threat. *Annual review of psychology*, 67(1), 415-437.

Miyake, A., Kost-Smith, L. E., Finkelstein, N. D., Pollock, S. J., Cohen, G. L., & Ito, T. A. (2010). Reducing the gender achievement gap in college science: A classroom study of values affirmation. *Science*, 330(6008), 1234-1237.

X. SESSION 19: CULTURE

Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332, 1100–1104.

Supplement:

Jackson, J. C., Watts, J., Henry, T. R., List, J. M., Forkel, R., Mucha, P. J., ... & Lindquist, K. A. (2019). Emotion semantics show both cultural variation and universal structure. *Science*, 366(6472), 1517-1522.

RESEARCH PROPOSALS DUE & PRESENTATIONS IN SESSION 20