SOP 6419: Advanced Seminar in Social Cognition
Spring 2009
Meeting Times: Wednesday Period 8-10
Meeting Location: PSY 151

Instructor:
Dr. John Chambers
Office location: PSY 259
Office hours: Wednesdays 10:30-11:30am, and by appointment

Overview: This course involves an in-depth analysis of current theories, empirical research, and controversies in the emerging field of social cognition. Social cognition is an approach to studying how people make sense of other people, themselves, and social situations. This approach focuses on understanding the cognitive processes and structures that underlie people's judgments, decisions, perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors in social situations. The course will cover selected topics in attribution, knowledge representation and activation, implicit attitudes, stereotyping, comparison, and the limits of rationality. The format of the class will largely be discussion based, but will included a limited amount of lecture.

Reading Assignments: There is no assigned textbook for this course. Rather, we will be reading mainly empirical and theoretical articles and book chapters. These articles and chapters have been compiled into a course pack which is available for purchase from "University Copy & More." In the class schedule listed below, you will see the set of readings assigned for each particular week of the semester. It is very important that you do the full set of readings before the Tuesday of that week.

Attendance: As the success of this course hinges upon student participation and involvement, your regular attendance is crucial. If there is some conflict in scheduling that will prevent you from attending regularly or from showing up at the start time, please do not enroll in this class. Also, if you know that you will need to miss a class ahead of time (e.g., travel to a conference), or are ill, please notify me as soon as possible.

Grades: Your grade in this class will be based upon your performance in four areas: class contributions, weekly comment papers, exams (midterm and final), and a research proposal. The point breakdown is as follows:

> ***Class contributions (30 points):*** The course is primarily discussion based, so active participation by everyone is critical. Ask questions, raise issues, suggest ideas, critique arguments made by myself or your classmates, and express opinions. I will keep track informally of your class contributions. For grading, both quantity and quality will be assessed.

> ***Weekly comment papers (30 points):*** Each week, you will write a 2-3 page (typed, single spaced) paper describing your thoughts and opinions about that week's readings. You should attempt to synthesize common themes in the readings as well as point out inconsistencies and unresolved issues. Do not merely summarize the findings or arguments made by the authors of those papers.

> ***Research proposal (50 points):*** On December 1st at 5:00pm, a 12-15 page research proposal is due. You will propose one or two experiments that should heavily utilize information from, or otherwise closely related to, topics you were exposed to in the course. If you would like, you can apply

knowledge from social cognition research to your own particular area of research, or perhaps develop an experiment to distinguish between two possible explanations for an effect of interest to social cognition researchers. There are several other types of proposals you could develop, but the important point is that you must draw on social cognition research you learned about in this course. The proposal should be typed, double-spaced, and written according to APA style guidelines (see the APA Publication Manual, 5th Edition). To make sure your proposal fits the requirements, you must submit a 1-page overview of your proposal to me by November 17th at 5:00pm. Remember that you are proposing a specific study or set of studies that could shed light on some important issue. Be convincing.

Exams (50 points each): There will be two in class, closed book exams covering material from your readings. Each exam will consist of 5-6 essay style questions. Make-up exams will only be given only for university-approved reasons (illnesses or medical emergencies, religious holidays), and must be approved by ahead of time.

The following point scheme will be used to compute your overall letter grade in this course.

Percentage of total points accumulated	Letter grade
90 – 100 % (189-210 points)	A
80 – 90% (168-188 points)	B
70 – 80% (147-167 points)	C
60 – 70% (126-146 points)	D
< 60 % (145 points or below)	F

Classroom Accommodations: Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the Instructor when requesting accommodation.

Academic Honesty: Cheating and plagiarism in any form will not be tolerated. If a student is suspected of cheating, a report of the incident will be made to the Student Judicial Affairs and may result in a reduced or failing course grade. Refer to the "Academic Honesty Guidelines" (http://regulations.ufl.edu/chapter4/4017.pdf) for more information about policies regarding cheating and dishonesty. Classroom misconduct, in the form of disrespectful behavior towards the instructor or classmates, will also not be tolerated and may result in a failure of the course and other academic sanctions.

Student Complaint Procedures: Complaints about the instructor or grading should ordinarily be resolved first with the instructor. If the complaint involves questions about grading, the student must provide a written (preferably email) statement noting the assignment, the grade received, and a description of how the grading is perceived to be unfair. This written statement must be received by the instructor within 1 week of receiving the grade for the assignment or exam.

Tentative class schedule:

Date	Topic	Readings

1/7	Introduction/Administrative
1/14	Dual Systems Approaches
1/21	Heuristics and Biases
1/28	Counterfactual Thinking
2/4	Attribution/Trait Inferences
2/11	Attribution/Trait Inferences
2/18	Spontaneous/Implicit Attitudes
2/25	Categorization/Impression Formation/Construct Activation
3/4	Automaticity
3/18	Self-referential Thinking
3/25	Comparison/Contrast and Assimilation
4/1	Comparison/Contrast and Assimilation
4/8	Stereotypes
4/15	Rationality/Naïve Realism
4/22	Affective Influences on Judgment

**Note: The dates listed above are subject to change at the instructor's discretion

Important Dates
3/7-3/14	No Class (Spring Break)
12/11 – 12/15	Finals Week

Dual Systems Approaches
1. Sloman, S. A. (2002). Two systems of reasoning. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment.* (pp. 379-396). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
2. Smith, E. R., & DeCoster, J. (2000). Dual-process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4,* 108-131.
3. Denes-Raj, V., & Epstein, S. (1994). Conflict between intuitive and rational processing: When people behave against their better judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,* 819-829.

Heuristics and Biases
4. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (2000). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Reprinted in T. Connolly, H. R. Arkes, and K. R. Hammond (Eds.), Judgment and decision making: An interdisciplinary reader (2nd ed.) (pp. 35-52). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
5. Schwarz, N., & Vaughn, L. A. (2002). The availability heuristic revisited: Ease of recall and content of recall as distinct sources of information. Reprinted in T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment.* (pp. 103-119). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
6. Chapman, G. B., & Johnson, E. J. (2002). Incorporating the irrelevant: Anchors in judgments of belief and value. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment.* (pp. 120-138). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
7. Ross, M., & Sicoly, F. (1979). Egocentric biases in availability and attribution. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 37,* 322-336.

Counterfactual Thinking
8. Roese, N. J. (1997). Counterfactual thinking. *Psychological Bulletin, 121,* 133-148.

9. Kahneman, D., & Miller, D. (2002). Norm theory: Comparing reality to its alternatives. Reprinted in T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment.* (pp. 348-366). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
10. McMullen, M. N., & Markman, K. D. (2000). Downward counterfactuals and motivation: The wake-up call and the pangloss effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26,* 575-584.
11. Medvec, V. H., Madey, S. F., & Gilovich, T. (2002). When less is more: Counterfactual thinking and satisfaction among Olympic medalists. Reprinted in T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment.* (pp. 625-635). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Attribution/Trait Inference
12. Ross, M., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1985). Attribution and social perception. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology, 3rd ed.* (pp. 73-90). New York: Random House.
13. Gilbert, D. T., & Malone, P. S. (1995). The correspondence bias. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 21-38.
14. McConnell, A. R., Sherman, S. J., & Hamilton, D. L. (1997). Target entitativity: Implications for information processing about individual and group targets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 750-762.
15. Gilbert, D. T. (2002). Inferential correction. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment.* (pp. 167-184). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Spontaneous/Implicit Attitudes
16. Krosnick, J. A., Betz, A. L., Jussim, L. J., & Lynn, A. R. (1992). Subliminal conditioning of attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 152-162.
17. Chen, M, & Bargh, J. A. (1999). Consequences of automatic evaluation: Immediate behavioral predispositions to approach or avoid the stimulus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25,* 215-224.
18. Bornstein, R. F., Leone, D. R., & Galley, D. J. (1987). The generalizability of subliminal mere exposure effects: Influence of stimuli perceived without awareness on social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,* 1070-1079.
19. Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2001). Implicit attitude formation through classical conditioning. *Psychological Science, 12,* 13-417.

Categorization, Impression Formation, and Construct Activation
20. Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social categories and schemas. In *Social Cognition* (2nd Ed.), (pp. 96-141). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
21. Bargh, J. A., & Pietromonoco, P. (1982). Automatic information processing and social perception: The influence of trait information presented outside of conscious awareness on impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,* 437-449.
22. Higgins, E. T., & Brendl, C. M. (1995). Accessibility and applicability: Some "activation rules" influencing judgment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31,* 218-243.
23. Bargh, J. A., Lombardi, W. J., & Higgins, E. T. (1988). Automaticity of chronically accessible constructs in person x situation effects on person perception: It's just a matter of time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 599-605.

Automaticity
24. Dijksterhuis, A. & van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior or how to win a game of trivial pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 865-877.
25. Bargh, J. A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71,* 230-244.
26. Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist, 54,* 462-479.

Self-referential Thinking
27. Kruger, J. (1999). Lake Wobegon be gone! The 'below-average effect' and the egocentric nature of comparative ability judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 221-232.
28. Epley, N., Keysar, B., & Van Boven, L. (2004). Perspective taking as egocentric anchoring an adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87,* 327-339.
29. Gilovich, T., & Savitsky, K. (1999). The spotlight effect and the illusion of transparency: Egocentric assessments of how we are seen by others. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8,* 165-168.

30. Dunning, D., & Hayes, A. F. (1996). Evidence for egocentric comparison in social judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71,* 213-229.

Comparison/Contrast and Assimilation

31. Mussweiler, T., & Strack, F. (2000). The "relative self": Informational and judgmental consequences of comparative self-evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79,* 23-38.

32. Strack, F., & Mussweiler, T. (1997). Explaining the enigmatic anchoring effect: Mechanisms of selective accessibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73,* 437-446.

33. Stapel, D. A., & Winkielman, P. (1998). Assimilation and contrast as a function of context-target similarity, distinctiveness, and dimensional relevance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 634-646.

34. Mussweiler, T., Ruter, K., & Epstude, K. (2004). The ups and downs of social comparison: Mechanisms of assimilation and contrast. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87,* 832-844.

Stereotypes

35. Hamilton et al. (1994). Social cognition and the study of stereotyping. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Social cognition: Impact on social psychology.* (pp. 291-321). New York: Academic Press, Inc.

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

37. Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (1997). Category and stereotype activation: Is prejudice inevitable? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 275-287.

Rationality/Naïve Realism

38. Gilbert, D. T., & Gill, M. J. (2000). The momentary realist. *Psychological Science, 11,* 394-398.

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

40. Wilson, T. D., & Dunn, E. W. (2004). Self-knowledge: Its limits, value and potential for improvement. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55,* 493-518.

41. Wilson, T. D., & Schooler, J. W. (1991). Thinking too much: Introspection can reduce the quality of preferences and decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 181-192.

Affective Influences on Social Judgment

42. Mayer, J. D., Gaschke, Y. N., Braverman, D. L., & Evans, T. W. (1992). Mood-congruent judgment is a general effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63,* 119-132.

43. Schwarz, N. (2002). Feelings as information: Moods influence judgments and processing strategies. In T. Gilovich, D. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment.* (pp. 534-547). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

44. Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgment and choice. *Cognition and Emotion, 14,* 473-493.

45. Tiedens, L. Z., & Linton, S. (2001). Judgment under emotional uncertainty: The effects of specific emotions on information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81,* 973-981.