PSY 752: Seminar in Social Psychology (Fall 2023)

Syllabus

Instructor: John V. Petrocelli
E-mail: petrocjv@wfu.edu
Office: 459 Greene Hall
Office phone: (336)-758-4171
Office hours: by appointment

Day(s): Monday
Time: 10:00–12:00
Location: Greene Hall 158
Course website: https://canvas.wfu.edu

Course Description
Content and methodology of social psychology examined through a critical and comparative analysis of contemporary theory and literature.

Course Overview
Most graduate students studying psychology have taken undergraduate courses in social psychology or have had exposure to this area in other courses. In most of those courses, the purpose was to provide an overview of the general area of social psychology. In your related courses you probably covered a wide variety of topics and learned what seemed to be numerous facts about social behavior. This approach is appropriate for undergraduate work but is not appropriate for graduate work in social psychology. You will see that the approach we will take in this seminar is quite different. The emphasis will be placed on developing a theoretical and conceptual understanding of social behavior at an advanced level. Essentially, the goal is to get you to think like a social psychologist and take a scientific approach to understanding social behavior and thought. In addition, you will learn about both current and classic research within the field and will gain experience discussing and presenting research at a graduate level.

Required Text
Finkel, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (Eds.). (2019). *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press. ISBN-10: 0190635592, ISBN-13: 978-0190635596.

Course Readings
The course readings consist professional journal articles (that we will select as a class) and advanced chapters from and Finkel and Baumeister's (2019) *Advanced Social Psychology: The State of the Science* text. It is imperative that you do the readings before attending class! Occasionally pop-quizzes may be given on these readings if I have reason to believe that you are not carefully reviewing the course readings before class. Reading selections will be posted on Canvas. Please bring to class sessions a hard copy of the assigned course readings for the week so that you can reference the material. Your performance in this course is likely to reflect your record of attendance and the effort that you put into reviewing the course readings.

Student Responsibilities
- Attend class and be prepared to participate (individually and as a group member)
- Carefully review each of the main readings assigned for each class session
- Complete all course requirements
- Check Canvas regularly for updates on course matters

Class Discussion
The learning experience in this course will involve sharing of thoughts during class discussions (focused on the required readings). I strongly encourage you to come to class willing and prepared to voice your thoughts and opinions. Please do ask questions in class.

Grading
Your letter grade for this course is determined by the percentage of total points (100 possible) earned throughout the semester. A letter grade will be assigned on the basis of the following scale:
A+ 98 - 100%   A 93 - 97%   A- 90 - 92%   B+ 88 - 89%   B 83 - 87%   B- 80 - 82%
C+ 78 - 79%   C 73 - 77%   C- 70 - 72%   D+ 68 - 69%   D 63 - 67%   D- 60 - 62%   F <60%

Points are earned in five ways:
- **Reaction Essays (20 points, 20% of grade):** You are assigned to write a Reaction Essay in response to the readings scheduled for each week (to be turned in on the class period in which the topic is covered). Submit a 1-page (maximum) paper (hard copy) in reaction to all of the readings for the week. Essays may be single-spaced (approx. 500 words) or double-spaced (approx. 250 words), but are not to exceed 1 page (if you have more to discuss, reduce the font and/or margins). Understand that a Reaction Essay is not a simple re-wording of the Abstract of an article, or a summarization. Reaction Essays should help prepare you for class discussion, and should reach beyond summarizing the readings to convey your own response. The Reaction Essay is intended to serve as an intellectual exercise that may take the form of an agreement, disagreement, elaboration, contrast, parallel, or critical analysis of the work selected. Your response can also be selective and could include, for instance, the most interesting idea you read or had about the topic, an example of something you have experienced that is relevant to the topic, an idea for a study, or an observation of how the readings interrelate. Divide your essay in half by providing two paragraphs and giving equal attention to both of the assigned readings for the week.
  Examples of sentences to get you started:
    o "I see a contradiction between Baumeister's (2010) chapter and the section we read about..."
    o "A possible experiment that could be conducted to test the hypothesis described in Baumeister's (2010) chapter involves..."
    o "The theory described in Baumeister's (2010) chapter could be used to..."
    o "The theory in Smith's (2002) article helped me to analyze an experience that I once had..."
    o "I disagree with the interpretation of the findings described in Smith's (2002) article..."
  Provide an "additional-voice" in your essay. The assigned, student-selected, readings will likely only scratch the surface of the depth of social psychological research. Many other "voices" have something to contribute to the various debates, and the assigned readings will only partly prepare you to debate the points raised. Each week, find (and briefly review) an article (published within the last 10 years) relevant to any of the debates raised in either (or both) of the readings. Cite this voice article in your reaction essay. Sometimes you may already have an additional-voice article in mind, but PsycINFO may be especially useful in this task. At minimum, you should read the Abstract of the additional-voice article you select. Submit a hard copy of the title page of the article you select with your Reaction Essay each week.

- **Experimental Social Psychology in Action Demonstration (ESPIAD; 5 points, 5% of grade):** This exercise will provide you with some presentation experience as well as an experiential way of learning more about experimental procedures used in experimental social psychological research today. During one session of class, you will be required to conduct a relatively informal, 15-minute demonstration/presentation of an experimental procedure (paradigm) used in reported researcher. The paradigm must be published within an experimental social psychological journal (such as *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, or *Judgment and Decision Making*). It is your responsibility to find the article. Please run the idea and the supporting article by me at least one week prior to your Paradigm Demonstration. During your demonstration, you can use

the entire class or a single volunteer (whichever is more feasible, given the time constraint). Focus on demonstrating the method/procedure. Afterwards, describe the hypothesis used by the researchers and a bit of background information (you do not have to use PowerPoint, but it is often helpful). Then you should briefly discuss what is typically found with the paradigm (the results). If at all possible (e.g., when the method-procedures take only a few minutes), tally and present the class results. In the interest of time, the procedures used during class may be modified from what is described in the article you select. In such cases, inform the class of how the demonstration was modified from what the researchers employed. Also, be prepared to answer questions. The keys here are to see experimental social psychology in action, have fun and make the ideas memorable.

- **Class Participation (15 points, 15% of grade):** Class participation should take the form of asking questions, expressing ideas, debating positions, etc. during class sessions. Discuss your own opinion of the strengths and limitations of the research of focus and solicit the opinions of your classmates. You will be graded on your preparation, understanding of the readings, strategy for creating interesting discussion, and the quality of your contributions to the discussion.

- **Mid-Term Exam (40 points, 40% of grade):** The Mid-Term Exam will apply what you have been learning and cover any materials provided from instructor lecture notes and assigned readings.

- **TED Talk and Outline/Paper (20 points, 20% of grade):** Create your very own edited TED Talk video. Select a theoretical topic of particular interest to you and form a clear research question that is not already answered by the existing social psychological literature. Your TED Talk is limited to 8 minutes. The first half of your TED Talk should detail the problem, issue, or call to action. Briefly discuss why funding is needed for research that addresses the problem. The second half of your TED Talk should focus on how your proposed social psychological experiment speaks to the problems/issues you raise in the first half of your TED Talk. The experimental proposal should include a theoretically-drawn set of hypotheses and a brief description of methods and procedures. Your proposed study must include at least one true (i.e., directly manipulated) independent variable. A moderation design (e.g., a 2 × 2 design) and/or the mediation design are highly appropriate (encouraged) designs. Among other aspects of your presentation, such as clarity and detail, you will be graded on how well you substantiate your hypotheses with relevant theory or previously published findings and how well you utilize the existing literature to structure your proposed experiment. Your research question, hypothesis(es) and expected results should be clear. Detail the purpose of the experiment, answering: Why would the research be important to social psychology and what are its potential applications? Include a 1-page outline/paper that details your independent and dependent variables and a Figure or Table that illustrates the hypothesized findings of your experiment. Also include three sources used to create the theoretical basis of your experiment.
  - Recommended Reading: Anderson, C. (2016). *TED talks: The official TED guide to public speaking*. Mariner Books; Social Psychology in Action Chapters from Aronson et al. (2016): Social Psychology in Action 1: Using Social Psychology to Achieve a Sustainable & Happy Future; Social Psychology in Action 2: Social Psychology & Health; Social Psychology in Action 3: Social Psychology & the Law; Final 7 Chapters of Finkel and Baumeister (2019)

Attendance
Class attendance will not be monitored. However, due to the participatory and interactive nature of this course, consider your attendance mandatory. Studies show that class time is the most efficient use of a student's time when it comes to learning material. Unless by reason of extenuating circumstances or participation in religious or civic observances, your attendance is expected at all times.

Lecture Notes
Lecture notes are provided on Canvas. However, lectures will be interactive, involving class-discussion related to the topic, and thought experiments. If you must miss a lecture, please get notes from a willing classmate.

Canvas
You are expected to become familiar with the Canvas academic suite https://canvas.wfu.edu/. Canvas is an online course environment that allows Wake Forest University faculty and students to create, integrate, and maintain web-based teaching and learning resources. Grades, announcements or course changes will be posted on Canvas.

Cheating and Plagiarism
Although I don't expect there to be any problems, cheating and/or plagiarism will not be tolerated. When you signed your application for admission to Wake Forest University, you agreed to live by the honor system. As part of the honor system, you agreed to abstain from cheating, which includes plagiarism. You are accountable to the following from the Student Handbook: "Plagiarism is a type of cheating. It includes: (a) the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without complete acknowledgment of the source; (b) the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another agency or person providing term papers or other academic materials; (c) the non-attributed use of any portion of a computer algorithm or data file; or (d) the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of on-line material without complete acknowledgment of the source."

Pagers, Beepers, and Phones
Please make sure that your pagers, beepers, cell phones, noise horns, cow-bells, and other equipment that are likely to be disruptive and counterproductive to learning experience, are turned off during class.

Students with Special Needs
Please let me know if you are a student with special needs such as visual impairment, hearing impairment, or a learning disability.

Contingency Plan
In the event that the university closes due to pandemic or other disaster, please review and study the required readings. Reading quizzes (distributed over Canvas, if the internet is available; or by postal mail if the internet is not available) must be completed to test your comprehension of the readings. Complete all required work (to be distributed either through Canvas, e-mail, or postal mail) listed on the schedule and send the solutions to: John Petrocelli (petrocjv@wfu.edu), if the internet is available; or if the internet is not available to: John Petrocelli, P.O. Box 7778, Winston-Salem, 27109. You will be mailed or e-mailed a midterm and final examination that should be taken closed book, without access to papers, persons, or other resources. The return date for the examination will be specified in the mailing. If the internet is available, Professor Petrocelli will be available for normal office hours by e-mail.

Disclaimer
Consider this syllabus a binding contract of your responsibilities. As with most other courses, I do reserve the right to modify the schedule as deemed necessary. Any changes made to the schedule or policies within this syllabus will be announced in class and on Canvas.

Course Readings and Schedule

August 28   Introduction to Social Psychology[1]

Finkel, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2019). Social psychology: Crisis and renaissance. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 1-8). Oxford University Press.

September 4   History of Social Psychology and Social Psychological Methods[2]

Reis, H. T. (2019). A brief history of social psychology. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 9-38). Oxford University Press.

Wilson, T. D., Aronson, E., & Carlsmith, K. (2010). The art of laboratory experimentation. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 51-81). McGraw-Hill.

Klinesmith, J., Kasser, T., & McAndrew, F. T. (2006). Guns, testosterone, and aggression: An experimental test of a mediational hypothesis. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 568-571.

ESPIAD: John Petrocelli – Quiz Game

September 11   Social Cognition, Attribution, Impression Formation[3]

Fiske, S. T. (2019). Social cognition. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social Psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 63-88). Oxford University Press.

Goldinger, S. D., Kleider, H. M., Azuma, T., & Beike, D. R. (2003). "Blaming the victim" under memory load. *Psychological Science*, *14*, 81-85.

ESPIAD: _____

September 18   Self-Understanding[4]

Baumeister, R. F. (2019). The self. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 89-116). Oxford University Press.

Ross, L., Lepper, M. R., & Hubbard, M. (1975). Perseverance in self-perception and social perception: Biased attributional processes in the debriefing paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *32*, 880-892.

ESPIAD: _____

September 25   Judgment and Decision Making[5]

Vohs, K. D., & Luce, M. F. (2010). Judgment and decision making. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 453-470). Oxford University Press.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values, and frames. *American Psychologist*, *39*, 341-350.

ESPIAD: _____

October 2   Attitudes, Persuasion, Social Influence[6]

Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., Fabrigar, L., & Wegener, D. (2019). Attitude structure and change. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 117-156). Oxford University Press.

Cialdini, R., & Griskevicius, V. (2019). Social influence. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 157-178). Oxford University Press.

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

ESPIAD: _____

October 9   Stereotyping, Prejudice, Discrimination[7]

Dovidio, J., & Jones, J. (2019). Prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination. In E. J. Finkel & R. F.
    Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 275-298). Oxford
    University Press.

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

ESPIAD: _____

October 16   Intergroup Behavior[8]

Brewer, M. B. (2019). Intergroup relations. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social
    Psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 249-274). Oxford University Press.

Turner, R. N., Crisp, R. J., & Lambert, E. (2007). Imagining intergroup contact can improve intergroup
    attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *10*, 427-441.

October 23   MIDTERM EXAM[9]

In-Class and Take-Home Exam

October 30   Morality[10]

Skitka, L., & Conway, P. (2019). Morality. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social
    psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 299-324). Oxford University Press.

Bostyn, D. H., Sevenhant, S., & Roets, A. (2018). Of mice, men, and trolleys: Hypothetical judgment versus
    real-life behavior in trolley-style moral dilemmas. *Psychological Science*, *29*, 1084-1093.

ESPIAD: _____

November 6   Attraction[11]

Finkel, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2019). Attraction and rejection. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister
    (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 201-226). Oxford University Press.

Dutton, D. G., & Aron, A. P. (1974). Some evidence for heightened sexual attraction under conditions of
    high anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *30*, 510-517.

ESPIAD: _____

November 13   Intimate Relationships[12]

Gable, S. (2019). Close relationships. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social
    psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 227-248). Oxford University Press.

Joel, S., MacDonald, G., & Plaks, J. E. (2013). Romantic relationships conceptualized as a judgment and
    decision-making domain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *22*, 461-465.

ESPIAD: _____

November 20   Emotion[13]

Mendes, W. B. (2019). Emotion. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology:
    The state of the science* (pp. 325-342). Oxford University Press.

Crawford, M. T., McConnell, A. R., Lewis, A. C., & Sherman, S. J. (2002). Reactance, compliance, and
    anticipated regret. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *38*, 56-63.

Schori-Eyal, N., Tagar, M. R., Saguy, T., & Halperin, E. (2015). The benefits of group-based pride: Pride can
    motivate guilt in intergroup conflicts among high glorifiers. *Journal of Experimental Social
    Psychology*, 61, 79-83.

ESPIAD: _____

November 27   Cultural Psychology[14]

Heine, S. (2019). Cultural psychology. In E. J. Finkel & R. F. Baumeister (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 399-430). Oxford University Press.

Choi, I., & Nisbett, R. E. (1998). Situational salience and cultural differences in the correspondence bias and actor-observer bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 949-960.

ESPIAD: _____

December 4   Future of Social Psychology[15]

No readings

December 13   FINAL MEETING[16]

Wednesday December 13, 9:00am

Final Presentation Due (Final Exams: December 11 – December 16)

Social Psychological Selections for the Voracious Reader

History of Social Psychology and Classic Experiments

Asch, S. E. (1955). Opinions and social pressure. *Scientific American*, *19*, 31-35.

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

Schachter, S., & Singer, J. E. (1962). Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological Review*, *69*, 379-399.

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

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

Social Psychological Methods

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1173-1182.

Rucker, D. D., Preacher, K. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2011). Mediation analysis in social psychology: Current practices and new recommendations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *5*, 359-371.

Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., & Fong, G. T. (2005). Establishing a causal chain: Why experiments are often more effective than mediational analyses in examining psychological processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 845-851.

Social Cognition, Attribution and Impression Formation

Jones, E. E., & Harris, V. A. (1967). The attribution of attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 3, 1-24.

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

Hamilton, D. L., & Sherman, S. J. (1996). Perceiving persons and groups. *Psychological Review*, *103*, 336-355.

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 173-220). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, (Vol. 23, pp. 1-74). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. B. (1988). A dual process model of impression formation. In T. K. Srull, R. S. Wyer (Eds.), *A dual process model of impression formation* (pp. 1-36). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception-behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 893-910.

Martin, L. L., Seta, J. J., & Crelia, R. A. (1990). Assimilation and contrast as a function of people's willingness and ability to expend effort in forming an impression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 27-37.

Wyer, N. A. (2010). You never get a second chance to make a first (implicit) impression: The role of elaboration in the formation and revision of implicit impressions. *Social Cognition*, *28*, 1-19.

Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination

Kunda, Z., Davies, P. G., Adams, B. D., & Spencer, S. J. (2002). The dynamic time course of stereotype activation: Activation,

dissipation, and resurrection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 283-299.

Stone, J., Lynch, C. I., Sjomeling, M., & Darley, J. M. (1999). Stereotype threat effects on Black and White athletic performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 1213-1227.

Willis, J., & Todorov, A. (2006). First impressions: Making up your mind after a 100-ms exposure to a face. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 592-598.

Sinclair, L., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Reactions to a Black professional: Motivated inhibition and activation of conflicting stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 885-904.

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

Biernat, M., & Manis, M. (1994). Shifting standards and stereotype-based judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 5-20.

Dovidio, J. E. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 829-849.

Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 239-249.

Gilbert, D. T., & Hixon, J. G. (1991). The trouble of thinking: Activation and application of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 509-517.

Hamilton, D. L., & Gifford, R. K. (1976). Illusory correlation in interpersonal perception: A cognitive basis of stereotypic judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *12*, 392-407.

Hamilton, D. L., & Rose, T. L. (1980). Illusory correlation and the maintenance of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 832-845.

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429-444.

Kay, A. C., Jost, J. T., Mandisodza, A. N., Sherman, S .J., Petrocelli, J. V., & Johnson, A .L. (2007). Panglossian ideology in the service of system justification: How complementary stereotypes help us to rationalize inequality. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 39, pp. 305-358). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Attitudes, Persuasion, and Social Influence

Knowles, E. S., & Linn, J. A. (2004). Approach-avoidance model of persuasion: Alpha and omega strategies. In E. S. Knowles & J. A. Linn (Eds.), *Resistance and persuasion* (pp. 117-148). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobstrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 1013-1027.

Roese, N. J., & Jamieson, D. W. (1993). Twenty years of bogus pipeline research: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*, 363-375.

Petty, R. E., Briñol, P., & Demarree, K. G. (2007). The Meta-Cognitive Model (MCM) of attitudes: Implications for attitude measurement, change, and strength. *Social Cognition*, *25*, 657-686.

Petty, R. E., Tormala, Z. L., Briñol, P., & Jarvis, W.B.G. (2006). Implicit ambivalence from attitude change: An exploration of the PAST model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 21-41.

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

Herek, G. M. (1987). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *50*, 285-303.

Breckler, S. J. (1984). Empirical validation of affect, behavior, and cognition as distinct components of attitude. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 1191-1205.

Edwards, K. (1990). The interplay of affect and cognition in attitude formation and change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 202-216.

Millar, M. G., & Millar, K. U. (1990). Attitude change as a function of attitude type and argument type. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 217-228.

Prosocial Behavior and Aggression

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

Anderson, C. A., & Dill, K. E. (2000). Video games and aggressive thoughts, feelings, and behavior in the laboratory and in life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 772-790.

Batson, C. D., Kobrynowicz, D., Dinnerstein, J. L., Kampf, H. C., & Wilson, A. D. (1997). In a very different voice: Unmasking moral hypocrisy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 1335-1348.

Batson, C. D., Dyck, J. L., Brandt, J. R., Batson, J. G., Powell, A. L., McMaster, M. R., & Griffitt, C. (1988). Five studies testing two new egoistic alternatives to the empathy-altruism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 52-77.

Anderson, C. A., Carnagey, N. L., & Eubanks, J. (2003). Exposure to violent media: The effects of songs with violent lyrics on aggressive thoughts and feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 960-971.

Anderson, C. A., Buckley, K. E., & Carnagey, N. L. (2008). Creating your own hostile environment: A laboratory examination of trait aggressiveness and the violence escalation cycle. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 462-473.

Anderson, C. A., Benjamin, A. J., Jr., & Bartholow, B. D. (1998). Does the gun pull the trigger? Automatic priming effects of weapon pictures and weapon names. *Psychological Science*, *9*, 308-314.

Anderson, C. A., Shibuya, A., Ihori, N., Swing, E. L., Bushman, B. J., Sakamoto, A., Rothstein, H. R., & Saleem, M. (2010). Violent video game effects on aggression, empathy, and prosocial behavior in Eastern and Western countries: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*, 151-173.

Ciarocco, N. J., Sommer, K. L., & Baumeister, R. F. (2001). Ostracism and ego depletion: The strains of silence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 1156-1163.

Greitemeyer, T., & Osswald, S. (2010). Effects of prosocial video games on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*, 211-221.

Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist*, *36*, 343-356.

Intergroup Behavior

Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 602-616.

Insko, C. A., Schopler, J., Kennedy, J. F., Dahl, K. R., Graetz, K. A., & Drigotas, S. M. (1992). Individual-group discontinuity from the differing perspectives of Campbell's Realistic Group Conflict Theory and Tajfel and Turner's Social Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *55*, 272-291.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions?: Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, *64*, 231-240.

Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*, 307-324.

Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., Ellemers, N., & Doosje, B. (2002). Intragroup and intergroup evaluation effects on group behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 744-753.

Insko, C. A., Schopler, J., Hoyle, R. H., Dardis, G. J., & Graetz, K. A. (1990). Individual-groupdiscontinuity as a function of fear and greed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 68-79.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 741-763.

Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, *54*, 699-724.

Pickett, C. L. (2001). The effects of entitativity beliefs on implicit comparisons between group members *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 515-525.

Group Processes

Baron, R. S. (2005). So right it's wrong: Groupthink and the ubiquitous nature of polarized group decision making. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 37 (pp. 219-253). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Zajonc, R. B., & Sales, S. M. (1966). Social facilitation of dominant and subordinate responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *2*, 160-168.

Latané, B., Williams, K., & Harkins, S. (1979). Many hands make light the work: The causes and consequences of social loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 822-832.

Stasser, G., & Titus, W. (1985). Pooling of unshared information in group decision making: Biased information sampling during discussion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*, 1467-1478.

Mason, W. A., Jones, A., & Goldstone, R. L. (2008). Propagation of innovations in networked groups. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *137*, 422-433.

Brauer, M., Judd, C. M., & Gliner, M. D. (1995). The effects of repeated expressions on attitude polarization during group discussions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 1014-1029.

Littlepage, G. E., Schmidt, G. W., Whisler, E. W., & Frost, A. G. (1995). An input-process-output analysis of influence and

performance in problem-solving groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 877-889.

Paulus, P. B., & Dzindolet, M. T. (1993). Social influence processes in group brainstorming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*, 575-586.

Attraction and Intimate Relationships

Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C .R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships*, *5*, 357-391.

Todd, P. M., Place, S. S., & Bowers, R. I. (2012). Simple heuristics for mate choice decisions. In J. I. Krueger (Ed.), *Social judgment and decision making* (pp. 193-207). New York: Psychology Press.

Aron, A., Aron, E. N., Tudor, M., & Nelson, G. (1991). Close relationships as including other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 241-253.

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

Lee, L., Loewenstein, G., Ariely, D., Hong, J., & Young, J. (2008). If I'm not hot, are you hot or not? Physical-attractiveness evaluations and dating preferences as a function of one's own attractiveness. *Psychological Science*, *19*, 669-677.

Herbst, K. C., Gaertner, L., & Insko, C. A. (2003). My head says yes but my heart says no: Cognitive and affective attraction as a function of similarity to the ideal self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 1206-1219.

Finkel, E. J., & Eastwick, P. W. (2008). Speed-dating. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *17*, 193-197.

Berscheid, E., Brothen, T., & Graziano, W. (1976). Gain-loss theory and the "law of infidelity": Mr. Doting versus the admiring stranger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *33*, 709-718.

Jones, J. T., Pelham, B. W., Carvallo, M., & Mirenberg, M. C. (2004). How do I love thee? Let me count the Js: Implicit egotism and interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 665-683.

Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 559-570.

Self-Understanding

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

Taylor, S .E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*, 193-210.

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

Bem, D. J. (1967). Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological Review*, *74*, 183-200.

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

Job, V., Dweck, C. S., & Walton, G. M. (2010). Ego depletion-is it all in your head? Implicit theories about willpower affect self-regulation. Psychological Science, *21*, 1686-1693.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 1245-1267.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 475-482.