Psy 730
The Self in Interconnected Social Contexts

Professor: Allen McConnell
E-mail: mcconnar@miamioh.edu
Office: 316 Psychology Building
Phone: +1.513.529.2407
Office hours: TBA, and by appointment

Course location, meeting time, and resources
Class meets in 127 Psychology Building, Mondays, 5:30 - 8:00 p.m. (CRN 74568)

The class's Canvas site has all of the assigned readings in PDF format (see weekly folders in *files*). All class assignment documents should be uploaded to Canvas in either PDF, RTF, or DOC formats (see *assignments*).

Overview
In this seminar, we focus on "the self" as a social entity. To many people, the idea that social psychologists would study the self may seem surprising. Topics such as impression formation, conformity, stereotyping, relationships, and helping behavior seem "more social" than the self. However, the self is extremely social for myriad reasons. First, we often learn about ourselves just like we learn about other social entities, and as a result, those processes inform us about self-understanding. Second, others teach us about ourselves and who we are. Third, our happiness in life is grounded in a social context and shaped by the influence that social agents have on us. Indeed, the self is at the heart of key important social psychological phenomena. Groups become ingroups because they contain the self. Social relationships become more important when they are enmeshed in our self-concepts, and some of our most important aspects of our lives involve family, friends, and even pets. Indeed, much of our behavior is driven by motives such as social belongingness, culturally shared beliefs, and interpersonally directed goals.

The first part of the course will examine classic issues involving the self, including its definition, representation in memory, and role in self-regulation. During the remainder of the semester, we will consider the self as a socially interconnected entity, examining the implications of group memberships, social relationships with others (e.g., relationships, pets, family) and connections to broad belief systems (e.g., religion, nature, culture). Unfortunately, there are many important topics involving the self with rich literatures and histories that we will not have enough time to explore this semester (e.g., self-perception, self-presentation, ostracism, self-awareness, self-verification, cognitive dissonance, self illusions, self-handicapping, self-relevant emotions).

Each week, students will read empirical papers and chapters, facilitating weekly discussions on the readings. Twice during the semester, students will develop, present, and provide feedback on research ideas in research workshops. Finally, at the end of the semester, students will author a grant proposal outlining a programmatic series of studies, which serves as the focal product of the course. The success of this class rests with the students and their preparation. The format of this course is to have students lead discussions each week, with student facilitators determining how to organize and facilitate discussion. Because this is a small seminar, contributing to group discussion is essential. The primary focus of this seminar is research: critiquing what exists, identifying what's missing or incomplete, and developing what's next. Accordingly, the grant proposal is the primary class product, which is designed to help students develop a program of research (cf., a simple, one-off experiment) to address a series of interrelated conceptual questions.

Activities and assignments

1) Student facilitation (twice during course, 10 points each, 20 points max)
Twice during the semester, students will facilitate class discussion and determine how best to accomplish this goal each week. It is not the responsibility of facilitators to explain the readings to others or to review the important points of each paper. Instead, their role is to provide a framework that is productive for discussing the topic. For example, facilitators may circulate e-mails before class to pose questions to ponder beforehand. Perhaps they might present an initial framework at the beginning of class to highlight common (or divergent) themes that run throughout the readings. There are no right or wrong ways to facilitate (okay, one exception would be starting class by saying, "Well, what did you think of this week's readings?"). The goal of facilitation is to provide structure and organization for class discussion, not *be* the discussion. Facilitators should emphasize *analysis and critiquing* of readings and *integration* of ideas and findings within any given week and across weeks.

2) Weekly reaction papers (up to 7 papers per semester, 2 points each, 14 points max)
Each week, students may submit a brief reaction paper (2-3 double-spaced pages) describing their reactions to the week's readings during weeks when they do not facilitate class discussion (up to a maximum of 7 papers total). This assignment is very open-ended. Because some students may specialize in different disciplines (e.g., clinical psychology, developmental psychology), they may want to "spin" the week's themes in a reasonable fashion toward their interests, which is fine. The goal is to make sure that students not only read before coming to class, but more important, that students put some degree of thought into the implications of, and interconnections among, the readings before class begins.

Each acceptable reaction paper contributes 2 points to the overall grade. Students must upload their reaction papers using Canvas (under *assignments*) before noon on the day *before* class (i.e., by Sundays at 12 noon). At the very beginning of class on Mondays, the professor will provide written comments and feedback before class discussion begins. Late reaction papers, *regardless of the circumstances*, will not be accepted.

3) Research workshops (twice during course, 10 points per workshop, 20 points max)
To encourage the development of new research and to gain practice in presenting and critiquing research, there are two days (i.e., March 14th, May 2nd) devoted to in-class research workshops. On these days, there are no readings. Instead, each student will (before coming to class) identify an interesting research question, describe it and its import, briefly outline an appropriate methodology to address it, and present the anticipated results (in either table or graph form). Thus, students will develop at least two research ideas in the course (one for March 14, a different one for May 2) before the grant proposal is submitted.

Before each workshop, students will prepare a document that is no longer than 1 page (single spaced) and provide a graph or figure (page 2). A copy of each student's pre-class work should be uploaded to Canvas by the normal reaction paper deadline (i.e., Sunday by 12 noon). These documents will be circulated to all class participants later that (Sunday) evening, providing students with the opportunity to read each proposal and develop feedback for it (to be shared in class). In class, students will present their ideas orally without the benefit of computers, powerpoint slides, etc. for a few minutes. Afterwards, other students will provide their feedback. Student evaluations will consist of the quality of their pre-class document (5 points per workshop) and their feedback to other students (another 5 points per workshop).

Additional details will be provided once the class composition and number of students is known. Students do not have to base their grant proposals (see below) on their research workshop projects, however doing so may be beneficial in that the student's ideas will receive feedback long before the grant proposal deadline.

4) Grant proposal (paper is due during finals week of the semester, 40 points)
The primary project in this seminar is the student grant proposal. Students will choose a topic related to the course based on their own interests and develop *a program of research* in the form of a grant proposal. The focus of the proposal need not be related to a student's research workshop or a week where the student facilitated class, though doing so may be beneficial. Unlike a typical research paper assignment, a grant proposal lays out *several experiments* in a programmatic fashion *developing a line of research* to address a *series* of important, interrelated research questions involving how the self is socially interconnected. Although students are not required to conduct the research they propose, the opportunity to develop a well-thought-out series of studies should be helpful to students who wish to develop new research. This assignment must take the form of a grant proposal (i.e., it cannot be a literature review or a single experiment paper). The instructor will be available to help students refine their ideas and suggest appropriate resources. The proposal will be written in accordance with the APA Publication Manual, though the format is very different from a traditional manuscript document. That is, it will correspond to a NIMH small grant proposal (R03 type), and it will outline 3-5 interrelated experiments (in a 10-page, single-spaced document). Additional information will be provided later in the semester. The grant proposal is due no later than **12 noon on Wednesday, May 11, 2016**. Late proposals face a 10% reduction for *each* 24-hour period they are overdue. Proposals not submitted by Saturday, May 14, 2016, at 12 noon will receive a zero, regardless of circumstances.

5) Class participation (every class, 1 point per class, 10 points max)
Because the success of this course rests with students' preparation and their active involvement in class discussions, class participation is evaluated. Specifically, students are evaluated for their participation each class meeting (1 point per class day). Failure to participate will result in no credit.

Course evaluation summary

1) Facilitation during the semester (2x; 10 points per class) 20
2) Weekly reaction papers (2 points per paper, 7 papers maximum) 14
3) Workshops (2x; 5 points for one's idea, 5 points feedback to others) ... 20   March 14 and May 2
4) Grant proposal (40 points total) 40   Due by Wednesday, May 11
5) Class participation (1 point per class) 10

Letter grades are assigned based on standard 10 percent gradients, including plus and minus designations (e.g., $104 \leq A \leq 93$, $92 \leq A\text{-} \leq 90$, $89 \leq B+ \leq 87$, $86 \leq B \leq 83$, $82 \leq B\text{-} \leq 80$, $79 \leq C+ \leq 77$, $76 \leq C \leq 73$).

Statement on academic misconduct

Both Miami University and the Department of Psychology are dedicated to providing a learning environment based not only upon academic excellence but academic integrity as well. In this course, it is expected that students will adhere to all Miami University guidelines regarding academic misconduct (for details, see Part 5, Miami Student Handbook: Academic Misconduct). Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:
• Submitting work (tests, homework, papers, etc.) done for another course without gaining approval.
• Submitting the work of another (whether in part or in whole) as one's own.
• Possessing prohibited materials during a test or quiz.
• Providing or receiving assistance from another student unless explicitly permitted by the professor.

Engaging in academic misconduct can result in penalties ranging from a minimum of an F on the assignment to an F in the course, an "AD" signifying academic dishonesty on your Miami transcripts, academic suspension, and expulsion from Miami University. "Misunderstanding of the appropriate academic conduct will not be accepted as an excuse for academic misconduct" (Section 501, Student Handbook). Please visit with the professor if you need any of these policies clarified. Also, the professor encourages students to meet with him if they suspect that another student in the course has engaged in academic misconduct.

Course Schedule and Readings

25 January • Organizational meeting

1 February • No class (SPSP meeting)

8 February • What is the self?

Morf, C. C. & Koole, S. L. (2015). The self. In M. Hewstone, W. Stroebe, & K. Jonas (Eds.), *Introduction to social psychology: A European perspective* (6th ed., pp. 123-170). Oxford: Blackwell.

Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J. P. (2012). The self as an organizing construct in the behavioral sciences. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 1-18). New York: Guilford.

Damian, R. I., & Robins, R. W. (2012). Investigations into the human self: A naturalistic perspective. *Social Cognition*, *30*, 431-448.

Oyserman, D., Elmore, K., & Smith, G. (2012). Self, self-concept, and identity. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 69-104). New York: Guilford.

15 February • The self in memory

Kihlstrom, J. F., Beer, J. S., & Klein, S. B. (2003). Self and identity as memory. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 68-90). New York: Guilford.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 63-78.

McConnell, A. R., Rydell, R. J., & Leibold, J. M. (2002). Expectations of consistency about the self: Consequences for self-concept formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *38*, 569-585.

McConnell, A. R., Brown, C. M., & Shoda, T. M. (2013). The social cognition of the self. In D. E. Carlston (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of social cognition* (pp. 497-516). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

22 February • Multiple selves

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, *41*, 954-969.

Donahue, E. M., Robins, R. W., Roberts, B. W., & John, O. P. (1993). The divided self: Concurrent and longitudinal effects of psychological adjustment and social roles on self-concept differentiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*, 834-846.

McConnell, A. R. (2011). The Multiple Self-aspects Framework: Self-concept representation and its implications. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *15*, 3-27.

Brown, C. M., & McConnell, A. R. (2009). When chronic isn't chronic: The moderating role of active self-aspects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*, 3-15.

29 February • Self-regulation and motivation

Baumeister, R. F., Schmeichel, B. J., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). Self-regulation and the executive function: The self as controlling agent. In A. Kruglanski & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 516–539). New York: Guilford.

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

Molden, D. C., Hui, C. M., Scholer, A. A., Meier, B. P., Noreen, E. N., D'Agostino, P. R., & Martin, V. (2012). The motivational versus metabolic effects of glucose on self-regulation. *Psychological Science*, *23*, 1137-1144.

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

7 March • Perspectives on self-esteem

Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2012). Contingencies of self-worth. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 309-326). New York: Guilford.

Leary, M. R. (2005). Sociometer theory and the pursuit of relational value: Getting to the root of self-esteem. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *16*, 75-111.

Srivastava, S., & Beer, J. S. (2005). How self-evaluations relate to being liked by others: Integrating sociometer and attachment perspectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 966-977.

Greenberg, J. (2008). Understanding the vital human quest for self-esteem. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*, 48-55.

14 March • Research Workshop 1

21 March • No class (Spring Break)

28 March • Group memberships

Brewer, M. B. (2003). Optimal distinctiveness, social identity, and the self. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 480-491). New York: Guilford.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*, 204–222.

Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 393-421.

Fredrickson, B L., Roberts, T., Noll, S. M., Quinn, D. M., & Twenge, J. M. (1998). That swimsuit becomes you: Sex differences in self-objectification, restrained eating, and math performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 269-284.

4 April • Relationships

Aron, A., & Nardone, N. (2012). Self and close relationships. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 520-541). New York: Guilford.

Slatcher, R. B., Vazire, S., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Am "I" more important than "We"? Couples' word use in instant messages. *Personal Relationships*, *15*, 407-424.

Slotter, E. B., Gardner, W. L., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Who am I without you? The influence of romantic breakup on the self-concept. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 147-160.

McConnell, A. R., Brown, C. M., Shoda, T. M., Stayton, L. E., & Martin, C. E. (2011). Friends with benefits: On the positive consequences of pet ownership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*, 1239-1252

11 April • Families

Correll, J., & Park, B. (2005). A model of the ingroup as a social resource. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *9*, 341-359.

McConnell, A. R., Buchanan, T. M., Lloyd, E. P., & Skulborstad, H. M. (under review). *Basic properties of families: Entitativity and group value promote well-being.*

Fingerman, K. L., Hay, E. L., & Birditt, K. S. (2004). The best of ties, the worst of ties: Close, problematic, and ambivalent social relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 792-808.

Swann, W. B., et al. (2014). What makes a group worth dying for? Identity fusion fosters perception of familial ties, promoting self-sacrifice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *106*, 912-926.

18 April • God and nature

Aydin, N., Fischer, P., & Frey, D. (2010). Turning to God in the face of ostracism: Effects of social exclusion on religiousness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 742-753.

Gervais, W. M., & Norenzayan, A. (2012). Like a camera in the sky? Thinking about God increases public self-awareness and socially desirable responding. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 298-302.

Seybold, K. S., & Hill, P. C. (2001). The role of religion and spirituality in mental and physical health. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *10*, 21-24.

Schultz, P. W. (2001). The structure of environmental concern: Concern for self, other people, and the biosphere. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *21*, 327-339.

Piff, P. K., Dietze, P., Feinberg, M., Stancato, D. M., & Keltner, D. (2015). Awe, the small self, and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *108*, 883-899.

25 April • Culture

Cross, S. E., & Gore, J. S. (2012). Cultural models of the self. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (2nd ed., pp. 587-614). New York: Guilford.

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Boucher, H. C., Mori, S. C., Wang, L., & Peng, K. (2009). The dialectical self-concept: Contradiction, change, and holism in East Asian cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*, 29-44.

English, T., & Chen, S. (2011). Self-concept consistency and culture: The differential impact of two forms of consistency. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *37*, 838-849.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*, 420-430.

2 May • Research Workshop 2

11 May • Grant proposal due no later than noon today
(note, May 11 is the Wednesday following MPA, but grants may be turned in at *any* time... early submissions are encouraged!)