

**BUSF 38903-50 / PSYC 38903-50**  
**Current Topics in Behavioral Science III Winter 2018**

Course time: Mondays, 1:30pm - 4:30pm

Course location: Harper Center (Booth School of Business), Room 3SW

Course website: <http://canvas.uchicago.edu>

**INSTRUCTORS**

Emma Levine ([Emma.Levine@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:Emma.Levine@chicagobooth.edu))

Ed O'Brien ([eob@chicagobooth.edu](mailto:eob@chicagobooth.edu))

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This is a graduate seminar for Ph.D. students interested in behavioral science. The course will be divided into two parts according to different content areas. Throughout, our goal is to stimulate future research, by you, on the course topics, and to help you understand how papers on these topics come to fruition. This is an action-oriented class geared towards familiarizing you with how to craft good ideas and write effective papers in the field. Each week, we also plan to discuss a paper of our own. We will share insights on how the paper came to be and discuss the review process.

The first part (taught by Emma) will consist of readings and discussions about the psychology of altruism, ethical decision-making, and trust. We will examine these topics from a range of perspectives (i.e., how economists, moral psychologists, and JDM researchers think about these topics) and we will discuss how common methodological tools have shaped the types of questions that scholars have investigated.

The second part (taught by Ed) will cover hot topics in social psychology. This includes the dark side of positivity, hedonic adaptation, work and play, and mind perception. Each week will include ideas for experiments within these topics that Ed is excited about and exciting ideas of your own.

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

***Class Participation: ~50%*** All students are expected to:

-Each and every week: Complete all of the assigned readings before class and be ready to discuss

-Each and every week: Submit a short (~one paragraph) thought paper about the readings

-Two weeks: Lead class discussion by synthesizing thought papers and generating discussion questions (each student will lead twice throughout the quarter: one Emma week and one Ed week).

- The discussion leader should be prepared to *briefly* (~5 min) summarize the key findings in the article, describe the methodological approach, and pose (~4-6) discussion questions, based on their own and others' thoughts.
- You do not need to prepare visual materials (e.g., powerpoint slides). If you choose to, please use them only to showcase key results or to visually clarify your summary or discussion point. Don't come with slides full of bullet-points.

***Research Proposal: ~50%*** All students are expected to:

-Think of one original research ideas that is (at least somewhat) related to a topic covered in class. It can relate to either the topics covered by Emma in Weeks 1-4 or the topics covered by Ed in Weeks 5-8. This must include the design of an experiment that you'd actually want to run.

- Prepare a short presentation to get feedback from the class in Week 9.
- Write one short research paper, in the style of a Psychological Science Short Report, on your idea. The paper should describe the topic and the design of at least one experiment to test the hypotheses empirically. The paper will be due during week 9.

### **COURSE POLICIES**

This Ph.D. seminar is intended to help you advance your own research interests. We will work together to further our understanding of how to conduct good research in psychology, how to raise interesting questions about what we read, how to present and explain that information to others, and how to develop an original research idea that adds to our knowledge of psychology.

Specifically, you are expected to:

1. Attend class. It's hard to contribute and learn from others if you're not in class.
2. Do the reading. This is not a lecture course. Discussion with your classmates is crucial for learning, so you will need to come to class prepared to discuss something with the rest of us. You will not be asked to memorize any terms, concepts, or formulas; rather, you should spend your time thinking of interesting questions or implications of the papers you read.
3. Respect others' time. This includes getting to class on time and handing in your thought papers on time so that the discussion leaders can prepare for the in-class discussion each week.

All readings are available on Canvas. *Note that some of the readings will be working papers, some of which our colleagues have asked us not to distribute beyond the class. Please do not cite any working paper outside of class without checking with us first.*

### **COURSE DEADLINES**

***Each and every Saturday by 5:00pm:*** By 5:00 each Saturday, you should email your thought paper to Emma, Ed, and that week's discussion leaders. The list of leaders can be seen in the schedule below.

***Monday, March 12<sup>th</sup>, 11:59pm:*** By the end of the day, you must email your final Research Proposal to Emma and Ed.

\*\*\*Note: the final class (including presentations) will be held on March 12<sup>th</sup> (during exam week). This is the makeup class for MLK day (no class January 15<sup>th</sup>)

## **Week 1 (1/8/2018): Altruism (Emma)**

### *Discussion leaders:*

Melissa Beswick (mbeswick@chicagobooth.edu) and Cintia Hinojosa (chinojosa@chicagobooth.edu)

### *Required Readings:*

1. Ariely, D., Bracha, A., & Meier, S. (2009). Doing good or doing well? Image motivation and monetary incentives in behaving prosocially. *American Economic Review*, 99(1), 544-55.
2. Newman, G. E., & Cain, D. M. (2014). Tainted altruism: When doing some good is evaluated as worse than doing no good at all. *Psychological science*, 25(3), 648-655.
3. Loewenstein, G., & Small, D. A. (2007). The Scarecrow and the Tin Man: The vicissitudes of human sympathy and caring. *Review of General Psychology*, 11(2), 112.
4. Jung, M.H., Nelson, L.D., Gneezy, A. & Gneezy, U. (2014). [Paying More When Paying for Others](#). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107, 3, 414-431".

### *Skim:*

1. Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: A theory of warm-glow giving. *The Economic Journal*, 100(401), 464-477.
2. Berman, J. Z., Barasch, A., Levine, E. E., & Small, D. A., "Impediments to Effective Altruism: Charity as a Taste-Based Decision" Forthcoming in *Psychological Science*.
  - All documents associated with the review process (different versions of the paper, reviews, and response to reviewers will be made available)
3. Barasch, A., Levine, E. E., Berman, J. Z., & Small, D. A. (2014). Selfish or selfless? On the signal value of emotion in altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(3), 393.
  - All documents associated with the review process (different versions of the paper, reviews, and response to reviewers will be made available)
4. Simpson, B., & Willer, R. (2015). Beyond altruism: Sociological foundations of cooperation and prosocial behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 43-63.

### *Optional Readings:*

1. Against Empathy, Paul Bloom: <http://bostonreview.net/forum/paul-bloom-against-empathy>
2. Smeets, P., Bauer, R., & Gneezy, U. (2015). Giving Behavior of Millionaires. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 34, 10641-10644.
3. Karlan, D. & Wood, D. "The effect of effectiveness: Donor response to aid effectiveness in a direct mail fundraising experiment", *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*
4. Berman, J. Z., Levine, E. E., Barasch, A., & Small, D. A. (2015). The braggart's dilemma: On the social rewards and penalties of advertising prosocial behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 52(1), 90-104.
5. Olivola, C. Y., & Shafir, E. (2013). The Martyrdom Effect: When pain and effort increase prosocial contributions. *Journal of behavioral decision making*, 26(1), 91-105.
6. Zlatev, J. J., & Miller, D. T. (2016). Selfishly benevolent or benevolently selfish: When self-interest undermines versus promotes prosocial behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 137, 112-122.

## **Week 2 (1/15/2018): MLK DAY, NO CLASSES HELD**

### **Week 3 (1/22/2018): Trust (Emma)**

#### *Discussion leaders:*

Annabelle Roberts (arobert5@chicagobooth.edu) and Yuji Winet (yuji.winet@chicagobooth.edu)

#### *Required Readings:*

1. Kim, P., Ferrin, D., Cooper, C. & Dirks, K. (2004). Removing the shadow of suspicion: the effects of apology versus denial for repairing competence-versus integrity-based trust violations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 104-118.
2. Dunning, D., Anderson, J. E., Schlösser, T., Ehlebracht, D., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2014). Trust at zero acquaintance: More a matter of respect than expectation of reward. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(1), 122.
3. Everett, J. A., Pizarro, D. A., & Crockett, M. J. (2016). Inference of trustworthiness from intuitive moral judgments. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145(6), 772.
4. Levine, E. E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2015). Prosocial lies: When deception breeds trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126, 88-106.
  - All documents associated with the review process (different versions of the paper, reviews, and response to reviewers will be made available)

#### *Skim:*

1. Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*.
2. Berg, J., Dickhaut, J., & McCabe, K. 1995. Trust, reciprocity, and social history, *Games and Economic Behavior*, 10, 122-142.

#### *Optional Readings:*

1. Meyer Davis & Schoorman AMR, 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust.
2. Ashraf, N., Bohnet, I., & Piankov, N. (2006). Decomposing trust and trustworthiness. *Experimental economics*, 9(3), 193-208.
3. Pillutla, M. M., Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. (2003). Attributions of trust and the calculus of reciprocity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(5), 448-455.
4. Fetchenhauer, D., & Dunning, D. (2010). Why so cynical? Asymmetric feedback underlies misguided skepticism regarding the trustworthiness of others. *Psychological Science*, 21(2), 189-193.
5. Dunn, J., Ruedy, N. E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2012). It hurts both ways: How social comparisons harm affective and cognitive trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(1), 2-14.

### **Week 4 (1/29/2018): Deception, honesty, and exploitation (Emma)**

#### *Discussion leaders:*

Shweta Desiraju (sdesiraju@chicagobooth.edu) and Donovan Rowsey (drowsey@chicagobooth.edu).

#### *Required Readings:*

1. Gneezy, U. (2005). Deception: The role of consequences. *The American Economic Review*, 95(1), 384-394.
2. Levine, E.E. Community standards of deception, working paper/ **OR** Levine, E.E. I'm just being honest: ethical justifications enable interpersonal harm, working paper
3. Sah, S., Loewenstein, G., & Cain, D. M. (2013). The burden of disclosure: increased compliance with distrusted advice. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 104(2), 289.
4. Shalvi, S., Dana, J., Handgraaf, M., and DeDreu, C. (2011). Justified ethicality: Observing desired counterfactuals modifies ethical perceptions and behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human*

Decision Processes, 115, 181-190.

*Optional Readings:*

1. Erat, S., & Gneezy, U. (2012). White lies. *Management Science*, 58(4), 723-733.
2. Mazar, N., Amir, O., & Ariely, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of marketing research*, 45(6), 633-644.
3. Levine, E.E., Hart, J., Moore, K., Rubin, E. Yadav, K., & Halpern, S (2017). The surprising costs of silence: Asymmetric preferences for prosocial lies of commission and omission. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
4. Gino, F., & Pierce, L. (2009). Dishonesty in the name of equity. *Psychological science*, 20(9), 1153-1160.
5. Levine, E.E. & Cohen, T.R. You can handle the truth: Mispredicting the consequences of honest communication, working paper.

**Week 5 (2/5/2018): Cooperation and fairness (Emma)**

*Discussion leaders:*

David Munguia Gomez (dmunguiagomez@chicagobooth.edu) and Elizabeth Huppert ([ehuppert@uchicago.edu](mailto:ehuppert@uchicago.edu))

*Required Readings:*

1. Dana, J., Cain, D.M., & Dawes, R. (2006). What you don't know won't hurt me: Costly (but quiet) exit in a dictator game. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 100(2), 193-201.
2. Weisel, O., & Shalvi, S. (2015). The collaborative roots of corruption. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(34), 10651-10656.
3. Shaw, A. (2013). Beyond "To share or not to share": The impartiality account of fairness. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22, 413-417.
4. Tyler, T. R., (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 830-838

*Skim:*

1. Hoffman, M., Yoeli, E., & Nowak, M. A. (2015). Cooperate without looking: Why we care what people think and not just what they do. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(6), 1727-1732.

*Optional Readings:*

1. Pillutla, M. M. and Murnighan, J. K. (1996). Unfairness, anger, and spite: Emotional rejections of ultimatum offers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 68: 208-224.
2. Shaw, A., DeScioli, P., Barakzai, A., & Kurzban, R. (2017). Whoever is not with me is against me: The costs of neutrality among friends. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 71, 96-104.
3. Rand, D. G., Greene, J. D., & Nowak, M. A. (2012). Spontaneous giving and calculated greed. *Nature*, 489(7416), 427-430.
4. Levine, E.E., Barasch, A., Rand, D., Berman, J.Z., Small, D. Emotion and reason as signals of cooperation. Forthcoming in JEP:G

**Week 6 (2/12/2018): Hedonic adaptation (Ed)**

*Discussion leaders:*

TBD

*Required Readings:*

1. Zajonc, R. B. (2001). Mere exposure: A gateway to the subliminal. *Current Directions in*

*Psychological Science*, 109, 224-228.

2. Reid, H. T., Maniaci, M. R., Caprariello, P. A., Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2011). Familiarity does indeed promote attraction in live interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 557-570.
3. Lyubomirsky, S. (2011). Hedonic adaptation to positive and negative experiences. In S. Folkman (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of stress, health, and coping* (pp. 200–224). New York: Oxford University Press.
4. Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Scollon, C. N. (2006). Beyond the hedonic treadmill: Revising the adaptation theory of wellbeing. *American Psychologist*, 61, 305-314.

*Optional Readings:*

1. O'Brien, E. (working paper). Repeated Experiences: Underappreciating the thrill of the familiar.

**Week 7 (2/19/2018): Dark side of positivity (Ed)**

*Discussion leaders:*

TBD

*Required Readings:*

1. Quoidbach, J., Dunn, E. W., Hansenne, M., & Bustin, G. (2015). The price of abundance: How a wealth of experiences impoverishes savoring. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41, 393-404.
2. Cooney, G., Gilbert, D. T., & Wilson, T. D. (2014). The unforeseen costs of extraordinary experience. *Psychological Science*, 25, 2259-2265.
3. Gilovich, T., Kerr, M., & Medvec, V. H. (1993). Effect of temporal perspective on subjective confidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 552-560.
4. Strack, F., Schwarz, N., & Gschneidinger, E. (1985). Happiness and reminiscing: The role of time perspective, affect, and mode of thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1460-1469.
5. O'Brien, E. (2015). Mapping out past and future minds: The perceived trajectory of emotionality versus rationality over time. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144, 624-638.

*Optional Readings:*

1. O'Brien, E., & Wang, S. (working paper). The “next” effect: When promises of a better future undermine present satisfaction.

**Week 8 (2/26/2018): Work and play (Ed)**

*Discussion leaders:*

TBD

*Required Readings:*

1. Sonnentag, S. (2012). Psychological detachment from work during leisure time: The benefits of mentally disengaging from work. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21, 114-118.
2. O'Brien, E., & Roney, E. (2017). Worth the wait? Leisure can be just as enjoyable with work left undone. *Psychological Science*, 28, 1000-1015.
3. Hsee, C. K., Zhang, J., Cai, C. F., & Zhang, S. (2013). Overearning. *Psychological Science*, 24, 852-859.
4. Hsee, C. K., Yang, A. X., & Wang, L. (2010). Idleness aversion and the need for justifiable busyness. *Psychological Science*, 21, 926-930.

*Optional Readings:*

5. Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*, 803-855.

**Week 9 (3/5/2018): Mind perception (Ed)**

*Discussion leaders:*

TBD

*Required Readings:*

1. Schumann, K., Zaki, J., & Dweck, C. S. (2014). Addressing the empathy deficit: Beliefs about the malleability of empathy predict effortful responses when empathy is challenging. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*, 475-493.
2. Critcher, C. R., Inbar, Y., & Pizzaro, D. A. (2012). How quick decisions illuminate moral character. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *4*, 308-315.
3. Strohminger, N., & Nichols, S. (2014). The essential moral self. *Cognition*, *131*, 159-171.
4. Klein, N. (2015). Insensitivity to gradations in warmth traits constrains beliefs about others' potential for improvement. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *37*, 348-361.

*Optional Readings:*

1. Klein, N., & O'Brien, E. (2017). The power and limits of personal change: When a bad past does (and does not) inspire in the present. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *113*, 210-229.

**Week 10 (3/12/2018): STUDENT PRESENTATIONS + PAPER DUE!**