

PSY 600G: Advanced Social Psychology

Spring 2018

Section 2: Thurs 12:00 pm until 2:40 pm

BSB 355

Office hours: Mondays, 1-3 pm

Jennifer J. Harman, PhD

jjharman@colostate.edu

(970) 491-1529

Office: BSB 219

Course Description: This course will provide you with a survey of social psychological theory and research. Because the topic is all-encompassing, we will cover only a small selection of possible social psychological topics this semester. This syllabus is subject to change, and students will be notified when this occurs. If you want more information about topics that we will not cover, just ask me and I can provide you with a recommended reading list.

Competencies: By the end of this semester, students in PSY600G should be able to demonstrate the following competencies:

1. Students should understand the history and development of social psychology as a field.
2. Students should be familiar with some of the central controversies within the field (e.g., replicability)
3. Students should be able to define key concepts (e.g., realistic group conflict theory, cognitive dissonance) in social psychology and should be able to provide an empirical or theoretical example to illustrate each concept.
4. Students should be able to think about how social psychology addresses diversity issues through topics such as intergroup relations, prejudice and stigmatization, and throughout other topical areas.
5. Students should be able to think critically about this knowledge.
6. Students should be able to apply social psychology concepts and theory from the course to their own area of research.

Intended students: This graduate core course is intended for graduate students in psychology. This course can also provide an in-depth background on this topic to students in allied disciplines.

Requirements: Preparation and participation in class discussion is essential. Although the course will include a fair amount of lecture time, I also expect you to have thoughtfully read the articles, and to be prepared to discuss them.

Grade: Grades are assigned on a standard 9 point A – F scale (A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, D, F), with the following weights:

- Preparation for class, participation in class discussion, and submitted questions: 20%
- Application of a Social Psychology Framework Assignment: 20%
- Exam 1: 30%
- Exam 2: 30%

Class preparation, discussion, and discussion questions (20% of the grade): Each week, you will submit discussion questions onto Canvas by 5pm the day before class (Wednesday night)– of course, I am happy to have the questions well in advance of then! Please be thoughtful and integrative in your questions (i.e., drawing from multiple articles in most cases). You are encouraged

to look over what your classmates submitted before coming to class. In addition to your question, I would like to see you provide your own educated thoughts on what the answer would be (and why), that can then be used as a point of discussion in class.

It is not enough for a question to 1) ask whether a certain theory or research question would apply in another culture; 2) whether the effect would hold with another population; or 3) just critique the method of the paper (if it is an empirical paper). You must explain why you pose that question from a social psychology perspective, and what you would expect based on the material you are learning. You must write one question (and your thoughts on an answer and why) for each of the assigned readings each class.

During class, I expect students to ask questions and bring up their discussion questions when appropriate, or be able to speak to them when called on during class.

Application of a Social Psychology Framework Assignment (20% of grade):

This is a fun way to apply what you are learning each week to an applied topic. At the end of the semester, students will select a real life problem that they are interested in studying/addressing. You are tasked with applying a **social psychological theory** to the solution of the problem. While it is tempting to draw from other fields (e.g., I/O or counseling), do not do this here. Demonstrate mastery and understanding of the social psychology content you just learned about in this class.

You will write an 8-10 page paper (APA formatted, 12-point font, double-spaced; page limit does not include title page and references). Your paper should have 5 sections: Significance, past approaches, new framework, hypotheses, and proposed methods:

1. You should start by outlining the problem you are interested in addressing and why it is important to study/intervene (**significance**).
2. Then, discuss how the problem has been thought about and studied to date, such as past theoretical orientations, methods used (**past approaches**).
3. In the third part of your paper, you will propose a new social psychological theoretical framework to better understand the problem (**new framework**). This new framework can extend on previous social psychology theory used to address the problem (e.g., integrating another theory) or be the first application of social psychology theory to the problem (if no other theory has yet been applied). You must clearly outline the logic about why this new framework is an important advancement.
 - a. For example, in the study of parental alienation, all previous research has taken clinical or developmental approaches to understanding the problem (e.g., attachment theory). I took a new approach, understanding it from the status incongruity/role incongruity perspective, opening a whole new line of research.
4. For the fourth part of the paper, you will specify clearly two or three hypotheses that you could test using this new framework (**hypotheses**).
5. Finally, you will briefly describe one method you would use to operationalize your hypotheses, which would essentially be a first test of the new framework you propose (**proposed methods**).

We will have one class period to present your paper to the class, at which point you will turn in a hard copy of your paper to me. Students are expected to prepare a formal presentation (e.g., Powerpoint) lasting at most 10 minutes, leaving a few minutes for questions.

Two Exams (30% of grade each):

You will be given two take-home essay exams. More details on these exams will be provided as the exam date draws closer.

Absences and Late Policies: Missing classes means that you will miss very important course content. We cover a lot of ground each week, so missing even one class will put you behind. Part of your grade is to participate in class discussions, which one cannot do unless they are present. If you are absent for any reason, you should contact me within 24 hours of the class, and find a way to obtain the notes, or a recording of the lecture and discussion in class that day.

I will not grade discussion questions that are posted after 5 pm on Canvas the day before the first class of each week (Sundays at 5 pm). If you know you will be late in posting due to a university sanctioned event (e.g., athletics) or excusable reason (e.g., death in the family, court subpoena), then contact me before the due date and we can work something out. The point is: communicate with me and all will be fine.

Readings: All readings will be on Canvas, along with other ancillary papers that may come up tangentially in class. *Note that articles that are in italics (e.g., all for Week 1) are background readings which may come up in class but are not required. They are strongly recommended for applied social and health psychology graduate students to enhance their background knowledge of their discipline.*

Please note that if you have not taken an undergraduate social psychology course, this class may be a bit challenging for you, as I assume in the course instruction that all students have had a basic introduction to social psychology. I have a lot of extra undergraduate textbooks in my office you are free to borrow or even take to refer to throughout the course if you need the extra background in order to keep up.

Course Topics, Schedule & Readings

Jan 18th WEEK 1: Course Overview

Jan 25th WEEK 2: Overview of Social Psychology; Evaluating Theory

I. Introduction: What is Social Psychology?

Reis, H. T. (2008). Reinvigorating the concept of the situation in social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 311-329.

Cooper, W. H., & Withey, M. J. (2009). The strong situation hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13, 62-72.

Chapters in A. W. Kruglanski & W. Stroebe (Eds.) Handbook of the history of Social Psychology (pp. 45-80). New York: Psychology Press.

II. Evaluating theory

Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2015). Theory evaluation. In B. Gawronski & G. V. Bodenhausen (Eds.), *Theory and Explanation in Social Psychology* (Ch. 1, pp 3-22). NY: Guilford.

Kruglanski, A. W. (2001). That “vision thing”: The state of theory in social and personality psychology at the edge of the new millennium. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 871-875.

Deutsch, M., & Krauss, R.M. (1965). *Theories in social psychology* (Chapter 1, pp. 1-13). NY: Basic Books.
Slawski, C.J. (1981). *Social psychological theories: A comparative handbook for students* (Chapter 1, pp. 1-17).
Shaw, M.E., & Costanzo, P.R. (1982). *Theories of social psychology* (2nd ed., Ch 1 & 15). NY: McGraw-Hill.
Platt, J.R. (1964). Strong inference. *Science*, 146, 347-353.

Misc. useful resources:

Handbook of Social Psychology (5th ed, vol 1 & 2, 2010); *Handbook of Basic Principles* (2nd ed., 2007), *Advances in Experimental Soc Psych.*

Journals:

Theory: PSPR (Personality and Social Psychology Review)

Empirical: JPSP (J Personality and Soc Psych), JESP (J of Experimental Soc Psych); PSPB (Personality and Soc Psych Bulletin) + many tier 2 social journals.

Primary (broad) psychology journals for theory and reviews were traditionally: Psych Review; Psych Bulletin

Feb 1 WEEK 3: Social Comparison

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.

Singer, J. E. (1980). Social comparison: The process of self-evaluation. In L. Festinger (Ed.), *Retrospections on social psychology* (pp. 158-199). New York: Oxford.

Gibbons, F., Benbow, C., & Gerrard, M. (1994). From top dog to bottom half: Social comparison strategies in response to poor performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 638-652.

Marsh, H.W., Trautwein, U., Ludtke, O., & Kooler, O. (2008). Social comparison and big-fish-little-pond effects on self-concept and other self-belief constructs: role of generalized and specific others. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(3), 510-524.

Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. *Psychological Review*, 57, 271-282.

Schacter, S. (1951). Deviation, rejection and communication. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 46, 190-207.

Taylor, S.E., & Lobel, M. (1989). Social comparison activity under threat: Downward evaluation and upward contacts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 569-575.

Feb 8; Week 4: Cognitive Dissonance

Festinger, L. (1957). An introduction to the theory of dissonance. In L. Festinger's *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (pp. 1 – 30). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cooper, J., & Fazio, R.H. (1984). A new look at dissonance theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 229–266). New York: Academic Press.

Aronson, E. (1992). The return of the repressed: Dissonance theory makes a comeback. *Psychological Inquiry*, 3(4), 303-311.

Lord, C. (1992). Was cognitive dissonance theory a mistake? *Psych Inquiry*, 3, 339-342.

Steele, C., & Spencer, S. (1992). The primacy of self-integrity. *Psych Inquiry*, 3, 345-346.

Swann, W. B. Jr. (1992) Dance with the one who brung ya? *Psychological Inquiry*, 3, 346-347.

Harmon-Jones, E., Amodio, D. M., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2009). Action-based model of dissonance: A review, integration, and expansion of conceptions of cognitive conflict. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 41, pp. 119-166).

Festinger, L., & Carlsmith, J.M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58, 203-211.

Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., & Schacter, S. (1956). *When prophecy fails (excerpt)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2007). *Cognitive dissonance theory after 50 years of development*. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 38, 7-16.

Feb 15 Week 5 Rational Actor Theories & Perspectives on Bias

Trafimow, D. (2015). Rational actor theories. In B. Gawronski & G. V. Bodenhausen (Eds.), *Theory and explanation in Social Psychology* (pp. 245-265). New York: Guilford.

Ajzen, I. (2012). The Theory of Planned Behavior. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 438-459). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Weiner, B. (2012). An attribution theory of motivation. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 135-177). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Gigerenzer, G., & Brighton, H. (2009). Homo heuristicus: Why biased minds make better inferences. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 1, 107-143.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). *The processes of causal attribution*. *American Psychologist*, 28, 107-112.

Major, B., Quinton, W. J., & McCoy, S. K. (2002). *Antecedents and consequences of attributions to discrimination: Theoretical and empirical advances*. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 34, pp. 251-330). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). *Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases*. *Science*, 185, 1124-1131.

Kahneman, D., & Klein, G. (2009). Conditions for intuitive expertise: A failure to disagree. *American Psychologist*, 64, 515-526.

Epstude, K., & Roese, N. J. (2008). The functional theory of counterfactual thinking. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 168-192.

Feb 22. Week 6 Cognitive Level Theories (a few contemporary examples)

Schwarz, N. (2012). Feelings-as-information theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 289-308). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review*, 117(2), 440-463. doi:10.1037/a0018963

Boothby, E. J., Clark, M. S., & Bargh, J. A. (2017). The invisibility cloak illusion: People (incorrectly) believe they observe others more than others observe them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112(4), 589-606. doi:10.1037/pspi0000082

Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2003). *Affective forecasting*. In M. P. Zanna, M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 35 (pp. 345-411). San Diego, CA, US: Elsevier Academic Press. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(03)01006-2

Landau, M. J., Meier, B. P., & Keefer, L. A. (2010). *A metaphor-enriched social cognition*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 1045-1067.

Mar 1. Week 7 Theories of Persuasion

Petty, R. E., & Wegener, D. T. (1999). The Elaboration Likelihood Model: Current status and controversies. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 41-72). NY: Guilford Press.

- Chaiken, S., & Ledgerwood, A. (2012). A theory of heuristic and systematic information processing. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 246-266). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Blanton, H., Stuart, A. E., & VandenEijnden, R. M. (2001). An introduction to deviance-regulation theory: The effect of behavioral norms on message framing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(7), 848-858. doi:10.1177/0146167201277007
- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in evaluation: An integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 692-731. Doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.692
- Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology*, 39(5), 752-766. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.39.5.752
- Blankenship, K. L., Wegener, D. T., & Murray, R. A. (2012). Circumventing resistance: Using values to indirectly change attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103, 606-621.

Mar 8th Week 8 MIDTERM EXAM

Mar 12: Spring Break!

Mar 22. Week 9: Relationship Theories

Exchange and Equity Theories

- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups* (pp. 9-30). New York: Wiley.
<earliest elements of an exchange theory: "interdependence theory">
- Rusbult, C. E., Agnew, C. R., & Arriaga, X. B. (2012). The Investment Model of commitment processes. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. pp. 218-231). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Hatfield, E. & Rapson, R. L. (2012). Equity theory in close relationships. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 200-217). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Le, B., & Agnew, C. (2003). Commitment and its theorized determinants: A meta-analysis of the investment model. *Personal Relationships*, 10, 37-57.

New directions (consequences of attachment: risks and benefits)

- Murray, S. L., Derrick, J. L., Leder, S., & Holmes, J. G. (2008). Balancing connectedness and self protection goals in close relationships: A levels-of-processing perspective on risk regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(3), 429-459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.3.429>
- Feeney, B. C., Van Vleet, M., Jakubiak, B. K., & Tomlinson, J. M. (2017). Predicting the pursuit and support of challenging life opportunities. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(8), 1171-1187.

General principles of exchange & distributive justice:

- McClintock, C.G., Kramer, R. M., & Keil, L. J. (1984). Equity and social exchange. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 17, 183-237. <excerpt only: section D, p. 198-206, plus section B, p. 194>.

“Communal” vs. exchange relationships:

- Clark, M. S. (1984). Record keeping in two types of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(3), 549-557.
- Collins, N. L., & Feeney, B. C. (2000). A safe haven: An attachment theory perspective on support seeking and caregiving in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(6), 1053-1073.
- Feeney, B. C., & Collins NL (2015). A new look at social support: A theoretical perspective on thriving through relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19, 113-147
- Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G Collins N. L. (2006). Optimizing assurance: the risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(5), 641-666.

Mar 29. Week 10: Groups: Social Identity and Beyond

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., Chapter 1, pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Simon, B., Hastedt, C., & Aufderheide, B. (1997). When self-categorization makes sense: The role of meaningful social categorization in minority and majority members' self-perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 310-320.
- Fredman, L. A., Buhrmester, M. D., Gomez, A., Fraser, W. T., Talaifar, S., Brannon, S. M., & Swann, W. B. (2015). Identity fusion, extreme pro-group behavior, and the path to defusion. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 9(9), 468-480. doi:10.1111/spc3.12193
- Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2010). Optimal distinctiveness theory: A framework for social identity, social cognition, and intergroup relations. In M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olson, M. P. Zanna, J. M. Olson (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol 43 (pp. 63-113). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- Smaldino, P. E., Pickett, C., Sherman, J., & Schank, J. (2012). An agent-based model of social identity dynamics. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 15(4), 7.
- Smaldino, P. E. (2017). Models are stupid and we need more of them. In R. R. Vallacher, S. J. Read, & A. Nowak (Eds.), *Computational social psychology* (pp. 311-331). New York: Routledge.
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223, November, 96-102.
- Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). The irony of harmony: Intergroup contact can produce false expectations for equality. *Psychological Science*, 20(1), 114-121. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02261.x
- Swann, W. J., Buhrmester, M. D., Gómez, A., Jetten, J., Bastian, B., Vázquez, A., & ... Zhang, A. (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(6), 912-926. doi:10.1037/a0036089

Apr 5. Week 11: Theories Regarding Stereotypes: Causes, Consequences

- Fiske, S. T. (2012). The continuum model and the stereotype content model. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A.W., Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 267-288). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Neuberg, S. L., & Schaller, M. (2016). An evolutionary threat-management approach to prejudices. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 7, 1-5.
- Rangle, U., & Keller, J. (2011). Essentialism goes social: Belief in social determinism as a component of psychological essentialism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 1056-1078.

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(6), 1267-1278. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003

Carr, P. B., & Steele, C. M. (2010). Stereotype threat affects financial decision making. *Psychological Science*, 21(10), 1411-1416. doi:10.1177/0956797610384146

Steele, C. M. (2012). Conclusion: Extending and applying stereotype threat research: A brief essay. In M. Inzlicht, & T. Schmader, (Eds.) , *Stereotype threat: Theory, process, and application* (pp.297-303). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Shapiro, J. R., & Neuberg, S. L (2007) *From stereotype threat to stereotype threats: Implications of a Multi-Threat framework for causes, moderators, mediators, consequences, and interventions. Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 107-130.

Apr 12. Week 12 Aggression

Englehardt, C. R., & Bartholow, B. D. (2013). Effects of situational cues on aggressive behavior. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7, 762-774.

Henry, P. J. (2009). Low-status compensation: A theory for understanding the role of status in cultures of honor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 451-466.

DeWall, C. N., Twenge, J. M., Bushman, B., Im, C., & Williams, K. (2010). A little acceptance goes a long way: Applying social impact theory to the rejection-aggression link. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1, 168-174.

Fisher, P. & Greitemeyer, T. (2006). Music and aggression: The impact of sexual-aggressive song lyrics on aggression-related thoughts, emotions, and behavior toward the same and opposite sex. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1165-1176.

Apr 19; Week 13 Hot Topic in Social Psychology: Automaticity

Gilbert, D. (1991). How mental systems believe. *American Psychologist*, 46(2), 107-119

Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1997). Nonconscious behavioral confirmation processes: The self-fulfilling consequences of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 541-560.

also read links regarding the controversy over replicating various priming results the controversy about priming results...I will provide them to you on Canvas prior to this week's readings*

MacCrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 808-817.

Payne, B.K., (2006). Weapons bias: Split-second decision and unintended stereotyping. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(6), 287 – 291.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5-18. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5

Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54(7), 462-479. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.7.462>

Apr 26; Week 14: Theory into Action: Understanding and Changing Health Behaviors and Stopping Conflict

- Quinn, D. M., & Chaudoir, S. R. (2009). Living with a concealable stigmatized identity: The impact of anticipated stigma, centrality, salience, and cultural stigma on psychological distress and health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(4), 634-651. doi:10.1037/a0015815
- Inzlicht, M., & Kang, S. K. (2010). Stereotype threat spillover: How coping with threats to social identity affects aggression, eating, decision making, and attention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(3), 467-481. doi:10.1037/a0018951
- Fisher, W. A., Fisher, J. D., & Shuper, P. A. (2009). The information-motivation-behavioral skills model of HIV preventive behavior. In R. J. DiClemente, R. A. Crosby, & M. C. Kegler (Eds), *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research* (2nd ed., pp. 21-64). Jossey-Bass
- Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., & Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing climates of conflict: A social network experiment in 56 schools, *PNAS*, 113, 566-571.

May 3: Week 15 Presentations

Wed, May 10th. Last Exam date as assigned by the Registrar.

Academic Integrity At CSU, academic integrity is taken very seriously. At minimum, academic integrity means that no one will use another's work as their own. While this is not something that I expect to see among students at the graduate level, I have run across students who have plagiarized past work to meet deadlines, copied entire sections of published papers, or even posted discussion questions written by students in past classes.

The CSU writing center defines plagiarism this way:

Plagiarism is the unauthorized or unacknowledged use of another person's academic or scholarly work. Done on purpose, it is cheating. Done accidentally, it is no less serious. Regardless of how it occurs, plagiarism is a theft of intellectual property and a violation of an ironclad rule demanding "credit be given where credit is due." (Understanding Plagiarism.
<http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/researchsources/understandingplagiarism/plagiarismoverview.cfm>.)

If you plagiarize in your work you could lose credit for the plagiarized work, fail the assignment, or fail the course. Plagiarism could result in expulsion from the university. Each instance of plagiarism, classroom cheating, and other types of academic dishonesty will be addressed according to the principles published in the CSU General Catalog (see, <http://www.catalog.colostate.edu/FrontPDF/1.6POLICIES1112f.pdf>).

Of course, academic integrity means more than just avoiding plagiarism. It also involves doing your own reading and studying. It includes regular class attendance, careful consideration of all class materials, and engagement with the class and your fellow students. Academic integrity lies at the core of our common goal: to create an intellectually honest and rigorous community.