

PSY 392C: Contemporary Issues in Psychology (Spring 2012)

Mental Simulation

Syllabus

Instructor: John V. Petrocelli

E-mail: petrocjv@wfu.edu

Office: 459 Greene Hall

Office phone: (336)-758-4171

Office hours: Mon: 9:30-10:30, Tues: 3:30-4:30
and by appointment

Days: Tuesday/Thursday

Time: 2:00 – 3:15

Location: Greene Hall 310

Course website: <https://sakai.wfu.edu>

Required Text

Course Reader (may be purchased at the University Bookstore).

Course Description

Seminar treatment of current theory and research in several areas of psychology. Prerequisites: Senior, major standing.

Course Design and Objectives

This course is designed to give you the opportunity to engage more fully in the field of experimental psychology by reading, discussing, and evaluating primary research articles related to a particular topic (i.e., counterfactual thinking and other forms of mental simulation). Although I will introduce you to some of the critical issues, the real emphasis will be on “playing” with ideas by thinking and talking about concepts and research in this area.

The course has two primary objectives: 1) to increase your awareness of the importance of counterfactual thinking, and other mental simulation processes, in thinking, feeling, and behaving; and 2) to increase your ability to review original sources, to present those ideas to your classmates, and to think about the relevance of this material to your own life.

Required Readings

Readings are made available in the Course Reader. These readings will serve as a framework for the course. Please bring to class either a hard copy of the readings (no computers) so that you can reference the material. The quality of your work (i.e., Final Quiz and Final Paper) 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
- Check Sakai regularly for updates on course matters
- Complete all course requirements
- Complete a student course evaluation

Grading

Your letter grade for this course is determined by the percentage of total points (500 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 (10 points each x 7 = 70 points; 14%):** You will be assigned to write a Reaction Essay to the two readings scheduled for each week. Submit a one-page paper in reaction to the readings for the week. Essays may be single-spaced (approx. 500 words) or double-spaced (approx. 250 words), but are not to exceed one page (if you have more to say, 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. It 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. Examples of sentences to get you started:

- “I see a contradiction between Smith’s (2002) article and the section we read about...”
- “A possible experiment that could be conducted to test the hypothesis described in Smith’s (2002) article involves...”
- “The theory describe in Smith’s (2002) article could be used to improve productivity in work groups by...”
- “The theory in Smith’s (2002) article helped me to analyze an experience that I once had in a group conflict situation that was hard for me to understand at the time...”
- “I disagree with the interpretation of the findings described in Smith’s (2002) article...”

Note: Only seven Reaction Essays are required. To make our lives a bit easier, you are being spotted 30 points. Beginning with week 2, Reaction Essays are due on the first class session of each week.

❖ **Class Discussion and Participation (100 points; 20%):** The learning experience in this course will involve sharing of thoughts during class discussions (focused on the required readings). Come to class willing and prepared to voice your thoughts and opinions; please ask questions during class. The Reaction Essays serve the goal of making you think about the readings before you come to class and prepare you for class discussion. As you are reviewing an assigned reading, writing your Reaction Essays, and thinking about upcoming class discussions, the following questions should help to guide you: What is the main research question of the article? What is the answer or conclusion that the article provides for this question? What evidence is used in support of this conclusion? Is this evidence sound? What questions do I still have about this paper? What aspects of the paper remain unclear? Are there weaknesses in the methodology, statistics or conclusions? Are there any other aspects of the article that draw criticism or cause concern?

❖ **Paradigm Demonstration and Discussion (100 points; 20%):** This exercise will provide you with some presentation experience as well as an experiential way of learning more about experimental procedures used in social psychology research today. During one session of class, you will be required to pair with one or more students to conduct a demonstration of an experimental paradigm described in a research article. I will provide the article (see the readings marked with **PDD** in the Readings and Schedule below). Many of the articles include multiple experiments, but you only need to demonstrate one, or a modified “hybrid” of multiple experiments.

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 (procedures). Afterwards, describe the hypothesis used by the researchers and the background information (you do not have to use PowerPoint, but it may help). Then you should briefly discuss what is typically found from the paradigm (the results). If at all possible, 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. In such cases, inform the class of how the demonstration was modified from what the researchers employed. With the remaining class time, lead a discussion about the topic. Make sure to prepare discussion questions based on the reading; these questions should be provocative and integrative questions that will engage the class.

❖ **Final Quiz (80 points; 16%):** There are several conceptual, factual, and applied concepts that will be discussed in the assigned readings and during class time. I’ll need to know that you understand these concepts and can apply them. The format of the quiz will be short-answer essay.

❖ **Final Paper (150 points; 30%):** Due at the final class meeting, is a 7-8 page final paper. The paper should be double-spaced, formatted using APA-style, include a Title-Page and References; do not include an Abstract. The paper must include at least seven references of published articles, books, or chapters (no internet articles). You may write one of two types of papers: 1) a theoretical review of a particular topic of interest to you (these types of papers often take the form of a question or set of

questions that are answered using the existing literature); or 2) a brief experimental proposal including a theoretically-drawn hypothesis and a brief description of methods and procedures. By the end of the second week of class, you are required to submit to me three possible titles of your paper (e.g., “The Effect of Sports Commentary Counterfactual Thoughts on Viewer’s Perceptions of Fairness”). I will then decide which paper I want to read. Make sure that all three titles reflect three different topics. Think specific for this paper.

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 not provided. Much of the lectures will be interactive, involving class-discussion related to the topic, thought experiments, and experimental procedure demonstrations. If you must miss a lecture, please get notes from a classmate (if they are willing).

Sakai

You are expected to become familiar with the Sakai Academic Suite <https://sakai.wfu.edu>. Sakai 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 will be posted on Sakai. Announcements or changes will be announced on Sakai as well.

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 Sakai, 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 Sakai, 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 Sakai.

Readings and Schedule

Week/Day(s): Topic(s) and Required Reading(s): PDD = Paradigm Demonstration and Discussion

1 Jan 19: Introduction

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1982). The simulation heuristic. In D. Kahneman, P. Slovic, & A. Tversky (Eds.), *Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases* (pp. 201-208). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gilovich, T. (1983). Biased evaluation and persistence in gambling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 1110-1126.

2 Jan 24: Distinctions of Counterfactual Thinking

Roese, N. J., & Olson, J. M. (1993). The structure of counterfactual thought. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 312-319.

Markman, K. D., Gavanski, I., Sherman, S. J., & McMullen, M. N. (1993). The mental simulation of better and worse possible worlds. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 29, 87-109.

NO CLASS Jan. 26 – SPSP Conference

3 Jan 31/Feb 2: Functionality of Counterfactual Thinking

Roese, N. J. (1994). The functional basis of counterfactual thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 805-818.

Sherman, S. J., & McConnell, A. R. (1995). Dysfunctional implications of counterfactual thinking: When alternatives to reality fail us. In N. J. Roese & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *What might have been: The social psychology of counterfactual thinking* (pp. 199-231). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

PDDKray, L. J., Galinsky, A. D., & Markman, K. D. (2009). Counterfactual structure and learning from experience in negotiations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 979-982.

4 Feb 7/9: Affect

Gleicher, F., Kost, K. A., Baker, S. M., Strathman, A. J., Richman, S. A., & Sherman, S. J. (1990). The role of counterfactual thinking in judgments of affect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 284-295.

Seta, J. J., McElroy, T., & Seta, C. E. (2001). To do or not to do: Desirability and consistency mediate judgments of regret. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 861-870.

PDDMcMullen, M. N. (1997). Affective contrast and assimilation in counterfactual thinking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 77-100.

5 Feb 14/16: Temporal Factors of Mental Simulation

Gilbert, D. T., Pinel, E. C., Wilson, T. D., Blumberg, S. J., & Wheatley, T. P. (1998). Immune neglect: A source of durability bias in affective forecasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 617-638.

Gilovich, T., & Medvec, V. H. (1994). The temporal pattern to the experience of regret. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 357-365.

PDDCrawford, 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.

6 Feb 21/23: Judgments of Causality

Wells, G. L., & Gavanski, I. (1989). Mental simulation of causality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*, 161-169.

Mandel, D. R., & Lehman, D. R. (1996). Counterfactual thinking and ascriptions of cause and preventability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 450-463.

PDDMedvec, V. H., Madey, S. F., & Gilovich, T. (1995). When less is more: Counterfactual thinking and satisfaction among Olympic medalists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 603-610.

PDDDougherty, M. R. P., Gettys, C. F., & Thomas, R. P. (1997). The role of mental simulation in judgments of likelihood. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *70*, 135-148.

7 Feb 28/Mar 1: Imagination Inflation

Garry, M., Manning, C.G., Loftus, E.F., & Sherman, S.J. (1996). Imagination inflation: Imagining a childhood event inflates confidence that it occurred. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, *3*, 208-214.

Goff, L. M., & Roediger, H. L., III. (1998). Imagination inflation for action events: Repeated imaginings lead to illusory recollections. *Memory and Cognition*, *26*, 20-33.

Petrocelli, J. V., & Crysel, L. C. (2009). Counterfactual thinking and confidence in blackjack: A test of the counterfactual inflation hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 1312-1315.

PDDLandau, J. D., Libkuman, T. M., & Wildman, J. C. (2002). Mental simulation inflates performance estimates for physical abilities. *Memory and Cognition*, *30*, 372-379.

8 Mar 6/8: Goals, Performance, Risk Taking and Confidence, and Other Topics

Greitemeyer, T., & Würz, D. (2005). Mental simulation and the achievement of health goals: The role of goal difficulty. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, *25*, 239-251.

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

PDDPham, L. B., & Taylor, S. E. (1999). From thought to action: Effects of process- versus outcome-based mental simulations on performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 250-260.

Final Meeting: Thursday, March 8

- **Final Paper Due**
- **Final Quiz**