

**GRADUATE SEMINAR IN PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY:
SELF-ESTEEM AND IDENTITY REGULATION**

**SOP 6409 Section 021A – Fall 2011
Dr. James A. Shepperd**

Office: 271 Psychology

Class Meetings: Monday 7-9 (1:55 – 4:55)
PSY 333

Phone: 273-2165

Office Hours: Tuesdays 1:00 – 3:00
& by appointment

email: shepperd@ufl.edu

home page: <http://www.psych.ufl.edu/~shepperd/>

Overview. The purpose of this course is to survey the theory and research relevant to self-esteem and identity regulation. The course addresses how people perceive (and misperceive), think about and respond to self-relevant information. Part of this course will focus on specific behaviors and cognitions employed in the pursuit of esteem and identity regulation. To this end we will focus on behaviors such as self-serving attributions, downward social comparison, self-handicapping and selective encoding and retrieval of information. A large part of the course, however, will focus on why we perceive the world in self-serving ways, the conditions that prompt self-serving processes and the end states we may be trying to achieve.

Reading Assignments. With the exception of a few readings that are accessible through my webpage, all readings for the class are available through Target Copy.

Grading. Grading will be based on your performance in 4 areas:

- 1) Weekly Thought Papers (40%) – During most weeks, you will be assigned to write a brief thought paper. The papers should be brief, not exceeding two typed pages. Late papers will not be accepted.
- 2) Class Participation (20%) – This is a small class with fewer than 10 students. Part of the class experience involves sharing your ideas and hearing the ideas expressed by your fellow students. Articulating and defending your ideas is an important part of the learning process. You are expected to participate fully in discussion in every class.
- 3) Discussion Leader (20%) – Each of you, along with a fellow student, will be responsible for leading class discussion during two class periods. You will be graded partly on your organization, partly on your presentation of material and in your ability to lead discussion. The class will evaluate each discussion leader immediately after the discussion. The discussion grade will be based partly on this evaluation. I will help you prepare your discussion. However, you should view this as an opportunity to be creative. Feel free to do demonstrations, organize a debate, show brief videos, assign additional readings, etc. At the very least, you should prepare an outline of how and where you want the discussion to proceed as well as a list of issues or questions you want the class to discuss.
- 4) Term Paper (20%) – You will be responsible for writing one term paper during the semester. The term paper must be typed, and must take the form of an NSF grant or similar (e.g., NRSA R-31) proposal. The paper is due at 2pm, Monday November 2. The paper serves two purposes: First, it will give you an opportunity to organize formally a program of research on a topic that is important to you. Second, it will give you practice a preparing a grant proposal. Ideally, you will submit a proposal sometime during your graduate career and this paper will give you valuable experience. I will discuss the term paper in detail during the semester and will provide examples of actual, successful NSF and R-31 proposals submitted to NIH in the past.

Weekly Papers

1. The weekly papers require that you think about what you read and integrate your understanding of the material with a personal example or with other articles you have read for the course. If a question asks you to provide a personal example, state the example briefly – no more than a couple of sentences. Then explain how the example fits the theory. In providing an answer you should summarize the theory in your own words. Keep in mind that at minimum I am trying to judge whether you truly understand the theory or the point of the article. I also am judging whether you can apply what you read and that you understand the ramifications of what you read.
2. Papers are graded on a 0-3 scale. If you fail to turn in an assigned paper, you get a “0”. A “1” is a weak paper. It generally means that you did not answer the question or that you communicated your ideas poorly. A “2” means an acceptable paper and encompasses a wide range. Most papers will receive a “2”. A “3” is an excellent paper. Few papers will receive a “3”.
3. Don’t expect to do well in the beginning. Most students do poorly on the first two to three papers but improve during the semester. As the semester proceeds and you acquire a sense of how I grade and what I am looking for in the papers, I will raise the standard of what is expected, requiring that you think more deeply about the issues. That is, a paper that would get a “3” at the beginning of the semester will only get a “2” by the end of the semester.
4. Frequent Errors –Students frequently make common in writing. I have attached a list of these errors. Commit this list to memory and avoid these errors. Making these errors, particularly after being informed about them, creates a negative impression.
5. Late papers – Papers are due at the beginning of class. I will not accept late papers regardless of the excuse. If you are having difficulty with your printer and cannot print a hard copy of your paper, you may email a copy of your paper PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF CLASS. You may send the paper as an attachment, or directly within an email message.
6. Typed – All papers should be typed and spell checked.
7. Length – Do not exceed two typed pages. Part of learning how to write is learning to write concisely. Each thought question can be answered in two pages. In many instances, keeping the paper to two pages will be difficult. However, it can be done. Read each sentence and decide if it is necessary. Then, read each sentence and decide if the point can be made more concisely. Using tricks to increase the number of words per page (e.g., a font smaller than 10 pt, margins less than an inch, more than 27 lines per page) will be viewed unfavorably.
8. No Cover Page – Please conserve paper; do not include a cover page with your paper.

Class Participation

1. This is a graduate seminar. A significant portion of your grade is based on your participation in class discussion. If you are shy or mute or otherwise reluctant to participate in class discussion, then this is an unwise class for you to take. If you do not participate in discussion, your grade will suffer.
2. Class participation grades range from 0 to 3. You receive a 0 if you miss class or arrive to class inordinately late. You receive a 3 if you participate fully in discussion, make substantive contributions that indicate that you understood and thought about the assigned readings. Keep in mind that it is obvious to me when you have not done the readings for the class. Not doing the readings will result in a low participation grade. Likewise, arriving to class late will result in a low participation grade.
3. In calculating or determining your grade, I will drop one classroom participation day. In other words, you have one that you can miss because of illness, religious events, or other conflicts. Thus, there is no need to come to me with an excuse for absences from class. However, no excuse will be accepted for missing more than one class.

Being a Discussion Leader

1. You are entirely responsible for leading two class discussions with a fellow student. Leading a discussion is not easy, but it can be very rewarding. It requires being extremely prepared in advance. It is not something people can “wing”.
2. I will meet with you to help you prepare your discussion. However, you must arrive prepared for the meeting. After all, YOU are responsible for preparing the discussion. Thus, I will make suggestions regarding your ideas for your discussion. This means that you and your fellow discussion leader need to read the articles, discuss the topic, and prepare an outline of what you plan to cover BEFORE we meet. Coming to our meeting unprepared makes a bad impression and I am very likely to cancel the meeting. We should meet no fewer than 2 days (and preferably 7 days) before you are discussion leader.
3. The best way to lead a discussion is to know in advance the topics you want to cover, the responses you want to elicit, and the discussion questions that specifically elicit those responses. You don't need to know the answers to the questions you ask, but you should have thought about the answer. Questions like, “What did you think about the article by Smith and Jones?” are poor discussion questions and tend to elicit blank stares or brief, uninformative responses. Your discussion questions should be brief and stated in your own words.
4. One of the toughest things about being a discussion leader is the pause that follows the question. It can take up to 10 seconds between when you ask a question and receive a response. People must digest what you said, think about it, formulate a response, and then speak. Typically, however, the 10 seconds seems like 2 hours. Be patient. If there is a problem with the question, people will ask you to repeat it or I will ask you to reword what the question.
5. There is a tendency for discussion leaders to dominate the discussion. This is not surprising. As a discussion leader you probably know the topic better than any other student in the class. You have thought about it more and probably have the answer written down in front of you. Avoid the temptation to dominate discussion. The best discussion leaders pull the answers from others in the class.
6. As noted earlier, this is an opportunity for you to be creative. Feel free to do demonstrations, organize a debate, show brief videos, assign additional readings, develop and administer a questionnaire, etc.
7. Attached is the survey that will be used to evaluate class discussion leaders.

11 Common Errors in Writing the Weekly Papers

(Many of my grammar and syntax comments come from Strunk & White)

1. Introductory/Overview Paragraphs – Your first paragraph should immediately begin answering the thought question. Please do not include a paragraph (or sentence) restating the question or giving an overview of the field or your answer.
2. Avoid the Passive Voice – The first noun in the sentence should be the subject and the “actor” in your sentence. Ex: “The teacher was tortured by the students’ poor grammar”, should read, “The students tortured their teacher with poor grammar.” The worst examples of the passive voice involve the words be, being and been. Avoid the verb “to be” and its variations when possible. Ex: “Spanking is the punishment that is to be given to participants who arrive late.” Should be, “Participants who arrive late will be spanked.”
3. Person – Write primarily in the third person. Avoid the first person unless you are referring specifically to yourself. Ex: “We place our fingers in our ears and scream loudly when we hear contrasting opinions”, should read, “People place their fingers in their ears and scream loudly when they hear contrasting opinions.” Always avoid the second person.
4. Noun Agreement – Make sure the nouns and pronouns within a sentence agree in terms of being singular and plural. Ex: “When a student feels threatened by impertinent questions, they will...”, should read, “When students feel threatened by impertinent questions, they will...”, or, “When a person feels threatened by impertinent questions, he or she will...”
5. This, That & Those – Avoid using “this” and “that” as nouns; they are adjectives. Ex: “This is the reason the sycophant got the job”, should read, “For this reason, the sycophant got the job.” Or better yet, “Because he knew when to say yes, the sycophant got the job.” In the last two years I have seen a trend toward increasing use of the word “these” as a noun. Avoid this trend.
6. Hyphenate the Self – Most psychology terms that include the self are hyphenated. Thus, self-esteem, self-concept, self-presentation, self-verification, etc., are all hyphenated.
7. “In Order To” – Usually this can be written to say “To...” Ex: “In order to fend off her date’s amorous advances...”, should read, “To fend off her date’s amorous advances...”
8. Which Hunting – The rule of thumb: If you can use “that”, use it. Example: “He had a face which only a mother could love”, should read, “He had a face that only a mother could love.” The following is a correct use of the word which. “His face, which only a mother could love, made regular appearances in children’s nightmares.”
9. Since – The words *because* and *since* are not synonyms. *Since* refers to time.
10. Impact – *Impact* is a noun, not a verb. It is fine to say that your dog’s breath has an impact on you, It is not okay to say that your dog’s breath *impacts* you.
11. Person, Individual, People – The plural of *person* and *individual* is *people*, not *persons* and not *individuals*.

If you don’t have a copy, I recommend reading *The Elements of Style* by Strunk and White. Originally published in 1959, this book is a must read for anyone who wishes to write professionally. I also suggest picking up a copy of *Grammar Girl’s 101 Misused Words You’ll Never Confuse Again* by Mignon Fogarty to help keep language errors at bay.

Discussion Leaders: _____

Date: _____

Topic: _____

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			
1. The discussion leaders seemed organized and prepared.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The discussion leaders asked good questions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. The questions challenged my thinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. The discussion leaders made me think critically about the topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. The discussion helped me understand the topic better.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I enjoyed the discussion today.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Indicate your overall evaluation of the discussion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Poor			Excellent			

Please describe what you liked about today's discussion. That is, in what ways did the discussion leaders do a good job? _____

Please describe what you didn't like about today's discussion. That is, what could have been done differently to make this a better discussion? _____

Questions for Weekly Thought Papers

08/29/11 – Self-Deception

Give a personal example of a belief that you or someone you know has that represents self-deception. Explain why the behavior is an illustration of self-deception. Which theoretical approach (Greenwald vs Paulhus & Suedfeld) to self-deception best explains your example? Why? In your answer, describe the personal example BRIEFLY, and spent most of your efforts describing how your example fits one approach and does not fit the other approach.

09/12/11 – Motivated Reasoning

Tom asks both Betty and Sue out for a date. Betty says yes, Sue says no. Tom attributes Betty's answer to his being charming, handsome, and desirable. Tom attributes Sue's response to her being a snob. (1) What explanation would self-enhancement theory give for Tom's attribution pattern? (2) Of course, we don't have to assume that self-enhancement strivings underlie Tom's attributions. How might Tom's explanations reflect nothing more than the way people process information when making judgments and drawing inferences? (3) How does the article by Kunda inform the issue?

09/19/11 – Self-Affirmation and Self-Verification

How do self-verification theory and self-affirmation theory predict how people will respond when they receive feedback that is inconsistent with their self-views. Use a personal example to illustrate how each theory works. Which approach do you think best represents reality? Explain your answer.

09/26/11 – Defining the Self by Comparison

In many ways Steele's Self-Affirmation Theory and Tesser's Self-Evaluation Maintenance (SEM) model are similar. However, in many ways the two approaches are different. How are the two approaches similar and how are they different? What factors are likely to elicit the self-affirmation process? What factors are likely to elicit the SEM process?

10/03/11 – The Consequences of Social Comparison

Both upward and downward comparison can have positive and negative consequences. What are the positive and negative consequences of downward social comparison? What are the positive and negative consequences of upward social comparison? Use personal examples to illustrate your response. Also note that there may be multiple positive and negative consequences linked with upward and downward social comparison.

10/10/11 – Positive Illusions

Now that you have read the Taylor & Brown (1988) paper and the Colvin & Block (1994) paper, which position do you favor and why? Given the data that each present, what conclusions can be drawn about the relationship between positive illusions, personal affect, and mental health? How does the Kwan article inform the debate about positive illusions?

10/17/11 – The Dark Side of Self-Serving Efforts

Although many theorists have championed the importance and benefit of self-serving efforts, such efforts can be problematic. When and how can self-serving efforts prove problematic? Illustrate your answer with examples.

10/24/11 – Self-Regulation

What is self-regulation and why does self-regulation sometimes fail? In answering this question, think of a difficult behavior you tried to regulate (e.g., eating, exercising, studying, staying awake, etc.) and use it to illustrate your answer.

10/31/11 – Terror Management Theory

How can thoughts about death produce both health costs and health benefits? In your answer be sure to describe terror management theory including when and why people experience terror, and explicate when thoughts about death produce health benefits and when they produce health costs.

11/07/11 – Social Inclusion Theory

Imagine a person who experiences an increase in self-esteem after winning a prestigious award. Briefly describe Terror Management Theory and Social Inclusion Theory and explain how each theory accounts for the change in self-esteem. In your answer, be sure to explain the function of self-esteem according to these two theories. Which theory is more convincing to you and why?

11/14/11 – Judging the Self & the Self Relative to Others

Is comparative optimism good, bad or an interesting phenomenon that has no real consequences? In your answer, describe possible advantages and disadvantages of comparative optimism. However, you should also take a side and defend it. There is little research on this topic, so feel free to be creative or speculative in addressing both sides of this question. **This question addresses the consequences of comparative optimism, not general optimism.

11/21/11 – Contemplating Alternatives

How people think about themselves and what they can accomplish differs depending on whether they are thinking about the self in the past, present or future. Is one perception (past self, present self, future self) more likely to be distorted? Explain your answer.

11/28/11 – Implicit Self-Esteem

As evident by the articles you read, considerable controversy surrounds the implicit measures of self-esteem. At the end of her article, Bosson argues that we should continue research on implicit measures. What arguments favor continued study of implicit self-esteem? What obstacles must researchers overcome before implicit measures of self-esteem gain wide acceptance among psychology researchers?

12/05/11 – Information Avoidance

Describe some of piece of information that you would rather not know about your parents. Why do you not want this information? How does the information you want to avoid about your parents fit within the model described in the article. Under what circumstances would you want to know this kind of information about your parents?

SCHEDULE

Aug 22 **First meeting – Introductions, Rules and Expectations**

Aug 29 **Self-Deception**

Greenwald, A. G. (1988). Self-knowledge and self-deception. In J. S. Lockard & D. L. Paulhus (Eds.), *Self-deception: An adaptive mechanism?*, (pp. 113-131). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Paulhus, D. L., & Suedfeld, P. (1988). A dynamic complexity model of self-deception. In J. S. Lockard & D. L. Paulhus (Eds.), *Self-deception: An adaptive mechanism?*, (pp. 132-145). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sep 5 *****NO CLASS: LABOR DAY*****

Sep 12 **Motivated Reasoning**

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case of motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 480-498.

Shepperd, J. A., Malone, W., & Sweeny, K. (2008). Exploring Causes of the Self-serving Bias, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 895–908.

Heine, S. H., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review*, 106, 766-794.

Sep 19 **Self-Verification Theory and Self-Affirmation Theory**

de la Ronde, C., & Swann Jr., W. B. (1993). Caught in the crossfire: Positivity and self-verification strivings among people with low self-esteem. In R. F. Baumeister, (Ed). *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard*, pp. 147-165. New York, Plenum Press.

Sherman, D. K., & Cohen, G. L. (2002). Accepting threatening information: self-affirmation and reduction of defensive biases, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 119-123.

Griffin, D. W., & Harris, P. R. (2011). Calibrating the response to health warnings: Limiting both overreaction and underreaction with self-affirmation. *Psychological Science*, 22, 572-578.

Leary, M. R. (2007). Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 317-344.

Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2008). Self-enhancement: Food for thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 102-116. doi: [10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00068.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00068.x)

Sep 26 **Defining the Self by Comparison**

Beach, S. R. H., Tesser, A., Fincham, F. D., Jones, D. J., Johnson, D., & Whitaker, D. J. (1998). Pleasure and pain in doing well, together: An investigation of performance-related affect in close relationships. *JPSP*, 74, 923-938.

Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a self-evaluation maintenance model of social behavior. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 181-227). New York: Academic Press. **Abbreviated version – see webpage**

Wood, J. V. (1989). Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 231-248.

Oct 3 The Consequences of Social Comparison

Collins, R. L. (1996). For better or worse: The impact of upward social comparison on self-evaluations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 51-69.

Exline, J. J., & Lobel, M. (1999). The perils of outperformance: Sensitivity about being the target of a threatening upward comparison. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 307-337.

Oct 10 Positive Illusions

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

Colvin, C. R., & Block, J. (1994). Do positive illusions foster mental health? An examination of the Taylor and Brown formulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 3-20.

Baumeister, R. F. (1989). The optimal margin of illusion. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 8, 176-189.

Kwan, V. S. Y., John, O. P., Kenny, D. A., Bond, M. H., & Robbins, R. W. (2004). Re-conceptualizing individual differences in self-enhancement bias: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Review*, 111, 94-110.

Oct 17 *NO CLASS: Need to reschedule*** The Dark Side of Self-Serving Efforts**

Baumeister, R.F., Bushman, B.J., & Campbell, W.K. (2000). Self-esteem, narcissism, and aggression: Does violence result from low self-esteem or from threatened egotism? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(1), 26-29.

Batson, C. D., Thompson, E.R., Seufferling, G., Whitney, H., & Strongman, J.A. (1999). Moral hypocrisy: Appearing moral to oneself without being so. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 525-537.

Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 392-414.

Gibson, B. & Sanbonmatsu, D.M. (2004). Optimism, pessimism, & gambling: The downside of optimism. *PSPB*, 30, 149-160.

Oct 24 Self-Regulation

Fitzsimons, G. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Interpersonal influences on self-regulation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19, 101-105.

Hall, P. A., & Fong, G. T. (2007). Temporal self-regulation theory: A model for individual health behavior. *Health Psychology Review*, 1, 6-52.

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 351-355.

Von Hippel, W. (2007). Aging, executive function, and social control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 240-244.

Oct 31 Terror Management Theory

Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Arndt, J., & Schimel, J. (2004). Why do people need self-esteem? A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 435-468.

Goldenberg, J. L., & Arndt, J. (2008). The implications of death for health: A terror management health model for behavioral health promotion. *Psychological Review*, 115, 1032-1053.

Ben-Zur, H., & Zeidner, M. (2009). Threat to life and risk-taking behaviors: A review of empirical findings and explanatory models. *Personality and Social Psychological Review*, 13, 109-128.

Nov 7 Social Inclusion Theory

Leary, M. R. (1999). Making sense of self-esteem. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 32-35.

Leary, M. R. (2004). The function of self-esteem in terror management theory and sociometer theory: Comment on Pyszczynski et al., (2004). *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 478-482.

Smart Richman, L., & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: A multimotive model. *Psychological Review*, 116, 365-383.

Williams, K. D., & Nida, S. A. (2011). Ostracism: Consequences and coping. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 71-75.

Nov 14 Judging the Self & the Self Relative to Others

Vazire, S., & Carlson, E. N. (2011). Others sometimes know us better than we know ourselves. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 104-108.

Kruger, J. (1999). Lake Wobegon be gone! The "Below-average effect" and the egocentric nature of comparative ability judgments. *JSPS*, 77, 221-232.

Klar, Y. & Giladi, E. E. (1999). Are most people happier than their peers, or are they just happy? *PSPB*, 25, 585-594.

Shepperd, J. A., Carroll, P., Grace, J., & Terry, M. (2002). Exploring the cause of comparative optimism. *Psychologica Belgica*, 42, 65-98.

Harris, A. J. L., & Hahn, U. (2011). Unrealistic optimism about future life events: A cautionary note. *Psychological Review*, 118, 135-154.

Nov 21 Contemplating Alternatives

Gilovich, T., & Medvec, V. H. (1995). The experience of regret: What, when, and why. *Psychological Review*, 102, 379-395.

Connolly, T., & Zeelenberg, M. (2001). Regret in Decision Making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 212-216.

Ross, M., & Wilson, A. E. (2003). Autobiographical memory and conceptions of self: Getting better all the time. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, 66-69.

Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2003). Temporal construal. *Psych Review*, 110, 403-421.

Carroll, P. J., Sweeny, K., & Shepperd, J. A. (2006). Forsaking optimism. *Review of General Psychology*, 10, 56-73.

Krizan, Z., & Windschitl, P. D. (2007). The influence of outcome desirability on optimism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133, 95-121.

Nov 28 Implicit Self-esteem

Bosson, J. K., Swann, W. B., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2000). Stalking the perfect measure of implicit self-esteem: The blind men and the elephant revisited? *JPSP*, *79*, 631-643.

Jordan, C. H., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2005). Types of High Self-Esteem and Prejudice: How Implicit Self-Esteem Relates to Ethnic Discrimination Among High Explicit Self-Esteem Individuals. *PSPB*, *31*, 693-702.

Blanton, H., Jaccard, J., & Gonzales, P. M. (2006). Decoding the implicit association test: Implications for criterion prediction. *JESP*, *42*, 192-212.

Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*, 297-327.

Olson, M. A., Fazio, R. H., & Hermann, A. D. (2007). Reporting tendencies underlie discrepancies between implicit and explicit measures of self-esteem. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 287-291.

Dec 5 Selective Exposure & Information Avoidance

Smith, S. M., Fabrigar, L. R., & Norris, M. E. (2008). Reflecting on six decades of selective exposure research: Progress, challenges, and opportunities. *Social & Personality Compass*, *2*, 484-493. doi: [10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00060.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00060.x)

Fischer, P., & Greitemeyer, T. (2010). A new look at selective-exposure effects: An integrative model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *19*, 384-389.

Sweeny, K., Melnyk, D., Malone, W., & Shepperd, J. A. (2010). Information avoidance: Who, what, when & why. *Review of General Psychology*, *14*, 340-353.

Which of the Following Events Represent Self-Deception?

- _____ 1. Arlo Guthrie's father, Woody Guthrie, died from Huntington disease, which is heritable and incurable. There is a 50% chance that Arlo Guthrie also has Huntington's disease, yet he refuses to be tested.
- _____ 2. Rachel runs into her old boyfriend and they have lunch together. Later that day she accidentally addresses her current boyfriend by the old boyfriend's name.
- _____ 3. One formidable Catholic sin is premarital sex. Yet Catholic students at Holy Cross College would routinely get plastered from alcohol and then couple up for the evening. They realize that sex is a sin, but do it anyway.
- _____ 4. Janet is "unaware" that her husband is having an affair even though there are signs (he stays and work late or can't be reached during the lunch hour, he seems especially tired at nights and uninterested in sex).
- _____ 5. You forget about an important scholarship deadline and thus miss an opportunity to receive dearly needed money.
- _____ 6. A student getting a "C" in a class argues with her professor (and truly believes) that she is not a "C" student, even though she has several "Cs" in her academic career.
- _____ 7. A man wakes up in a jail cell to learn that he killed two people in a car accident. He refuses to believe it because he has no memory for the event.
- _____ 8. Shelley Taylor finds that some homosexuals testing positive for HIV believe they are less likely than homosexuals who are not infected to develop AIDs.
- _____ 9. You see an acquaintance but you blank on his name.
- _____ 10. Harold sets the time on his alarm clock 10 minutes ahead of the actual time.
- _____ 11. Carl explains that he could have been a college basketball player even though he only played junior varsity for one year in high school, is short, and uncoordinated.
- _____ 12. Nisbett and Wilson find that people show a position effect when judging the quality of panty hose. When presented 5 samples, people judge the one that is furthest on the right as the best, even though all samples are identical. People seem unaware that the position determines their judgment.
- _____ 13. According to Calvinism, it is predetermined who will and who will not go to heaven. Nothing you can do will change your fate. However, it is evident who will go to heaven -- those people who live virtuous, righteous lives, and are less subject to moral avarice. Does this belief require self-deception?
- _____ 14. Quattrone & Tversky casually tell Ss that how long a person is able to hold his/her arm in cold circulating water is associated with longevity. Some Ss are told the correlation is positive and some are told the correlation is negative. All Ss report trying to hold their arm in the water as long as they can. However, the length of time Ss hold their arm in the water is always in the direction of greater longevity.