***Syllabus from Fall 2015. This Fall should be quite similar***

**Psychology 612: Through the Mind’s eye: Perceiving Other People**

**Stephen J. Read,** **read@usc.edu****, X-02291**

**Monday 2-6PM, GFS112**

How do we understand ***what*** other people are doing and ***why*** they are doing it? How do we ***form impressions*** of what kind of people they are? This is a central question that we all wonder about and it has long been a central question in social psychology. This class will address this question from a number of different perspectives, drawing on everything from the classic literature on person perception, to work on stereotyping, to current work on the neuroscience of face perception, to perception of biological motion and Agency, Theory of Mind, and computational modeling of social perception.

The psychology and social neuroscience literatures have addressed these questions from a number of different perspectives. Most work has focused on the cognitive processes involved in social perception, and increasingly there is work that examines the neural processes involved in social perception. However, a growing body of work focuses less on the processes involved in the head of the social perceiver, and much more on the information that is directly available in the face and in physical movement. We will examine all these different aspects and perspectives on person perception.

A major goal of the class is to try to arrive at an integrated approach to person perception that ties all these threads together. Thus, as we go through the various weeks and topics one question that will always be at the forefront of our discussion is how that week’s topics and findings could contribute to the development of an integrated model of social perception and what would/should such a model look like.

In this class we will explicitly examine four components of person perception

* What is the nature of the stimulus?
	+ Facial features: race, gender, age, etc.
	+ Facial expressions: emotions, etc.
	+ Biological motion, action
	+ Nonverbal behaviors
	+ Language and meaning
	+ Prosody (rhythm, tone, variability)
	+ Situational context
* What are the mental representations that are used? As we move from perception to social inference there is a hierarchy of increasingly abstract features/concepts. What are the different kinds of features and concepts that are central to social perception?
* What are the processing steps? What should a process model of person perception look like?
* What are we trying to figure out?
	+ Race, gender, age
	+ Social categories: Roles, occupations, etc.
	+ Emotions
	+ *What* are people doing? What is the identity of the action?
	+ *Why* are people doing it? Goals, intentions, motives.
	+ Beliefs
	+ Traits.

**Topics covered (among others):**

Representation of social knowledge

Classic models of person perception.

History of Person perception

Modern models of person perception

Computational models of person perception

Face perception

Ecological approach (what is the information in the face that allows us to perceive race, age, humanness, emotions, sexual orientation, attractiveness, etc.)

Emotions in the face

Neuroscience of face perception

Event perception, biological motion.

First impressions

Trait inferences

Stereotyping

Theory of Mind, understanding of goals and intentions.

**Nature of Class:** Class will be run as a seminar and the focus will be on discussion of the readings and questions for the week. One thread during the discussion is how we could build a model of person perception from the pieces that we will be reading.

**Reaction Papers:** Given how important a lively discussion is in this seminar, short reaction papers will be due each class (1 page, double-spaced, 1” margin, 12 point font). These are due 8pm the day before class. The goal is for these reaction papers to engage with the central issues from the main readings. For example, you might challenge researchers’ interpretation of the findings, you might pose a question, compare/contrast two sets of authors, among other options. You have a great deal of latitude—be creative—except for a basic summarization of the readings. Reaction papers should be emailed to me by 8pm the day before class. Your two lowest reaction paper grades will be dropped.

Students should be prepared to read their reaction papers aloud to the class, as a way to ensure that their ideas are shared and contribute to the class discussion. I will also integrate the issues raised in reaction papers into our class discussions. Reaction papers are always required.

**Class participation**. Classes will consist primarily of discussions of the readings, and the success of the course depends on everyone’s full engagement. Students should come to class prepared to discuss each of the articles, with a list of the most intriguing puzzles or issues raised in the readings, and comments about the major strengths and/or weakness of particular experiments or theoretical perspectives.

**Final paper:** The final paper will either present several proposed experiments or a theoretical model of some aspect of person perception. It should be roughly 15 double-spaced pages, plus references and title page. The paper will be due during Final exam period.

**Evaluation:** Students will be evaluated on the basis of their participation in class, their reaction papers and on their final class paper.

***Week 1: 8/24***

*Heider and Simmel film*

Illustrative video of social interaction and person perception.

Ask people what goes into the social perception process, both in terms of stimuli and in terms of cognitive representations.

***Week 2: 8/31***

**History and Classic Models**

Uleman, J. S., & Kressel, L. M. (2013). A Brief History of Theory and Research on Impression Formation. *Oxford Handbook of Social Cognition*, 53–73.

Asch, S. E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *41*, 258-290.

Heider, F. (1958).  *The psychology of interpersonal relations.*  New York: Wiley. Chapter 2: Perceiving the other person

**General overviews of person perception.**

Uleman, J. S., & Saribay, S. A. (2012). Initial impressions of others. *Oxford Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*, 337–366.

Macrae, C. N., & Quadflieg, S. (2010). Perceiving people. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 1). 5th Edition.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

***Week 3: 9/7, Labor Day, No Class***

**Mental Representations**

Smith, E. R., & Queller, S. (2001). Memory representations. In A. Tesser & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook in social psychology, Vol. I: Intraindividual processes* (pp. 111-133). Oxford: Basil Blackwell. [pdf]

Wittenbrink, B., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (1998). The role of stereotypic knowledge in the construal of person models. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler and C. A. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior.* (pp. 177-202). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. [pdf]

***Week 4: 9/14:* Information in the face that is used in person perception**

Alex Todorov’s social perception demonstrations: <http://tlab.princeton.edu/demonstrations/>

Alex Todorov’s face databases: <http://tlab.princeton.edu/databases/>

Zebrowitz, L. A. (2011). Ecological and social approaches to face perception. In A. Calder, J. V. Haxby, M. Johnson, & G. Rhodes (Eds.), *Handbook of Face Perception* (pp. 15-30)*.* Oxford University Press.

Zebrowitz, Leslie A, Bronstad, M.P., & Montepare, J.M.. "An ecological theory of face perception." *The Science of Social Vision.* Ed. N. Ambady, R. Adams, K. Nakayama, & S.Shimojo. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 3-30.

Langlois, J. H., & Roggman, L. A. (1990). Attractive faces are only average. *Psychological Science, 1*, 115-121.

Rhodes, G., Sumich, A., & Byatt, G. (1999). Are Average Facial Configurations Attractive Only Because of Their Symmetry?*Psychological Science, 10,* 52-58.

Apicella, C. L., Little, A. C., & Marlowe, F. W. (2007). Averageness and attractiveness in an isolated population of hunter-gatherers. *Perception, 36*, 1813-1820

Winkielman, P., Halberstadt, J., Fazendeiro, T., & Catty, S. (2006). Prototypes Are Attractive Because They Are Easy on the Mind. *Psychological Science, 17,* 799-806.

***Week 5: 9/21:* Perceiving Faces**

Sacks, O. (August 30, 2010). A neurologist’s notebook: Face-blind. *The New Yorker*, 36-43.

Ellis, H. D., & Florence, M. (1990). Bodamer’s (1947) paper on prosopagnosia. *Cognitive Neuropsychology, 7*, 81-105. [OPTIONAL]

Kanwisher, N., McDermott, J., & Chun, M. M. (1997). The fusiform face area: A module in human extrastriate cortex specialized for face perception. *Journal of Neuroscience, 17*, 4302-­‐‑11.

Sagiv, N. & Bentin, S. (2001). Structural encoding of human and schematic faces: Holistic and part-based processes. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 13*, 937-951. [OPTIONAL]

O’Toole, A. J. (2011). Cognitive and computational approaches to face recognition. In A. Calder, J. V. Haxby, M. Johnson, & G. Rhodes (Eds.), *Handbook of Face Perception* (pp. 15-30)*.* Oxford University Press.

Todorov, A. (2012). The Social Perception of Faces. In S. T. Fiske & C. N. Macrae (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Social Cognition*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kurt, H., & Wilson, J. P. (2013). Faces are central to social cognition. In D. Carlston (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Social Cognition*. Oxford University Press.

***Week 6: 9/28:* Perceiving Race and Gender**

Freeman, J.B., Pauker, K., Apfelbaum, E.P., & Ambady, N. (2010). [Continuous dynamics in the real-time perception of race](http://psych.nyu.edu/freemanlab/pubs/Freeman_JESP.pdf). *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 179-185.

Ito, T.A., & Bartholow, B.D. (2009). The neural correlates of race. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 13,* 524-531.

Derks, B., Stedehouder, J., & Ito, T. A. (2015). Social identity modifies face perception: An ERP study of social categorization. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 10,* 672-679.

Cunningham, W. A., Johnson, M. K., Raye, C. L., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). Separable neural components in the processing of Black and White Faces. *Psychological Science,* *15*, 806-813.

Cloutier, J., Freeman, J. B., & Ambady, N. (2014). [Investigating the early stages of person perception: The asymmetry of social categorization by sex vs. age](http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi/10.1371/journal.pone.0084677). *PLoS ONE*, *9*, e84677.

Freeman, J.B., Ma, Y., Barth, M., Young, S.G., Han, S., & Ambady, N. (2015). [The neural basis of contextual influences on social categorization](http://psych.nyu.edu/freemanlab/pubs/2013_Freeman_CC.pdf). *Cerebral Cortex, 25*, 415-422.

**Additional Readings**

Van Bavel, J. J., Packer, D. J., & Cunningham, W. A. (2011). Modulation of the Fusiform Face Area following minimal exposure to motivationally relevant faces: Evidence of in-group enhancement (not out-group disregard). *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 23,* 3343-3354.

Cunningham, W. A., Van Bavel, J. J., Arbuckle, N. L., Packer, D. J., & Waggoner, A. S. (2012). Rapid social perception is flexible: Approach and avoidance motivational states shape P100 responses to other-race faces. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6, 140.

Ratner, K. G., & Amodio, D. M. (2013). Seeing “us vs. them": Minimal group effects on the neural encoding of faces. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49, 298-301.*

***Week 7: 10/5:* Emotion perception.**

Adolphs, R. (2002). Recognizing emotion from facial expressions: Psychological and neurological mechanisms. *Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience Reviews, 1*, 21–61.

Atkinson, A. P. and Adolphs, R. (2011). The neuropsychology of face perception: beyond simple dissociations and functional selectivity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 366 (1571). pp. 1726-1738. ISSN 0962-8436.

Kawasaki, H., Tsuchiya, N., Kovach, C. K., Nourski, K. V., Oya, H., Howard, M. A., & Adolphs, R. (2012). Processing of Facial Emotion in the Human Fusiform Gyrus, *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience 24:6*, 1358–1370.

Gendron, M., Mesquita, B., & Feldman Barrett, L. (2013). Emotion perception: Putting the face in context. In D. Reisberg (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Psychology.* Oxford University Press.

***Week 8: 10/12:* Perception of Events and Biological Motion**

Heider and Simmel Film

Zacks, J. M., Speer, N. K., Swallow, K. M., Braver, T. S., & Reynolds, J. R. (2007). [Event perception: A mind/brain perspective](https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/dcl/zackspsychbull07.pdf). *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*, 273-293.

Kurby, C. A. & Zacks, J. M. (2008). [Segmentation in the perception and memory of events](https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/dcl/kurbytics08.pdf). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *12*, 72-79.

Radvansky, G.A. & Zacks, J. M. (2011). [Event perception.](https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/dcl/radvansky_wires_10.pdf) *WIREs Cognitive Science*, *2(*6*)*, 608-620.

Blake, R. & Shiffrar, M. (2007) Perception of human motion. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 47-73.

<http://www.psy.vanderbilt.edu/faculty/blake/BM/BioMot.html>

[***http://www.biomotionlab.ca/Demos/BMLwalker.html***](http://www.biomotionlab.ca/Demos/BMLwalker.html)

[***http://www.biomotionlab.ca/?page\_id=11***](http://www.biomotionlab.ca/?page_id=11)

***Week 9: 10/19:* Stereotyping and Person Perception**

Fiske, S. T., & Bearns Tablante, C. (2014). Stereotyping: Processes and content. In E. Borgida & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*,Volume 1: *Attitudes and Social Cognition.* Washington, DC: APA.

Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Milne, A. B. (1995). The dissection of selection in person perception: Inhibitory processes in social stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 397-407.

Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science, 17*, 383-386.

Kunda, Z., & Spencer, S. J. (2003). When do stereotypes come to mind and when do they color judgment? A goal-based theoretical framework for stereotype activation and application. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 522-544.

***Week 10: 10/26:* First Impressions and Spontaneous inferences**

Uleman, J. S., Adil Saribay, S., & Gonzalez, C. M. (2008). Spontaneous inferences, implicit impressions, and implicit theories. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, *59*, 329–360.

Uleman, J. S., Hon, A., Roman, R. J., & Moskowitz, G. B. (1996). On-line evidence for spontaneous trait inferences at encoding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*(4), 377–394.

Schneid, E. D., Carlston, D. E., & Skowronski, J. J. (2015). Spontaneous evaluative inferences and their relationships to spontaneous trait inferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108(5),* 681-696.

Kressel, L. M., & Uleman, J. S. (2010). Personality traits function as causal concepts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(1), 213–216.

Kressel, L. M., & Uleman, J. S. (2015). The causality implicit in traits. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *57*, 51–54.

Yang, Y., Read, S. J., Denson, T. F., Xu, Y., Zhang, J., & Pedersen, W. C. (2014). The key ingredients of personality traits: Situations, behaviors, and explanations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40(1),* 79-91.

Read, S. J., Jones, D. K., & Miller, L. C. (1990). Traits as goal-based categories: The importance of goals in the coherence of dispositional categories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* *58*, 1048-1061. [pdf]

Read, S. J., & Miller, L. C. (2005). Explanatory coherence and goal-based knowledge structures in making dispositional inferences. In B. Malle & S. Hodges. *Other Minds.*  New York: Guilford Press. [pdf]

***Week 11: 11/2:* Speed and consequences of first impressions.**

Freeman, J. B. & Stolier, R. M. (2014). [The medial prefrontal cortex in constructing personality models](http://psych.nyu.edu/freemanlab/pubs/2014_Freeman%26Stolier_TICS.pdf). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *18*, 571-572.

Willis, J., & Todorov, A. (2006). First impressions: Making up your mind after 100 ms exposure to a face. *Psychological Science, 17*, 592-598.

Rule, N.O., & Ambady, N. (2008). Brief exposures: Male sexual orientation is accurately perceived at 50 ms. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44,* 1100-1105.

Verosky, S. C., & Todorov, A. (2010). Generalization of affective learning about faces to perceptually similar faces. *Psychological Science, 21*, 779-785.

Ballew, C.C. & Todorov, A. (2007). Predicting political elections from rapid and unreflective face judgments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA, 104,* 17948-17953.

Flowe, H. D. & Humphries, J. E. (2011). An examination of criminal face bias in a random sample of police lineups. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 25*, 265-273.

Lenz, G. S, & Lawson, C. (2011). Looking the part: Television leads less informed citizens to vote based on candidates’ appearance. *American Journal of Political Science, 55*, 574–589.

***Week 12: 11/9:* Theory of Mind, perception of goal-based behavior.**

Apperly, I. (2011). The cognitive basis of mindreading: A “two-systems” account. Chapter 6 from I. Apperly. *Mindreaders: The cognitive basis of “Theory of Mind”.* New York: Psychology Press.

Csibra, G., & Gergely, G. (2007). ‘Obsessed with goal’: Functions and mechanisms of teleological interpretation of actions in humans. *Acta Psychologica, 124,* 60-78.

Schaafsma, Sara M. and Pfaff, Donald W. and Spunt, Robert P. and Adolphs, Ralph (2015) Deconstructing and reconstructing theory of mind. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 19 (2),* 65-72. ISSN 1364-6613.

Epley, N., & Waytz, A. (2010). Mind perception. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 1). 5th Edition.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

***Week 13: 11/16:* Models of person perception**

Asch, S. E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *41*, 258-290.

Heider, F. (1958).  *The psychology of interpersonal relations.*  New York: Wiley. Chapter 2: Perceiving the other person

Fiske, S. T. (in press). The Continuum Model and the Stereotype Content Model. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, and E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

 Make sure that we compare with Kunda and Thagard

Read, S. J. (1987). Constructing causal scenarios: A knowledge structure approach to causal reasoning. *Journal of Personality and* *Social Psychology*, *52*, 288-302. [pdf]

Krull, D. S. (1993). Does the grist change the mill? The effect of the perceiver’s inferential goal on the process of social inference. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*(3), 340–348.

Krull, D. S., & Erickson, D. J. (1995). Judging situations: On the effortful process of taking dispositional information into account. *Social Cognition*, *13*(4), 417–438.

Cunningham, W. A., & Zelazo, P. D. (2007). Attitudes and evaluations: a social cognitive neuroscience perspective. *TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences*, *11(3)*, 97-104.[pdf]

***Week 14: 11/23:* Computational models of person perception I**

Read, S. J., & Miller, L. C. (1993). Rapist or "regular guy": Explanatory coherence in the construction of mental models of others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 526-540.

Read, S. J., & Miller, L. C. (1998). On the dynamic construction of meaning: An interactive activation and competition model of social perception. In S. J. Read & L. C. Miller (Eds.) *Connectionist models of social reasoning and behavior*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kunda, Z., & Thagard, P. (1996). Forming Impressions from Stereotypes, Traits and Behaviors: A parallel constraint satisfaction theory. *Psychological Review*, *103*, 284-308. [pdf]

Contrast with Fiske and Neuberg

***Week 15: 11/30:* Computational models of person perception II**

Ehret, P. J., Monroe, B. M., & Read, S. J. (2015). Modeling the dynamics of evaluation: A multilevel neural network implementation of the iterative reprocessing model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 19(2),* 148-176.

Freeman, J.B. & Ambady, N. (2011). [A dynamic interactive theory of person construal](http://psych.nyu.edu/freemanlab/pubs/FreemanPsychReview.pdf). *Psychological Review*, *118*, 247-279.

Freeman, J.B. & Ambady, N. (2014). [The dynamic interactive model of person construal: Coordinating sensory and social processes](http://psych.nyu.edu/freemanlab/pubs/2013_DualProcess.pdf). In J. Sherman, B. Gawronski, & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual Process Theories of the Social Mind*. New York: Guilford Press.

Orghian, D., Garcia-Marques, L., Uleman, J. S., & Heinke, D. (2015). A Connectionist Model of Spontaneous Trait Inference and Spontaneous Trait Transference: Do They Have the Same Underlying Processes? *Social Cognition*, *33*(1), 20–66.

Zebrowitz, Leslie A., Kikuchi, M., & Fellous, J.M.. (2007) "Are Effects of Emotion Expression on Trait Impressions Mediated by Babyfaceness? Evidence from Connectionist Modeling." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 33.* 648-662.

Zebrowitz,Leslie A., Fellous, J.M., Mignault, A., & Andreoletti, C.. (2003) "Trait Impressions as Overgeneralized Responses to Adaptively Significant Facial Qualities: Evidence from Connectionist Modeling." *Personality and Social Psychology Review 7.* 194-215.

Study Days: 12/5-12/8

Finals: 12/9-12/16

**Final Project Due: 12/11/2015**