

Psych 412

Current Topics in Social Psychology: Thinking, Feeling, and Deciding in Everyday Life

Fall 2018 – Mon & Wed, 2-4pm

Norbert Schwarz

norbert.schwarz@usc.edu

Draft – details will change.

The final syllabus lives on Blackboard.

Things to know about this class

What is this class about?

How do we make sense of the world around us? How do we imagine the future and remember the past? How does that impact our preferences and daily decisions? What do we enjoy and regret? And why are we often wrong in what we think we'd enjoy or regret? Why do we often fail to learn from experience? How do we think about well-being, consumption, money, politics, and relationships? What is the role of feelings in all of this? Psychologists address such issues by bringing basic research into the interplay of thinking and feeling to bear on judgment and decision making in everyday life. This class reviews some of the key lessons learned.

We will explore these issues in a mix of overview lectures, in-depth analyses of select original studies, and discussions of their implications. The overview lectures present exemplary findings and highlight the underlying principles. The discussions elaborate on the implications of the research, address how this knowledge was developed and tested, how compelling the evidence is, and what kind of research could improve on this knowledge and extend its applications.

Learning Objectives

The learning objectives are to

- (1) develop an understanding of principles of social cognition
- (2) and the interplay of feeling and thinking;
- (3) learn to recognize the operation of the underlying processes in everyday life
- (4) and consider the implications for our own decision making;
- (5) learn to analyze competing theoretical accounts and their implications;
- (6) consider ways to distinguish these accounts empirically;
- (7) learn to evaluate how well the methods chosen for a given study test a theoretical account; and
- (8) learn how to design theoretically informative studies.

Format

The class meets twice a week. Each topic will be covered in several meetings, one that mostly consists of an overview lecture and one or two that mostly consist of a discussion of readings and student presentations. Each week, *all* students read one to three core readings. In addition, some students prepare short presentations

on one additional reading of their choice (from a list) and present the key points during the discussion. Expect to make 4 presentations over the course of the semester. The bulk of the readings will be original research articles. All will be available on Blackboard.

Prerequisites

PSYC 274 (statistics) and PSYC 314 (research methods).

Grading

Over the course of the semester, there will be 4 short quizzes, covering key issues of preceding classes. Each quiz will take 15 to 20 minutes. I drop your weakest quiz and the remaining three make up 45% of your grade. In addition, students will make 4 short presentations that summarize key points from one reading. I drop your weakest presentation and the remaining 3 presentations make up 45% of the grade. Discussion participation counts 10%. There is no final exam.

Instructor

My own research falls into the areas we cover in this class. You can find information about what my students and I do at my USC [homepage](#) and on [Google Scholar](#). Most of my papers are available on [ResearchGate](#), an open access paper archive.

Questions to consider for each reading

These questions can guide your thinking about the empirical readings. They are the kind of questions you should always have in mind when you read research reports. As you'll notice over the course of the semester, there is no "perfect" study -- there's always some room for improvement and once the findings are in, everybody is smarter in hindsight.

Introduction: Theory & predictions

- What problem was studied, and why?
 - How does this study relate to, and go beyond, past investigations of the problem?
- How did the researchers derive their hypotheses?
 - What are the theoretical assumptions they make?
 - Can they support these assumptions with earlier research?
 - Which predictions follow from them?
 - How well do these predictions follow?
 - Are there additional assumptions they have to make to get from here to there?
- Would you have arrived at different predictions?
 - If so, why? Explain your logic

Methods

- How do the authors test their predictions?
 - Is the study correlational or experimental (= based on random assignment)?
 - What are the independent and dependent variables?
 - Which independent variables are *manipulated*? How?
 - Which independent variables are *measured*? How?
 - How is the dependent variable assessed?
- Are the methods used adequate for testing the theoretical predictions?
- Is there something you would have done differently?
 - If so, why?

Results

- Is there a “manipulation check”?
 - Does it indicate that the manipulation “worked”?
- What are the major findings?
- Do these findings support or challenge or falsify the authors’ predictions?
 - Support = the results are consistent with predictions
 - Challenge = the results are not quite what was expected although by and large they seem to support the bulk of the theorizing
 - Falsify = this is clearly not what was predicted and it is hard to see how the findings could be compatible with the theory

So what?

- What conclusions can be drawn from the study?
 - What are the key theoretical implications of the findings?
 - If what you read is right, what else would follow?
 - Does it challenge other things we think we know?
- Do the authors revise their theorizing in light of their results?
 - How?
- What are some of the applied implications of these findings?
 - What could one do with these insights?
 - How would you test if that works?

What’s next?

- What would be a useful next step in this research program?
 - Important conceptual issues?
 - Conceptual clarifications?
 - Contradictions with other bodies of research?
 - Improvements on the experiment?
 - Better manipulations?
 - Naturalistic study?
 - New domain of application?
 - They’re wrong!
 - How would you show that?
 - What would support your alternative explanation?
 - Any other exciting stuff coming to mind?

Implications for everyday life

- How does this bear on human behavior in the wild?
 - Are there phenomena it can illuminate?
 - Are there phenomena that are incompatible with the researchers’ rationale?
 - Can the conceptual rationale help us in solving some real problem?
- What would you like lay people to know about this?
 - Which aspects should they know about?
 - Why?
 - How would you convey that information to them?

USC regulations

Please note that these regulations are frequently updated. The ones that apply are always the current ones, even if this preliminary syllabus cites last semester's version.

Statement for Students with Disabilities

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Website and contact information for DSP: http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html, (213) 740-0776 (Phone), (213) 740-6948 (TDD only), (213) 740-8216 (FAX) ability@usc.edu.

Statement on Academic Integrity

USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one's own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another's work as one's own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. *SCampus*, the Student Guidebook, (www.usc.edu/scampus or <http://scampus.usc.edu>) contains the University Student Conduct Code (see University Governance, Section 11.00), while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A.

Emergency Preparedness/Course Continuity in a Crisis

In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies.

Syllabus Changes

The syllabus and course schedule may change as we move along, mostly in response to your interests and in response to new topics that may come up in discussion. The official syllabus is the document on Blackboard. I will announce changes in class and via email sent by Blackboard.

Topics & readings

08/20, Mon Lecture: Introduction & overview

The introductory lecture provides an overview of the core themes by asking, somewhat tongue-in-cheek: *Suppose you wanted to think yourself happy, how would you do that?* How would you use what we know about human judgment and decision making to enhance your subjective well-being? In the following weeks, we will address these basic judgment processes and their implications in more detail.

There is no required reading for this first class. However, I recommend that you look at the 2004 chapter below, which elaborates on material of this first lecture.

Reading

Schwarz, N., & Strack, F. (2004). How to think (and not to think) about your life: Some lessons from social judgment research. In S. Neiman (ed.), *Zum Glück* (pp. 163-182). Berlin, Germany: Akademie Verlag.

This overview chapter addresses many aspects of the first lecture. It was published in German and Blackboard has the English manuscript version.

08/22, Wed Discussion: Reading & presenting empirical journal articles

This class requires you to read original experimental research articles. The Jordan & Zanna piece provides some advice on what to look out for. We will use the first discussion meeting to go over basic questions of how to read an empirical journal article, how to summarize key aspects of its methods and findings; how to spot problems; and how to present the research in class. This will also be your first opportunity to select presentation topics.

Reading

Jordan, C.H., & Zanna, M.P. (2008). How to read a journal article in social psychology. In R. Fazio & R. Petty (eds.), *Attitudes* (pp. 461-469). New York: Psychology Press

08/27, Mon Lecture: Constructing reality and its alternatives

Social reality is inherently ambiguous and the same events can be seen in many different ways. Is a friend who believes that she will excel at everything she does admirably confident or disgustingly conceited? Does a great vacation brighten your whole year or does it make your everyday life look dull and unbearable? Does a scandal ridden politician undermine your trust in politicians in general or does he make his peers look all the more trustworthy by comparison? It depends on how you think about it and this lecture looks at the mental construal processes involved in such judgments.

08/29, Wed Discussion & presentations: Constructing reality and its alternatives

We discuss select experiments and their implications in more depth.

Reading

Tbd

Presentations

Higgins, E. T., Rholes, W. S., & Jones, C. R. (1977). Category accessibility and impression formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 13*(2), 141-154.

Chopik, W. J., O'Brien, E., Konrath, S. H., & Schwarz, N. (2015). MLK Day and racial attitudes: Liking the group more but its members less. *Political Psychology, 36*(5), 559-567.

Schwarz, N., & Bless, H. (1992). Scandals and the public's trust in politicians: Assimilation and contrast effects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*(5), 574-579.

Xu, A. J., & Wyer Jr, R. S. (2008). The comparative mind-set: From animal comparisons to increased purchase intentions. *Psychological Science, 19*(9), 859-864.

09/03, Mon Labor Day. No class!

09/05, Wed Group project: Do people have insight into their biases?

Reading

Pronin, E. (2007). Perception and misperception of bias in human judgment. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 11*(1), 37-43.

Detailed assignment on Blackboard

09/10, Mon Discussion & presentations: Naïve realism: I see the world correctly -- and you are wrong!

People have limited insight into the factors that shape their thoughts. They usually assume that their impressions are accurate and that others who disagree are simply wrong. This week we examine this “naïve realism” and its many manifestations.

Reading for all

Ross, L. & Ward, A. (1996). Naïve realism in everyday life: Implications for social conflict and misunderstanding. In E. S. Reed, E. Turiel, & T. Brown (eds.), *Values and knowledge*. New York: Psychology Press.

Presentations

What we learned from last week's group project.

Vallone, R. P., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. R. (1985). The hostile media phenomenon: biased perception and perceptions of media bias in coverage of the Beirut massacre. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(3), 577-585.

09/12, Wed Lecture: Predicting future outcomes: Will this be good for me?

Many important decisions involve predictions about the hedonic nature of future states – would this be good or bad for me? Would your life get worse if you moved from sunny California to icy Boston? Would a better paying job in Boston compensate you for that change in climate? Would driving a BMW be more fun than driving a Ford Escort? Would you be forever miserable if you lost a leg? Despite strong and compelling intuitions, we often get it wrong. We look at how we make such hedonic forecasts and why they frequently lead us astray. Next week we extend the discussion by asking why we often learn surprisingly little from the prediction errors we make.

Reading

Kahneman, D., & Snell, J. (1992). Predicting a changing taste: Do people know what they will like? *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 5(3), 187-200.

Recommended

March, J. G. (1978). Bounded rationality, ambiguity, and the engineering of choice. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 587-608.

09/17, Mon Discussion & presentations: Will this be good for me?

Reading

Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2005). Affective forecasting: Knowing what to want. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(3), 131-134.

Gilbert, D. T., & Wilson, T. D. (2007). Propection: Experiencing the future. *Science*, 317(5843), 1351-1354.

Presentations

Dunn, E.W., Wilson, T.D., & Gilbert, D.T. (2003). Location, location, location: The misprediction of satisfaction in housing lotteries. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1421–1432.

Lacey, H. P., Smith, D. M., & Ubel, P. A. (2006). Hope I die before I get old: Mispredicting happiness across the adult lifespan. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7(2), 167-182.

Lucas, R. E. (2007). Adaptation and the set-point model of subjective well-being: Does happiness change after major life events?. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(2), 75-79.

Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2006). Would you be happier if you were richer? A focusing illusion. *science*, 312(5782), 1908-1910.

Schkade, D. A., & Kahneman, D. (1998). Does living in California make people happy? A focusing illusion in judgments of life satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 9(5), 340-346.

Quiz 1 - At the beginning of discussion, we'll spend 20 minutes on the first quiz. It will pose a few questions about topics covered in the preceding weeks (8/20 to 9/10). There will be no odd surprises. All questions will be similar to questions we address during our discussions. E.g., you may be asked to apply a concept to a phenomenon described in the question; to spell out differences between two theoretical constructs; or to predict the outcome of an experiment described in the question. There will be 4 quizzes and I will drop your

weakest one from grading.

09/19, Wed Lecture: Reconstructing our past

What were you like when you were 16? What were your opinions and preferences? What happened that year? Our autobiographical memory is often foggy and we reconstruct what our past must have been like by applying general beliefs and inference rules to the bits and pieces we seem to remember. This is particularly true when we're thinking about past feelings. We review these processes of reconstructive memory and their role in judgment and pay particular attention to how they impair learning from our past experience.

09/24, Mon Discussion & presentations: Reconstructing our past

Reading

Ross, M. (1989). Relation of implicit theories to the construction of personal histories. *Psychological review*, 96(2), 341.

Presentations

Tbd

09/26, Wed Discussion & presentations: How we fail to learn from experience

Reading

Schwarz, N., & Xu, J. (2011). Why don't we learn from poor choices? The consistency of expectation, choice, and memory clouds the lessons of experience. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 21(2), 142-145.

Presentations

Kahneman, D., Fredrickson, B. L., Schreiber, C. A., & Redelmeier, D. A. (1993). When more pain is preferred to less: Adding a better end. *Psychological Science*, 4(6), 401-405.

Redelmeier, D. A., & Kahneman, D. (1996). Patients' memories of painful medical treatments: Real-time and retrospective evaluations of two minimally invasive procedures. *Pain*, 66(1), 3-8.

Wirtz, D., Kruger, J., Scollon, C. N., & Diener, E. (2003). What to do on spring break? The role of predicted, on-line, and remembered experience in future choice. *Psychological Science*, 14, 520-524.

Mantonakis, A., Schwarz, N., Wudarszewski, A., & Yoon, C. (2017). Malleability of taste perception: biasing effects of rating scale format on taste recognition, product evaluation, and willingness to pay. *Marketing Letters*, 28(2), 293-303.

10/01, Mon Discussion & presentations: What if? Looking back with regret

Although we have all experienced regret, our assumptions about what we would or would not regret are often wrong. When looking ahead, we are concerned about how much we might regret things we do (acts of commission), but when looking back we are more likely to regret all the things we did not do (acts of omission). This way our prospective acts of regret avoidance become future sources of regret – if only we

had.... In many cases, our regrets have more to do with our fantasies about how things could have been otherwise, than with the actual outcomes we obtained. We review basic insights into counterfactual thinking and regret.

Reading

Tbd

Presentations

Tbd

10/03, Wed Lecture: Thinking about money

Money figures prominently in people's plans for their future. We address three broad themes. First, typical pitfalls of everyday financial decisions and the underlying mental processes. This section will introduce you to prospect theory and some of its implications. Second, the (weak and complicated) relationship between money and happiness. Finally, Vohs and colleagues (2008) look at other effects of thinking about money, including its adverse social consequences.

10/08, Mon Discussion & presentations: Money mistakes

Readings

Tbd

Presentations

10/10, Wed Discussion & presentations: The good and the bad of money

Dunn, Gilbert, & Wilson (2011) review when money does or does not contribute to well-being. They assume that if your money doesn't make you happy, you're probably not spending it right and offer research-based advice on what you should do with your bucks. Read and obey (or see if they're wrong).

Readings

Dunn, E. W., Gilbert, D. T., & Wilson, T. D. (2011). If money doesn't make you happy, then you probably aren't spending it right. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 21(2), 115-125.

Vohs, K. D., Mead, N. L., & Goode, M. R. (2008). Merely activating the concept of money changes personal and interpersonal behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(3), 208-212.

Presentations

Dunn, E. W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Spending money on others promotes happiness. *Science*, 319(5870), 1687-1688.

Galak, J., Givi, J., & Williams, E. F. (2016). Why certain gifts are great to give but not to get: A framework for understanding errors in gift giving. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(6), 380-385.

Gilovich, T., Kumar, A., & Jampol, L. (2015). A wonderful life: Experiential consumption and the pursuit of happiness. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(1), 152-165.

Carter, T. J., & Gilovich, T. (2014). Getting the most for the money: The hedonic return on experiential and material purchases. In *Consumption and well-being in the material world* (pp. 49-62). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.

Vohs, K. D., Mead, N. L., & Goode, M. R. (2006). The psychological consequences of money. *Science*, 314(5802), 1154-1156.

10/15, Mon Lecture: When thoughts flow smoothly: Metacognitive experience and judgments of beauty, truth, and risk

So far, focused on what comes to mind and how we use that information. However, thinking is accompanied by subjective experiences, like our emotional reactions to what we think about or the metacognitive experience that thoughts are easy or difficult to bring to mind. We begin with the familiar experience that thinking can feel easy or difficult and look at how this influences a wide range of judgments, including what we find familiar, risky, trustworthy, pretty, and true.

Reading

Song, H., & Schwarz, N. (2010). If it's easy to read, it's easy to do, pretty, good, and true. *The Psychologist*, 23, 108-111.

10/17, Wed Discussion & presentations: Fluency and truth

Reading

Schwarz, N., Newman, E., & Leach, W. (2016). Making the truth stick & the myths fade: Lessons from cognitive psychology. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, 2(1), 85-95.

Presentations

Greifeneder, R., Alt, A., Bottenberg, K., Seele, T., Zelt, S., & Wagener, D. (2010). On writing legibly: Processing fluency systematically biases evaluations of handwritten material. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1(3), 230-237.

Lev-Ari, S., & Keysar, B. (2010). Why don't we believe non-native speakers? The influence of accent on credibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1093-1096.

Newman, E. J., Garry, M., Bernstein, D. M., Kantner, J., & Lindsay, D. S. (2012). Nonprobative photographs (or words) inflate truthiness. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 19(5), 969-974.

Newman, E. J., Sanson, M., Miller, E. K., Quigley-McBride, A., Foster, J. L., Bernstein, D. M., & Garry, M. (2014). People with easier to pronounce names promote truthiness of claims. *PLoS One*, 9(2), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0088671

Quiz 2 - At the beginning of discussion, we'll spend 20 minutes on the second quiz. It will pose a few questions about topics covered in the preceding weeks (9/17 to 10/15).

10/22, Mon Discussion & presentations: Fluency and beauty

Readings

Tbd

Presentations

Tbd

10/24, Wed Lecture: How do I feel about this? Learning from moods and emotions

We often simplify the judgment process by consulting our feelings, essentially asking ourselves “How do I feel about this?” When doing so, we may misread our pre-existing moods as being a response to what we are thinking about and end up seeing everything as more positive when we are in a happy rather than sad mood. Moreover, our moods influence *how* we think about things – by and large, we think more systematically and logically when we are in a mildly sad mood, but are more creative and playful when in a good mood. This lecture addresses the role of moods and emotions in judgment and reasoning.

10/29, Mon Discussion & presentations: Moods and emotions

Reading

Tbd

Presentations

tbd

Lee, S. W., Schwarz, N., Taubman, D., & Hou, M. (2010). Sneezing in times of a flu pandemic: Public sneezing increases perception of unrelated risks and shifts preferences for federal spending. *Psychological Science*, 21(3), 375-377.

10/31, Wed Lecture: Election special: Thinking about politics

On Nov 6 we will have mid-term elections. This lecture will cover diverse aspects of political behavior: Who votes and who doesn't? What influences whether we trust a candidate? Why do male and female politicians present themselves differently? How does the location of the ballot box influence voting? Does it make a difference if you see a school or a church when you cast your vote? What's the story about "red" and "blue" states? In what do they differ and why? Etc.

11/05, Mon Discussion & presentations: Politics

Instead of readings – a TED talk & podcast

Hidden Brain (NPR) podcast on George Lakoff's analysis of how we think about politics in terms of family and parenting metaphors, shedding light on the moral orientations of conservatives and liberals.

<https://www.npr.org/2016/09/13/493615864/when-it-comes-to-our-politics-family-matters>

Jonathan Haidt – TED talk on the moral principles of liberals and conservatives.

<https://youtu.be/vs41JrnGaxc>

Presentations

Tbd

11/07, Wed Lecture: Grounding cognition in the senses: How bodily experiences shape our thoughts

We interact with the world through our body and experience it through our senses. A rapidly growing area of research highlights close links between our thoughts and our bodily movements and experiences. Many of these relationships are reflected in metaphors. E.g., holding a cup of warm coffee rather than ice coffee makes you feel “warmer” about the person you are talking with, looking “up” to someone increases perceived authority, and talking badly leaves you with a “dirty mouth” that triggers an interest in mouthwash. Beyond such cute findings, this work breaks new ground in understanding the interplay of body and mind.

For this topic, we have one overview lecture and several discussion sessions that focus on different aspects.

Reading

Tbd

11/12, Mon Discussion & presentations: “Clean minds” -- physical cleansing and psychological separation

All religions have cleaning rituals that are assumed to clean more than the body, essentially allowing believers to remove their sins. Experimental research shows that moral violations induce a sense of “dirtiness” that elicits a desire to clean, complete with a willingness to pay more for cleaning products. More important, washing one’s hands can relieve guilt and reduce the impact of one’s past misdeeds on current behavior. Going beyond a “clean conscience”, other traces of the past – from doubts about one’s decisions to the influence of previous good or bad luck—can be washed away as well. We explore the underlying processes and daily implications.

Reading

Lobel, T. (2014). *Sensation*. New York: Simon & Schuster. – Chapter 9. “Out, damned spot. Guilt, morality, and cleaning”.

Presentations

Zhong, C. B., & Liljenquist, K. (2006). Washing away your sins: Threatened morality and physical cleansing. *Science*, 313(5792), 1451-1452.

Kaspar, K. (2013). Washing one’s hands after failure enhances optimism but hampers future performance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4(1), 69-73.

Lee, S. W., & Schwarz, N. (2010). Dirty hands and dirty mouths: Embodiment of the moral-purity metaphor is specific to the motor modality involved in moral transgression. *Psychological science*, 21(10), 1423-1425.

Lee, S. W., & Schwarz, N. (2010). Washing away postdecisional dissonance. *Science*, 328(5979), 709-709.

Ritter, R. S., & Preston, J. L. (2011). Gross gods and icky atheism: Disgust responses to rejected religious beliefs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(6), 1225-1230.

Quiz 3 - At the beginning of discussion, we'll spend 20 minutes on the third quiz. It will pose a few questions about topics covered in the preceding weeks (10/17 to 11/07).

11/14, Wed Discussion & presentations: The substitutability of physical and social warmth

Reading

Bargh, J. A., & Shalev, I. (2012). *The substitutability of physical and social warmth in daily life. Emotion, 12*(1), 154-162.

Presentations

Williams, L. E., & Bargh, J. A. (2008). Experiencing physical warmth promotes interpersonal warmth. *Science, 322*(5901), 606-607.

Zhong, C. B., & Leonardelli, G. J. (2008). Cold and lonely: Does social exclusion literally feel cold? *Psychological Science, 19*(9), 838-842.

Hong, J., & Sun, Y. (2011). Warm it up with love: The effect of physical coldness on liking of romance movies. *Journal of Consumer Research, 39*(2), 293-306.

11/19 Mon Open topic

At this point of the semester, our discussions will have identified additional topics of interest. This place holder will allow us to add topics or to spend more time on some earlier topic. Most likely, we will use this open slot earlier, as we move along, resulting in date changes for some of the topics above. Blackboard can easily handle this. Remember that the Blackboard syllabus is the official document of record. This draft is only for early planning.

11/21 Wed Thanksgiving break

11/26, Mon Discussion: So what?

We covered a lot of ground this semester and it is time to bring it together. In preparation for this discussion, please consider the following questions and be prepared to talk about them:

- What do you consider the major insights in this area of research?
- What do you consider the major gaps?
- Which aspects would need more attention?
- What should the agenda for the next 5 years look like?

Quiz 4 - At the beginning of discussion, we'll spend 20 minutes on the last quiz. It will pose a few questions about topics covered in the preceding weeks (11/07 to 11/21).

11/28, Wed Lecture: The big picture: Human cognition is situated, experiential, embodied, and pragmatic

We wrap up the semester with an integrative lecture that reviews what we learned and outlines the big picture of how we make it through the day with the body and mind we have.

There is no final exam
