

**National Research University  
Higher School of Economics**

School of Psychology

**Syllabus for the course “Interpersonal Behavior”**

English-taught Master’s programme “Applied Social Psychology”  
(37.04.01 Psychological Sciences)

Author:

Kotova M., PhD, [mkotova@hse.ru](mailto:mkotova@hse.ru)

Velkova K., [kvelkova@hse.ru](mailto:kvelkova@hse.ru)

Chuprikov B., [chbi@list.ru](mailto:chbi@list.ru)

Moscow 2017

*This syllabus can not be used by other units of the University and other universities without the permission of the Department-developer of the syllabus*



## I. Basic methodical principles

The course is **aimed** to introduce to students the international findings in the area of interpersonal behavior. Specific topics addressed are: social exclusion and the need to belong, conflict and cooperation, distributive and procedural justice, fairness and self-interest, negotiation, social exchange, and social influence.

**The main objectives** of the course are:

- To acquaint students with basic theories and investigations in the area of interpersonal behavior.
- To develop students’ abilities to analyze and compare different research approaches, and to identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- To develop students' abilities to present their ideas, analysis results, and to organize the scientific discussion.
- To develop students' abilities to participate in the scientific discussion.

**Methodical novelty** of the course:

- Combination of lecture sessions (which are aimed to provide theoretical and methodological basics) with discussions, analysis of video fragments, and group work (which develop students’ abilities to analyze and compare different approaches, justify their ideas, and participate in the scientific discussion) makes the course diverse and interesting for students.
- Concentrated approach to course material and studying process. Each meeting is devoted to a specific topic and includes both a lecture and a seminar session. This type of classes’ organization leads to several consequences. Foremost, students come at lecture having a background knowledge that provides in turn a base for lecture information learning. Further, there is no a time gap between lecture and seminar, that reduces time for introduction part of seminar and allows to study more in depth.
- Tasks, which increase student’s responsibility for the education process. For instance, students chose a particular topic, form a work group, read additional literature about this topic, and are responsible for discussion at seminar devoted to this topic.
- Tasks that are aimed to set a connection between course materials and students’ research projects. This gives students an opportunity to see an alternative to their research plan, compare and evaluate its strength and weaknesses.

**Course prerequisites and formed competencies:**

The course is designed for first year master students, and is based on the previously learned courses (“Social psychology”, “Advanced social psychology”, “Qualitative and quantitative methods in psychology”).

Working language of the course is English (teaching and all communications). Duration of the course is 2 modules (152 academic hours, 4 credits).

### Competencies

General competencies	Specific competencies
Student is familiar with the core theoretical and methodological backgrounds of humanitarian knowledge (partly formed competency)	Student is familiar with the core theoretical and methodological backgrounds in the area of interpersonal behavior research.
Student is familiar with the research methods of social psychology and their application in the particular research field (partly formed competency).	Student is familiar with the research methods application in the area of interpersonal behavior research.
Student is able to analyze scientific literature, argue his or her point of view, and participate in a scientific discussion (partly formed competency).	Student is able to make a theoretical overview of a particular course topic and organize a part of seminar discussion.



Student is able to use modern IT technologies for information search and analysis (partly formed competency).	Student is able to find appropriate literature in the electronic library databases of HSE.
Student is able to plan an independent research project according to international academic standards (partly formed competency).	Student is able to propose the research plan based on both the course materials and his or her master thesis research field.
Student is able to present the results of scientific work in a written and verbal form in English (partly formed competency).	Student is able to write a theoretical overview of a particular course topic in English and present this work using illustrations (e.g. Power Point slides).

## II. Course contents

### Novelty of the course:

1. Scientific. Course materials combine both basic theoretical approaches and contemporary investigations (made in last three-five years) in the field.
2. In comparison with international standards. On the one hand this course is based on analogue delivering in Tilburg University (partner of the Master’s programme), hence it meets international standards and two degrees Master’s programme demands. On the other hand course materials were modified and adjusted to “Applied social psychology” Master’s programme needs and structure. Thus the course provides international standards for domestic Master’s programme.
3. In comparison with domestic syllabuses. This course has no full analogues and has party overlapping with different courses delivering at Higher School of Economics and Lomonosov Moscow State University (“Advanced Social Psychology”, “Conflict Management”, “World’s Business Cultures and International Business Negotiations”, “Psychology of Competition”, “Psychology of Altruism”, “Social Influence”, “Psychology of Risky Behavior and Decision Making”). However none of listed courses provides a deep and concentrated analysis of interpersonal motivation and behaviors.

### Thematic plan

№	Topic	Hours in total	Auditory classes, including:			Self-Studying
			Lectures	Seminars	Practice	
1	<b>Introduction: Overview of the course</b>	1	1	-	-	-
	<b>Social exclusion and need to belong</b>					
2	Need to belong	13	2	1	-	10
3	Exclusion and ostracism	13	2	1	2	8
	<b>Conflict and cooperation</b>					
4	Interdependence	12	2	-	-	10
5	Coordination problems	12	1	-	3	8
6	Dilemmas	14	2	1	3	8
7	Moral emotions	11	-	1	2	8
	<b>Social exchange</b>					
8	Reciprocal altruism	11	1	-	-	10
9	Altruistic punishment	12	1	1	2	8
	<b>Distributive and procedural justice</b>					
10	Equity theory	12	2	-	-	10
11	Voice effect	14	2	1	3	8



<b>Negotiation, Self-interest and fairness</b>						
12	Deception	13	2	1	2	8
13	Fairness: strength in weakness	14	2	1	3	8
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>104</b>

### III. Program contents

#### Topic 1. Introduction: Overview of the course

Thematic overview of the course and research area is presented as well as auditory classes' process, homework structure, and methods of assessment are explained. Students choose topics they will be responsible for and form workgroups. Students' and teacher's expectations are discussed.

#### Core reading:

1. Horowitz, L.M., Wilson, K.R., Turan, B., Zolotsev, P., Constantino, M.J., Henderson, L. (2006). How interpersonal motives clarify the meaning of interpersonal behavior: A revised circumplex model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 67-86.

#### For further reading:

1. Hsiang, S.M., Meng, K.C., Cane, M.A. (2011). Civil conflicts are associated with the global climate. *Nature*, 476, 438-441.
2. Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S.H., Fontaine, J. (2009). Hypocrisy or maturity? Culture and context differentiation. *European Journal of Personality*, 23, 251-264.
3. Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 1161-1178. doi: 10.1037/h0077714
4. Snyder, M., Tanke, E.D., Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 656-666.
5. Wiggins, J.S., Phillips, N., Trapnell, P. (1989). Circular reasoning about interpersonal behavior: Evidence concerning some untested assumptions underlying diagnostic classification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 296-305.
6. Youngren, M.A., Lewinsohn, P.M. (1980). The functional relation between depression and problematic interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 89, 333-341.

#### Part one. Social exclusion and need to belong

##### Topic 2. Need to belong

The need to belong as a fundamental human motivation is stated and described. Different antecedents and consequences of this fundamental need are analyzed and discussed. Firstly, basics of intrinsic motivation, well-being, and Self-Determination Theory are presented. Then, assumption that people seek positive self-regard (motivation to possess, enhance, and maintain positive self-views) as far as cross-cultural generalizability of such motivation are discussed. Next and the last contemporary studies of the need to belong are presented and discussed.

#### Core reading:

1. Baumeister, R.F., Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachment as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
2. Heine, S.J., Markus, H.R., Lehman, D.R., Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review*, 106, 766-794.

#### For further reading:

1. Heerdink, M.W., van Kleef, G.A., Homan, A.C., Fischer, A.H. (2015). Emotional expressions as social signals of rejection and acceptance: Evidence from the Affect Misattribution Paradigm. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56, 60-68.



2. Lambert, N.M., Stillman, T.F., Hicks, J.A., Kamble, S., Baumeister, R.F., Fincham, F.D. (2013). To Belong Is to Matter: Sense of Belonging Enhances Meaning in Life. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 1418-1427.
3. Ryan, R.M., Decy, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>.
4. Ryan, R.M., Decy, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudemonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.

### Topic 3. Exclusion and ostracism

Conceptual background of ostracism understanding and theorizing is analyzed and discussed, namely: an evolutionary perspective of ostracism; paradigms and manipulations of ostracism, social exclusion, and rejection (ball tossing, cyberball, life alone prognosis paradigm, get acquainted techniques). Special attention is devoted to K.Williams' temporal responses to ostracism viewpoint (reflexive painful response, a reflective stage, and resignation) and empirical findings on every stage. Effects of being ostracized from a death game (Cyberball paradigm) are discussed.

#### Core reading:

1. Williams, K.D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 425-452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085641>
2. Van Beest, I., Van Dijk, E., Williams, K.D. (2011). Cyberbomb: Effects of being ostracized from a death game. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14, 581-596.

#### For further reading:

1. Goodwin, S.A., Williams K.D., Carter-Sowell A.R. (2010). The psychological sting of stigma: The costs of attributing ostracism to racism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 612-618.
2. MacDonald, G., Leary, M.R. (2005). Why does social exclusion hurt? The relationship between social and physical pain. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 202-223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.2.202>.
3. Nezelek, J.B., Wesselmann, E.D., Wheeler, L., Williams, K.D. (2012). Ostracism in everyday life. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16, 91-104.
4. Sacco, D.F., Wirth, J.H., Hugenberg, K., Chen Z., Williams, K.D. (2011). The world in black and white: Ostracism enhances the categorical perception of social information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 836-842.
5. Steele, C., Kidd, D.C., Castano E. (2015). On Social Death: Ostracism and the accessibility of death thoughts. *Death Studies*, 39, 19-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2013.844746>
6. Van Beest, I., Andeweg, R., Koning, L., Van Lange, P. A. M. (2008). Do groups exclude others more readily than individuals in coalition formation? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 11, 69-81.
7. Van Beest, I., Van Dijk, E., & Wilke, H. (2003). The excluded player in coalition formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 237-247.
8. Van Beest, I., Williams, K. D. (2006). When inclusion costs and ostracism pays, ostracism still hurts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 918-928.

## Part two. Conflict and cooperation

### Topic 4. Interdependence

The notions of interdependence, interaction, and relationships are analyzed. The main focus is on interdependence, its structure and processes. Following phenomena are discussed as a parts of interdependence structure: (1) matrices and transition lists, (2) needs, preferences, and outcomes, (3) dimensions of situation structure (level of dependence, mutuality of dependence, basis of dependence,



covariation of interests, temporal structure, information about partners and future interaction possibilities). Different stages, components, and factors of interdependence processes are described and analyzed. Specific attention is devoted to development of social value orientation (SVO). Processes underlying this development are discussed.

*Core reading:*

1. Rusbult, C.E., Van Lange, P.A.M. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 351-375.
2. Van Lange, P.A.M., Otten, W., De Bruin, E.M.N., Joireman, J.A. (1997). Development of prosocial, individualistic, and competitive orientations: Theory and preliminary evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 733-746.

*For further reading:*

1. Agnew, C.R., Van Lange, P.A.M., Rusbult, C.E., Langston, C.A. (1998). Cognitive interdependence: Commitment and the mental representation of close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 939-954. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.4.939>
2. Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. NY: Basic Books.
3. Balliet, D., Mulder, L.B., Van Lange, P.A.M. (2011). Reward, punishment, and cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137, 594-615. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023489>
4. Karremans, J.C., Van Lange, P.A.M. (2004). Back to caring after being hurt: the role of forgiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 207-227. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.192
5. Kurzban, R., Houser, D. (2005). Experiments investigating cooperative types in humans: A complement to evolutionary theory and simulations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 1803-1807. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0408759102
6. Murray, S.L., Holmes, J.G., Collins, N.L. (2006). Optimizing assurance: The risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 641-666. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.641>
7. Penner, L., Dovidio, J.E., Piliavin, J.A., Schroeder, D.A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 365-392. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141
8. Totenhagen, C.J., Curran, M.A., Serido, J., Butler, E.A. (2013). Good days, bad days: Do sacrifices improve relationship quality? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30, 881-900. doi: 10.1177/0265407512472475
9. Valor-Segura, I., Expósito, F., Moya, M., Kluwer, E. (2014). Don't leave me: the effect of dependency and emotions in relationship conflict. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44, 579-587. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12250
10. Van Lange, P.A.M. (1999). The pursuit of joint outcomes and equality in outcomes: An integrative model of social value orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 337-349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.2.337>

### **Topic 5. Coordination problems**

This topic is based on T.Schelling ideas about tacit bargaining and tacit co-ordination. Firstly, Schelling's model is analyzed, namely: (1) the notion of "tacit co-ordination", (2) tacit coordination possibility in cooperative and conflicts situations, (3) types of clues or keys for tacit coordination. Then social information as a cue for tacit coordination is discussed. A series of four empirical studies (experiments) provided by De Kwaadsteniet et al., (2011) are described and analyzed.

*Core reading:*

1. Schelling, T.C. (1957) Bargaining, communication, and limited war. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1, 19-36.
2. De Kwaadsteniet, E., Homan, A.C., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I. (2011). Social information as a



cue for tacit coordination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 15, 257-271. doi: 10.1177/1368430211410235

*For further reading:*

1. Abele, S., Stasser, G. (2008). Coordination success and interpersonal perceptions: Matching versus mismatching. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 576–592.
2. Bornstein, G., Gneezy, U., Nagel, R. (2002). The effect of intergroup competition on group coordination: an experimental study. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 41, 1-25.
3. Camerer, C.F. (2003). *Behavioral game theory: Experiments in strategic interaction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
4. De Kwaadsteniet, E.W., Van Dijk, E. (2010). Social status as a cue for tacit coordination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 515–524.
5. Mehta, J., Starmer, C., Sugden, R. (1994). The nature of salience: An experimental investigation of pure coordination games. *American Economic Review*, 84, 658–673.
6. Schelling, T.C. (1960). *The strategy of conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
7. Weber, R., Camerer, C., Rottenstreich, Y., Knez, M. (2001). The illusion of leadership: Misattribution of cause in coordination games. *Organization Science*, 12, 582-598.

### Topic 6. Dilemmas

Dilemmas is one of the key topic of the course. Firstly, different types and classifications (social traps and social fences, commons and public goods dilemmas, Prisoner's dilemma, chicken dilemma, assurance dilemma) of dilemmas are presented and analyzed. Then theoretical approaches (Interdependence theory, Appropriateness framework, and evolutionary theory) are discussed. Special attention is devoted to developments structural, psychological, and dynamic interaction recent influences in dilemmas research. And lastly empirical study about tacit coordination possibility in social dilemmas is presented and thoroughly discussed.

*Core reading:*

1. Van Dijk, E., De Kwaadsteniet, E., De Cremer, D. (2009). Tacit coordination in social dilemmas: the importance of having a common understanding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 665-678. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012976>
2. Van Lange, P.A.M., Joireman, J., Parks, C.D., Van Dijk, E. (2013). The psychology of social dilemmas: A review. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 120, 125-141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.11.003>

*For further reading:*

1. Balliet, D., Li, N., Joireman, J. (2011). Relating trait self-control and forgiveness within prosocials and proselfs: Compensatory vs. synergistic models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 1090–1105.
2. Balliet, D., Mulder, L.B., Van Lange, P.A.M. (2011). Reward, punishment, and cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137, 594–615.
3. Balliet, D., Parks, C.D., Joireman J. (2009). Social value orientation and cooperation in social dilemmas: A meta-analysis. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 12, 533–547.
4. Campbell, W.K., Bush, C.P., Brunell, A.B. (2005). Understanding the social costs of narcissism: The case of the tragedy of the commons. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1358–1368.
5. De Cremer, D., Van Lange, P. A. M. (2001). Why prosocials exhibit greater cooperation than proselfs: The role of social responsibility and reciprocity. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 5–18.



6. Griskevicius, V., Tybur, J. M., Van den Bergh, B. (2010). Going green to be seen: Status, reputation, and conspicuous conservation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 392–404.
7. Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162, 1243–1248.
8. Joireman, J., Van Lange, P. A. M., Van Vugt, M. (2004). Who cares about the environmental impact of cars? Those with an eye toward the future. *Environment and Behavior*, 36, 187–206.
9. Kollock, P. (1998). Social dilemmas: Anatomy of cooperation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 183-214.
10. Weber, J.M., Kopelman, S., Messick, D.M. (2004). A conceptual review of decision making in social dilemmas. Applying the logic of appropriateness. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 281-307.

### Topic 7. Moral emotions

Firstly, emotions' specificity in the decision making process is discussed. Special attention is devoted to difference between affects and emotions. Then feeling-is-for-doing approach is analyzed. And the last part is devoted to negative consequences of guilt experience for the third part. Three pilot studies and four experiments are analyzed and discussed.

#### Core reading:

1. De Hooge, I.E., Nelissen, R.M.A., Breugelmans, S., Zeelenberg, M. (2011). What is moral about guilt? Acting prosocially at the disadvantage of others. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 100, 462-473.
2. Zeelenberg, M., Nelissen, R.M.A., Breugelmans, S.M., Pieters, R. (2008). On emotion specificity in decision making: why feeling is for doing. *Judgement and Decision making*, 3, 18-27.

#### For further reading:

1. Baumeister, R.F., Stillwell, A.M., Heatherton, T.F. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 243-267.
2. Baumeister, R.F., Vohs, K.D., De Wall, C.N., Zhang, L.Q. (2007). How emotion shapes behavior: Feedback, anticipation, and reflection, rather than direct causation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11, 167–203.
3. Brookman, F. (2015). Killer decisions: The role of cognition, affect and "expertise" in homicide. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 20, 42-52.
4. De Hooge, I.E., Breugelmans, S., & Zeelenberg, M. (2008). Not so ugly after all: When shame acts as a commitment device. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 95, 933-943.
5. Greene, J.D., Cushman, F.A., Stewart, L.E., Lowenberg, K., Nystrom, L.E., Cohen, J.D. (2009). Pushing moral buttons: The interaction between personal force and intention in moral judgment. *Cognition*, 111, 364-371. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2009.02.001
6. Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108, 814-834. doi: 10.1037//0033-295X. 108.4.814
7. McCullough, M.E., Kilpatrick, S.D., Emmons, R.A., Larson, D.B. (2001). Is gratitude a moral affect? *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 249-266. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.127.2.249
8. Sheikh, S., Janoff-Bulman, R. (2010). The "shoulds" and "should nots" of moral emotions: A self-regulatory perspective on shame and guilt. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 213-224. doi:10.1177/0146167209356788
9. Zeelenberg, M., Pieters, R. (2007). A theory of regret regulation 1.0. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 17, 3–18. doi: 10.1207/s15327663jcp1701\_3
10. Zeelenberg, M. (1996). Consequences of regret aversion: Effects of Expected feedback on risky decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 65, 148-158.



### **Part three. Social exchange**

#### **Topic 8. Reciprocal altruism**

This topic focuses on two issues. Firstly, the evolution of reciprocal altruism from simple symbioses through animal behavior to human conduct is discussed. R.Trivers' model of reciprocal altruism is described as a basis for evolutionary point of view. Secondly, the evolution of cooperation is discussed. Following R.Axelrod's and W.Hamilton's ideas cooperation is considered as a strategies of Prisoner's Dilemma solving. Especial attention is devoted to robustness, stability, and initial viability of such strategies.

#### *Core reading:*

1. Axelrod, R., Hamilton, W.D. (1981). The evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 211, 1390–1396.
2. Trivers, R.L. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 46, 35–57.

#### *For further reading:*

1. Bereczkei, T., Birkas, B., Kerekes, Z. (2010). Altruism toward strangers in need: costly signaling in an industrial society. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 95-103.
2. Brosnan, S.F., de Waal, F.B.M. (2002). A proximate perspective on reciprocal altruism. *Human Nature*, 13, 129-152.
3. Gintis, H., Bowles, S., Boyd, R., Fehr, E. (2003). Explaining altruistic behavior in humans. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 153-172.
4. Mifune, N., Hashimoto, H., Yamagishi, T. (2010). Altruism toward in-group members as a reputation mechanism. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 109-117.
5. Stewart-Williams, S. (2007). Altruism among kin vs. nonkin: Effects of cost of help and reciprocal exchange. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 193-198.

#### **Topic 9. Altruistic punishment**

The problem of human cooperation as an evolutionary puzzle is discussed. The notion of "altruistic punishment" as an explanation of human cooperation is depicted and analyzed. Main focus is devoted to different factors influencing on altruistic punishment increasing or decreasing: (1) emotional condition of partners, (2) social norm of distributive justice, (3) empathy level, etc.

#### *Core reading:*

1. Fehr, E. & Gächter, S. (2002). Altruistic punishment in humans. *Nature*, 415, 137–140.
2. Fehr, E. & Fishbacher, U. (2004). Third-party punishment and social norms. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 25, 63-87.
3. Leliveld, M.C., Van Beest, I., Van Dijk, E. (2012). Punishing and compensating others at your own expense: The role of empathic concern on restoring distributive justice. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 135-140.
4. Nelissen, R.M.A. (2008). The price you pay: cost-dependent reputation effects of altruistic punishment. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 242-248. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2008.01.001

#### *For further reading:*

1. Lotz, S., Baumert, A., Schlösser, T., Gresser, F., Fetchenhauer, D. (2011). Individual differences in third-party interventions: How justice sensitivity shapes altruistic punishment. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 4, 297-313.
2. Marlowe, F.W., Berbesque, J.C. (2008). More "altruistic" punishment in larger societies. *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, 275, 587-590.
3. Nelissen, R.M.A., Zeelenberg, M. (2009). Moral emotions as determinants of third-party punishment: Anger, guilt and the functions of altruistic sanctions. *Judgment and Decision*



*Making*, 4, 543-553.

4. Okimoto, T.G., Wenzel, M. (2011). Third-party punishment and symbolic intragroup status. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 709-718.
5. Shinada, M., Yamagishi, T., Ohmura, Y. (2004). False friends are worse than bitter enemies: "Altruistic" punishment of in-group members. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 25, 379-393. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.08.001
6. Strobel, A., Zimmermann, J., Schmitz, A., Reuter, M., Lis, S., Windmann, S., Kirsch, P. (2011). Beyond revenge: Neural and genetic bases of altruistic punishment. *NeuroImage*, 54, 671-680. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.07.051
7. Will, G.-J., Crone, E.A., Van den Bos, W., Grolu, B. (2013). Acting on observed social exclusion: Developmental perspectives on punishment of excluders and compensation of victims. *Developmental Psychology*, 49, 2236-2244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032299>

#### **Part four. Distributive and procedural justice**

##### **Topic 10. Equity theory**

J.Adams' ideas about inequality in social exchange are presented and discussed. The notions of "relative deprivation", "distributive justice", "inequality" and its' antecedents and consequences are depicted and thoroughly examined. New directions in equity research are presented and discussed.

##### *Core reading:*

1. Adams, J.S. (1965) Inequality in Social Exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Psychology* (pp. 267-299). NY: Academic Press.
2. Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 137-149.

##### *For further reading:*

1. Cappelen, A.W., Eichele, T., Hugdahl, K., Specht, K., Sorensen, E.O., Tungodden, B. (2014). Equity theory and fair inequality: A neuroeconomic study. *PNAS*, 111, 15368-15372
2. Cozzolino, P.J. (2011). Trust, cooperation, and equality: A psychological analysis of the formation of social capital. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 302-320.
- 3.
4. Gray, K., Wegner, D.M. (2009). Moral typecasting: Divergent perceptions of moral agents and moral patients. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 505-520.
5. Karagonlar, G., Kuhlman, D.M. (2013). The role of Social Value Orientation in response to an unfair offer in the Ultimatum Game. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 120, 228-239.
6. Kennedy-Lightsey, C.D. (2010). Recognizing contributions: Face-support and face-threat influences students' emotional and communicative responses. *Communication Research Reports*, 27, 20-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08824090903526588>
7. Laurin, K., Fitzsimons, G.M., Kay, A.C. (2011). Social disadvantage and the Self-regulatory function of justice beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 149-171.
8. Miron, A.M., Warner, R.H., Branscombe, N.R. (2011). Accounting for group differences in appraisals of social inequality: Differential injustice standards. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 342-353.
9. Walster, E., Berscheid, E., Walster, G. W. (1973). New Directions in Equity Research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 151-176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0033967>

##### **Topic 11. Voice effect**

##### *Core reading:*

1. Van den Bos, K., Poortvliet, P. M., Maas, M., Miedema, J., & Van den Ham, E.-J. (2005). An



enquiry concerning the principles of cultural norms and values: The impact of uncertainty and mortality salience on reactions to violations and bolstering of cultural worldviews. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 91-113.

2. Van Prooijen, J. W., Karremans, J. & Van Beest, I. (2006). Procedural justice and the hedonic principle: How approach versus avoidance motivation influences the psychology of voice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 686-697.

*For further reading:*

1. Brebels, L., De Cremer, D., Sedikides, C. (2008). Retaliation as a response to procedural unfairness: A Self-regulatory approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1511-1525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012821>
2. Gray, K., Wegner, D.M. (2009). Moral typecasting: Divergent perceptions of moral agents and moral patients. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 505-520.
3. Hogg, M.A., Kruglanski, A., Van den Bos, K. (2013). Uncertainty and the roots of extremism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69, 407-418.
4. Laurin, K., Fitzsimons, G.M., Kay, A.C. (2011). Social disadvantage and the Self-regulatory function of justice beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 149-171.
5. Martin L.L., Van den Bos K. (2014) Beyond terror: Towards a paradigm shift in the study of threat and culture. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25, 32-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2014.923144>
6. Miron, A.M., Warner, R.H., Branscombe, N.R. (2011). Accounting for group differences in appraisals of social inequality: Differential injustice standards. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 342-353.
7. Van den Bos, K. (2005). What is responsible for the fair process effect? In J. Greenberg & J.A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice: Fundamental questions about fairness in the workplace* (pp. 273-300). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
8. Van den Bos, K., Ham, J., Lind, A.E., Simonis, M., Van Essen W.J., Rijpkema, M. (2008). Justice and the human alarm system: The impact of exclamation points and flashing lights on the justice judgment process. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 201-219.

## **Part five. Negotiation, Self-interest and fairness**

### **Topic 12. Deception**

Firstly, the phenomenon of deception in interpersonal relationships and different theoretical and research approaches to deception are described. Main focus of the topic is devoted to instrumental account of deception and reaction to deceit in bargaining. Then different empirical findings are discussed: (1) power and deception in bargaining, (2) suspicion-based rejections of high offers, (3) limited capacity to lie, (4) time limitations for honesty acts.

*Core reading:*

1. Koning, L., Steinel, W., Van Beest, I., Van Dijk, E. (2011). Power and deception in bargaining: An instrumental account of deception. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 35-42.
2. Van 't Veer, A.E., Stel, M., van Beest, I. (2014). Limited capacity to lie: Cognitive load interferes with being dishonest. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 9, 199-206.
3. Shalvi, S., Eldar, O., Bereby-Meyer, Y. (2012). Honesty requires time (and lack of justifications). *Psychological Science*, 23, 1264-1270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797612443835>.

*For further reading:*

1. Debey, E., Verschuere, B., Crombez, G. (2012). Lying and executive control: An experimental



- investigation using ego depletion and goal neglect. *Acta Psychologica*, 140, 133–141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2012.03.004>.
- Gino, F., Ariely, D. (2012). The dark side of creativity: Original thinkers can be more dishonest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 445-459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026406>.
  - Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108, 814-834. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0033-295X.108.4.814>
  - Koning, L., Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I., Steinel, W. (2010). An instrumental account of deception and reaction to deceit in bargaining. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 57-73.
  - Mazar, N., Amir, O., Ariely, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45, 633-644. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.45.6.633>.
  - Mead, N. L., Baumeister, R. F., Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., & Ariely, D. (2009). Too tired to tell the truth: Self-control resource depletion and dishonesty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 594–597. [http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.02.004](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.02.004).
  - Shalvi, S., Dana, J., Handgraaf, M. J. J., De Dreu, C. K. W. (2011). Justified ethicality: Observing desired counterfactuals modifies ethical perceptions and behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 181-190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.02.001>.
  - Steinel, W., De Dreu, C. K. W. (2004). Social motives and strategic misrepresentation in social decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 419-434.
  - Steinel, W., Van Beest, I., Van Dijk, E., (2014). Too good to be true: Suspicion-based rejections of high offers. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 17, 682-698, doi: 10.1177/1368430213507323
  - Zhong, C.-B. (2011). The ethical dangers of deliberative decision making. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56, 1-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2011.56.1.001>.

### Topic 13. Fairness: strength in weakness

#### Core reading:

- Van Dijk, E., Van Beest, I. (2007). Self-interest and fairness in coalition formation: A social utility approach to understanding partner selection and payoff allocations in groups. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18, 132-174.
- Van Beest, I., Steinel, W., Murnighan, J. K. (2011). Honesty pays: on the benefits of having and disclosing information in coalition bargaining. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 738-747.

#### For further reading:

- Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J.L., Thaler, R.H. (1986). Fairness and the Assumptions of Economics. *Journal of Business*, 59, S285-S300. doi: 10.1086/296367
- Mazar, N., Amir, O., Ariely, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45, 633-644. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.45.6.633>.
- Shalvi, S., Dana, J., Handgraaf, M. J. J., De Dreu, C. K. W. (2011). Justified ethicality: Observing desired counterfactuals modifies ethical perceptions and behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 181-190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.02.001>.
- Van Beest, I., Andeweg, R., Koning, L., Van Lange, P. A. M. (2008). Do groups exclude others



more readily than individuals in coalition formation? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 11, 69-81.

5. Van Beest, I., Van Dijk, E., De Dreu, C. K. W. & Wilke, H. A. M. (2005). Do-no-harm in coalition formation: Why losses inhibit exclusion and promote fairness cognitions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 609-617.
6. Van Beest, I., Van Dijk, E., & Wilke, H. (2004). Resources and alternatives in coalition formation: the effects on payoff, self-serving behavior, and bargaining length. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 713-728.
7. Van Beest, I., Van Kleef, G., & Van Dijk, E. (2008). Get Angry, Get Out: The Interpersonal Effects of Anger Communication in Multiparty Negotiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(4), 993-1002.

## Examples of test questions, home tasks

### (1) Examples of test questions from seminar quiz

IB, Q\_6, Reciprocal altruism

Name \_\_\_\_\_

1. What does "altruism" mean? List the main features of altruistic behavior:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. According to Triver's model there are three basic conditions that affect the possibility of reciprocal altruistic behavior. Check the correct answers:

- A. dispersal rate
- B. the proportion of altruists and non-altruists in a population
- C. kin selection
- D. degree of mutual dependence
- E. length of lifetime
- F. type of interspecies relationship

3. What strategy of interaction is robust, stable, and initial viable (in other words, is evolutionary stable) if the interactions between the individuals have a sufficiently large probability of continuing? Name this strategy, please:

\_\_\_\_\_



## (2) Structure for home tasks

See Appendix A.

## (3) Questions for final exam test

Questions for final exam test can't be posted in open access syllabus file. Nevertheless the final test is comprised of the same type of questions as in the seminar quizzes, and covers the material taught and discussed in class..

## IV. Methods of assessment

Form of the assessment	Criteria
<i>Homework (2)</i>	
1) Homework №1. Article analysis. Students should analyze 1 scientific paper with the results of empirical research chosen from the further reading. Students make the presentation during the class and then provide a post-hoc analysis of the presentation process. For detailed assignment for HW 1 see Appendix A.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Student used all the necessary standards for the evaluation of academic paper.</li><li>2. Student understands those standards, and can see the strengths and weaknesses of the paper.</li><li>3. Student is able to differentiate and recognize a good quality from poor quality research.</li><li>4. Student is able to analyse the quality of performed presentation.</li></ol>
2) Homework №2. Students' own proposal of an empirical study that is based on course materials (one of the studied articles). Performed in small teams of 3 or 4 people. Students write and present a proposal with a theoretical overview, formulated research question, aims and hypotheses and proposed methodology and study design.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Quality of the theoretical overview.</li><li>2. Adequacy of hypotheses. Connection of hypotheses with the theoretical overview.</li><li>3. Appropriateness of research methods chosen to test the hypotheses.</li><li>4. Usage of both course materials and student's research topic details.</li><li>5. Quality of the presented proposal and written report.</li></ol>
<i>Final examination</i>	
Test 60 min, 45-55 questions.	Test grades are transformed into 10-point scale and are included into the formula for the final grade.



### Formula for the final grade

The final grade consists of several parts:

- Final exam (exam) – 20%
- Accumulated mark (during the course process) – 80%, which includes:
  - Homeworks (hw) – 50%
  - Quizzes (q) – 25%
  - Class participation (class) – 25%

Formula for the final grade:

$$O_{\text{final grade}} = 0.2 * O_{\text{exam}} + 0.8 * (0.6 O_{\text{hw}} + 0.2 O_{\text{q}} + 0.2 O_{\text{class}})$$



## **Appendix A**

### Methodical recommendations for students

#### **Homework (1) – Article analysis (presentation and post hoc analysis)**

**Deadline** – presentation day + 3 days (example: if you present on Jan 24, deadline for homework is Jan 27, 23:59). You should send to the course instructor an e-mail with two attachments: presentation and post hoc analysis.

**Homework description.** Homework consists of two parts. The **first part** is your presentation at class as a result of article analysis. Presentation plan:

- short introduction (what problem the article is devoted to?);
- key notions and statements of the theoretical overview;
- hypotheses (and/or RQs), methods, and procedure of the empirical study/studies;
- results and conclusions;
- your critical comments, doubts, or compliments;
- tasks, open-ended questions for audience, and discussion topics are highly appreciated.

**Second part** is your post hoc analysis of your presentation’s success/quality. This should be a short written document (0.5-1 page is enough), which contains your reasoning on:

- What were the strengths of your presentation;
- What should be done in a different way and why.

#### **Individual or group work**

Both options are possible. When group work is chosen (or more than one student has chosen a particular topic):

- The number of articles you analyze should be equal to the number of members in the group, thus fair contribution and difficulty are implemented;
- You can work as entire group and present united analysis or work separately;
- Every student must present something so that a teacher has an opportunity to assess his or her work/contribution.

**Please, note:** before analyzing any article, check if it is not chosen by another student. Then add your name in the online table and specify your choice, so other students would be aware.



## Appendix B

### Homework (2) – Research project

Deadline – May 1st (Presentation + short written report)

**Homework description.** This homework is a result of creating your own research proposal that is based on course materials (one of the studied articles). The homework is carried out in small teams of 3 or 4 people.

#### Homework plan:

##### *1. Choosing a topic.*

After you form a group, you can choose any topic you like based on both core reading papers and materials for individual presentations. It should be a topic that lets you construct a new study based on the study described in the article. It can be an enhanced study or a new design that challenges the findings in the article.

##### *2. Proposal.*

You will have 2 to 3 weeks to prepare a study proposal for your topic (as a presentation). Proposal should include:

- short description of the original study and additional theory you based on;
- your problem statement and your study goal;
- your own ideas of this study modification and sufficient rationale for this modification (or sufficient rationale for the critique arguments if you want to conduct a challenging study);
- your hypothesis(es) that are based on theoretical background;
- method section (participants, design, measures, proposed analysis method).

##### *3. Final report.*

The report is a full continuation of your project proposal (8-10 pages). It should include:

- Introduction: consists of several paragraphs about the initial study you based on and the main changes you have made and why. Limitations of the initial study should be analyzed. The goal and hypotheses of your own study should be clearly reported here. Hypotheses have to be based on theoretical background that is described after.
- Background is aimed to introduce theoretical basics of the study. Key ideas from every side, course material and your research topic are clearly described. Concise but complete evidence is provided for the hypotheses.
- Method section should include information about participants, study design, measures, and results (take the initial study as an example for presenting this section).
- Discussion and conclusion section should include your anticipated study results, tied in with your hypotheses; and discussion of how the proposed study enhances the knowledge of the initial study that you based it on. Try to think about the limitations of the proposed study.



The final mark is the combination of the written work and presentation (0.8\*proposal + 0.2\*presentation).

*Please, note:*

- be aware of timing and deadlines, we have no opportunity to change them. Keep in mind that theoretical research takes the most time.
- be aware of study feasibility: how many participants will you need? what statistics should you know? etc.
- do not suffer alone: ask help any time you need, there will be consultations organized.
- do not add words in order to make your proposals or report as long as possible. The length itself is not valued, the goal is to write a thoughtful and sufficient proposal that can actually be carried out in reality.

Timetable for the homework:

No	Step	Time interval / Date*	Description
1	Teams formation	till April 1	Form a team with 3 or 4 classmates
2	Choosing a topic	till April 1	Choose a topic based on course materials
3	Making a presentation	till April 14	Presenting the preliminary version of the proposal, sending the presentation for later review
6	Consultation	April 20	Ask any questions you have
7	Written proposal	May 1	Handing in the final written version of the proposal and the latest version of the presentation

\* *Note:* precise dates will be available before the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> module. Dates in the timetable are approximate.