

Syllabus for the course “Interpersonal Behavior”

Approved

MP Academic Council

Protocol №01 01/09/2017

Authors	Kotova M., PhD Chuprikov B. Velkova K.
Credits	4
Contact hours	48
Self-study hours	104
Year	1 st year
Format of study	No online course elements

I. COURSE GOALS, RESULTS AND PREREQUISITES

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 and social exchange.

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.

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 accordance with international standards. On the one hand this course is based on a similar course taught at Tilburg University (double degree partner of the Master's programme), hence it meets international standards and the demands of a double degree Master's programme. 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 the domestic Master's programme.
3. This course has no full analogues and is only partly overlapping with different courses taught 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.

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

scientific discussions) makes the course diverse and engaging 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 class organization gives several advantages. Foremost, students come to the class having a background knowledge that, in turn, provides the basis for information learning at the lecture. Further, there is no time gap between a lecture and a seminar, which reduces time for introduction part of seminar and allows studying more in-depth.
- Tasks which increase student's responsibility during the education process. For instance, students choose a particular topic, form a work group, read additional literature about this topic, and are responsible for discussions at the seminars 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” (optional, adaptive), “Theory and methodology of 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 with 48 auditory classes, 4 credits).

Universal (system-level) competencies	
SLC-1	Student is able to reflect (evaluate and process) taught scientific methods and ways of professional activity.
SLC-3	Student is able to independently study new research methods and changing the scientific and professional area of his activity.
SLC-6	Student is able to analyze, verify, evaluate the completeness of information during his professional activity and, if needed, add and synthesize required information.
SLC-7	Student is able to organize multi-directed communication and manage it.
General professional competencies	
GPC-1	Student is able to organize independent professional activity based on legal, professional and ethics norms, skills and responsibilities.
GPC-2	Student is able to communicate in verbal and written form in the framework of professional activity.
GPC-3	Student is able to organize and present the results of his activity with the use of modern digital instruments.
GPC-4	Student is able to find and process appropriate information and databases with the use of modern digital instruments.
GPC-5	Student is able to use specific research-based concepts, models, methods and instruments to solve complex tasks.
Professional competencies	
SPC-1	Student is able to use the modern methodology of psychological research and to come up with problems, hypotheses, aims and goals for a research.
SPC-2	Student is able to develop a programme, to plan and carry out a psychological research, to use science-based methods of evaluating the practices and other research and applied programmes.
SPC-3	Student is able to develop and choose suitable, reliable and valid methods of evaluation to solve scientific and applied problems.
SPC-5	Student is able to apply science-based approaches to collect data and make diagnostic decisions.
SPC-6	Student is able to directly formulate and give feedback on the results of a study and diagnostics.

SPC-12	Student is able to articulate and present complex research information for various types of audiences.
--------	--

II. COURSE CONTENTS

№	Topic
0	Introduction: Overview of the course
	Social exclusion and need to belong
1	Need to belong
2	Exclusion and ostracism
	Conflict and cooperation
3	Interdependence
4	Coordination problems
5	Dilemmas
6	Moral emotions
	Social exchange
7	Reciprocal altruism
8	Altruistic punishment
	Distributive and procedural justice
9	Equity theory
10	Voice effect
	Negotiation, Self-interest and fairness
11	Deception
12	Fairness: strength in weakness

III. GRADING

The course does not have blocking grades.

The final grade consists of several parts:

- Final exam (exam) – 20%
- Accumulated mark (over duration of the course) – 80%, which includes:
 - Homework 1 (Ohw1) – 20%
 - Homework 2 (Ohw2) – 30%
 - Mini-tests (Omt) – 10%
 - Class participation (not just presence) (Oclass) – 40%

Formula for the final grade:

$$O_{\text{final grade}} = 0.2 * O_{\text{exam}} + 0.8 * (0.2 * O_{\text{hw1}} + 0.3 * O_{\text{hw2}} + 0.1 * O_{\text{mt}} + 0.4 * O_{\text{class}})$$

Form of the assessment	Criteria
1) Homework №1.	
Article analysis. Students should analyze and review 1 scientific paper with the results of an empirical research chosen from the course's further reading. Students make a presentation (individually or in groups of 2-3) during the class and then provide a post-hoc analysis of the presentation process.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student used all the necessary standards for the evaluation of academic paper. 2. Student understands those standards, and can see the strengths and weaknesses of the paper. 3. Student is able to differentiate and recognize a good quality from poor quality research.

For details on HW1 see Appendix A.	4. Student is able to analyse the quality of performed presentation. 5. Student is able to process article findings, make conclusions and pose questions to the findings.
2) Homework №2.	
Students' own empirical study that is based on course materials (one of the studied articles). Performed in small teams of 5 or 6 people. Students present a research proposal, including a corresponding methodology, which allows obtaining meaningful results, and writing a study report. For details on HW2 see Appendix B.	1. Quality of the theoretical overview. 2. Adequacy of hypotheses. Connection of hypotheses with the theoretical overview. 3. Appropriateness of research methods chosen to test the hypotheses. 4. Usage of both course materials and outside scientific sources. 5. Quality of the presented proposal and conclusions. 6. Quality of the final presentation and written report.
Final examination	
Test 60 min, 45-55 questions.	Test grades are transformed into 10-point scale and are included into the formula for the final grade.

IV. EXAMPLES OF FORMS OF ASSESSMENT

(1) Examples of test questions from seminar mini-test

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) Examples of homework assignments

See Appendices A and B.

(3) Questions for final exam test

Questions for final exam test can't be posted in open access syllabus file. Their format is similar to the questions of the mini-tests.

V. RESOURCES

All course literature can be found through HSE Electronic resources

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.

For further reading:

1. 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
2. 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>.
3. 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.

4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

Software

№	Name	Access conditions
1.	Microsoft Windows 7 Professional RUS Microsoft Windows 10 Microsoft Windows 8.1 Professional RUS	<i>From the local network of HSE (agreement)</i>
2.	Microsoft Office Professional Plus 2010	<i>From the local network of HSE (agreement)</i>

Professional data base, informational referral systems, internet sources (electronic educational resources)

№	Name	Access conditions
Professional data base, informational referral systems		
1.	Electronic resources of HSE	<i>From the local network of HSE (agreement)</i> URL: https://library.hse.ru/e-resources
Internet sources (electronic educational resources)		
1.	Open education	URL: https://openedu.ru/

1. Material and technical support of the discipline

Classrooms for lectures on the discipline enable the use and demonstration of thematic illustrations that correspond with the program disciplines and includes:

- Desktops with Internet access (operating system, office software, antivirus software);
- Multimedia projector with the remote control.

Classrooms for practical classes of the discipline “Interpersonal behavior” have the Internet access to the electronic informational and educational environment of the HSE.

APPENDIX A
Homework (1) – Article analysis (presentation and post hoc analysis)

Deadline – presentation day + 3 days (example: if you present on Jan 24, deadline for sending the files is Jan 27, 23:59). You should send two files via email: presentation (.ppt(x) file) and post hoc analysis (.doc(x) file).

Homework description. Homework consists of two parts. The **first part** is your presentation at class as a result of article analysis of no more than **15 minutes**.

Presentation plan:

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

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

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

The presentation weighs 0.8 of the grade, while post hoc analysis weighs 0.2 of the grade.

Individual or group work

Both options are possible. Every student must present something so that there is an opportunity to assess his or her work/contribution.

Please, note: before analyzing any article, check in the on-line table if it is not chosen by another student/group. Then add your name in the table and specify your choice, so other students are aware.

Appendix B

Homework (2) – Research project

Deadline – June 14 (Presentation + short written report)

Homework description. This homework is a result of your own empirical study that is based on course materials (one of the studied articles). The homework is carried out in small teams of 4 to 6 people.

1. *Choosing a topic.*

After you form a group, you can choose any topic you like based on both core and further reading. 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. *Preliminary proposal.*

You will have around 6 weeks to prepare a preliminary 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 (optional)

3. *Final proposal.*

In **late April** the groups present their proposals in class with following discussion among the groups (each presentation no more than 15 minutes).

By **May 20th** the groups have to send their fully finished project proposal (6-8 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. The problem statement should be clearly defined. The goal and hypotheses of your own study should be clearly reported here as well. Hypotheses have to be based on theoretical background that is described after. The final paragraph should include your study's relevance.
- Background is aimed to introduce theoretical basics of the study. Key ideas from every side, course material and your research topic are clearly described. **Complete evidence is provided for the hypotheses!** Theoretical background and hypotheses are not repeating the original study – it has to be your own research piece.
- Method section should include information about required number of participants (and short sample description), study design and procedure, instruments (with justification for every one; if it's your own instrument, describe the pre-test), and anticipated results.
- Conclusion section should include the significance of your project, tied in with your hypotheses. Try to think about the limitations of the study that you carried out.

The final mark is the combination of the written work and presentation (0.6*proposal + 0.4*presentation).

Each person's contribution to the project should be indicated

Please, note:

- **be aware of timing and deadlines**, there is no opportunity to change them.
- be aware of study feasibility: how many participants will you need? what statistics should you know? etc. The project in its final form should be a ready-to-go research project.
- do not suffer alone: ask help any time you need; there will be consultations as well.
- do not add words in order to make your proposals or report as longer as possible. The length itself is not valued. Try to write a thoughtful and sufficient paper!

Timetable for the homework:

#	Step	Time interval / Date*	Description
1	Teams formation	til February 28	Form a team with 5 or 6 classmates
2	Choosing a topic	til February 28	Choose a topic based on course materials, add it to the table
3	Making a proposal	March-May	Make a proposal (see the description above)
4	Consultations	April 16 th	Optional
5	Proposal presentation	April 20 th & 23 rd	Presenting in class
6	Handing in the written proposal	May 20 th	Sending the project proposal text (6-8 pages) via email

* *Note:* Dates in the timetable are approximate, follow the emails and announcements in class.