Psychology 888: Moral Psychology

Instructor: Kurt Gray (kurtjgray@gmail.com) Davie 327

Mondays, 9-12pm
Room Davie 302

Can liberals and conservatives ever get along? Who deserves moral rights and moral responsibilities? Do different cultures have different kinds of morality? When do people cheat and when do they harm others? This course explores the social psychology of morality--including both behavior and judgment--with an emphasis on how to make sense of modern moral conflict (including politics and religion).

GRADING

Class Opening Statements: 15%

Every class, each student will give a 2-minute oral statement about something in the reading. This statement should be something that will stimulate discussion and include strong (and perhaps controversial) stances.

Class Discussion Leading: 15%

Every class, two students will be selected to lead discussion. They will be responsible for briefly summarizing the broad themes of the readings with a few slides and prepare a set of questions that we can come back to as we go through each paper. They will be evaluated by the depth, intensity, and on-topic-ness of discussion.

Class Discussion Participation: 15%

Students are expected to participate in class, which includes offering insightful comments for each and every paper/chapter, posing questions to others, and helping to maintain a high level of discourse.

Research Proposal Project Summary: 10%

The major assignment in this class is a research project and presentation. By March 25, you will submit a ~1 page project. This will lay out the basic research question, cite a couple of relevant papers (in text citation only no reference section needed), and outline the methodology and prediction. Times New Roman 12 Point Font, single spaced, in full paragraphs. The more concrete the better, but keep it short and sweet. Remember, if you can't explain your research question to your grandmother, then you likely don't understand it yourself.

Grading Scheme:

Do you identify a research question relevant to morality?

Do you cite some relevant literature to use as a jumping off point?

Do you briefly outline a feasible method for testing this question?

Do you make a clear and sensible (set of) prediction(s)?

Do you write in a clear engaging manner (style, formatting, etc.)?

Research Proposal: 30%

Your assignment is to complete a written proposal of a feasible study relevant to moral psychology (broadly defined). Ideally, you should aim for something simple—manipulate up to two variables in a classic 2x2 design or examine a simple regression or mediation prediction. Try to come up with the simplest way of testing your research hypothesis—what would be the Study 1 'proof of concept study' in a series of studies? Ideally it should be something you could conduct online or easily on campus. Alternatively, you could sketch out a big review paper.

This paper will be a standard manuscript with an introduction to your research question, brief but relevant literature review, clear hypothesis, method section, and a graph of the predicted results. Everything APA Format 6th edition, with title page, running heads, no extra spacing after paragraphs, double spacing. No specific page limit, but likely a short-to-medium length report— so around 2000-5000 words for the introduction, and unlimited space for the methods (but likely around 2000 or so). Pick a journal such as SPPS, Cognition, JESP, PSPB, Psych Science… write as if submitting to it. Only very preliminary Results and Discussion sections needed, but please do include a full reference section, properly formatted, plus an appendix with any new material you develop for this project (e.g. scenarios you write). Your paper is due on LDOC. Please email your paper as a word document attachment to kurtjgray@gmail.com.

<u>Grading Scheme</u> (for the typical experimental proposal):

/10 Introduction

Do you start out with a board question, problem or idea, catching the reader's interest? Do you set the reader up with the basic idea early on?

Do you develop enough background on the topic of interest to catch readers up to speed without drowning them in facts? Is it clear what the 'grandfather/grandmother' article was in your area, and what landmark publications followed from that?

Do you set up a question that has yet to be examined? Is it clear why its worth examining that question? What does the reader stand to learn?

Do you set up one or more plausibly hypotheses regarding your research question? What is the likely outcome according to theory, and if a different outcome occurred, what might that suggest theoretically?

/10 Methodology

Have you operationalized your research question in a clear, concrete, and conceptually valid manner?

Does your writing make it clear when you transition from the abstraction of theory to the specifics of operationalization?

Do you present enough detail about the methods so that the reader could conduct the experiment themselves?

Do you cite all materials you borrow/adapt from previous research, and add an appendix with any new material you create?

/5 Graph of Predicted Results

Do you clearly and legibly present key findings, label things well, provide an appropriate title?

Can a naïve person correctly interpret your findings from the graph and title alone without reference to the text?

/5 Overall writing style

Do you write clear sentences and refer to things in unambiguous ways?

Do you use active voice (participants did X, we conducted the study) rather than passive voice (X was provided to the participants, a study was conducted)?

Do you structure your paper logically, with a flow from general idea, through past relevant work, to your specific hypotheses?

Do you define key terms and cite appropriately?

Do you draw the reader in with vivid examples or a puzzling paradox or a socially important question? Do you make the reader care about the work?

/3 OSF (Open Science Framework) Bonus Points:

1 Bonus point for power analysis or other sample size rationale

1 Bonus point for specifying data collection stopping rule

1 Bonus point for specifying a priori rules for participant exclusion

/30 Total + Bonus Points

Research Presentation: 15%

On the last class, you will present your research proposal as if you are giving a conference talk. It will be 10 minutes. You will be evaluated on the clarity of your presentation, your speaking style, your use of slides, and your ability to answer questions effectively (and not defensively).

Grading Scheme:

/5 Clarity

Is the research design and motivation for running the studies transparent?

Is the logic easy to follow?

/5 Slides

Are they beautiful? Do they add to the presentation or do they detract?

/5 Style

Is your talk engaging? Do you capture people's attention?

Is the talk memorized? Do you answer questions well?

READINGS

In this class, we will read a number of original source articles. They can all be found in a dropbox folder. We will also read a number of chapters from this book:

Atlas of Moral Psychology, Gray, K. & Graham, J. (Eds.) Guilford: New York, NY

You can buy it for $60 at Guilford's website. I also have a couple copies you can borrow if you need to.

CLASS SCHEDULE

- **January 8: Welcome to Class. Introductions, and Introduction to Speaking**

- **January 15: Modern Philosophy**

Chapters 5, 27, 28, 55, 56, 57

- **January 22: From Turiel to Haidt to Royzman: Talking to Participants**

Turiel, E., Hildebrandt, C., Wainryb, C., & Saltzstein, H. D. (1991). Judging social issues: Difficulties, inconsistencies, and consistencies. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *56*(2), 1–116. https://doi.org/10.2307/1166056

Haidt, J., Bjorklund, F., & Murphy, S. (2000). Moral dumbfounding: When intuition finds no reason. *Unpublished Manuscript, University of Virginia*.

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, *108*(4), 814–834.

Haidt, J., & Hersh, M. A. (2001). Sexual morality: The cultures and emotions of conservatives and liberals. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*(1), 191–221. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02489.x

Royzman, E., Kim, K., & Leeman, R. F. (2015). The curious tale of Julie and Mark: Unraveling the moral dumbfounding effect. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *10*(4), 296–313.

- **January 29: Moral Emotions**

Chapters 8-10

Rozin, P., Lowery, L., Imada, S., & Haidt, J. (1999). The CAD triad hypothesis: a mapping between three moral emotions (contempt, anger, disgust) and three moral codes (community, autonomy, divinity). *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *76*(4), 574.

Schnall, S., Haidt, J., Clore. G. L., & Jordan, A. H. (2008). Disgust as embodied moral judgment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1096-1109.

Landy, J. F., & Goodwin, G. P. (2015). Does incidental disgust amplify moral judgment? A meta-analytic review of experimental evidence. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10,* 518–536.

Cameron, C. D., Lindquist, K. A., & Gray, K. (2015). A constructionist review of morality and emotions: No evidence for specific links between moral content and discrete emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *19*(4), 371- 394.

- **February 5: Moral Dilemmas**

Greene, J. D., Sommerville, R. B., Nystrom, L. E., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2001). An fMRI investigation of emotional engagement in moral judgment. *Science*, *293*(5537), 2105–2108. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1062872

Mikhail, J. (2007). Universal moral grammar: Theory, evidence and the future. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(4), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.12.007

Terbeck, S., Kahane, G., McTavish, S., Julian, S., Levy, N., Hewstone, M., & Cowen, P. J. (2013). Beta adrenergic blockade reduces utilitarian judgement. *Biological Psychology*, *92*(2), 323–328. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2012.09.005

Gawronski, B., Armstrong, J., Conway, P., Friesdorf, R., & Hütter, M. (2017). Consequences, norms, and generalized inaction in moral dilemmas: The CNI model of moral decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *113*(3), 343–376. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000086

Everett, J. A. C., & Kahane, G. (2020). Switching Tracks? Towards a Multidimensional Model of Utilitarian Psychology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.11.012

- **February 12: Ideology**

Chapter 23

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J. & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance orientation and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17,* 271-30.

Jost, J. T., Nosek, B.A., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Ideology: It's resurgence in social, personality, and political psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3,* 126-136.

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology, 25,* 881-919.

Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(2), 366–385. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847

Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2015). From gulf to bridge when do moral arguments facilitate political influence? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(12), 1665–1681.

- **February 19: Dyadic Morality Debate**

Gray, K., & Keeney, J. E. (2015). Impure, or just weird? Scenario sampling bias raises questions about the foundation of moral cognition. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *6*(8), 859–868.

Graham, J. (2015). Explaining away differences in moral judgment: Comment on Gray and Keeney (2015). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *6*(8), 869–873. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550615592242

Gray, K., & Keeney, J. E. (2015). Disconfirming moral foundations theory on its own terms: Reply to Graham (2015). *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 874–877.

Gray, K., Schein, C., & Cameron, C. D. (2017). How to think about emotions and morality: Circles, not arrows. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *17*, 41–46.

Schein, C., & Gray, K. (2018). The Theory of Dyadic Morality: Reinventing moral judgment by redefining harm. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *22*(1), 32–70.

- **February 26: No Class—SPSP**

- **March 4: Identity**

Chapter 11, 13, 16, 24

Pizarro, D., & Tannenbaum, D. (2011). Bringing character back: How the motivation to evaluate character influences judgments of moral blame. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil* (pp. 91–108). Washington, DC: APA Press.

Strohminger, N., & Nichols, S. (2015). Neurodegeneration and identity. *Psychological Science*, *26*(9), 1469–1479. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615592381

Vonasch, A. J., Reynolds, T., Winegard, B. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2018). Death before dishonor: Incurring costs to protect moral reputation. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*(5), 604–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617720271

Hester, N., & Gray, K. (2019). The moral psychology of raceless genderless strangers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 47.

- **March 11: No Class—Spring Break**

- **March 18: Evolution and Evolution of Cooperation**

Chapter 18

Axelrod, R., & Hamilton, W. D. (1981). The evolution of cooperation. *Science*, *211*(4489), 1390–1396. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7466396

Rand, D. G., & Nowak, M. A. (2013). Human cooperation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *17*(8), 413–425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.06.003

DeScioli, P., & Kurzban, R. (2013). A solution to the mysteries of morality. *Psychological Bulletin*, *139*(2), 477–496. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029065

Enke, B. (2019). Kinship, cooperation, and the evolution of moral systems. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *134*(2), 953–1019. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz001

- **March 25: Culture**

Robertson, C., & Fadil, P. A. (1999). Ethical decision making in multinational organizations: A culture-based model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *19*(4), 385–392. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005742016867

Shweder, R. A. (2012). Relativism and Universalism. In D. Fassin (Ed.), *A Companion to Moral Anthropology* (pp. 85–102). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Buchtel, E. E., Guan, Y., Peng, Q., Su, Y., Sang, B., Chen, S. X., & Bond, M. H. (2015). Immorality east and west are immoral behaviors especially harmful, or especially uncivilized? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(10), 1382–1394. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215595606

Barrett, H. C., Bolyanatz, A., Crittenden, A. N., Fessler, D. M. T., Fitzpatrick, S., Gurven, M., … Laurence, S. (2016). Small-scale societies exhibit fundamental variation in the role of intentions in moral judgment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(17), 4688–4693. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1522070113

Gelfand, M. J., Harrington, J. R., & Jackson, J. C. (2017). The strength of social norms across human groups. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(5), 800–809. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708631

Cohn, A., Maréchal, M. A., Tannenbaum, D., & Zünd, C. L. (2019). Civic honesty around the globe. *Science*, *365*(6448), 70–73. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau8712

- **April 1: Religion and God**

Chapter 35

Atran, S., & Ginges, J. (2012). Religious and sacred imperatives in human conflict. *Science*, *336*(6083), 855–857. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1216902

Xygalatas, D., Mitkidis, P., Fischer, R., Reddish, P., Skewes, J., Geertz, A. W., … Bulbulia, J. (2013). Extreme rituals promote prosociality. *Psychological Science*, *24*(8), 1602–1605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612472910

Cohen, A. B. (2015). Religion's profound influences on psychology: Morality, intergroup relations, self-construal, and enculturation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *24*(1), 77–82.

Purzycki, B. G., Apicella, C., Atkinson, Q. D., Cohen, E., McNamara, R. A., Willard, A. K., … Henrich, J. (2016). Moralistic gods, supernatural punishment and the expansion of human sociality. *Nature*, *530*(7590), 327–330.

Jackson, J. C., & Gray, K. (in press). When a Good God Makes Bad People: Testing a Theory of Religion and Immorality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 117.

Clark, C. J., Winegard, B. M., Beardslee, J., Baumeister, R. F., & Shariff, A. F. (in press). Declines in Religiosity Predicted Increases in Violent Crime—But Not Among Countries with Relatively High Average IQ.

- **April 8: Behavior**

Chapter 47

Ariely, D., & Loewenstein, G. (2006). The heat of the moment: The effect of sexual arousal on sexual decision making. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *19*(2), 87–98.

Martens, A., Kosloff, S., Greenberg, J., Landau, M. J., & Schmader, T. (2007). Killing begets killing: Evidence from a bug-killing paradigm that initial killing fuels subsequent killing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*(9), 1251–1264. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207303020

Mazar, N., Amir, O., & Ariely, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *45*(6), 633–644.

Cushman, F., Gray, K., Gaffey, A., & Mendes, W. B. (2012). Simulating murder: The aversion to harmful action. *Emotion*, *12*(1), 2–7. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025071

Crockett, M. J., Kurth-Nelson, Z., Siegel, J. Z., Dayan, P., & Dolan, R. J. (2014). Harm to others outweighs harm to self in moral decision making. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *111*(48), 17320–17325. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1408988111

- **April 15: Morality and Technology**

Greene, J. D., & Cohen, J. (2004). For the law, neuroscience changes nothing and everything. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *359*(1451), 1775–1785. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1546

Singer, P., & Sagan, A. (2012). Are we ready for a 'morality pill'? The New York Times.

Harris, J., & Savulescu, J. (2015). A debate about moral enhancement. Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, 24, 8.

Waytz, A., & Gray, K. (2018). Does online technology make us more or less sociable? A preliminary review and call for research. Perspectives on Psychological Science.

Crockett, M. J. (2017). Moral outrage in the digital age. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *1*(11), 769. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0213-3

Awad, E., Dsouza, S., Kim, R., Schulz, J., Henrich, J., Shariff, A., … Rahwan, I. (2018). The Moral Machine experiment. *Nature*, *563*(7729), 59–64. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0637-6

Bigman, Y. E., & Gray, K. (2018). People are averse to machines making moral decisions. Cognition, 181, 21-34.

- **April 22: Presentations**