SYLLABUS (draft)
COG401H1 -- Winter 2017 -- Seminar in Cognitive Science: Moral Psychology
Instructor: Dr. Catherine Stinson
Office: UC F306

Course Description:
The topic of this seminar is Moral Psychology, which is the psychological study of moral behaviour. In particular, we will examine the cognitive science of moral attitudes and moral decision-making, applied to several social issues of immediate concern, including the polarization of political views, political correctness on campus, and responses to climate change. These are emotionally charged issues on which students will likely strongly disagree, but in this course we will embrace those disagreements as an opportunity for learning.

        The aims of the course are to understand why well-meaning people disagree, to find ways of communicating effectively about divisive moral issues, to change minds and find consensus rather than polarize debates, to understand why well-meaning people often fail to act according to their values, and to seek ways of convincing people to act morally. These issues can be approached from many angles, however, we will focus our attention on empirical evidence from the cognitive sciences.

Evaluation:
In-class Exercises	15%
Short Reading Responses (5)	25%
Longer Reading Responses (2)	20%
Annotated Bibliography	10%
Course Project	30%

In-class Exercises:
Throughout the semester, short assignments, activities, and quizzes will be done in class. These will typically not be announced in advance. Your full participation in these exercises is expected, which will require coming to class having done the readings.

Reading Responses:
One reading response paper may be handed in each week before class begins. You may choose which weeks to hand in these papers, as long as you write a total of 5 short responses and 2 longer responses over the course of the semester.

        Short responses (300 – 400 words) should express the main points made in the readings, any criticisms you may have, additional questions you might want answered, and/or corroborating evidence from other readings or your own experience.

        Longer responses (4 – 5 pages) should go into considerably more detail in response to the week's readings. You may focus your attention on select aspects of the readings, and should give detailed arguments for or against a thesis. Feel free to consider additional material from the recommended readings, and beyond.

Annotated Bibliography:
This is the first step toward developing a Course Project idea. Choose a project topic, and research it. Pick the 5 most relevant texts you found in your research, provide full bibliographic information for each, and annotate each entry with 1-2 paragraphs summarizing the main points of the text and how it is relevant to your project. Although the

project may be done in groups, each student should submit their own bibliography reflecting their own reading on the topic, with individually written annotations.

Course Project:
Working either alone or in groups of up to 4 students, choose an issue that involves an element of moral reasoning. Research the factual background of the issue, and make an informed decision about what the moral response should be. Also research any psychological factors that may shape how people actually behave. (This may involve conducting your own experiments, in addition to reading.) Develop a plan to convince people to accept and/or act according to your chosen moral response. Implement the plan, and report on the results in the form of an empirical research paper.

For example, if your issue is household energy conservation, your research might lead you to the conclusion that the lights in your apartment should be turned off at certain times of day. You might then research what factors lead your roommates to leave the lights on, including running some experiments to test their responses. Implement a strategy to change their behaviour, and evaluate its success.

Relatively superficial issues like this are ok, but more substantial issues are great too.

Main Texts:
1. The Moral Psychology Handbook, by John Doris and The Moral Psychology Research Group (2010), MIT Press. (Download from the library website.)

2. The Righteous Mind: Why Good People are Divided by Politics and Religion, by Jonathan Haidt (2012), Pantheon. (Available in the University Bookstore.)

3. A Perfect Moral Storm: The Ethical Tragedy of Climate Change, by Stephen Gardiner (2011), Oxford University Press. (Download from the library website.)

4. Norms in the Wild: How to Diagnose, Measure, and Change Social Norms, by Cristina Bicchieri (2016) Oxford University Press. (Available in the University Bookstore in late January.)

Optional Background Texts:
Moral Psychology, Volume 2: The Cognitive Science of Morality: Intuition and Diversity, Ed. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, (2007) MIT Press. (On reserve in Laidlaw Library.)

Moral Psychology, Volume 3: The Neuroscience of Morality: Emotion, Brain Disorders, and Development, Ed. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, (2007) MIT Press. (On reserve in Laidlaw Library.)

Additional Readings:
A selection of the readings listed below will be assigned each week, along with chapters from the main texts. Any texts not readily available for download will be posted on Blackboard.

Introduction to Moral Psychology
Doris, J. M., & Plakias, A. (2007). "How to Argue about Disagreement: Evaluative Diversity and Moral Realism." In Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (ed.), *The Psychology and Biology of Morality.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Greene, J. (2003). From neural 'is' to moral 'ought': What are the moral implications of neuroscientific moral psychology? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience,* 4, 846-850.

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

Paxton, J. M., Ungar, L., & Greene, J. D. (2012). Reflection and reasoning in moral judgment. *Cognitive Science*, *36*, 163-177.

Moral Emotions
Horberg, E.J., Oveis, C., Keltner, D., & Cohen, A. B. (2009). Disgust and the moralization of purity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 963-976.

Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D.A., Knobe, J., & Bloom, P. (2009). Disgust sensitivity predicts intuitive disapproval of gays. *Emotion*, 9, 435-439.

Cheng, J. S., Ottati, V. S. C., & Price, E. (2013). The arousal model of moral condemnation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 1012-1018.

Gu, J., Zhong, C.B., Page-Gould, E. (2013). Listen to your heart: When false somatic feedback shapes moral behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142, 307-312.

Moral Convictions
Graham, J., & Haidt, J. (2012). Sacred values and evil adversaries: A moral foundations approach. In P. Shaver & M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Morality: Exploring the Causes of Good and Evil.* New York: APA Books.

Skitka, L. J. (2010). The psychology of moral conviction. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4,* 267-281.

Miller, R., & Cushman, F. (2013). Aversive for me, wrong for you: First-person behavioral aversions underlie the moral condemnation of harm. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *7*, 707-718.

Morgan, G. S., Mullen, E., & Skitka, L.J. (in press). When values and attributions collide: Liberals' and conservatives' values motivate attributions for alleged misdeeds. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.*

Moral Politics
Young, L., Saxe, R. (2011). Moral universals and individual differences. *Emotion Review*, *3*, 323-324.

Napier, J. L., & Luguri, J. B. (in press). Moral mindsets: Abstract thinking increases a preference for 'individualizing' over 'binding' moral foundations. *Social and Personality Psychological Science.*

Graham, J., Englander, Z., Morris, J. P., Hawkins, C. B., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2013). Warning bell: Liberals implicitly respond to group morality before rejecting it explicitly.

Smith, K., Alford, J. R., Hatemi, P. K., Eaves, L. J., Funk, C., & Hibbing, J. R. (2012). Biology, ideology, and epistemology: How do we know political attitudes are inherited and why should we care? *American Journal of Political Science, 56,* 17-33.

Dodd, M. D., Balzer, A., Jacobs, C. M., Gruszczynski, M. W., Smith, K. B., & Hibbing, J. R. (2012). The political left rolls with the good and the political right confronts the bad: connecting physiology and cognition to preferences. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *367*, 640-649.

Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D., Iyer, R., & Haidt, J. (2012). Disgust sensitivity, political conservatism, and voting. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*, 537-544.

Origins of Morality
Hamlin, J. K., Wynn, K., & Bloom, P. (2007). Social evaluation by preverbal infants. *Nature, 450,* 557-559.

Olson, K. R.,& Spelke, E. S. (2008). Foundations of cooperation in preschool children. *Cognition, 108,* 222-231.

Bloom, P. (May 2010). The moral life of babies. *New York Times Magazine.*

DeScioli, P., & Kurzban, R. (2013). A solution to the mysteries of morality. *Psychological Bulletin*, *139*, 477-496.

Fessler, D., et al. (2015). Moral parochialism and contextual contingency across seven societies. *Proc. R. Soc. B., 282.*

Carnes, N.C., Lickel, B., Janoff-Bulman, R. (2015). Shared perceptions: Morality is embedded in social contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41, 351-362.

Neurodiveristy and Morality
Koenigs, M., Young, L., Adolphs, R., Tranel, D., Cushman, F., Hauser, M., et al. (submitted). Damage to the prefrontal cortex increases utilitarian moral judgments.

Mendez, M. F., Anderson, E., & Shapira, J. S. (2005). An investigation of moral judgement in frontotemporal dementia. *Cogn Behav Neurol, 18*(4), 193-197.

Glenn, A. L., Iyer, R., Graham, J., Koleva, S., & Haidt, J. (2009). Are all types of morality compromised in psychopathy? *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *23*, 384-398.

Gray, K., Jenkins, A. C., Heberlein, A. S., & Wegner, D. M. (2011). Distortions of mind perception in psychopathology. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *108*, 477- 479.

Moral Cognition
Gantman, A. P., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2014). The moral pop-out effect: Enhanced perceptual awareness of morally relevant stimuli. *Cognition, 132*, 22-29.

Pärnamets, P., Johansson, P., Hall, L., Balkenius, C., Spivey, M. J., & Richardson, D. C. (2015). Biasing moral decisions by exploiting the dynamics of eye gaze. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112*, 4170-4175.

Hall, L., Johansson, P., & Strandberg, T. (2012). Lifting the veil of morality: Choice blindness and attitude reversals on a self-transforming survey. *PloS ONE*, 7, e45457.

Crockett, M., & Rini, R. A. (2015). Neuromodulators and the (in)stability of moral cognition. In J. Decety & T. Wheatley (Eds.), *Moral Brains* (pp. 221-235). MIT Press.

The Flexibility of Morality
Valdesolo, P., & DeSteno, D. (2006). Manipulations of emotional context shape moral judgment. *Psychol Sci, 17*(6), 476-477.

Valdesolo, P., & DeSteno, D. (in press). Moral hypocrisy: the flexibility of virtue. *Psychological Science.*

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.

Barkan, R., Ayal, S., Gino, F., & Ariely, D. (2012). The pot calling the kettle black: Distancing response to ethical dissonance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141,* 757-773.

Schnall, S., Benton, J., & Harvey, S. (2008). With a clean conscience: Cleanliness reduces the severity of moral judgments. *Psychological Science, 19,* 1219-1222.

Moral Failings
Doris, J. M., & Murphy, D. 2007. "From My Lai to Abu Ghraib: The Moral Psychology of Atrocity." *Midwest Studies in Philosophy XXXI.*

Shalvi, S., Gino, F., Barkan, R., Ayal, S. (2015) Self-serving justifications: Doing wrong and feeling moral. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *24*, 125-130.

Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., Mead, N. L., & Ariely, D. (2011). Unable to resist temptation: How self-control depletion promotes unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 115*, 191-203.

Ruedy, N.E., Moore, C., Gino, F., Schweitzer, M.E. (2013) The cheater's high: The unexpected affective benefits of unethical behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*, 531-548.