

Psychology 246: Psychology of Good and Evil, Spring 2013

Monday and Wednesday 3:10-4:30 in Olin 203

Instructor: Kristin Lane

Office Hours: Monday, 4:45-5:45; Tuesday, 11:00-12:00, or by appointment

Office: 106 Preston email: lane@bard.edu Office Phone: x7224

COURSE OVERVIEW

Hannah Arendt observed that “The sad truth is that most evil is done by people who never make up their minds to be good or evil.” In this course, we will examine why ordinary people can behave in extraordinarily deplorable ways (often, as Arendt notes, without intending to do so), yet at the same time have the capacity for exceptional acts of altruism and even heroism. We will take a social psychological approach to understanding the situational and personal causes of acts of social destruction and humanitarianism. Topics to be covered include aggression, prejudice, and genocide, as well as altruism, volunteerism, and morality. Sources will include empirical articles as well as review articles, videos, and case studies.

In addition to generating interest in and knowledge about the material, the broader aims of this course are to help you to 1. become a critical consumer of psychological and empirical research; 2. increase your effectiveness in oral and written communications; and 3. improve your ability to craft and defend an argument using empirical data.

MATERIALS

Sign up for the course’s Moodle website (access code: badgoods13 [all lowercase]). We will use it extensively. All of the readings are posted there.

You will need to obtain a copy of the following book for the final paper:

Browning, C. R. (1998). *Ordinary men : Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the final solution in Poland*. New York: HarperPerennial.

POLICIES

Attendance. Attendance will be noted and absences will hurt your grade. Late arrivals are very disruptive - consistent patterns of lateness will be addressed and may also affect your grade. Please be on time.

Plagiarism. In its most easily identifiable form, plagiarism represents copying someone else’s words. This kind of offense is rare. More common are other, similarly damaging ways to plagiarize. Use of someone else’s ideas or words without citing them constitutes plagiarism, and is unacceptable. You should review the section on plagiarism and academic dishonesty in the student handbook

(<http://inside.bard.edu/doso/handbook/index.php?aid=1201&sid=705&pid=>). When in doubt, check with me and keep in mind that no one ever got in trouble for citing too often. Quizzes, exams and other written assignments are to be completed independently unless otherwise specified. Violations of academic integrity will result at a minimum in loss of credit for the assignment, and could result in failure in the course.

Cell Phones and Laptops. Turn off (not vibrate!) cell phones before class. No laptop computers will be allowed.

Late Assignments will immediately lose 15% of their grade, and another 10% for every additional day late.

ASSIGNMENTS

Exams. Two non-cumulative examinations. Make-up exams will 80 minute oral exams and will be offered only with a documented emergency. If you need accommodation for the exams, please speak with me after the first class. **70 points each (140 points total).**

Discussion Questions. At 10 points during the semester, you will post a short (one paragraph or less) question or reflection each week to Moodle based on the class reading. These questions or reflections are intended to raise issues for class discussion. They should be more than simple clarification (“I don’t understand what the author is saying here,”), although those are good when offered in addition to more substantive comments or questions.

QUESTIONS MUST BE POSTED TO MOODLE BY 11:30 AM THE DAY OF THE RELEVANT CLASS TO COUNT. YOU MUST POST AT LEAST FIVE QUESTIONS BEFORE SPRING BREAK (ALTHOUGH YOU CAN POST MORE THAN THAT). **30 points (3 points for each question)**

As ideas, here are some of the kinds of questions that psychologists ask:

- Are the hypotheses reasonable? Are they logical, given the literature reviewed?
- Do the methods of the study allow the author(s) to test the hypotheses outlined?
- Do the data support the inferences drawn in the article?
- Are there alternative explanations for the findings?
- Does anything you know (from other classes, other readings in this class, or being human) contradict or limit the theory or data in the article?
- Does the literature you've read suggest any new directions, or hypotheses, that research might take?

Class Participation. Come to class prepared to discuss the readings and topics. Class participation consists of active contributions to interactive experiences, group work, and thoughtful speaking and careful listening. If you tend to be uncomfortable speaking up in classes, please talk to me early in the semester to discuss ways to help you succeed. Occasionally I will ask you to complete a small (less than 15 minute) activity outside of class in preparation for class, and consistent completion of these activities will count toward your participation grade as well. **40 points.**

Article Presentation. In pairs or groups of three, you will present an additional article to your classmates. These articles will focus on contemporary work. This activity will increase our collective knowledge while keeping the reading list manageable and give you a sense of the current state of the discipline. Additionally, it provides an opportunity for you to practice clearly communicating research studies' methods and results. Each presentation should be between 10 and 12 minutes. Presenters should distribute to the class (in hard copy) a summary of their article in "QALMRI" format. You may (and are encouraged) to use any additional handouts or activities that will aid communication, and to be creative. If you choose to use Powerpoint, your presentation must be uploaded to Moodle by no one the day of your presentation. Studies from the presentations are fair game for the exams – listen to your classmates and ask questions. **20 points.**

Group Presentation and Paper. You will work in groups to choose an event of that you consider to be an act of "evil" or "goodness." You will then: 1. Research that event; 2. Present the relevant facts of the event to the rest of our class; 3. Lead the class in a discussion of this event as a case study, in which you consider how the principles and evidence of the course can (or cannot) explain the event. Your group will then write a piece in the style of a blog post that summarizes the event and analyzes it using psychological theories and evidence. See the end of the syllabus for more details. **Group presentation: 25 points; Group blog post: 25 points; Contributions to group work: 10 points. 60 points total.**

Final Paper. One final paper. See the end of the syllabus for more details. **60 points.**

GRADING

Grading is on a 350-point scale. Grades will be assigned based on total points earned within the following ranges – pluses and minuses will be assigned at the top and bottom of each range. I reserve the right to change the grading scale, but any changes will only help your grade.

POINTS EARNED	GRADE
315-350	A
280-314	B
245-279	C
228-244	D
Below 228	F

SUMMARY OF DUE DATES

ASSIGNMENT	DUE DATE
Exam 1	Monday, March 11
Exam 2	Monday, May 6
Group-led case study presentations	Topic due: March 1 Group-led discussion: Week of March 18 Blog post due: Friday, March 22 at 5pm
Final paper due	Tuesday, May 21 at 5pm
Article presentations	As scheduled in class
Moodle Questions	Posted 10 times during the semester; at least five times before Spring Break.

SCHEDULE

MONDAY, JANUARY 28: INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE

No reading

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30: THE POWER OF THE SITUATION

Sommers, S. (2011). *Situations matter: understanding how context transforms your world*. New York: Riverhead Books.
CHAPTER 1.

Zimbardo, P. G. (2004). A situationist perspective on the psychology of evil: Understanding how good people are transformed into perpetrators. In *The Social Psychology of Good and Evil: Understanding Our Capacity for Kindness and Cruelty* (pp. 21–50). New York: Guilford Press. SELECTED PAGES.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4: AUTOMATIC AND CONTROLLED PROCESSES

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. CHAPTER 1.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6: METHODS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY.

Aronson, E. A., Wilson, T. D., Akert, R. M., & Fehr, B. (2006). *Social psychology* (6th ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall.
Chapter 2, pp. 32-45.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11: READING AN ARTICLE IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Jordan, C. H. & Zanna, M. P. (1999). How to read a journal article in social psychology. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The self in social psychology* (pp. 461-470). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

QALMRI (Adapted from: Kosslyn, S.M. & Rosenberg, R.S. (2001). *Psychology: The brain, the person, the world*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.)

Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2009). Contagion and differentiation in unethical behavior: The effect of one bad apple on the barrel. *Psychological Science*, 20, 393–398.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13: “EVERYDAY” ILLS: LYING, CHEATING, AND STEALING

DePaulo, B. M., Kashy, D. A., Kirkendol, S. E., Wyer, M. M., & Epstein, J. A. (1996). Lying in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 979–995.

Shalvi, S., Eldar, O., & Bereby-Meyer, Y. (2012). Honesty requires time (and lack of justifications). *Psychological Science*, 23, 1264–1270.

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.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18: DEINDIVIDUATION AND DEHUMANIZATION

Diener, E., Fraser, S. C., Beaman, A. L., & Kelem, R. T. (1976). Effects of deindividuation variables on stealing among Halloween trick-or-treaters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 178–183.

Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 292–306.

Reimann, M., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2011). The dark side of social encounters: Prospects for a neuroscience of human evil. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics*, 4, 174–180.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20: THE STANFORD PRISON EXPERIMENT

Zimbardo, P. G. (1973, April 8). A Pirandellian prison. *New York Times Magazine*.

Hersh, S. (2004, May 10). Torture at Abu Ghraib. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2004/05/10/040510fa_fact.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25: OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY, PART I

Milgram, S. (2009). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York; Enfield: Perennial ; Publishers Group UK.
PREFACE; CHAPTERS 1, 2 and 4

Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: Would people still obey today? *American Psychologist*, 64, 1–11.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27: OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY, PART II

Baumrind, D. (1964). Some thoughts on ethics of research: After reading Milgram's "Behavioral Study of Obedience." *American Psychologist*, 19, 421–423.

Haslam, S. A., & Reicher, S. D. (2012). Contesting the "nature" of conformity: What Milgram and Zimbardo's studies really show. *PLoS Biology*, 10, e1001426.

Arendt, H. (2006). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: a report on the banality of evil*. New York, N.Y: Penguin Books.
SELECTIONS

MONDAY, MARCH 4: PREJUDICE, PART I

Aronson, E. (2008). *The social animal* (10th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers. **CHAPTER 7 up to Page 338 (Stop at "Reducing Prejudice").**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6: PREJUDICE, PART II

Vedantam, S. (2005, January 23). See no bias. *Washington Post Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27067-2005Jan21.html>

Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1314–1329.

Green, D. P., & Seher, R. L. (2003). What role does prejudice play in ethnic conflict? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6, 509–531.

MONDAY, MARCH 11: EXAM 1

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13: GUEST SPEAKER: KEN STERN, DIRECTOR ON ANTISEMITISM AND EXTREMISM, AJC.

Readings to be announced.

MONDAY, MARCH 18 AND WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20: GROUP PRESENTATIONS

Group presentations – see end of syllabus for details.

MONDAY, MARCH 25 AND WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27: SPRING BREAK – NO CLASS!

Enjoy your break!

MONDAY, APRIL 1: IMPROVING INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Aronson, E. (2008). *The social animal* (10th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers. **CHAPTER 7 page 338-end.**

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Deference, dissent, and dispute resolution: An experimental intervention using mass media to change norms and behavior in Rwanda. *American Political Science Review*, 103, 622.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3: AGGRESSION

Fiske, S. T. (2010). *Social beings: a core motives approach to social psychology* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: J. Wiley.
CHAPTER 10.

Berkowitz, L. (2008). On the consideration of automatic as well as controlled psychological processes in aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 34*, 117–129.

MONDAY, APRIL 8: PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Batson, C. D., & Powell, A. A. (2003). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In I. B. Weiner (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychology* (5th ed., pp. 463–484). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10: EMPATHY

Singer, T. (2004). Empathy for pain involves the affective but not sensory components of pain. *Science, 303*, 1157–1162.

Cehajic, S., Brown, R., & Gonzalez, R. (2009). What do I care? Perceived ingroup responsibility and dehumanization as predictors of empathy felt for the victim group. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 12*, 715–729.

MONDAY, APRIL 15: EMOTIONS

Claassen, C. (2012). The emotional logic of participation in intergroup violence.

Keltner, D. (2009). *Born to be good: the science of a meaningful life*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co. **CHAPTER 11.**

Bartlett, M. Y., & DeSteno, D. (2006). Gratitude and prosocial behavior: helping when it costs you. *Psychological Science, 17*, 319–325.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17: HEROISM

Zimbardo, P. G. (2006, Fall/ Winter -2007). The banality of heroism. *Greater Good*, pp. 30–35.

Nelson, L. D., & Norton, M. I. (2005). From student to superhero: Situational primes shape future helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41*, 423–430.

MONDAY, APRIL 22: MORALITY, PART I

Pinker, S. (2008, January 13). *The moral instinct*. New York Times.

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*, 2105-2108

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24: MORALITY, PART I

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 193–209.

MONDAY, APRIL 29: ADVISING DAY – NO CLASS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1: HYPOCRISY

DeSteno, D. (2011). *Out of character: the surprising truths about the liar, cheat, sinner (and saint) lurking in all of us* (1st ed.). New York: Crown Publishers. **CHAPTER 2**

MONDAY, MAY 6: EXAM 2

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8 AND MONDAY, MAY 13: BOARD WEEK – NO CLASS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15 AND MONDAY, MAY 20: COMPLETION DAYS: Meet with Kristin about final paper.

ASSIGNMENT: GROUP-LED CASE STUDY

In groups of 4-6 students, you will select an event (some suggestions are below) that you will research. You will have half a class session (approximately 35-40 minutes) to both present the event to the class and to lead the class in a discussion of the event as a case study in “goodness” or “evil.” You should spend no more than 10 minutes giving background information on the event – the bulk of your time should be spent engaging your classmates in discussion about the event, and thinking about the principles, theories, and data we have discussed in class can (or cannot) explain the event itself.

Specifically, you should do the following:

- Let me know what event you are choosing by March 1 (I will assign groups in advance of this). Each event can only be covered by only one group, so let me know early what you hope to do for the best shot at getting your top choice.
- Research the historical and psychological background of the event. You should use – and document – credible sources (i.e., academic works, major media outlets. NOT Wikipedia). Present the facts to the class in an engaging and clear way. You may use handouts, Powerpoint, etc., if it will help to communicate your points. Powerpoints should be uploaded to Moodle by noon on the day of your presentation.
- Have a clear lesson plan (that you will submit via Moodle) to guide the discussion. Some suggestions: Start with “big picture” questions about the event, and move to more specific questions. Have a clear plan for how you want the discussion to go, but maintain your flexibility (and humor) in the class session itself. Overprepare – sometimes questions that I think will spark a lot of conversation totally flop, and I need to fill that time and space. Have priorities in your questions and discussion topics – know which ones are most important for your discussion, and which ones are least important. Wrap the session up with a closing comment or two.
- Write a blog post that describes the situation and analyzes it from a social psychological perspective. You can use the class discussion as fodder for this blog post (so, you may wish to appoint a scribe for the class discussion, so you have a record of your classmates’ insights). Look at <http://thesituationist.wordpress.com/> for examples of such blog posts. You’ll submit the blog post via Moodle’s blog function, and should include pictures, links to other information, background sources, videos, etc. Your blog post should be between 1000-1500 words. See the link on Moodle for how to create a blog post. Use the features that distinguish web text from plain text – you have the ability to link, add images, add video, use unusual formatting, etc., to make your argument persuasive and compelling.
- Be a good group member. You will (anonymously) evaluate and grade the other members of your group for their contributions, and will be evaluated for your work in the group.

Possible topics (these are just suggestions, feel free to suggest other ones)

- The attacks of September 11 (e.g., the social psychological causes of the terrorists’ actions)
- The murder of Emmett Till (a 14-year old African-American boy who was murdered in Mississippi in 1955 after reportedly flirting with a European-American woman)
- A public shooting (e.g., Columbine, Virginia Tech, Sandy Hook, the movie theatre shootings in Aurora, Colorado)
- A particular aspect of the Darfur conflict (e.g., the cause of the conflict itself, a specific moment in the conflict, or the reaction/ intervention of other nations and organizations in the conflict)
- A specific moment in the Holocaust of World War II (we will be discussing several aspects of this in class, so you will want to choose a specific event or organization so as not to overlap with the rest of the class discussion)
- An act of rescue or shelter during a crime or genocide – e.g., the story of Joseph Andre, who provided shelter for Jewish children during the Holocaust

Working in Groups

Writing a group "paper" may be an unusual and novel task for some of you. Here are some suggestions for working in groups and with others. These suggestions are adapted from Colorado State's website on "Working in Groups." <http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/guide.cfm?guideid=42>

Working in a group can be enjoyable or frustrating--sometimes both. The best way to ensure a good working experience in groups is to think hard about whether a project is best done in a group, and, if so, to have a clear set of expectations about group work.

Why Work in Groups?

- In group work, you can draw on each group member's knowledge and perspectives, frequently giving you a more well thought out paper at the end or a better understanding of the class material for exams, labs, etc.
- You can also draw on people's different strengths. For example, you might be a great proofreader while someone else is much better at organizing papers.
- Groups are great for motivation: they force you to be responsible to others and frequently, then, do more and better work on a project than you might when only responsible to yourself.
- Group work helps keep you on task. It's harder to procrastinate when working with others.
- Working in groups, especially writing texts together, mirrors working styles common outside school. In business, industry, and research organizations, collaborative work is the norm rather than the exception.

What to Expect in Group Work.

Several factors we may not always think about when working in a group are vital to a successful group project. You should always establish how your group will handle each of these.

Agreement. Although we might assume productive groups will always be in complete agreement and focused on task, the reality of groups, as we have probably all experienced, is much messier than this. "Ideal" productive groups do not exist. In fact, some of the most productive groups will disagree, spend a lot of time goofing around, and even follow many blind alleys before achieving consensus. It's important to be aware of the rather messy nature of group work.

Conflict. Student groups will fight--in fact, they should fight, but only in particular ways. Research shows that "substantive" conflict, conflict directed toward the work at hand and issues pertaining to it, is highly productive and should be encouraged. "Personal" conflict, conflict directed toward group members' egos, however, is damaging and unproductive. The lesson is that students need to respect each other. Some groups decide to negotiate respect by making rules against inappropriate comments or personal attacks. When a damaging instance arises in a certain situation, any group member can immediately censor back the comment by saying "inappropriate comment."

Socializing. Of course, groups will not continually argue nor will they continually stay on task. Socializing, joking around, or telling stories are a natural part of group interaction and should be encouraged. It is primarily through "goofing off"; that group members learn about each other's personalities, communication styles, and senses of humor. Such knowledge builds trust and community among the members. Although groups should be counseled not to spend inappropriately long amounts of time simply gossiping or telling stories, they should also realize the importance and influence such interactions can have on achieving a group identity that all members come to share.

Wrong Decisions. Group members should be aware of and comfortable with the frequently frustrating reality of making the wrong decisions. Making mistakes, trying out options that don't work, and so on are not "a waste of time." In any creative situation, particularly in writing, trying out unsuccessful options is frequently the only way to discover what needs to be done. Although such frustrations take place even in individual contexts, they are particularly hard to negotiate in a group context because our immediate instinct is to blame another group member for a faulty suggestion. Students should be aware that all time spent on a task is productive even if it does not lead to any tangible product.

Unequal Commitments. In a perfect world, everyone would have as much time and desire in a group as others to create the best paper possible, but the reality is some people are procrastinators or care more about their grades in certain classes. Expect this and make contingencies for it by deciding early on what the "penalty" will be for those who miss meetings or fail to pull their weight. Note that you will be graded by your peers for your contributions to the group.

How to Have a Productive Group – Initial Decision Making

Where many groups go wrong is not being clear about expectations from the onset. Problems are much easier to deal with when you discuss their possibility in the abstract rather than when they involve individual people and feelings. As such, making the following decisions early on can help deflect feelings of personal attack later and also help organize the group.

Agree on a Meeting Format. While many groups will (and should) spend time socializing, talking about class, etc., it's helpful to set up expectations for how much of this type of talk should/can occur during a meeting. Also, because of how much typically gets said during meetings, you need a way to keep track of what occurred and plan for the next meeting. For instance, you should:

- Appoint a secretary for each meeting
- Plan for the next meeting (set an agenda) at the end of each meeting
- Plan a short amount of time at the beginning of each meeting for chatting and appoint someone to get the group "started" after that time has passed

Construct Rules for Discussion Although it usually seems unlikely in the beginning, a healthy disagreement can easily turn nasty when people are invested in a topic. Decide early on what will be considered inappropriate comments and make sure someone monitors these in later meetings. Here are some rules to consider:

- No personal attacks on a person's intelligence, background, way of speaking, etc.
- No yelling; all disagreements should be kept in a rational tone
- No name calling
- If a person objects to a comment directed at them, the conversation stops there, no matter anyone's opinion of the objection
- Out of Line Comments: "That's a dumb idea;" "You don't know what you're talking about;" "It figures a man/woman would say that"

Construct a Timeline. It's very easy to get lost in people's individual schedules week to week and put off certain tasks "just this time." Also, it's easy for a group project to seem "huge" until the tasks are broken down. For these reasons, it's useful to decide what tasks need to be done and when they need to be finished in order for the group to meet its final deadline.

Make a schedule and keep to it. This will also help group members monitor each other so that someone isn't stuck with all the work at the end. Consider the following:

- When will a final decision on the topic/focus be made?
- What kinds of research do we need to do? Who will do what? By when?
- When will people report back on research? What notes should they write up for others? By when?
- When will the paper be drafted initially?
- When will the comments/suggestions for revision be completed? When will the revisions be done?
- When will the final proofreading occur?

Agree on Penalties for Missing Meetings or Deadlines. Although it would be great if this weren't true, the reality is some people are going to miss meetings and deadlines; some might even try to get others to do their work by not completing tasks. Groups need to be prepared for these contingencies by constructing rules and their consequences that can be applied later if individuals "drop the ball." Consider the following:

- If someone misses a meeting, or doesn't do a certain task, he/she has to type the final paper, buy pizza for the next meeting, etc.
- If more than one meeting is missed or a member consistently fails to do what she/he is supposed to, the group can decide not to include their name on the project. (Check this one with your instructor)
- In the same scenario, the group can decide to write a written evaluation of the member's work and pass it in to the instructor with the paper.

Discuss What Each Member Brings to the Group. While you might know your other group members as friends, you probably don't know as much about them as students as you might think. A very productive topic for the first meeting, after all the logistics have been worked out, is to discuss what individual members' strengths and weaknesses are. In short, have everyone conduct a "personal inventory" and share it with the other members on their experiences relevant to the collaborative assignment. Doing this also helps alleviate the feeling that some group

members are "smarter" or "know more" than others. Everyone has strengths they bring to the group; we're simply not always aware of them. Consider the following:

- What's your previous experience with the topic?
- What do you understand best from class? What are you struggling with?
- Do you have any outside experience (job, internships, previous classes) relevant to the topic and/or class?
- What's your experience with the kind of research we're doing (field, library, etc.)
- What kinds of papers do you write best? What have teachers and others complimented you on?
- What problems do you have in writing?

ASSIGNMENT: FINAL PAPER

In the final paper, you will analyze Christopher Browning's *Ordinary Men*. You should buy a copy (available used on amazon.com as of this writing for about \$5.00) and read the entire book. You will write a review of and response to the book, comprised of the following elements.

- What is Browning's primary question of inquiry, and how does he answer it? (approximately 1 page)
- Briefly describe the role and activities of the Reserve Police Battalion 101 in the Holocaust (approximately 1 page)
- Summarize Browning's use of social scientific evidence to understand the Reserve Police Battalion's actions. (approximately 1 page)
- The rest (and the bulk) of your paper will analyze Browning's argument in light of the course material. In other words, you should provide the perspective of an expert reviewer. Note too that if you are critiquing the book, your response should not be simply negative but rather should address how the weaknesses or flaws you describe might be addressed and what these changes would add. Your analysis should be grounded in the readings of the class and should cite at least three additional peer-reviewed empirical articles that are not on our reading list to build your argument. I suggest focusing on one or two issues or questions and addressing them in depth, rather than addressing many questions or issues superficially. (4-5 pages)
- What open questions does your analysis raise? Connect this back to the course material by proposing a direction for future research. This section does not need to include a fully-fleshed out study, but it should pose a specific research question that could be tested with social scientific methods and quantitative data. State a hypothesis about the answer to this question, and explain your logic. (1-2 pages)

Grading Criteria

Accurate summary of facts	You should be fair and accurate in your summary of the events of the Reserve Police Battalion 101 and Browning's argument
Clarity of analysis	Your analysis of Browning's argument should be based on empirical evidence that comes from studies that are clearly described. The evidence to support your assertions should be clear. (If you make assumptions, be explicit that they are assumptions and that your argument rests on their validity.) Your argument should be clear and logical. An excellent paper will avoid sweeping generalizations, will be objective in considering evidence, and will carefully address counterarguments to the thesis. Ideas should progress linearly.
Use of Evidence	You will use psychological evidence appropriately, and will find additional sources as per the assignment guidelines.
Proposal for Future research	Your proposal for future research should clearly emerge from your argument, be a well-articulated research question, and your proposal should be a good test of your hypothesis.
Writing	Prose should be straightforward, clear, and easy to follow. Your paper should be well-organized and written for a professional audience. The paper should be carefully proofread before turning it in!
APA Format	The paper should follow APA format. In particular, in-text citations and your reference list should be accurate. See the handout posted on Moodle.