

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX
School of Psychology

CARING AND HELPING

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CONCERN AND COMMITMENT

(C8014)



Final Undergraduate Year Optional Module (Level 6, 15 Credits)
Autumn Term 2017-18

Module Convenor and Tutor: Tom Farsides

Our task must be to free ourselves by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature and its beauty (Albert Einstein)

Always do right -- this will gratify some and astonish the rest (Mark Twain)

There's nothing more dangerous than a shallow-thinking compassionate person. God, he can cause a lot of trouble (Garrett Hardin)

Every major horror of history was committed in the name of an altruistic motive (Ayn Rand)

Essentials

Timetable (See more information on next page, ‘Overview’)

- Week 1: *Caring” and “Helping”* (Also, homework set)
- Week 2: *Caring about and helping who or what?*
- Week 3: *Help why?* (Also, homework set)
- Week 4: *Belief*
- Week 5: *Passion* (Also, homework set)
- Week 6: *Actions have consequences*
- Week 7: *Promises and rewards* (Also, **report** submitted this week)
- Week 8: Reading week (No seminar)
- Week 9: *Children and other animals* (Also, homework set)
- Week 10: *Expectations*
- Week 11: *Inaction* (Also, homework set)
- Week 12: *Commitment*


Assessment

- Coursework report (REP) weighted at 30%
- 2000-word Essay (ESS) weighted at 70%

Module Tutor

Location: Pevensey 1, 1C7
Telephone: 01273 67 8886
E-mail: T.L.Farsides@susx.ac.uk
Twitter: @TomFarsides

Overview

Week 1	“Caring” and “Helping” <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Galizzi & Navarro-Martínez (2015) and Rozin (2001)• <u>Homework</u>: ‘Helping goal’ identification using an online example
Week 2	Caring about and helping who or what? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Farsides (2013 & 2015) and Farsides & Sparks (2016)
Week 3	Help why? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Batson (1994) and Farsides (2014)• <u>Homework</u>: Watch the film, ‘<i>The lives of others</i>’
Week 4	Belief <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Gehlbach & Brinkworth (2012) and Håkansson & Montgomery (2003).
Week 5	Passion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Bloom (2014).• <u>Homework</u>: Critical evaluation of <i>Dunn et al. (2008)</i>
Week 6	Actions have consequences <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Dunn et al. (2008) and Okasha (2005)
Week 7	Promises and rewards <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Gneezy et al. (2011) and Warneken & Tomasello (2008)• Report submitted this week: Critically analyse Cascio & Plant (2015)
Week 8	 Reading week (No seminar)
Week 9	Children and other animals <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Martin & Olson (2013) and Pérez-Manrique & Gomila (2017)• <u>Homework</u>: Essay question generation and evaluation.
Week 10	Expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Cohn et al. (2014) and Lois (1999)
Week 11	Inaction <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Ferraro et al. (2005) and Latané & Darley (1969)• <u>Homework</u>: Marking an essay.
Week 12	Commitment <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Req. reading</i>: Lee et al. (2005) and Reed & Aquino (2003).

Assessment

This module is assessed via a coursework report (REP) weighted at 30% and a 2000-word Essay (ESS).

Correct submission is each student's own responsibility. Submission details can be found on *Study Direct*.

Report (30%)

The task is to critically evaluate:

Cascio, J., & Plant, E. A. (2015). Prospective moral licensing: Does anticipating doing good later allow you to be bad now? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56, 110-116.

There is no word-limit - write as much as you need to concisely but comprehensively make and justify the most important points. However, if your report is longer than 1000 words, you are probably not being selective or concise enough.

The "Guidance for homework set in Week 5" in an Appendix to this document directly applies to the assessed report, too. (This homework is specifically designed to help prepare you for writing the report.)

Equivalent criteria will be used for this assignment as are used in all undergraduate assignments in Psychology at Sussex. For this assignment in particular, a premium will be put on critical evaluation of claims and of the evidence for them; conclusions being relevant and well-justified; and writing being as clear and concise as possible whilst adequately conveying relevant and important points.

Essay (70%)

Write a 2000-word essay using a title from a list that will be provided during the Autumn Term. Students wishing to use a title not from this list must get permission from the module convenor via email.

Students are strongly encouraged to pay close attention to the marking criteria for undergraduate essays in psychology at Sussex, in particular the need to display effective critical thinking. There are many resources available to help you develop your critical thinking skills, not least the University of Sussex Skills Hub:

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/skillshub/>

Information on the following can be found at the link below:

- Submitting your work
- Missing a deadline
- Plagiarism and Collusion - Academic Misconduct
- Late penalties
- Exceptional circumstances
- Exams
- Help with managing your studies and competing your work
- Assessment Criteria

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/psychology/internal/students/examinationsandassessment>

Week 1: Identifying Caring and Helping

Introduction

People sometimes want good things for others (i.e., they care about them and for this reason they are concerned about what happens to them). Sometimes people do what they do because they seek to serve others' interests/promote their welfare (i.e., they act to try to help). And sometimes people bring about good things for others (i.e., their actions are helpful).

These (three) things can be related. Caring can lead to attempted helping and attempted helping can actually lead to helpful outcomes. Similarly, but 'moving in the opposite direction', helpful outcomes can stem from attempted helping and attempted helping can be motivated by other-care.

However, these things are not necessarily related. I may care but do nothing and I may try to help but fail. And, 'moving in the other direction', my actions may help you without this being my intention and I may have reasons to help you that do not stem from me caring especially about you or your welfare.

Caring and attempted helping are the central phenomenon of interest on this module. As far as possible, we shall seek to understand **these phenomenon** with reference to specific examples and NOT by arguing about the meaning of particular words or phrases sometimes used to describe them, e.g., "altruism" or "prosocial behaviour".

Homework for Week 2

Identify one or more real or fictional examples online (in news reports, YouTube clips, or whatever) of behaviours that could be thought to be examples of motivated helping behaviour. Some source material is given below but by all means choose examples from elsewhere that might be new to me.

Citizenperth (2013, May 23). *Amazing acts of human kindness* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QnOIOcbKgJl>. The incident shown from 2:07 – 2:33.

Cribb, R. (2016, July 17). Canadian surrogates and their extraordinary altruism. *The Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/news/world/2016/07/17/canadian-surrogates-and-their-extraordinary-altruism.html>

McCann, K. (2010, November, 23). Altruistic donation: 'I could save a life – and that's all that matters'. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/health/8147224/Altruistic-donation-I-could-save-a-life-and-thats-all-that-matters.html>

McIntyre, N. (2017, May1). Toddler laughs as five firefighters try to free him from locked car. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/toddler-laughs-firefighters-free-him-from-locked-car-a7711376.html>

O'Leary, A. (2017, May 2). Amazing 'Good Samaritans' who held on to suicidal man for TWO HOURS to stop him jumping from bridge. *The Mirror*. Retrieved from <http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/amazing-compassion-good-samaritans-who-10342483>

Complete a separate 'Record' sheet for each example you choose. Each record sheet should include (1) **your name** at the top followed by (2) an **APA-style reference** for the example you are using. Under that, write as concisely and as objectively as you can (3) **an objective description of the behaviour**. Next, as precisely as possible, (4) identify the actor's **focal goal**, i.e., what they were apparently trying to do or achieve, plus (5) your **evidence** for that claim. Finally, try to identify the most likely (6) **motive** they had for that goal. Optionally, you may also like to evaluate the extent to which each example can be identified as an instance of "altruism", "helping", "prosocial behaviour", or similar according to definitions of such things that you may have come across in your preparatory reading (or elsewhere). I provide an example completed by me in Appendix 1 of this Handbook and a blank Record Form for your use in Appendix 2. Both are also provided on the module's *Study Direct* website.

Please bring your sheet(s) to Week 2's seminar. You will need them during the seminar and you will benefit to the extent that you have taken the task seriously. Neither the homework nor the seminar activity using it will directly contribute to the grade you receive on this module, i.e., they are not "summative" assignments. However, both are designed, in part, to help you eventually get the best grade you are capable of on this (or any indeed any) module, i.e., they are "formative" assignments.

If and only if you are willing, I would like collect your completed report(s) at the end of the seminar. The main reason for this is to give me concrete evidence of how things are going on the module so far, for you individually and for the class as a whole. However, please be aware that I might also use the (anonymised) reports in various other ways that I consider legitimate, e.g., as examples or stimuli in subsequent teaching, research, or assessment; as evidence of my teaching methods and outcomes; to help me write references for some of you in the future; etc.

Required reading

- * Galizzi, M., & Navarro-Martínez, D. (2015). *On the external validity of social preference games: A systematic lab-field study* (No. 802). Barcelona Graduate School of Economics. Retrieved from http://www.barcelonagse.eu/sites/default/files/working_paper_pdfs/802.pdf
- * Rozin, P. (2001). Social psychology and science: Some lessons from Solomon Asch. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 2-14.

Potential additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Bardsley, N. (2008). Dictator game giving: Altruism or artefact? *Experimental Economics*, 11, 122-133.
- Block, J. (1996). Some jangly remarks on Baumeister and Heatherton. *Psychological Inquiry*, 7, 28-32.
- Chadwick, R. A., Bromgard, G., Bromgard, I., & Trafimow, D. (2006). An index of specific behaviors in the moral domain. *Behavior Research Methods*, 38, 692-697.
- Clavien, C., & Chapuisat, M. (2013). Altruism across disciplines: One word, multiple meanings. *Biology & Philosophy*, 28(1), 125-140.
- Folbre, N., & Goodin, R. E. (2004). Revealing altruism. *Review of Social Economy*, 62, 1-25.
- Johnson, R., Danko, G. P., Darvill, T. J., Bochner, S., Bowers, J. K., Huang, Y-H., Park, J. Y., Rahim, A. R. A., & Pennington, D. (1989). Cross-cultural assessment of altruism and its correlates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10(8), 855-868.
- Levine, R. V. (2003). The kindness of strangers. *American Scientist*, 91, 226-233.
- López-Pérez, B., Howells, L., & Gummerum, M. (2017). Cruel to be kind: Factors underlying altruistic efforts to worsen another person's mood. *Psychological Science*, doi: 10.1177/0956797617696312. [Epub ahead of print]
- Lupoli, M. J., Jampol, L., & Oveis, C. (2017). Lying because we care: Compassion increases prosocial lying. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 146(7), 1026-1042.
- McGuire, A. M. (1994). Helping behaviors in the natural environment: Dimensions and correlates of helping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 45-56.
- Pearce, P. L., & Amato, P. R. (1980). A taxonomy of helping: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *Social Psychological Quarterly*, 43, 363-371.
- Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D., & Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2, 293-302.
- Sprecher, S., & Fehr, B. (2005). Compassionate love for close others and humanity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 629-651.

Week 2: Caring about and helping who or what?

Introduction

It is, I think, useful to differentiate what people try to do (i.e., what their goals are) from why they try to do it (i.e., what their motives are). For any given behaviour it can be constructive to ask, “Is this a genuine attempt to improve the welfare of someone or something other than the actor (and if so, who or what, and how)?” as well as or instead of asking, “Why is the actor trying to do whatever it is that they are actually trying to do?” There is a direct parallel with the distinction between intentional harm (e.g., deliberate killing) and reasons for engaging in intentional harm (e.g., hatred, professional assassination, euthanasia). Before asking why a person tried to help or harm it is necessary to establish that there *were* trying to help or harm.

If this is correct, for any given behaviour we need to establish what the actor’s goals were as well as (and perhaps sometimes instead of) why they had those goals.

This week we will consider how it might be possible to identify people’s goals, especially their attempts to promote others’ welfare. Next week, we will consider the relationship between (especially helping-) goals and motives.

Required reading

- * Farsides, T. (2015, October 3). Deep reasons for superficial altruism [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://tomfarsides.blogspot.com/2015/10/deep-reasons-for-superficial-altruism.html>
- * Farsides, T. (2013, October 7). Where’s the “I” in altruism? [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://tomfarsides.blogspot.com/2013/10/wheres-i-in-altruism.html>
- * Farsides, T. L., & Sparks, P. (2016). Buried in bullshit. *The Psychologist*, 29(5), 368-371. <https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-29/may-2016/buried-bullshit>

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Barasch, A., Levine, E. E., Berman, J. Z., & Small, D. A. (2014). Selfish or selfless? On the signal value of emotion in altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(3), 393-413.

- Bruns, F., & Chelouche, T. (2017). Lectures on inhumanity: Teaching medical ethics in German medical schools under Nazism. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 166(8), 591-595.
- Campbell, R. L. (2006). Altruism in Auguste Comte and Ayn Rand. *Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*, 7 (2), 357-369.
- Carlsmith, K. M., & Sood, A. M. (2009). The fine line between interrogation and retribution. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(1), 191-196.
- Eckel, C., & Gintis, H. (2009). Blaming the messenger: Notes on the current state of experimental economics. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 73 (1), 109-119.
- Förster, J., Liberman, N., & Friedman, R. S. (2007). Seven principles of goal activation: A systematic approach to distinguishing goal priming from priming of non-goal constructs. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11 (3), 211-233.
- Urminsky, O. (2017). The role of psychological connectedness to the future self in decisions over time. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(1), 34-39.

Week 3: Help why?

Introduction

Last week we explored how to tell when people want and seek good things for others (broadly conceived). This week we will consider whether there is compelling evidence for any claim that they do this for any *particular* reason. Do people help and serve primarily for hedonistic reasons, literally to feel good or to enjoy a ‘warm glow’? Or perhaps people’s help is primarily motivated by attempts to feel less bad; to avoid feelings of guilt? Or maybe people help only because and when they think it is in their material best-interest to do so. Then again, perhaps people’s helping is motivated primarily by their desires for fame, status, or similar. In a nutshell, last week we asked *what* people think will bring them personal satisfaction and this week we ask *why* they think that getting what they want will be personally satisfying. (That said, “how” and “why” are slippery terms, so try to understand what the distinction is as well as how to communicate it.)

When considering such matters, it is helpful to keep in mind distinctions that we have already established as important. In particular, people’s reasons for wanting things to go well for others may differ from their reasons for striving to improve things for others.

It is also helpful to keep in mind a few other things. First, many of the things we do are the combination of many causes (‘multideterminism’). Think about how you answer when people ask, “Why did you want to study psychology at Sussex?” Second, people can engage in the same behaviour for different reasons (‘equifinality’). Imagine how many answers all the people in your class would give to the previous question. Third, people with a particular goal can follow different paths to it (‘equipotentiality’). Some Sussex students came via the ‘typical’ route. Others are mature students. Others achieved entry requirements abroad, etc. Finally (for now), people may initially engage in a behaviour in an attempt to serve one set of motives (e.g., desire for achievement) but continue engaging in that behaviour to try to serve other motives (e.g., desire for belonging). Because of this complexity, asking *if* people are trying to help may ultimately be a more manageable question than asking *why* they are trying to help and/or what their ‘underlying’ or ‘real’ motives are.

Homework for Week 4

Watch the Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck’s (2 hour and 7 minute) film, *The lives of others*. (This can be watched for free on *Box of Broadcasts* (BoB), available via *Sussex Direct*.) This film is relevant to much of the course, perhaps particularly Weeks 4 and 5. While watching, think about caring and helping behaviour and the determinants of each, particularly with respect to Captain Gerd Wiesler. Pay special attention to the role of beliefs. Write a short account, in whatever format you like (e.g., narrative, bullet-points, whatever), explaining, with whatever evidence you can identify, how one or more key beliefs seem to have been instrumental in influencing Wiesler’s cares and attempted helping behaviour.

Please bring your account(s) to Week 4's seminar. You will need them during the seminar and you will benefit to the extent that you have taken the task seriously. Neither the homework nor the seminar activity using it will directly contribute to the grade you receive on this module, i.e., they are not "summative" assignments. However, both are designed, in part, to help you eventually get the best grade you are capable of on this (or any indeed any) module, i.e., they are "formative" assignments.

If and only if you are willing, I would like collect your written account at the end of the seminar. The main reason for this is to give me concrete evidence of how things are going on the module so far, for you individually and for the class as a whole. However, please be aware that I might also use the (anonymised) accounts in various other ways that I consider legitimate, e.g., as examples or stimuli in subsequent teaching, research, or assessment; as evidence of my teaching methods and outcomes; to help me write references for some of you in the future; etc.

Required reading

- * Batson, C. D. (1994). Why act for the public good? Four answers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 603-610.
- * Farsides, T. (2014, October 13). Real world altruism [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://tomfarsides.blogspot.com/2014/10/real-world-altruism.html>

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1516-1530.
- Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2003). Motivations for caregiving in adult intimate relationships: Influences on caregiving behaviour and relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 950-968.
- Ginges, J., Atran, S., Sachdeva, S., & Medin, D. (2011). Psychology out of the laboratory: The challenge of violent extremism. *American Psychologist*, 66(6), 507.
- Kelly, S. P., Morgan, G. G., & Coule, T. M. (2014). Celebrity altruism: The good, the bad and the ugly in relationships with fundraising charities. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19(2), 57-75.
- Kesselheim, A. S., Studdert, D. M., Mello, M. M. (2010). Whistle-blowers' experiences in fraud litigation against pharmaceutical companies. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 362, 1832-1939.

- Misje, A. H., Bosnes, V., Gåsda, O., & Heier, H. E. (2005). Motivation, recruitment and retention of voluntary non-remunerated blood donors: A survey-based questionnaire study. *Vox sanguinis*, 89(4), 236-244
- Nimmons, D., & Folkman, S. (1999). Other-sensitive motivation for safer-sex among gay men: Expanding paradigms for HIV prevention. *Aids and Behavior*, 3, 313-324.
- Sanner, M. A. (2006). People's attitudes and reactions to organ donation. *Mortality*, 11, 133-150.
- Small, D. A., & Cryder, C. (2016). Prosocial consumer behavior. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 10, 107-111.

Week 4: Belief

Introduction

It is routinely claimed that empathy promotes caring and/or attempted helping. It is also routinely claimed that one aspect of empathy is “cognitive empathy”, by which is usually meant something like “beliefs about what others are experiencing” and/or various processes by which people might reach such beliefs, such as contagion, fantasy, imagination, imitation, inference, mentalizing, mind perception, mirroring, perspective taking, projection, simulation, social intelligence, theory of mind, or transference. And that is a large part of what we will be trying to come to terms with this week, the more cognitive side of empathy, although some other beliefs of potential importance will also be considered.

Required reading

- * Gehlbach, H., & Brinkworth, M. E. (2012). The social perspective taking process: Strategies and sources of evidence in taking another's perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 114(1), n1. [pdf via, e.g., Google Scholar]
- * Håkansson, J., & Montgomery, H. (2003). Empathy as an interpersonal phenomenon. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20, 267-284.

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Bekkers, R., & Ottoni-Wilhelm, M. (2016). Principle of care and giving to help people in need. *European Journal of Personality*, 30(3), 240-257.
- Churher, M. (2016). Can empathy be a moral resource? A Smithean reply to Jesse Prinz. *Dialogue: Canadian Philosophical Review/Revue canadienne de philosophie*, 55(3), 429-447.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.
- Gerdes, K. E., Segal, E. A., & Lietz, C. A. (2010). Conceptualising and measuring empathy. *British Journal of Social Work*, 40 (7), 2326-2343.
- Gray, H. M., Gray, K., & Wegner, D. M. (2007). Dimensions of mind perception. *Science*, 315, 619.

- Kerem, E., Fishman, N., & Josselson, R. (2001). The experience of empathy in everyday relationships: Cognitive and affective elements. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18, 709-729.
- Wispé, L. (1986). The distinction between sympathy and empathy: To call forth a concept, a word is needed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 314-421.
- Zahavi, D. (2008). Simulation, projection, and empathy. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 17, 514-522.
- Zaki, J. (2014). Empathy: A motivated account. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(6), 1608-1647.

Week 5: Passion

Introduction

All manner of feelings (or at least things labelled as “feelings”) demonstrably influence caring and attempted helping, e.g., anger, awe, blame, disgust, distress, elevation, gratitude, guilt, happiness, sadness, shame. The one that has received the most attention in the psychological literature is probably compassion, a.k.a., sympathy, empathic concern...

Of course, this being psychology, it is far from clear what “compassion” is. There appear to be various things sometimes called “compassion” (e.g., a temporary feeling, a dispositional feeling, a ‘stance’, etc.). Some of these things are not obviously “feelings” in the sense of actually feeling like anything, i.e., being “hot” or having a phenomenology.

“Empathic concern”, for example, *may* feel like something but sometimes seems better represented as a “desire” or a “want”. If I, in a general, abstract sense, “feel sorry for sick animals and want them to be helped”, is that necessarily a feeling, even if it is often accompanied by or results in one?

Philosophers distinguish between beliefs and desires by saying that the former have (or ought to have) a ‘mind-to-world’ direction of fit (i.e., beliefs should reflect the way things appear to be in the world) whereas the latter have a ‘world-to-mind’ direction of fit (i.e., desires want the world to reflect personal preferences). The former, then, are our best estimates about how things *are* and could be. The latter are about how we would *like* them to be.

In this sense, we arguably need beliefs and desires; reason and passion. “Beliefs without desires are inert” and “desires without beliefs are blind”. I think that lots of people suffer in the world but if this leaves me unmoved – if I don’t really want anything different – I will neither care nor (unless motivated by something else) act. Similarly, I might care a lot but lack beliefs that make action possible. I might, for example, desperately want people to stop killing each other but if I have no idea about how this might be accomplished, I may just wring my hands and wail.

It’s complicated.

Homework for Week 6

Critically evaluate the following paper, which also happens to be one of the Required Readings for next week’s seminar:

Dunn, E. W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Spending money on others promotes happiness. *Science*, 319, 1687-1688.

Write a summary of your analysis. Guidance on how to do this is given in Appendix 3 of this handbook and on the module’s *Study Direct* website.

Please bring your summary to Week 6's seminar. You will need it during the seminar and you will benefit to the extent that you have taken the task seriously. Neither the homework nor the seminar activity using it will directly contribute to the grade you receive on this module, i.e., they are not "summative" assignments. However, both are designed, in part, to help you eventually get the best grade you are capable of on this (or any indeed any) module, i.e., they are "formative" assignments.

If and only if you are willing, I would like collect your summary at the end of the seminar. The main reason for this is to give me concrete evidence of how things are going on the module so far, for you individually and for the class as a whole. However, please be aware that I might also use the (anonymised) accounts in various other ways that I consider legitimate, e.g., as examples or stimuli in subsequent teaching, research, or assessment; as evidence of my teaching methods and outcomes; to help me write references for some of you in the future; etc.

Required reading

- * Bloom, P. (2014, August 26). Against empathy. *Boston Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.bostonreview.net/forum/paul-bloom-against-empathy>

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- CogSai (2012, June 5). What is empathy? *YouTube*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q5jrUg_kXjY
- Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136 (3), 351-374.
- Hobson, J.A., Harris, R., García-Pérez, R., & Hobson, R. P. (2009). Anticipatory concern: A study in autism. *Developmental Science*, 12 (2), 249-263.
- Lishner, D. A., Batson, C. D., & Huss, E. (2011). Tenderness and sympathy: Distinct empathic emotions elicited by different forms of need. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(5), 614-625.
- Loewenstein, G., & Small, D. A. (2007). The Scarecrow and the Tin Man: The vicissitudes of human sympathy and caring. *Review of General Psychology*, 11, 112-126.
- Nichols, S. (2001). Mindreading and the cognitive architecture underlying altruistic motivation. *Mind and Language*, 16, 425-455.
- Vitaglione, G. D., & Barnett, M. A. (2003). Assessing a new dimension of empathy: Empathic anger as a predictor of helping and punishing desires. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27, 301-325.

Week 6: Actions have consequences

Introduction

Last week we noted that emotions can influence caring and attempted helping. Also, of course, caring, attempted helping, and the (planned and unplanned) outcomes of each can affect emotions. Indeed, each of these things can have all sorts of consequences, not just emotional ones. There can be costs and benefits of all sorts and those costs and benefits can accrue to all sorts of people and things. So, for example, my attempt to help you by adopting the teaching methods I do might have consequences for me, for you, for 'the university', for 'society', for 'future generations', and for who knows what and who else. This week, the consequences of caring and attempted helping will be our primary focus.

Required reading

- * Dunn, E. W., Aknin, L. B., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Spending money on others promotes happiness. *Science*, 319, 1687-1688.
- * Okasha, S. (2005: Minor corrections from 2003). Biological altruism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Online Edition, Spring 2005): <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2005/entries/altruism-biological/>

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Clark, M. S., & Grote, N. K. (1998). Why aren't indices of relationship costs always negatively related to indices of relationship quality? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 2-17.
- Crocker, J., Canevello, A., & Brown, A. A. (2017). Social motivation: Costs and benefits of selfishness and otherishness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 299-325.
- Ginges, J., Atran, S., Sachdeva, S., & Medin, D. (2011). Psychology out of the laboratory: The challenge of violent extremism. *American Psychologist*, 66(6), 507-519.
- Harbaugh, W. T., Mayr, U., & Burghart, D. R. (2007). Neural responses to taxation and voluntary giving reveal motives for charitable donations. *Science*, 316, 1622-1625.
- Hirt, E. R., Zillman, D., Erikson, G. A., & Kennedy, C. (1992). Costs and benefits of allegiance: Changes in fans' self-ascribed competencies after team victory versus defeat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 724-738.

- Kogan, A., Impett, E. A., Oveis, C., Hui, B., Gordon, A. M., & Keltner, D. (2010). When giving feels good: The intrinsic benefits of sacrifice in romantic relationships for the communally motivated. *Psychological Science*, 21 (12), 1918-1924.
- Minson, J. A., & Monin, B. (2012). Do-gooder derogation: Disparaging morally motivated minorities to defuse anticipated reproach. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(2), 200-207.
- Newman, G. E., & Cain, D. M. (2014). Tainted altruism: When doing some good is evaluated as worse than doing no good at all. *Psychological Science*, 25(3), 648-655.
- Tasimi, A., Dominguez, A., & Wynn, K. (2015). Do-gooder derogation in children: The social costs of generosity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1036.
- Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., & Chin, J. (2007). Feeling duped: Emotional, motivational, and cognitive aspects of being exploited by others. *Review of General Psychology*, 11 (2), 127-141.

Week 7: Promises and rewards

Introduction

This week we will be considering whether introducing enticements or rewards (or threats or punishments) changes how caring and helping people subsequently are. The focal claim will be what is called ‘the overjustification effect’ by psychologists and ‘crowding out’ by economists. This claim is difficult to state elegantly but it goes something like this:

IF someone is already (perhaps ‘intrinsically’) motivated to do something
THEN introducing additional enticements to do that activity (and/or materially rewarding that activity) will undermine the original (perhaps ‘intrinsic’) motivation, so that any subsequent removal of the introduced enticements will make people *less* likely to engage in the activity than they were in the first place.

That said, the claim has been made in various ways and is often tested in ways that make it clear that some claim *other* than the one above is being tested. In particular, there are differences in the claimed or examined roles of “enticements and/or rewards” and there is sometimes a certain vagueness about *what*, specifically, is enticed or rewarded. Similarly, some researchers make much of the role of initial motivation while others neglect this clause, and some are insistent that this motivation is “intrinsic” (variously defined) whereas others do not worry about such things.

This messy but potentially crucially important claim will be the focus of this week’s efforts.

Reminder: Report Deadline

A critical evaluation of:

Cascio, J., & Plant, E. A. (2015). Prospective moral licensing: Does anticipating doing good later allow you to be bad now? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56, 110-116.

Required reading

- * Gneezy, U., Meier, S., & Rey-Biel, P. (2011). When and why incentives (don't) work to modify behavior. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25(4), 191-209.
- * Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2008). Extrinsic rewards undermine altruistic tendencies in 20-month-olds. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(6), 1785-1788.

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Batson, C. D., Coke, J. S., Jasnoski, M. L., & Hanson, M. (1978). Buying kindness: Effect of an extrinsic incentive for helping on perceived altruism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 86-91.
- Batson, C. D., Fultz, J., Schoenrade, P. A., & Paduano, A. (1987). Critical self-reflection and self-perceived altruism: When self-reward fails. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 594-602.
- Batson, C. D., Harris, A. C., McCaul, K. D., Davis, M., & Schmidt, T. (1979). Compassion or compliance: Alternative dispositional attributions for one's helping behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 42, 405-409.
- Batson, C. D., & Thomas, G. (1981). Effects of helping under normative pressure on self-perceived altruism. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44, 127-131.
- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 980-1008.
- Chao, M. (2017). Demotivating incentives and motivation crowding out in charitable giving. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(28), 7301-7306.
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 105-115.
- Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J., Eisenberg, N., May-Plumlee, T., & Christopher, F. S. (1989). Effects of rewards on children's prosocial motivation. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 509-515.
- Przepiorka, W., & Berger, J. (2016). The sanctioning dilemma: A quasi-experiment on social norm enforcement in the train. *European Sociological Review*, 32(3), 439-451.
- Rode, J., Gómez-Baggethun, E., & Krause, T. (2015). Motivation crowding by economic incentives in conservation policy: A review of the empirical evidence. *Ecological Economics*, 117, 270-282.

Week 8: Reading Week

Week 9: Children and other animals

Introduction

This week we shall examine various questions. Can animals care about and try to help others? Do they and, if so, when? How can we tell? What, if anything, does this reveal about human caring and helping?

Similarly, when do ‘normally developing’ ‘healthy’ children develop abilities and tendencies to care and to try to help? Or, to take a slightly different approach, what can prevent a child from developing abilities and tendencies to care and to try to help? Do the answers to such questions tell us anything useful about how to encourage adult caring and attempted helping?

Homework for Week 10

Assignment: Writing titles for assessed essays that promote and allow evaluation of critical thinking is a skill. Learning why will help you write high-quality essays that have the best possible chance of obtaining good grades. This assignment is intended to help your learning in this area. Please write between one and three essay titles relevant to this module and explain how answers to each could satisfy the marking criteria required to obtain a first-class grade. (It is possible that you could end up using one of the titles!) The following reference may be helpful for completing this assignment:

Reiner, C. M., Bothell, T. W., Sudweeks, R. R., & Wood, B. (2002). How to prepare effective essay questions: Guidelines for university faculty. Brigham Young University Testing Services. (Use *Google Scholar* or download from the Module site on *Study Direct*.)

Please bring a record of your titles and explanations to Week 10’s seminar. You will need them during the seminar and you will benefit to the extent that you have taken the task seriously. Neither the homework nor the seminar activity using it will directly contribute to the grade you receive on this module, i.e., they are not “summative” assignments. However, both are designed, in part, to help you eventually get the best grade you are capable of on this (or any indeed any) module, i.e., they are “formative” assignments.

If and only if you are willing, I would like collect your written account at the end of the seminar. The main reason for this is to give me concrete evidence of how things are going on the module so far, for you individually and for the class as a whole. However, please be aware that I might also use the (anonymised) accounts in various other ways that I consider legitimate, e.g., as examples or stimuli in subsequent teaching, research, or assessment; as evidence of my teaching methods and outcomes; to help me write references for some of you in the future; etc.

Required reading

- * Martin, A., & Olson, K. R. (2013). When kids know better: Paternalistic helping in 3-year-old children. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(11), 2071.
- * Pérez-Manrique, A., & Gomila, A. (2017). The comparative study of empathy: Sympathetic concern and empathic perspective-taking in non-human animals. *Biological Reviews*, doi: 10.1111/brv.12342

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Brosnan, S. F. (2012). Introduction to 'Justice in animals'. *Social Justice Research*. Special issue: Justice in animals, 25(2), 109-121.
- De Waal, F. B. M. (2012). Moral behaviour in animals. TEDX talk.
http://www.ted.com/talks/frans_de_waal_do_animals_have_morals.html
- Farsides, T. (2015, October 11). Altruistic rats? [Blog post]. Retrieved from
<http://tomfarsides.blogspot.com/2015/10/altruistic-rats.html>
- Hepach, R., Vaish, A., & Tomasello, M. (2017). The fulfillment of others' needs elevates children's body posture. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(1), 100-113.
- Jensen, K. (2016). Chapter Seven - The prosocial primate - A critical review. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 48, 387-441.
- Paulus, M. (2014). The emergence of prosocial behavior: Why do infants and toddlers help, comfort, and share? *Child Development Perspectives*, 8(2), 77-81.
- Sapolsky, R. M. (2007). Peace among primates. *Greater Good*, IV(2), 34-37.
- Thompson, C., Barresi, J., & Moore, C. (1997). The development of future-oriented prudence and altruism in preschoolers. *Cognitive Development*, 12, 199-212.
- Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2009). Varieties of altruism in children and chimpanzees. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 13 (9), 397-402.

Week 10: Expectations

Introduction

This week we consider the role that actual or perceived expectations have on our tendencies to care or to try to help. Such expectations may come from various places including law, morality, norms, or customs and culture.

Required reading

- * Cohn, A., Fehr, E., & Maréchal, M. A. (2014). Business culture and dishonesty in the banking industry. *Nature*, 516(7529), 86-89.
- * Lois, J. (1999). Socialization to heroism: Individualism and collectivism in a voluntary search and rescue group. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62, 117-135.

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Balfe, M. (2016). Standardizing psycho-medical torture during the War on Terror: Why it happened, how it happened, and why it didn't work. *Social Science & Medicine*, 171, 1-8.
- Bennett, J. (1974). The conscience of Huckleberry Finn. *Philosophy*, 49(188), 123-134. Retrieved from *Some texts from Early Modern Philosophy*
<http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/jfb/huckfinn.pdf>
- Berger, J., & Hevenstone, D. (2016). Norm enforcement in the city revisited: An international field experiment of altruistic punishment, norm maintenance, and broken windows. *Rationality and Society*, 28(3), 299-319.
- Grant, A. (2016, October 22). Does studying economics breed greed? *Psychology Today*, <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/give-and-take/201310/does-studying-economics-breed-greed>
- Henderson, M. D., Huang, S. C., & Chang, C.C. (2011). When others cross psychological distance to help: Highlighting prosocial actions toward outgroups encourages philanthropy. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48 (1), 220-225.
- O'Toole, M., & Grey, C. (2016). 'We can tell them to get lost, but we won't do that': cultural control and resistance in voluntary work. *Organization Studies*, 37(1), 55-75.
- Schultz, P. W., Nolan, J. M., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2007). The constructive, destructive, and reconstructive power of social norms. *Psychological Science*, 18 (5), 429-434.

Tarrant, M., Dazeley, S., & Cottom, T. (2009). Social categorization and empathy for outgroup members. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48 (3), 427-446.

Week 11: Inaction

Introduction

This week's concern will be factors that prevent, block, or actively discourage caring and helping (in specific instances or in general). Some of these will undoubtedly have been discussed earlier in the module but there will be lots left to discover and explore.

Homework for Week 12

Any number of agencies that offer 'ghost writing', 'academic proof-reading', and the like will write undergraduate essays for a fee. Most profess only to be providing 'guides' and warn against students simply submitting as their own the allegedly unique essays they buy. About the same number promise that their essays will not be identifiable as ghost-written by standard plagiarism procedures used by universities. Because such agencies undermine scholarship and virtue, both of which I value highly, I loathe them. I very much hope that you have too much academic integrity and personal self-respect to contemplate paying for their services.

Some of these agencies provide free example essays on the internet as 'bait'. This week's homework starts by you taking advantage of this ☺ Start by obtaining the following essay:

UKEssays. (No date). True altruism does not exist. Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/services/example-essays/psychology/true-altruism-does-not-exist.php> (A copy is also available on the Module page of *Study Direct*.)

If necessary, copy and paste the essay into *Word*, remove all the advertisements and other extraneous content, change the formatting if you wish, and save your new version. Then mark the essay as you would like your own essays to be marked whilst paying close attention to Sussex Psychology's marking criteria for coursework essays (available from *Study Direct*). As constructively as you can, write comments, corrections, and suggestions in margins or elsewhere. Indicate instances where the marking criteria are or are not well met. Write an 'overall summary' of your feedback at the end of the essay and assign an appropriate grade. You might also want to highlight evidence that this essay was *not* written by a student on this module (evidence that I will always be on the look-out for).

Please bring a copy of your marked essay to Week 12's seminar. You will need it during the seminar and you will benefit to the extent that you have taken the task seriously. Neither the homework nor the seminar activity using it will directly contribute to the grade you receive on this module, i.e., they are not "summative" assignments. However, both are designed, in part, to help you eventually get the best grade you are capable of on this (or any indeed any) module, i.e., they are "formative" assignments.

If and only if you are willing, I would like collect your written account at the end of the seminar. The main reason for this is to give me concrete evidence of how things are going on the module so far, for you individually and for the class as a whole. However, please be aware that I might also use the (anonymised) accounts in various other ways that I consider legitimate, e.g., as examples or stimuli in subsequent teaching, research, or assessment; as evidence of my teaching methods and outcomes; to help me write references for some of you in the future; etc.

Required reading

- * Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2005). Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 8-24.
- * Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1969). Bystander "apathy". *American Scientist*, 57(2), 244-268.

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Anderson, C. J. (2003). The psychology of doing nothing: Forms of decision avoidance result from reason and emotion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 139-167.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetuation of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 193-209.
- Berman, J.Z., & Small, D. A. (2012). Self-interest without selfishness: The hedonic benefit of imposed self-interest. *Psychological Science*, 23(10), 1193-1199.
- Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., Millard, K., & McDonald, R. (2015). 'Happy to have been of service': The Yale archive as a window into the engaged followership of participants in Milgram's 'obedience' experiments. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 54(1), 55-83.
- Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1429.
- Margolis, J. D., & Molinsky, A. (2008). Navigating the binds of necessary evils: Psychological engagement and the production of interpersonally sensitive behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51 (5), 847-842.
- Plötner, M., Over, H., Carpenter, M., & Tomasello, M. (2015). Young children show the bystander effect in helping situations. *Psychological Science*, 26(4), 499-506.

- Seider, S. (2009). Overwhelmed and immobilized: Raising the consciousness of privileged young adults about world hunger and poverty. *International Studies Perspectives*, 10(1), 60-76.
- Van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (2013). On sense-making reactions and public inhibition of benign social motives: An appraisal model of prosocial behavior. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 48, 1-58.

Week 12: Commitment

Introduction

Much of this module reflects a focus in much of the literature, i.e., caring and attempted helping in specific situations or at specific times. This week, our concern will be whether and how it is possible to make people more broadly and consistently or repeatedly caring and helpful.

Required reading

- * Lee, D. Y., Kang, C. H., Lee, J. Y., & Park, S. H. (2005). Characteristics of exemplary altruists. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 42, 146-155.
- * Reed, A. II., & Aquino, K. F. (2003). Moral identity and the expanding circle of moral regard toward out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1270-1286.

Additional reading

The following references are *examples* of topic-relevant additional reading.

- Aquino, K., & Reed, A. II. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1423-1440.
- Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2001). Being committed: Affective, cognitive, and conative components of relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(9), 1190-1203.
- Berg, M. B., Janoff-Bulman, R., & Cotter, J. (2001). Perceiving value in obligations and goals: Wanting to do what should be done. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(8), 982-995.
- Cioffi, D., & Garner, R. (1996). On doing the decision: Effects of active versus passive choice on commitment and self-perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 133-147.
- Davis, M. H., Mitchell, K. V., Hall, J. A., Lothert, J., Snapp, T., & Meyer, M. (1999). Empathy, expectations, and situational preferences: Personality influences on the decision to participate in volunteer helping behaviors. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 469-503.
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Freeman, E. C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others, and civic orientation, 1966–2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(5), 1045-1062.

Caring and helping: The psychology of concern and commitment (C8014)

Walker, L. J., & Frimer, J. A. (2007). Moral personality of brave and caring exemplars. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 845-860.

Appendix 1: Demonstration for homework set in Week 1

My name

Tom Farsides

Task

Select a documented instance of someone who seemed to deliberately improve someone else's welfare. Complete the rest of this sheet with reference to it.

Reference

Daily Digest (2014, April 26). *French policeman shoots suicidal man to save his life* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=75uR4u5YEs>

Objective description of the behaviour of someone who potentially cared about and/or tried to help another

One person ("the policeman") seemingly deliberately shoots another person ("the citizen") in the leg.

What was their focal goal? What were they trying to do or achieve?

Preventing the citizen's death with minimum harm and risk.

What evidence is there that they cared about the welfare of anyone or anything other than themselves?

Shooting involved injury to the citizen and multiple risks, including to the actor. Presumably for these reasons, the policeman did not shoot whilst he thought his preferred state of affairs (which *became* his goal) might be obtained by other means, in this case by the actions of other policemen, the citizen's relatives, the citizen himself, or by 'fate'. This suggests that acting was not the policeman's primary desire: ensuring the citizen's safety was.

When the policeman's actions seemed both necessary and sufficient to ensure the citizen's safety, the policeman was willing to incur the costs and risks of acting as he did. Again, this suggests that at the time of action the policeman was primarily concerned to protect the citizen's welfare, even if this required shooting him!

What was the actor's most likely primary motive? Why did they act as they did?

To fulfil his job-specific role by professionally complying with police procedure.

Appendix 2: Record for homework set in Week 1

Your name

Task

Select a documented instance of someone who seemed to deliberately improve someone else's welfare. Complete the rest of this sheet with reference to it.

Reference

Objective description of the behaviour of someone who potentially cared about and/or tried to help another

What was their focal goal? What were they trying to do or achieve?

What evidence is there that they cared about the welfare of anyone or anything other than themselves?

What was the actor's most likely primary motive? Why did they act as they did?

Bonus question (complete overleaf or on separate sheet(s), with citations): Would this behaviour count as an example of "altruism", "helping", "prosocial behaviour", or similar according to any given definition(s) you have come across? Explain why and share any thoughts you might have about this.

Appendix 3: Guidance for homework set in Week 5

There is no *one* way to read a scientific paper well. How to do so will vary by experience, familiarity, where and how the paper is published, your reason for possibly wanting to read the paper, etc. There are many online and other guides that may help you develop your own preferences and practices, e.g.:

Pain, E. (2016, March 21). How to (seriously) read a scientific paper. *Science*. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2016/03/how-seriously-read-scientific-paper>

When critically examining an empirical paper on this module, I recommend that you **read and summarise the Methods and Results first**, i.e., before you read (and are potentially ‘contaminated’ by) the Introduction and Discussion. For multiple-study papers, do this separately for each study.

To start, **write a summary of what was done and found** as clearly and as objectively as you can, doing your best to balance the incompatible ideals of comprehensiveness and conciseness. E.g.:

In a sample ($n = 15$) of predominantly female ($n = 13$) British undergraduate students, a correlation of .21 was found between a single-item, self-report measure of ‘happiness’ (“Do you feel better than James Brown?” 1 = *sadly, no*; 2 = *no*; 3 = *a little*; 4 = *sometimes*; 5 = *a lot*; 6 = *always*; 7 = *hell, yeah!*) and a male teaching assistant’s evaluation of how ‘attractive’ each student was (1 = *not hot*; 2 = *meh*; 3 = *hot*).

Then, having read the rest of the paper, report **how the authors** (and/or others impressed by the paper) **report the finding and its significance**, ideally using direct quotes.

The authors report that their “findings demonstrate that happiness is dependent on people’s attractiveness to others” (p. 65) and claim that this supports their theory that “(un)happiness is an evolved mechanism serving to alert people that they need to divert resources from other things to improve their sexual attractiveness to the opposite sex” (p. 66). The authors go on to say that this “highlights an urgent need to make available to unhappy students government-funded cosmetic products and procedures” (p. 66).

Finally, write **a summary of your analysis of the findings and their significance**. Note that this will take a lot of preparatory work on your part. You will need to have evaluated every aspect of the study but then report only the things that you think are *most* important and your main reasons for thinking this (that you think are likely to be persuasive to any fair and competent judge). No particular format is required but ‘the usual’ criteria for good academic writing should be pursued, e.g., concision, clarity, structure, relevance, insight, etc. The example below is *illustrative only*. Ideally, it would cite and give full references for relevant supporting material.

The study was so methodological weak that no conclusions may be supported by it.

Both measures had unknown but unchecked and probably very poor validity. The single-item, self-report 'happiness' measure required participants to calibrate their own happiness relative to James Brown's, a task likely to have been either nonsensical or challenging for at least some of the students. The combination of magnitude (e.g., "a little") and frequency (e.g., "sometimes") options in the measure's response alternatives also make it unlikely that it achieved even ordinal qualities (i.e., higher scores may not have reliably indicated higher happiness). Similarly, the measure of participants' 'attractiveness' relied on a single rating from a single person who appears to have been given no instructions on how to evaluate "attractiveness" (e.g., from his perspective or from some judged third-part perspective such as people of the same age and sexual orientation as, but the opposite sex to, as the participant) or even to evaluate specifically *sexual* attractiveness.

The sample was tiny and poorly representative of the populations to which results would need to be generalised for the authors' conclusions to be supported. Inadequately small samples have a high likelihood of giving 'false positive' results, i.e., of inappropriately providing evidence for a phenomenon. This problem is compounded by the authors needing to generalise their findings to all adults as well as specifically to all adult males and all adult females. (Although the authors do not specify the claimed generality of their results or theory, it seems unlikely that they intend it to apply to, for example, infants.) A maximum of two male British undergraduates is likely to be very poorly representative of all males. (Two is a maximum because the two "non-female" students may not have identified themselves as "male".)

Even if the measurement were accurate and valid, there are many possible reasons for the correlation found that are at least as plausible as the reason given by the researchers. Both measures may have increased, for example, to the extent that each participant liked and was liked by the teaching assistant. That is, there seems no good reason to think that students' alleged happiness in this study was *caused* by their alleged sexual attractiveness.

Even if the study had been methodologically adequate, it would provide a wholly inadequate basis for the theoretical conclusions that the authors reach and the policy recommendation that they make.

Even if attractiveness does contribute to happiness, this says nothing about whether or not happiness is "an evolved mechanism", still less that it has evolved for the specific purpose the authors contend, i.e., "serving to alert people that they need to divert resources from other things to improve their attractiveness to the opposite sex". The study reported does not test any of these issues.

Finally, even if the study did support the authors' theory, a lot more would be needed to justify claims of an "urgent need to make available to unhappy students government-funded cosmetic products and procedures" (p. 66).

The sort of thing *illustrated* above is what is required in this assignment. **You** need to identify what is most relevant and how best to communicate it. Don't stress too much about this, though. The important thing for now is that the exercise is designed to help you to develop

your skills of conducting and communicating critical analyses of empirical findings. Doing the exercise is much more important than trying to do it perfectly!

