

**Psychology 699 Social and Emotional Development
Spring, 2018**

Instructor: Dr. Thalia R. Goldstein

Office: David King, 2050

Voice: 703-993-6460

Email: tgoldste@gmu.edu

Office Hours: T: 10-12, R: 1:30-3, by appointment

Goals and Objectives:

In this course, we will examine significant issues in social and emotional development. This course is designed to give the student a thorough grounding in developmental theories describing children's (1) abilities to interact and form relationships with others; and (2) their emotional lives. Empirical results from eclectic theoretical and methodological perspectives also will be emphasized. In class and in our writing, we'll be articulating theories and ideas clearly and concisely, unpacking arguments into their components and analyzing the logic of these parts, integrating the different aspects of development, and generating new ideas based on theory & research. Every class period we will end by discussing "how can these issues/findings be applied?"

Organization of Class:

We will hold this class as a true seminar. I will be doing some lecturing, particularly on Tuesdays, but, as a seminar, this course is discussion-based and thus reliant on the energies of all the participants. Given this format and the size of the class, it is imperative that everyone come prepared to participate in each class. Readings will be available on Blackboard.

Thursdays will be organized around a class leader and group discussion. We will break into groups for the first 5 minutes of each class Tuesday and Thursday to discuss what the most salient discussion points for that day should be. On Tuesdays, we'll come back together as a group and I will lead class. On Thursdays, it will be one group's turn to lead the discussion. Groups will be created on the first day of class. Each person in the class should bring in 3-4 questions every Thursday to begin discussion.

Text:

There will be an overview/chapter reading for Tuesdays, with empirical articles for Thursdays. All readings will be posted in advance on blackboard.

Grading Requirements (please see details of all requirements at end of syllabus)

1. Class participation (12%)
2. Group Class Leadership (15%)
3. Four Individual Critiques of articles (8%)
4. Initial study/ grant draft (15%)
5. Peer study/ grant critique (10%)
6. Study/grant responses to critique (10%)
7. Presentation of study/grant (15%)
8. Final study/ grant proposal paper (15%)

Grading:

Grade	Percentage	Quality Points	Graduate Courses
A+	97-100	4.00	Satisfactory/Passing
A	93-96.99	4.00	Satisfactory/Passing
A-	90-92.99	3.67	Satisfactory/Passing
B+	87-89.99	3.33	Satisfactory/Passing
B	83-86.99	3.00	Satisfactory/Passing
B-	80-82.99	2.67	Satisfactory*/Passing
C	70-79.99	2.00	Unsatisfactory/Passing
F	Under 70	0.00	Unsatisfactory/Failing

Disability statement

If you are a student with a disability and you need academic accommodations, please see me and contact the Office of Disability Resources at 703.993.2474. All academic accommodations must be arranged through that office.

Honor Code: George Mason University has an Honor Code, which requires all members of this community to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Cheating, plagiarism, lying, and stealing are all prohibited. It is every student's responsibility to familiarize himself or herself with the Honor Code.

- All violations of the Honor Code will be reported to the Honor Committee.
- See honorcode.gmu.edu for more detailed information.

What is Plagiarism? **Plagiarism** (v.) is the act of taking undeserved or unwarranted credit for something. **Plagiarism** (n.) is something represented in a plagiaristic fashion.

Severe plagiarism (a.k.a. "copying") is the most overt and deceptive form of plagiarism. This involves deliberately misrepresenting all or part of another person's work as one's own. For example, a student might turn in a paper written by another student in a previous term. Another common example is writing containing chunks of "copy-and-paste" from published articles or internet sources such as Wikipedia. Papers copied from the internet are typically obviously copied, and can be located on the internet with a simple Google search.

Irresponsible plagiarism (a.k.a. "omission") is the act of paraphrasing or quoting from a source, without giving credit to the source. The author does not necessarily explicitly take credit for the idea or materials (but this is nevertheless implied). Please be aware that not only do ideas need to be cited, but they should also be stated *in your own words*.

Self-plagiarism (a.k.a. "recycling") is the act of representing one's own previous ideas or materials as new and original. For example, a student might turn in all or part of the same paper for more than one course. This may not seem as bad as stealing another person's work, but it is *deceptive*, and therefore unacceptable.

Should I Plagiarize? You should absolutely not plagiarize. You will be caught and there will be severe consequences.

Sometimes students tell me that they do not know what constitutes plagiarism. All students should go to <http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml> and read this site carefully. Clear examples are provided about the difference between using a secondary source correctly and plagiarizing from it.

It is very easy to discover Internet plagiarism by typing in a few words of the plagiarized paper into Google. If a student is suspected of academic dishonesty, the matter will be turned over to the Committee on Academic Integrity. Students who violate academic integrity will receive an F in the course, and the Committee on Academic Integrity may determine other more serious consequences. I have an extremely strict policy on plagiarism. So please remember, it is never worth it!

Enrollment statement

Students are responsible for verifying their enrollment in this class.

Schedule adjustments should be made by the deadlines published in the Schedule of Classes.

(Deadlines each semester are published in the Schedule of Classes available from the Registrar's Website registrar.gmu.edu.)

- Last day to Add classes/ drop with no tuition penalty: Monday, January 29, 2018
- Last Day to Drop (67% tuition penalty): Friday, February 23, 2018
- Selective Withdrawal period: Feb 26-28, 2018

Official Communications via GMU email message

Official Communications via GMU E-mail: Mason uses electronic mail to provide official information to students. Examples include communications from course instructors, notices from the library, notices about academic standing, financial aid information, class materials, assignments, questions, and instructor feedback. Students are responsible for the content of university communication sent to their Mason e-mail account and are required to activate that account and check it regularly.

If the university is closed for any reason such as inclement weather, the calendar will slide to the next regularly scheduled class meeting unless otherwise informed by email.

Summary Schedule

	Day/Date	Topic	Notes
1	Tues 1/23	Theories & Methods of Social and Emotional Development	Create presentation groups
	Thurs 1/25	Theories & Methods of Social-Emotional Development	
2	Tues 1/30	Biological and Genetic Predictors of Social Emotional Development/ Temperament	
	Thurs 2/1	Biological and Genetic Predictors of Social Emotional Development/ Temperament	
3	Tues 2/6	The Self, Identity, and Personality	
	Thurs 2/8	The Self, Identity, and Personality	
4	Tues 2/13	Attachment and Love through the Lifespan	
	Thurs 2/15	Attachment and Love through the Lifespan	
5	Tues 2/20	Families, Parents, Socialization	
	Thurs 2/22	Families, Parents, Socialization	
6	Tues 2/27	Peers, Schools, and TV	
	Thurs 3/1	Peers, Schools, and TV	
7	Tues 3/6	Gender and Sexuality	
	Thurs 3/8	Gender and Sexuality	
		<i>Spring Break!</i>	
8	Tues 3/20	Emotional Control and Regulation	Initial Grant Draft Due
	Thurs 3/22	Emotional Control and Regulation	
9	Tues 3/27	Social Cognition, Prosociality and Morality	
	Thurs 3/29	Social Cognition, Prosociality and Morality	
10	Tues 4/3	Prejudice and Intergroup Understanding	Critiques Due
	Thurs 4/5	Prejudice and Intergroup Understanding	
11	Tues 4/10	Aggression and Conflict	
	Thurs 4/12	Aggression and Conflict	
12	Tues 4/17	Wisdom, Emotionality, and Aging	Responses to Critiques Due
	Thurs 4/19	Wisdom, Emotionality, and Aging	
13	Tues 4/24	Dying and Bereavement	
	Thurs 4/26	Dying and Bereavement	
14	Tues 5/1	Final Presentations of Study/Grants	
	Thurs 5/3	Final Presentations of Study/Grants	
15	Fri 5/11		Final Study/ grant proposal due!

Detailed course schedule and assigned readings (Reading are due for initial discussion on Tuesdays, critique papers and class leadership is on Thursdays)

1. Introductions/ Theories and Methods of Social and Emotional Development

- a. TUESDAY: Eisenberg, N. (2006). Introduction. In *Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol 2: Social, Emotional, and Personality Development*. Pp 1-23
- b. THURSDAY: Hartup, W. W. (1989). Social relationships and their developmental significance. *American Psychologist*, 44, 120-126.
- a. THURSDAY: Lemerise, E., & Arsenio, W. F. (2000). An integrated model of emotion processes and cognition in social information processing. *Child Development*, 71, 109-118

2. Biological and Genetic Predictors of Social Emotional Development & Temperament

- a. TUESDAY: Shiner, R. L., Buss, K. A., McCloskey, S. G., Putnam, S. P., Saudino, K. J., & Zentner, M. (2012). What Is Temperament Now? Assessing Progress in Temperament Research on the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of Goldsmith et al. *Child Development Perspectives*, 6, 436-444.
- b. THURSDAY: Henderson, H. A., & Wachs, T. D. (2007). Temperament theory and the study of cognition-emotion interactions across development. *Developmental Review*, 27(3), 396-427.
- c. THURSDAY: Belsky, J., & Pluess, M. (2009). Beyond diathesis stress: Differential susceptibility to environmental influences. *Psychological bulletin*, 135(6), 885.

3. The Self: Identity and Personality

- a. TUESDAY: Kashdan, T. B., & McKnight, P. E. (2011). Dynamic, contextual approaches to studying personality in the social world. *Journal of Personality*, 79(6), 1177-1190.
- b. THURSDAY: Syed, M. (2010). Developing an integrated self: academic and ethnic identities among ethnically diverse college students. *Developmental psychology*, 46(6), 1590.
- c. THURSDAY: McCrae, R. R., Costa Jr, P. T., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., Hřebíčková, M., Avia, M. D., ... & Smith, P. B. (2000). Nature over nurture: temperament, personality, and life span development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(1), 173.

4. Attachment and Love Throughout the Lifespan

- a. TUESDAY: Thompson, R. A., & Raikes, H. A. (2003). Toward the next quarter-century: Conceptual and methodological challenges for attachment theory. *Development and psychopathology*, 15(3), 691-718.
- b. THURSDAY: Lieberman, M., Doyle, A-B., & Markiewicz, D. (1999). Developmental patterns in security of attachment to mother and father in late childhood and early adolescence: Associations with peer relations. *Child Development*, 70, 202-215
- c. THURSDAY: Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of general psychology*, 4(2), 132.

5. Families, Parents, Socialization

- a. TUESDAY: Holden, G. W. (2010). Childrearing and developmental trajectories: Positive pathways, off-ramps, and dynamic processes. *Child Development Perspectives*, 4, 197-204.

- b. THURSDAY: Vélez, C. E., Wolchik, S. A., Tein, J.-Y., & Sandler, I. (2011). Protecting children from the consequences of divorce: A longitudinal study of the effects of parenting on children's coping processes. *Child Development, 82*, 244-257.
- c. THURSDAY: Lunkenheimer, E. S., Shields, A.M., & Cortina, K. S. (2007). Parental emotion coaching and dismissing in family interaction. *Social Development, 16*, 232-248.

6. Peers and Schools, and TV

- a. TUESDAY: Lansford, J. E., Yu, T., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (2014). Pathways of peer relationships from childhood to young adulthood. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 35*(2), 111-117.
- b. THURSDAY: Mistry, K. B., Minkovitz, C. S., Strobino, D. M., & Borzekowski, D. L. (2007). Children's television exposure and behavioral and social outcomes at 5.5 years: does timing of exposure matter?. *Pediatrics, 120*(4), 762-769.
- c. THURSDAY: Reich, S. M., Subrahmanyam, K., & Espinoza, G. (2012). Friending, IMing, and hanging out face-to-face: overlap in adolescents' online and offline social networks. *Developmental psychology, 48*(2), 356.

7. Gender and Sexuality

- a. TUESDAY: Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*, 581-592. 2.
- b. THURSDAY: Lemaster, P., Delaney, R., & Strough, J. (2017). Crossover, degendering, or...? A multidimensional approach to life-span gender development. *Sex Roles, 76*(11-12), 669-681.
- c. THURSDAY: Fields, E. L., Bogart, L. M., Smith, K. C., Malebranche, D. J., Ellen, J., & Schuster, M. A. (2015). "I always felt I had to prove my manhood": Homosexuality, masculinity, gender role strain, and HIV risk among young Black men who have sex with men. *American journal of public health, 105*(1), 122-131.

Spring Break!!

8. Emotion Control and Regulation

- a. TUESDAY: Cole, P. M., Martin, S. E., & Dennis, T. (2004). Emotion regulation as a scientific construct: Methodological challenges and directions for child development research. *Child Development, 75*, 317-333.
- b. THURSDAY: Cole, P. M., Bendezú, J. J., Ram, N., & Chow, S. M. (2017). Dynamical systems modeling of early childhood self-regulation. *Emotion, 17*(4), 684.
- c. THURSDAY: Kromm, H., Färber, M., & Holodyski, M. (2015). Felt or False Smiles? Volitional Regulation of Emotional Expression in 4-, 6-, and 8-Year-Old Children. *Child development, 86*(2), 579-597.

9. Social Cognition, Prosociality, and Morality

- a. TUESDAY: Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R. H. (1977). Moral development: A review of the theory. *Theory into practice, 16*(2), 53-59.
- b. THURSDAY: Findlay, L. C., Girardi, A., & Coplan, R. J. (2006). Links between empathy, social behavior, and social understanding in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 21*, 347-359.
- c. THURSDAY: Imuta, K., Henry, J. D., Slaughter, V., Selcuk, B., & Ruffman, T. (2016). Theory of mind and prosocial behavior in childhood: A meta-analytic review.

10. Prejudice and Intergroup Understanding

- a. TUESDAY: Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist, 60*(1), 16.
- b. THURSDAY: Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(3), 279-291.
- c. THURSDAY: Elenbaas, L., Rizzo, M. T., Cooley, S., & Killen, M. (2016). Rectifying social inequalities in a resource allocation task. *Cognition, 155*, 176-187.

11. Aggression and Conflict

- a. TUESDAY: Vitaro, F., Brendgen, M., Barker, E. D. (2006). Subtypes of aggressive behaviors: A developmental perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 30*, 12-19
- b. THURSDAY: Huesmann, L. R., Moise, J., Podolski, C. P. & Eron, L. D. (2003). Longitudinal relations between childhood exposure to media violence and adult aggression and violence: 1977- 1992. *Developmental Psychology, 39*, 201-221.
- c. THURSDAY: Nansel, T. R., Craig, W., Overpeck, M. D., Saluja, G., Ruan, J., & the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children Bullying Analyses Working Group. (2004). Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviors and psychosocial adjustment. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 158*, 730-736.

12. Wisdom, Emotionality and Aging

- a. TUESDAY: Charles, S. T., & Carstensen, L. L. (2010). Social and emotional aging. *Annual review of psychology, 61*, 383-409.
- b. THURSDAY: Rowe, J. W., & Kahn, R. L. (1997). Successful aging. *The gerontologist, 37*(4), 433-440.
- c. THURSDAY: Hoppmann, C. A., & Gerstorf, D. (2016). Social interrelations in aging: The sample case of married couples. In *Handbook of the Psychology of Aging (Eighth Edition)* (pp. 263-277).

13. Dying and Bereavement

- a. TUESDAY: Bonanno, G. A., & Kaltman, S. (1999). Toward an integrative perspective on bereavement. *Psychological bulletin, 125*(6), 760.
- b. THURSDAY: Palgi, Y., Shrira, A., Ben-Ezra, M., Spalter, T., Kavé, G., & Shmotkin, D. (2014). Age-related and death-related differences in emotional complexity. *Psychology and aging, 29*(2), 284.
- c. THURSDAY: Bonanno, G. A., Wortman, C. B., Lehman, D. R., Tweed, R. G., Haring, M., Sonnega, J., ... & Nesse, R. M. (2002). Resilience to loss and chronic grief: a prospective study from preloss to 18-months postloss. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 83*(5), 1150.

ASSIGNMENTS

Class participation (12%)

Class discussions on the readings play a critical role in your success in the course. Effective class comments may integrate material from this and other courses, draw on real-world experiences and observations, address questions raised by others, or pose new questions to the class. High quality participation involves knowing when to speak and when to listen or allow others to speak. Take the time to think about how your comments will be received; comments that are vague, repetitive, unrelated to the current topic, or without sufficient foundation are distracting and do not move forward the discussion. *Those that are insensitive to other students in the class or are framed as personal attacks are unacceptable under any circumstances.* If for any reason (social anxiety, language difficulties, etc) you feel that you will have problems speaking up in class, I have several methods for engaging in class participation without having to speak in class. Please set up an appointment to see me as soon as possible. This can include handing in a note with ideas and questions at the end of each class, or sending me a copy of your notes with questions or ideas integrated.

Criteria for assessment:

Strong Contributor: Contributions in class reflect thorough preparation. Ideas offered are substantive and provide good insights as well as direction for the class. Challenges are well substantiated and are persuasively presented in a respectful manner. If the strong contributor person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished considerably.

Adequate Contributor: Contributions in class reflect satisfactory preparation. Ideas offered are sometimes substantive, provide generally useful insights but seldom offer a new direction for the discussion. Challenges are sometimes presented, fairly well substantiated and are sometimes persuasive. If the adequate contributor were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be somewhat diminished.

Minimal Contributor: Contributions in class reflect minimal preparation. Ideas offered are occasionally but rarely substantive, and offer repetitive or obvious insights. Challenges are rarely presented, or are not persuasive if presented. If the minimal contributor were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would diminish only slightly.

Non-Participant: The non-participant says little or nothing in class. Hence, there is not an adequate basis for evaluation. If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would not be changed.

Unsatisfactory Contributor: Contributions in class reflect inadequate preparation. Ideas offered are seldom substantive, provide few if any insights and are often tangential and off track. Comments are insensitive to other students in the class. If this person were not a member of the class, valuable time would be saved and the comfort level of the class would be elevated.

Group Class Leadership (15%)

Group class leadership involves preparing adequately to not only discuss the assigned articles for the day, engaging in substantial critique and commentary, but also preparing additional material to be brought to the discussion to aid class knowledge and insight. This can involve follow up studies to the articles assigned, ideas for future work that could be completed (perhaps with a grant proposal), related research from other sub disciplines, or findings that propose opposing hypotheses. Questions posed to the rest of the class regarding the articles (not just simple open ended queries) should be prepared ahead of time. The group should know the assigned articles well, and be prepared to answer other students' questions about background, methods, results, and implications.

Four Individual Critiques of articles (8%)

Four short critiques (@ 1 double-spaced page each), based on the readings, will be due before class on blackboard, on Tuesdays. These papers are a means of enhancing our discussion preparation. Critiques should focus on selected issues from the week's readings that are of interest to the student and should demonstrate critical analyses of the articles, suggestions of future work and analyses of gaps in current literature, possibilities for alternative explanations. You can discuss what you thought was important in the readings, what was confusing or illogical, where the connections are to other work, and in what new and interesting directions the work leads us. *You are not summarizing the articles for me; you are integrating the important main points*. I strongly suggest that the writing of these critiques be spaced out through the semester; try not to write 2 consecutive weeks, especially late in the semester. Also, ALL papers must be uploaded before the class for which they were written.

Thinking about articles:

Generally, thinking about articles and previous research, whether you are writing an individual critique, preparing to lead the class in discussion, contributing to the class discussion, or writing a literature review to set up a grant proposal, follow certain guidelines:

You can: (a) find a problem with the research you read, (b) ask a pretty specific question about how something was done. For the first choice, you can analyze whether the goals the research were actually achieved, thus investigating whether the theory and method are walking together hand in hand. Or you can ask whether alternative hypotheses might as easily explain the data. Or you can ask whether cohort effects might reported explain developmental differences; or the particular type of statistical analysis that was used; etc. Also use the second choice when there are statistical analyses, claims, connections that you do not understand. This can simply point to specific tables or figures, or can ask a specific question (e.g., "The authors claim significance for hypothesis 1, but I do not see where they demonstrate this.") or confusion (e.g., "I sort of understand multiple regression, but this one leaves me totally in the weeds.").

You can also think about Integration. Integration can include connections between or to (a) the readings within a topic, (b) material covered earlier in the semester or your career, (c) content from other courses, areas, general readings, etc., and, of course, (d) one's own areas of expertise.

You can also propose future studies and possible alternative hypotheses. Weaving hypotheses is a lot of fun, and a central skill in psychology. You can begin with "if-then" statements, or "The real question really is ... and I predict that..." Or you can add a twist to someone else's hypothesis that suggests different outcomes (or causes) by age, ethnicity, gender, life experience, etc. (Although you do need to come up with a valid reason *why*. Every study could use more diversity, or more participants, or a different age group, or a different culture. It's the *why* that matters). Or try to figure a distinct application to practice with typically or atypically developing children. But always try to come up with something uniquely yours.

Initial study/ grant draft (15%)

The major assignment for this class will take place over several iterations over the second half of the semester. This is on purpose. The goal is for you to work with one idea, one set of questions, over an extended period of time, seeing how it can change and shift in response to criticism, and what you learn through conversation with peers. You will be writing a grant proposal for funded

research. Proposed research should address a carefully delineated question reflecting your knowledge about issues in social-emotional development. Ideally, the chosen topic will have its origins in the readings/class discussion, but the final package will be a unique creation based on the required readings, plenty of additional reading, and the author's particular interests, skills, knowledge base, and personal flair.

You can choose one of three formats:

- 1) NIH (for proposals with a health outcome focus)
- 2) IES (for proposals with an education outcome focus)
- 3) NSF (for proposals based in basic research, without a health or education outcome)

You must read and closely follow a basic CFP (call for proposals) from the agency you will be "applying" to. You will be required to work on both a budget narrative (although not a full budget) and the description of the research plan ("the science"). You do not need to worry about the other pieces (e.g. data management plan, bio sketches, subawards and contracts, most appendices). In either case the following should be included: (a) aims of proposed research; (b) relevant literature review; (c) significance of the proposed research; (d) clear and detailed method section; (e) brief results section that reiterates the hypotheses and tells how the data will be analyzed

Peer study/ grant critique (10%)

We will also have small group review panels during which we will develop our reviewing and analytical skills, and further contribute to our colleagues' work. As is the custom with NIH panels, reviews are due in writing, up to 3 pages in length per grant reviewed.

Grant responses to critique (10%)

The author will then write a 3-5 page response to all critiques, explaining why the ideas suggested will or will not be integrated into the final proposal, how the proposal has shifted or changed as a result of suggestions, new measurement strategies, or other items.

Presentation of Grant (15%)

Brief oral presentations of your ideas (@ 5 - 10 minutes) will be made towards the end of the semester. The purpose of the presentations are (a) to ensure that you continue to work on your grant proposal; (b) to pick your colleagues' brains for their expertise and good ideas, and (c) to help your colleagues develop and improve their ideas. You will also have to answer questions during the proposal and to integrate the questions asked into your final paper.

Final study/ grant proposal paper (15%)

The final proposal will be formally submitted online, including both the program of research and the budget justification. You should include a half page at the end of the grant noting how you have incorporated any comments from the presentation of the grant.