

PSY/SPM 311: Origins of Moral Thought

Fall 2019: Mondays & Wednesdays, 8:30–9:50, Stager 109

Professor: Joshua Rottman; **Office:** LSP 132D

Phone: (717) 358-4874; **Email:** jrottman@fandm.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays from 10:00–11:30 & Wednesdays from 1:30–3:00 (or by appointment)

Course Description

How have humans acquired the capacity to make judgments about right and wrong, and to (often) behave in accordance with these judgments? We will address this question on three different timescales – millennia (human evolution), centuries (modern history), and years (individual development) – to explore how morality has resulted from natural selection, how cultural and ecological shifts bring about new moral convictions, and how moral beliefs emerge during childhood. Readings will combine insights from psychology, anthropology, philosophy, economics, history, and biology to provide manifold perspectives on the genesis of morality.

Course Objectives

Our moral values define us, unite us, and give meaning to our lives. Being so near and dear to our hearts, we often take them to be self-evident. However, like other aspects of human nature, morality is a psychological phenomenon with a history that can be uncovered with scientific tools. In this course, we will explore how moral beliefs, far from being timeless truths, are products of biological and cultural evolution that are reliably developed in early childhood. The vantage point that we will attain by coming to view morality as a naturalistic phenomenon can deliver an elevated understanding of how to transcend our predispositions, if we wish, thus providing us with improved abilities to create a better future. By the end of the semester (provided regular attendance, active participation in class discussions, assiduous completion of all assignments, and adherence to all other class policies), you will attain and cultivate the skills needed to achieve the following objectives:

- **Understand** how particular moral beliefs and behaviors have emerged throughout human history.
- **Analyze** evidence critically when explaining, discussing, and writing about scientific findings and claims.
- **Synthesize** data and theory from a range of materials to construct innovative arguments.
- **Communicate** ideas by honing your abilities to confidently express evidence-based viewpoints.
- **Evaluate** previously accepted moral commitments to determine whether they are rationally justifiable.
- **Apply** knowledge from this course in deciding how to pursue moral aims for creating a better future.

Required Texts

- Bloom, P. (2013). *Just babies: The origins of good and evil*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Additional material posted on Canvas (canvas.fandm.edu)

Course Requirements and Grading

You will be assessed by your performance on the following assignments, detailed below (1,000 points total):

| First Paper | Second Paper | Third Paper | Reading Reflections | Debate Responses | Leading Discussion | Thoughtful Participation | Oral Exam |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 150 pts. | 150 pts. | 200 pts. | 5 pts. (x 18) | 35 pts. (x 4) | 45 pts. | 150 pts. | 75 pts. |

Letter grades will be assigned as follows (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| A 93–100 | A- 90–92 | B+ 87–89 | B 83–86 | B- 80–82 | C+ 77–79 |
| C 73–76 | C- 70–72 | D+ 67–69 | D 63–66 | D- 60–62 | F 0–59 |

Please note: You are not your grade. Your grade is an assessment of your mastery of course material; it is *not* an assessment of your worth as a human being.

General Guidelines for Paper Assignments

All papers should be submitted electronically to Canvas as Word documents. You are responsible for making sure that you upload correct and readable documents. In order for grading to be accomplished without the possible influence of any unconscious biases, you should include only your F&M ID number for identification (five points will be deducted if you include your name). However, while it is important for your papers to be graded as fairly as possible, it is even more important for you to obtain prior feedback as needed – so you are encouraged to do so even when it might compromise the anonymity of your submission. In addition to the option to discuss your paper during office hours, you may submit an introductory paragraph, an outline, or a full draft by email for ungraded feedback one week or more before any of the due dates.

A particularly excellent paper will present a delightfully insightful argument that thoroughly responds to the prompt by synthesizing material from a range of readings and class discussions. It will demonstrate a strong grasp of the topic at hand (without misconceptions), maintain a clear thesis, perceptively evaluate the strength of the supporting evidence, and acknowledge limitations of current scientific knowledge.

First Paper: Increasing Inclusion

Course Objectives Fulfilled: Understand / Synthesize / Apply

One of the largest threats to a progressive society is the existence of bigotry and discrimination directed toward outgroup members. In this paper, you should propose an evidence-based solution for creating a community with greater tolerance and support of minorities and stigmatized groups. In particular, you should utilize evidence from the readings and class discussions to propose a concrete means of fostering social inclusion and reducing social exclusion. You should additionally incorporate at least one additional journal article that you find on your own. Your main task is to construct a well-formulated argument for why your solution is better than various alternative solutions to this predicament. This paper is due by 11:59pm on September 27, and should be 1,500 words in length (± 250 words).

Second Paper: Staking a Position

Course Objectives Fulfilled: Understand / Analyze / Synthesize

In this paper, you should defend or refute one of the following claims:

1. Humans acquire tendencies to be cooperative, generous, kind, and fair only because of socialization.
2. Morality is rooted in emotions, and positive moral outcomes cannot be achieved through reason alone.
3. One cannot understand the evolution of moral thought without also studying culture and development.
4. A child who grew up alone on an isolated desert island would never develop a sense of right and wrong.
5. There is often no single moral solution (e.g., being caring and being fair can be mutually incompatible).
6. Development and evolution always yield moral progress, such that humanity is steadily becoming better.
7. Moral beliefs are extremely flexible and culturally determined, and can be easily shaped by social pressures.
8. Invisibility cloaks or Rings of Gyges would negate all potential for people to behave morally.
9. A person's private moral beliefs and attitudes have little to do with his or her public moral behaviors.
10. Understanding the origins of moral thought can illuminate the current political landscape.
11. *Choose your own adventure.* (You may submit a prompt of your own for approval.)

You should support your thesis argument with abundant usage of class readings and at least two additional journal articles that you find on your own. This paper is due by 11:59pm on October 25, and should be 1,500 words in length (± 250 words).

Third Paper: Revision

As an opportunity to make substantial revisions after receiving feedback, your third paper will consist of a substantial revision of either Paper #1 or Paper #2 (the choice is yours). Taking both my comments and the additional course content into account, you should submit your heavily revised paper to Canvas by 11:59pm on November 22. Please use tracked changes to indicate the edits you have made since your first submission. This paper should be 2,000 words in length (± 250 words).

Reading Reflections

Course Objectives Fulfilled: Understand / Analyze / Synthesize / Evaluate

During the first 7 minutes of each class (excepting the four debate days), you will be required to write a *short* reflection on the assigned readings. Each of these reflections will be worth 5 points. You cannot make these up, so you will forfeit your points by being late or absent. If you have taken notes on the readings in advance, you are welcome to use these as a resource. Your highest 18 responses will be counted toward your grade; you may therefore replace your 4 lowest scores (or take up to 4 “free passes” for excused/unexcused absences).

Possible content includes raising questions about confusing aspects of the readings, remarking on applications to your life or the lives of others, noting contradictions or agreements between different readings, suggesting potential follow-up research, or critiquing methods or conclusions in the readings. Because these reflections are brief, it is crucial that you do not include irrelevant details and that you do not merely summarize. These reflections will serve two purposes: allowing me to ensure that you have completed the assigned readings, and allowing you to reflect on and critically interrogate the material before beginning discussion.

I will not provide extensive written feedback on these reflections, but I am very happy to discuss your grades or strategies for improvement at any time. I encourage you to take advantage of this by visiting me in my office.

Debate Responses

Course Objectives Fulfilled: Understand / Analyze / Synthesize / Evaluate

You will participate in four class debates throughout the course of the semester. For each, you will be randomly assigned a position in advance and you will be responsible for contributing either to opening/closing statements or to the primary back-and-forth. Your involvement during each debate (which will require substantial preparation, involving synthesizing evidence across a range of readings) will impact your overall participation grade. In addition, you will submit a two-part response that will be worth 35 points per debate.

Prior to each debate (before 8:30am), you should submit a 500- to 750-word response to the debate topic. This should take the form of an argument in favor of a particular position (of your choice), in which you will evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the evidence on both sides of the debate. You may use either bullet points or paragraphs, and you should be sure to cite a wide range of evidence to support your claims. This portion of the response will be worth 20 points and should be uploaded to Canvas as a Word document, with only your F&M ID number for identification. Please also bring a hard copy of your response with you to the debate, as they will help to guide your participation.

After each debate (within 72 hours), you should additionally submit a 250- to 350-word reflection on the debate itself. This does not need to appeal to evidence from the readings, but should instead include thoughtful considerations of whether various points in the debate have changed your mind about the issues under discussion, whether there are ideas that resonated with you or that frustrated you, and other similar contemplations. You can also raise questions or arguments that you did not have a chance to bring up during the debate itself. This portion of your response will be worth 15 points and should be uploaded to Canvas as a Word document, with only your F&M ID number for identification.

Leading Discussion

Course Objectives Fulfilled: Analyze / Synthesize / Communicate

You will assist in facilitating discussion on a day of your choosing, either individually or with a peer. As a discussion leader, you should engage the class by posing several thoughtful questions throughout the class session, each of which should consistently generate complex and lively conversations. You may also provide additional commentary on the readings, show film clips, or engage the class in an interactive activity, but this is optional; your focus should be on encouraging and guiding conversation rather than on presenting material.

In order to prepare, you must submit three or more discussion questions by email at least one week in advance. Additionally, you are required to set up a meeting to review your plans for leading discussion. You will be assessed on the quality of the questions that you formulate and on your moderation of class participation.

Thoughtful Participation

Course Objectives Fulfilled: Understand / Analyze / Synthesize / Communicate

The success of this course depends heavily on your contributions to our class discussions. Also, as research has convincingly shown, you will learn more effectively by actively participating in these discussions. You are expected to come to class prepared to discuss all of the readings critically and creatively, by making intelligent claims, raising objections, and asking thought-provoking questions that range from specific critiques of a particular methodology to big-picture applications of a body of findings. To give everybody an equal opportunity to receive full credit, I may sometimes refrain from calling on frequent participators. I will also frequently institute random cold calling, but I will typically provide you time to prepare for this. Side conversations during class are strongly discouraged and will result in penalties on your participation grade.

Please respect a diversity of opinions and questions, and aim to contribute constructively and considerately. You are expected to bring all assigned readings with you, and it will often be helpful to bring relevant readings from previous classes, as well as any notes you have taken. Because consistent attendance is necessary for you to have the opportunity to participate, frequent absences will negatively impact your participation grade.

Because we have a large class, you will each have a “volume” flag and a “prolix” flag to hold up when you are having trouble hearing or when you feel that a contribution has been fully made, such that no further elaboration is needed. These flags are to be used respectfully. If you would like to respond to a classmate directly, please raise a finger rather than your hand to signal that you are building from a previous remark.

Your participation grade will primarily reflect the quality – rather than quantity – of your in-class comments, including how well you respond to classmates and actively encourage their participation. An excellent grade will be earned by reliably participating in thoughtful ways that reveal intellectual acuity and a deep engagement with the material; by always displaying excellent preparation, having thought critically about all assigned readings and formulated discussion questions before class; by respectfully engaging others and generously listening to their contributions, thus approaching discussion as a collaborative activity; and by making sophisticated connections that consistently elevate the level of discussion.

Oral Exam

Course Objectives Fulfilled: Synthesize / Communicate / Evaluate / Apply

You will give a 10-minute oral presentation during a one-on-one appointment that you will schedule during the reading period or the final exam period. To prepare for this presentation, you should take a step toward bettering the world. Reflect on the moral aim that is of utmost importance to you (e.g., reducing disparities in health care, curtailing sexual assault, minimizing humanity’s carbon footprint, etc.) and take a concrete action to further this aim (e.g., volunteer, donate to charity, stop yourself from engaging in a bad habit, etc.). This topic should not overlap with your Increasing Inclusion paper. You must email me with your chosen topic for my approval by December 2.

Upon choosing your topic, you will craft a presentation that: (1) briefly describes the significance of your moral aim; (2) describes the natural (biological, psychological, etc.) and systemic (sociological, economic, etc.) barriers that have prevented this aim from being fully realized; and (3) proposes concrete solutions for overcoming these obstacles by leveraging or curtailing elements of human nature and/or cultural institutions that have been discussed in the course. Your treatment of these issues should be both practical and creative, and should draw heavily on empirical evidence. You may wish to discuss extra sources in addition to the ones that have been assigned, but this is not required. If you would like, you are welcome to use notecards and/or a PowerPoint presentation.

After your 10-minute presentation, I will ask follow-up questions for an additional 5–10 minutes.

An excellent grade will be awarded for a stellar presentation that synthesizes and evaluates multiple readings without inaccuracies or irrelevant information; that demonstrates a highly sophisticated understanding of course material; and successfully applies theory and evidence to a real-world moral aim that you are passionate about; that delivers content in a clear, organized, and well-rehearsed manner, evidencing strong oral communication skills; and that includes insightful responses to questions.

Opportunities for Extra Credit

You may earn up to 20 extra credit points during the semester through any combination of the options below. Additional bonus opportunities may also arise, providing the potential to earn even more extra credit.

- Each time you email a paragraph-length description of a relevant talk that you attended (e.g., Common Hour), you will earn 3 extra credit points.
- Each time you email a paragraph-length description of a relevant news article, television show, or movie, accompanied by a paragraph detailing the connections to class content, you will earn 2 extra credit points.
- Each time you visit the Writing Center for help on a paper, or provide evidence that you and a classmate have engaged in substantial peer review of each others' papers, you will earn 2 extra credit points.

Communication

Email is generally the best way to reach me. Unless I announce otherwise, I will respond within 24 hours. I will also be available to talk in my office during the times listed at the top of the syllabus, by appointment, and anytime when my door is open. I strongly encourage you to take advantage of this, particularly in cases when you need further clarity on an assignment or when course material has made you uncomfortable in any way. Because this class involves discussions of sensitive topics, it may trigger a stress response or lead to strong emotional reactions. While mild discomfort can often be a positive indication of personal and intellectual growth, please come speak to me immediately if you experience (or anticipate experiencing) more severe forms of distress. If any issues arise that have the potential to interfere with your success in the course, please be in touch with me as soon as possible. I value open communication, and I invite you to be frank with me.

Tips for Success

This class will be intensive. You will be expected to consistently keep up with all of the readings and to assimilate and synthesize a lot of difficult material. This will often require spreading readings across several days preceding each class session and re-reading some material after classes. I am here to help you succeed, and I urge you to come talk to me about concerns or confusions regarding the course material and assignments. Your fellow students can also be great resources; reaching out to them can be a fun and collaborative way to learn. In particular, swapping paper drafts with your classmates to receive informal peer evaluations is an acceptable and encouraged practice to improve your writing. Additionally, please feel free to take advantage of the many other resources that Franklin & Marshall has to offer! For example, the Writing Center (located on the second level of Diagonthian Hall) can assist you with writing and other academic skills. Finally, a number of resources are available to support your wellbeing, including the Student Wellness Center Counseling Services (located in the LGH Wellness Center in College Square), DipCares, and the House Deans. If any issues arise that have the potential to interfere with your success, please be in touch with me as soon as possible.

Academic Integrity

I take academic honesty very seriously. You risk severe consequences by committing acts of plagiarism (i.e., representing someone else's work as your own), cheating, falsification, impersonating, or other similar offenses, including facilitating another student in committing an act of academic dishonesty. Penalties for these offenses will be carefully assessed on a case-by-case basis, and may include receiving a failing grade in the course or expulsion from F&M. Please refer to the Franklin & Marshall College Catalog for additional details.

Policy on Late Assignments

You will lose 5% of your grade on an assignment for every day it is late. However, you have **five “free gifts”** that you can use at any time: the opportunity to take a one-day extension on any assignment (excepting the Reading Responses, the initial component of the Debate Responses, Leading Discussion, and the Oral Exam) without penalty. (These may be used in conjunction for a single assignment; for example, you could use three “free gifts” in order to submit a paper three days past the deadline.) In extreme cases when unexpected and unavoidable circumstances prevent you from completing an assignment on time, please inform me as soon as possible, and I will use my discretion to determine whether to waive or attenuate the late penalty.

Policy on Electronic Devices

In order to maximize your success and minimize the possibility for distractions, **you may not use ANY electronic devices during class.** Research has indicated this will be likely to enhance your learning. Exceptions will be granted for students with compelling reasons for using a laptop or other device to take notes (if this is the case, please speak with me privately at the beginning of the semester).

Appealing Grades

If you receive a grade that is inconsistent with what you believe you should have earned, you have a week to set up an appointment with me to appeal your grade. When scheduling this appointment, you must submit a written statement explaining your case. After one week has passed, all grades will be considered final.

Academic Accommodations

I strive to provide an environment that is equitable and conducive to achievement and learning for all students. As such, I invite you to speak with me about your individual learning needs so that we can discuss how this course can best accommodate them. In addition, formal academic accommodations are available for students who require them. Please schedule an appointment with me during the first week of class to discuss any accommodations for this course that have been supported by appropriate documentation and approved by the Office of Student Accessibility Services. I will keep all information confidential.

Important Dates

| September 4 | September 11 | September 25 | October 7 & November 27 | November 25 |
|---|---|---|--|------------------------------------|
| Last day to add classes | Last day to drop classes without record | Last day to elect P/NP option | College-wide recesses; no classes in session | Last day to withdraw (with record) |
| September 27 | October 25 | November 22 | December 9–13 | |
| Due date for Increasing Inclusion paper | Due date for Staking a Position paper | Due date for revision of Paper #1 or #2 | Oral exams administered | |

Semester Schedule

*Components of this schedule are subject to change; please check Canvas regularly for updates.
Please bring hard copies of all required readings to class with you each day.*

| Date | Lecture Topic | Reading Assignments (to be completed before each class) |
|--|--|--|
| 8/28 | Moral dilemmas | N/A |
| 9/2 | The origins and diversity of moral thought | <i>Course syllabus.</i> Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 1–31). Haidt, J. (2008, March). The moral roots of liberals and conservatives. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/1kJz3Lc] |
| Part 1: In and Out of Others' Shoes | | |
| 9/4 | Paths to moral parochialism | Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 101–130). Dunham, Y. (2018). Mere membership. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> , 22(9), 780–793. |
| 9/9 | Moral deficits in psychopaths | Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 33–39). Poppa, T., & Bechara, A. (2015). A neural perspective of immoral behavior and psychopathy. <i>AJOB Neuroscience</i> , 6, 15–24. |
| 9/11 | Empathy, compassion, and prosociality | Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 39–57). Batson, C. D., & Ahmad, N. Y. (2009). Using empathy to improve intergroup attitudes and relations. <i>Social Issues and Policy Review</i> , 3(1), 141–177. |
| 9/16 | Empathic failures and blind spots | Ditto, P. H., & Koleva, S. P. (2011). Moral empathy gaps and the American culture war. <i>Emotion Review</i> , 3, 331–332. Cikara, M., et al. (2011). Us and them: Intergroup failures of empathy. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> , 20, 149–153. Bloom, P. (2017). Empathy and its discontents. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> , 21, 24–31. |
| 9/18 | Disgust blunts empathic concern | Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 131–157). Harris, L. T., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Dehumanizing the lowest of the low: Neuroimaging responses to extreme out-groups. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 17, 847–853. |
| 9/23 | DEBATE #1: Should empathy be eliminated? | |
| Part 2: The Roots of Altruism | | |
| 9/25 | Solving the struggles of getting along | Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. <i>Science</i> , 162, 1243–1248. Melis, A. P., & Warneken, F. (2016). The psychology of cooperation: Insights from chimpanzees and children. <i>Evolutionary Anthropology</i> , 25, 297–305. |
| 9/30 | The economics of cooperation | Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 59–82). Ridley, M. (1996). <i>The origins of virtue: Human instincts and the evolution of cooperation</i> (pp. 52–66). |
| 10/2 | Nice guys can finish first | Krebs, D. (2010). Born bad? Evaluating the case against the evolution of morality. In <i>Human morality and sociality</i> (pp. 13–30). Bshary, R., & Schäffer, D. (2002). Choosy reef fish select cleaner fish that provide high-quality service. <i>Animal Behaviour</i> , 63, 557–564. |
| 10/9 | The strategic application of moral principles | Shaw, A., et al. (2014). Children develop a veil of fairness. <i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</i> , 143(1), 363–375. Blake, P. R., et al. (2014). The developmental origins of fairness: The knowledge-behavior gap. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i> , 18, 559–561. |
| 10/14 | Looking good by being good | Sperber, D., & Baumard, N. (2012). Moral reputation: An evolutionary and cognitive perspective. <i>Mind & Language</i> , 27, 495–518. Frank, R. H., et al. (1993). The evolution of one-shot cooperation: An experiment. <i>Ethology and Sociobiology</i> , 14, 247–256. |
| 10/16 | The effects of religion on cooperation | Norenzayan, A. (2014). Does religion make people moral? <i>Behaviour</i> , 151, 365–384. Graham, J., & Haidt, J. (2010). Beyond beliefs: Religions bind individuals into moral communities. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i> , 14, 140–150. |
| 10/21 | DEBATE #2: Is it selfish to be unselfish? | |

Part 3: Dealing with Bad Apples

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| 10/23 | Social control of moral deviants | Feinberg, M., et al. (2014). Gossip and ostracism promote cooperation in groups. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 25, 656–664. Boehm, C. (2014). The moral consequences of social selection. <i>Behaviour</i> , 151, 167–183. |
| 10/28 | Vengeance and punishment | Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 82–100). Goodwin, G.P., & Gromet, D.M. (2014). Punishment. <i>WIREs: Cognitive Science</i> , 5, 561–572. |
| 10/30 | Harming for the sake of honor | Nisbett, R. E. (1993). Violence and U.S. regional culture. <i>American Psychologist</i> , 48, 441–449. Appiah, K. A. (2010). <i>The honor code: How moral revolutions happen</i> (pp. 137–172). |
| 11/4 | Virtuous violence | Fiske, A. P., & Rai, T. S. (2014). Violence for goodness' sake. <i>New Scientist</i> , 224, 30–31. Atran, S. (2016). The devoted actor: Unconditional commitment and intractable conflict across cultures. <i>Current Anthropology</i> , 57, S192–S203. |
| 11/6 | DEBATE #3: Are we ever justified in intentionally harming another person? | |

Part 4: Moral Progress

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| 11/11 | The predicament of moral obstinacy | Shalvi, S., et al. (2015). Self-serving justifications: Doing wrong and feeling moral. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> , 24, 125–130. Liu, B. S., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). What dilemma? Moral evaluation shapes factual belief. <i>Social Psychological and Personality Science</i> , 4(3), 316–323. |
| 11/13 | Gaining traction on resolving moral disputes | Appiah, K. A. (2006). <i>Cosmopolitanism</i> (pp. 45–85). Willer, R. (2016, September). How to have better political conversations. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/2kbnkdw] |
| 11/18 | Shifting the landscape of moral norms | Bloom, P. (2013). <i>Just babies: The origins of good and evil</i> (pp. 187–218). Tankard, M. E., & Paluck, E. L. (2016). Norm perception as a vehicle for social change. <i>Social Issues and Policy Review</i> , 10, 181–211. |
| 11/20 | Leveraging moral psychology for the greater good | Rand, D. G., et al. (2014). Harnessing reciprocity to promote cooperation and the provisioning of public goods. <i>Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences</i> , 1, 263–269. Spencer, K. B., Charbonneau, A. K., & Glaser, J. (2016). Implicit bias and policing. <i>Social and Personality Psychology Compass</i> , 10(1), 50–63. |
| 11/25 | Charitable giving | Small, D. A. (2011). Sympathy biases and sympathy appeals: Reducing social distance to boost charitable contributions. In <i>The science of giving</i> (pp. 149–160). Olivola, C. Y. (2011). When noble means hinder noble ends: The benefits and costs of a preference for martyrdom in altruism. In <i>The science of giving</i> (pp. 49–62). Singer, P. (2013, March). The why and how of effective altruism. <i>TED</i> . [bit.ly/1ko7Qoo] |
| 12/2 | Further topics in moral psychology | <i>T.B.A., based on a class vote</i> (possibilities include: hypocrisy, victim blaming, morality and law, cultural variation, morality and religion, morality and eating, media influences on morality, moral learning, moral conformity, environmentalism, expansions of any topic above, etc.) |
| 12/4 | DEBATE #4: Do protests, marches, and rallies fuel moral progress? | |