

University of Toledo
College of Languages, Literature and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology
PSY 6200001/7200-001: Systems of Personality
Syllabus for Spring Semester 2014*

"The purpose of psychology is to give us a completely different idea of the human condition."
~ Paul Valery

UT Mission Statement

The mission of The University of Toledo is to improve the human condition; to advance knowledge through excellence in learning, discovery and engagement; and to serve as a diverse, student-centered public metropolitan research university.

UT Vision Statement

The University of Toledo is a transformative force for the world. As such, the University will become a thriving student-centered, community-engaged, comprehensive research university known for its strong liberal arts core and multiple nationally ranked professional colleges, and distinguished by exceptional strength in science and technology.

Time and Place:

4:15 pm - 6:45 pm Wednesdays in UH 1610

Professor:

Dr. M. Tiamiyu

Office: Department

not meet me.

Office Hours:

My office hours are on Tuesdays & Wednesdays from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM, and by appointment. Please visit me during my office hours if you have any questions. You can also talk with me for a few minutes, before and after class in UH 1610.

Course Description:

Catalog Description

Advanced historical overview of the main systems for understanding human beings: sources of

contexts. This course does not deal in depth with assessment and therapeutic techniques that stem from the systems covered (PSY 6230 -- Personality Assessment does this).

Course Objectives:

By the end of this course, students will be better able to:

1. describe the basic tenets and principles of major personality systems
2. appreciate the principal proponents associated with major personality systems
3. elaborate on the concepts and language used by different personality theorists to describe the structure, dynamics, and development of personality
4. evaluate the historical and cultural perspectives of the personality theories and resulting biases
5. understand the development of healthy personality and personality disorders from different theoretical viewpoints
6. identify assessment techniques of theoretical models and implications for therapy
7. discuss empirical research related to major personality systems
8. demonstrate ability to follow directions regarding personality theories and research assignments.

Textbook and Reading Material:

Required Textbook/Reading:

Ryckman, R. (2013). *Theories of Personality* (10th. Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning [ISBN-978-1-111-83066-3]

(This is an advance undergraduate level textbook, which is an overview of personality theories and research, and has received some good reviews.)

Additional Required Readings

I will assign the additional required readings (mostly original journal articles) on personality theories and research (see course calendar provided towards the end of this syllabus for details, including locations of such readings).

Course Requirements:

Class Participation (Max. 120 Points)

This is a graduate level course. A significant part of the course is your participation in class discussions. Everyone in the class will be expected to participate actively, not to sit back passively and let others do the talking. You need to do the readings prior to class and be ready to discuss them. If you are silent during class, arrive to class very late, or miss class altogether, your grade will be adversely affected.

You will get a class participation grade for each class for which you are not a discussion facilitator. **These grades can range from 0 to 10 points** You will earn a 0 if you are very late or miss class. You will earn a 10 if you participate fully in class discussion, making essential contributions to class that indicate you read, understood and thought about the assigned readings.

It will help class discussions if you critically analyze what you read. Do not read the material in passive mode, akin to watching television with one's critical capabilities disengaged. Every time you read the assigned readings, you should be thinking about the following questions. What are the major themes of the chapters and/or articles? What are the key points and conclusions? How do these differ from the assertions of other theorists/researchers/authors? What data support the points? What ideas/data are inconsistent? What alternative explanations exist for the ideas/findings? How would you test these alternatives? How could this information be applied in community, business, clinical, educational or other real world settings? Also, keep in mind that it will be obvious to me and your course mates when you have not done

submission criteria mentioned in the above paragraphs.

P.S. Students will NOT submit discussion questions the week that they will be the discussion facilitator .

Reflection Papers (120 Points)

Each student will turn in a total of THREE reflection papers You are free to choose from week 2 to week 14 readings, with the exception of the week that you will be the facilitator. The expected length of each paper is two full pages, typed (double-spaced, P D U page numbered), include your name, week of assignment, and a creative title at the top of page 1. Email your submission as an attachment to me by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet W R G L V F X V V W. The paper should contain your thoughts about some aspects of the readings for the week. Keep in mind that at minimum I am trying to judge whether you truly understand the readings and how you express your thoughts. More importantly, I am judging whether you can apply what you read and that you understand the ramifications of what you read.

What should you write about in your reflection papers? The reflection papers should be your comments on the research/theory. It can be your ideas for further research/theoretical revisions, new ways of applying some ideas in the readings, criticisms, or an integration or comparison of the readings/articles. **Do not summarize**, because I have done the readings already. In these papers I am expecting you to come up with original ideas that in some way extend our understanding of the topic(s). There are many ways to do this:

If you ask a couple of questions, answer them. It is easy to ask rhetorical questions. If the readings inspire you to pose such questions, let the reflection paper be a chance to address them. By speculating a little, you may come up with ideas that go beyond the material contained in the readings.

If you have methodological criticisms, tell me why they matter. It is easy to critique the sample or methodology of any study / theory. The challenge is to explain why the results of the study for example would be different if the sample and/or methodology were different. So, for example, you might think: "Hmmm, this study was only conducted on white males!" Okay, but we only learn something new if you explain why we should expect that the findings would be different in a sample of more varied population. If you cannot think of any good reason why the results would be different among a different population, then you haven't come up with much of a critique. Occasionally, there may be important methodological concerns that need to be discussed. However, simply critiquing solely the methodology in all your papers will not earn you high scores on the papers. I expect you to dig deeper into the readings and think about them at the theoretical level as well.

If you have many ideas, choose some of your good ones. YOU DO NOT HAVE TO FOCUS EQUALLY ON ALL THE READINGS OF THE PARTICULAR WEEK. You need to read them all to know what the issues are (you do not want to make a point that appears in the article you did not read!). Establish the issues you are addressing, make your points, support them, and explain why they matter. This way, you will have enough to write in two pages.

When in doubt, go back to those questions I posed in the previous section on class participation. If you are thinking of these questions each time you do the readings, it should not be too difficult for you to come up with what to write.

Other issues regarding reflection papers:

Do not exceed two typed pages. Part of learning how to write is learning to write succinctly. I expect every paper to have a beginning, middle, and an ending. Think of these papers as short essays. Sometimes,

it may be difficult to keep the paper to two pages, but you and I know it can be done. Also, conserve paper; do NOT include a cover page/reference page with your paper.

Each paper will be graded for clarity, logic, and thoughtfulness using the following scale

2 points = You turned in something that bears no relation to the readings. (This is rare)

4 points = You demonstrated some understanding of the readings.

6 points = You understood the readings and made original comments.

8 points = You understood the readings, made original comments and contributed ideas that extend existing theories / research in some ways

10 points = You understood the readings, made original comments and contributed ideas that extend existing theories / research in some ways, and you followed all the instructions for the paper.

Late papers will not be graded. For the three weeks you choose to submit a reflection paper, your papers are due at me via email by 5 pm the Monday before the class will meet. WR GLVFXVV WKH ZHHN ¶ V W will typically be the Wednesday of that week. Remember to send your paper as an attachment, NOT typed directly within an email message. Please include in the email subject line: PSY 6200/PSY 7200 RP 1, 2 or 3 (indicate Week number in parentheses). I will not grade late submissions regardless of the excuse. If you are having difficulty with your computer, please use another computer (e.g., one of those in our psychology department computer labs) by the due date.

Being a Discussion Facilitator (80 Points)

You are entirely responsible for facilitating at least one class discussion during the semester [I will assign the day each student will be a facilitator via random drawing]. Facilitating a discussion

PSY 6200/7200- SYSTEMS OF PERSONALITY
COURSE CALENDAR -- Spring

Week5:

Skinner, B. F. (1987). Whatever happened to psychology as the science of behavior? *American Psychologist*, 42, 780-786. [Available on Course Web site]

Week 9: March 5– Spring Break (NO CLASS)

HUMANISTIC/EXISTENTIAL PERSPECTIVES

Week 10: March 12

Buss, D. M. (2009). How can evolutionary psychology successfully explain personality and individual differences? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(4), 359-366. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01138.x [Available on Course Web site]

-- Last day to email me your Special Project topic (i.e., by 5 pm)

Week 13: April 2 – Abnormal Personality and Personality Disorders

Clark, L. A. (2005). Temperament as a unifying basis for personality and psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 114(4), 505-521. DOI: 10.1037/0021-843X.114.4.505 [Available on Course Web site]

Livesley, W., & Jang, K. L. (2005). Differentiating Normal, Abnormal, and Disordered Personality. *European Journal Of Personality*, 19(4), 257-268. doi:10.1002/per.559. [Available on Course Web site]

Oltmanns, T. F. & Turkheimer, E. (2009). Person perception and personality pathology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(1), 32-36. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01601.x [Available on Course Web site]

Krueger, R. F., Schmutte, P. S., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Campbell, K., & Silva, P. A. (1994). Personality traits are linked to crime among men and women: Evidence from a birth cohort. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103(2), 328-338. [Available on Course Web site]

Welch, S., Klassen, C., Borisova, O., & Clothier, H. (2013). The DSM-5 controversies: How should psychologists respond? *Canadian Psychology*, 54(3), 166-175. doi: 10.1037/a0033841. [Available on Course Web site]

CROSSCULTURAL APPROACHES TO PERSONALITY

Week 14: April 9

Ziegler, A., Fidelman, M., Reutlinger, M., Vialle, W., & Stoeger, H. (2010). Implicit personality theories on the modifiability and stability of the action repertoire as a meaningful framework for individual motivation: A cross-cultural study. *High Ability Studies*, 21(2), 147-163. doi:10.1080/13598139.2010.528924. [Available on Course Web site]

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S., & Fontaine, J. (2009). Hypocrisy or maturity? Culture and context differentiation. *European Journal of Personality*, 23(3), 251-264. doi:10.1002/per.716. [Available on Course Web site]

Carlo, G., Knight, G. P., Roesch, S. C., Opal, D., & Davis, A. (2014). Personality across cultures: A critical analysis of Big Five research and current directions. In F. L. Leong, L. Comas-Díaz, G. C. Nagayama Hall, V. C. McLoyd, J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *APA handbook of multicultural psychology, Vol. 1: Theory and research* (pp. 285-298). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/14189-015. [Available on Course Web site]

-- You can begin to submit your Special Project paper as an attachment via our Blackboard course Web site *Assignments* tool as from 5pm on Wednesday, April 9.

Student Discussion Facilitator Feedback Form

Name of Discussion Facilitator: _____ Date: _____

Topic: _____

1 = Strongly Disagree

5 = Strongly Agree

- | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1. The facilitator seemed organized & prepared. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The facilitator asked good questions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. The questions posed challenged my thinking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. The discussion helped me understand topics better. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I enjoyed the discussion today. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Indicate your overall evaluation of the discussion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | Poor | | | | Excellent |

3 OH DVH GHV FULEH ZKDW \RX OLNHG DERXW WRGD \¶V GLVFRQVWUJHQ
do a good job?

3 OH DVH GHV FULEH ZKDW \RX GLGQ¶W OLNH DERXW WRGD \¶V GLVFRQVWUJHQ
differently by the facilitator to make this a better discussion?