

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY

FAIRNESS, RECIPROCITY, ALTRUISM, AND TRUST: COMPETITION AND COOPERATION BETWEEN HUMANS

FRPG 188V: SPRING 2009

INSTRUCTOR:	Dr. Natalia V. Ovchinnikova
OFFICE:	Hepburn 203
TELEPHONE:	315-229-5437
EMAIL:	novchinn@stlawu.edu
INSTRUCTOR'S OFFICE HOURS:	M 4:10-5:00 pm; W 3:40-5:00 pm; or by appointment I have an open-door policy, please stop by if I am around
MENTOR'S OFFICE HOURS:	Sun, T 6:00-8:00 pm; Th 7:00-8:00 pm; for appointments outside of office hours use: bmmazi07@stlawu.edu or x6539
WORD STUDIO:	M-T 8:30 am - 11:00 pm; F 8:30 am - 4:00 pm; Sun 1:00-11:00 pm
CLASS MEETS:	M 1:40-4:10 pm, W 1:40-3:40 pm, Hepburn 11

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Your friend never offers to help to pay for pizza, often borrows your bike, always wants to copy your class notes, but your friend never does anything for you in return. Do you think you would still consider this person your true friend? In this seminar we are going to explore the nature of human interactions. We are going to investigate questions like: Why do people cooperate? Why do they free-ride? One of my favorite quotes is the following:

“The appearance of other-regardingness comes from the self-regarding requirements of, and the need for, reciprocity in social exchange. Take away all social context – no others can know – and we see the naked expression of purely self-regarding behavior.” Vernon Smith, 2002 Nobel Prize in Economics

The author argues that if nobody knows what you are doing – you will behave selfishly. Do you agree with such an assertion? I don't. However, I see many reasons and examples why and when the quote will correctly represent reality. In this seminar we will be also discussing whether there can (or cannot) be a right balance between pursuing your self-interest and other-regarding behavior. We will try to expand our understanding of what altruism is, what drives such behavior and whether pure altruists can survive in our modern society. We will also spend time on discussing the meaning of fairness, justice, and trust and their difference between cultures and

societies. Finally we are going to investigate how to measure the degree of cooperation, altruism, trust and trustworthiness. We will play games which mimic situations which we are likely to encounter in real life. We will analyze the results of these games to gain insights into individual and group behavior.

FIRST-YEAR PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY AND GOALS 2008-09

A residentially-based, interdisciplinary first-year program is an ideal environment for beginning the four-year process of developing the complex intellectual and social skills that are at the heart of a liberal education and the habits of considered values and engaged citizenship that such an education should produce. The First-Year Program (FYP) and First-Year Seminar (FYS) are the core of our institutional commitment to improving your ability to engage in critical inquiry and research, to design and deliver written, spoken and/or visual texts that demonstrate rhetorical sensitivity, and to be sophisticated readers, listeners, and viewers of the texts of others. We believe that these same competencies can help develop your ability to communicate across differences (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, class, ethnicity, political views) as you find ways to live and learn together in the residence halls and as engaged and ethically reflective citizens both during and after your college years. These goals should be understood as the first step in our work with you over a four-year process of helping you to meet the University's Aims and Objectives.

We hope to help you see that writing, speaking, research, and interacting with others are rhetorical endeavors. Effective communicators are, by definition, rhetorically sensitive. Rhetorical sensitivity means understanding that all communication, whether formal or informal, involves having to make choices about your messages, whether written, spoken, or visual. To become an effective communicator, you need to recognize that the creation of a meaningful and powerful message involves both a creator and an audience, and that therefore the voice you adopt in your communication, and the audience you imagine yourself communicating to, matter a great deal in creating your message. The choices you make in writing and speaking are central in determining how people read and hear your voice. Becoming conscious and reflective about those choices, and their ethical dimensions, is a central goal of the FYP and FYS.

Working with you so that you become more rhetorically sensitive means that you should be increasingly able to assess the requirements of a particular task and make intentional decisions about which mode or modes of communication and inquiry would be most effective in addressing it. To do so, you must develop specific writing, speaking, research, and technological competencies. To accomplish these goals, the FYP and FYS will present you with assignments that ask you to engage in a process that involves **recognizing** the rhetorical situation, **planning** communication strategies to address the task at hand, **composing and presenting** the message, and then engaging in **critical assessment** of your own work and that of others. The results of that assessment process will allow you to rethink, restructure, and revise your work. We further recognize that this process is not linear and that the effective creation of texts requires that you move back and forth among these four elements of the message creation process. This is why we require that your writing and speaking assignments be "projects" that include preparatory exercises and multiple drafts or rehearsals, all of which ask you to continue to reflect critically on the choices you have made in constructing your message.

This process of increased rhetorical awareness and skill development is at the heart of the philosophical and pedagogical perspectives that inform the work of the FYP and FYS. Because this process both transcends and integrates a variety of specific skills, the program has a philosophical commitment to

designing assignments that ask you to integrate various modes of communication in furtherance of the higher-level rhetorical goals in which they are situated.

To ensure that the program is meeting its stated goals, all FYP and FYS syllabi are read by other faculty in the program to determine if they include a variety of assignments that forward the writing, speaking, research, and literacy goals of the program. All FYP and FYS courses have to be approved by faculty in the program before they are offered.

FIRST-YEAR SEMINAR RESEARCH PROJECT LEARNING GOALS 2008-09

With respect to research skills specifically, our learning goals for the spring are that students should:

- Be introduced to ways of conducting productive and imaginative inquiry and research in order to become a part of the various conversations surrounding issues.
- Learn to differentiate among the various ways that information is produced and presented, between popular and scholarly journals and books, between mainstream and alternative publications, between primary and secondary sources.
- Learn how to evaluate and synthesize information, whether gathered from traditional sources, e.g., books and journals, or from websites or electronic media.
- Begin to develop the skills of critical analysis in the interpretation and use of information gathered from any source.
- Be introduced to the ethical obligations that scholars have to both responsibly represent their sources and inform their readers of the sources of their information, as well as learning, and being held responsible for the proper use of, the conventions of scholarly citation and attribution.
- Present the results of your research in written, spoken, visual and/or other forms that demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively using the conventions of the mode of communication adopted.

THE WORD STUDIO

The Munn Center for Rhetoric and Communication maintains The WORD Studio in ODY Library—a place to get feedback from peers on assignments in Writing, Oral communication, Research, and Design of visual projects. You can come for a consultation to plan a paper or presentation (you don't need anything but a blank piece of paper!); to find ways to improve the ideas, organization, and style of a draft; to videotape and review a presentation rehearsal; to practice a PowerPoint presentation, and more. Peer tutors are not proofreaders or editors who silently “fix” your work for you; instead, they are trained to have a conversation with you about ways you can fix problem areas yourself and become better overall communicators. You may use The WORD Studio for consultations on assignments for any of your courses, although for FYP assignments you should first seek out your course mentor during his or her office hours.

The WORD Studio is open Monday through Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.; Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; and Sunday, 1:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. You may also IM the Studio during regular hours with quick questions about grammar, citation, and style: *SLUword*.

GRADES (total 500 points)

Reflection and thought papers	50 points (10%), you've earned ____+____=____
Homework	100 points (20%), you've earned ____+____+____+____+____=____
Article presentation	50 points (10%), you've earned ____
Paper on Experimental project	200 points (40%), you've earned ____+____+____+____-____=____
Poster presentation	50 points (10%), you've earned ____
Portfolio and reflection	25 points (5%), you've earned ____
Participation	25 points (5%), you've earned ____+____+____-____=____
<i>Total</i>	<i>500 points (100%), you've earned ____</i>

Reflection and thought papers (total 50 points)

There will be one reflection and one thought paper. In the thought paper you will be applying the course readings and discussions to analyze the movie "Amelie". In the reflection paper you will be evaluating your and your group's performance during the board game "Game of Thrones". Both will be discussed further in class.

Homework (total 100 points)

Written homework will be assigned for the next class, so please plan your time in advance. Homework should be typed, with graphs, charts, tables, pictures, and formulas produced using Word and Excel if necessary.

Article presentation (total 50 points)

You will be assigned a partner (one team will have three students). Each team will make a presentation of a scholarly article as if the team wrote that article and is delivering it at a conference. The team will be also responsible for initiating the classroom discussion on the article findings.

Paper and Poster on Experimental Research Project (total 200+50 points)

The goal of this hands-on experimental project is to design, conduct, and analyze an experiment to test your hypotheses about human interactions, including fairness, trust, reciprocity, altruism, other-regarding behavior, etc. You will work on this research project throughout the semester together with one or two classmates. The project is divided into several steps. Each step should be completed and submitted to me by its deadline as indicated in the Class Schedule (see below). Some of the steps carry some points, for other steps you will have points deducted if you do not complete them.

On the last day of classes you are expected to create a poster and present your results to the class. We are going to have a member of the Quantitative Resources Center conducting a poster workshop in our class.

All materials submitted should be type-written, with graphs, charts, tables, pictures, and formulas produced using Word, Excel, or Power Point.

Steps of the project	Number of points
Notes on sources and research question	+ max 10
Detailed outline with embedded bibliography	+ max 20
Thoughts on experimental design and hypotheses	-10 if not submitted -5 if submitted incomplete or sloppy work
Draft of the experimental design	+ max 20
Draft of the IRB proposal	-10 if not submitted -5 if submitted incomplete or sloppy work
IRB Proposal and Informed Consent	+ max 25
Experimental Design Section	-10 if not submitted -5 if submitted incomplete or sloppy work
Literature Review section	-10 if not submitted -5 if submitted incomplete or sloppy work
Data collected in the experiment	-20 if not submitted -10 if submitted incomplete or sloppy work
Data Analysis section	-10 if not submitted -5 if submitted incomplete or sloppy work
Conclusions and Policy Applications section	-10 if not submitted -5 if submitted incomplete or sloppy work
Final papers due April 22	+ max 125

Portfolio and reflection on research work (total 25 points)

You are responsible to keep all the material you have accumulated during the work on the experimental research project, including, but not limited to, notes on bibliography, papers read, drafts and parts of the project (particularly graded and containing the feedback), the final paper, and the poster. In addition, each group has to write a reflection on the research work conducted and the team cooperation (or the absence of such) and performance.

Submission Policy (Papers, Homework, Sections of the Paper, and other assignments): Late submissions will be penalized by deducting 25% of the full grade for each day of delay starting from the next day regardless of the excuse. It is your responsibility to submit your work on time. If you are sick – send me your work by e-mail or ask your friend/classmate to bring it to me. If you have problems with printing the assignment – submit it to me by e-mail BEFORE the class. In this case the assignment is considered “submitted” only if I acknowledged the receipt of it.

Participation (total 25 points)

Participation implies meaningful, significant, and voluntary contribution to the classroom discussions. Sometimes I will be calling on you or inviting you to share your opinion. However, I expect that you take the initiative and raise your hand. Classroom participation is evaluated twice per semester (10+10 points): around the fall break for the first half and on the final week of classes for the second half of the semester.

Participation in each half of the semester is assessed according to the following scale: perfect attendance is worth 2 points; perfect attendance plus rare participation – 4 points; perfect attendance plus frequent participation – 6 points; perfect attendance plus frequent high quality participation – 8 points; perfect attendance and high quality participation in every class meeting – 10 points.

The final 5 points are reserved for participation during the poster session.

Attendance is required in this class. If you miss a class more than 3 times, your participation grade will be reduced by 3 points for each class above 3 that you have missed. Please also see Course Policies.

Grades are assigned as follows:

Grade	Class points	Grade	Class points
4.0	481-500	2.25	366-380
3.75	461-480	2.0	351-365
3.5	441-460	1.75	336-350
3.25	426-440	1.5	321-335
3.0	411-425	1.25	311-320
2.75	396-410	1.0	300-310
2.5	381-395	0.0	<300

COURSE POLICIES

1. I am spending several hours each day preparing for classes (and I am teaching more than one class), so I expect you to do the same. It is imperative that **YOU COME TO CLASS PREPARED**, read assigned readings, and did the homework. If for some reason you are not prepared for a class – please notify me at the beginning of class.
2. All papers, homework assignments and the project should be typewritten.
3. I will use the web page Angel, so please be sure that you have access to it a day before class.
4. It is your responsibility to keep yourself informed about all information given during class time even if you have an excuse for missing a class.
5. Attendance is required and if you are going to miss a class – please notify me a day before.
6. The class time is exclusively devoted to course discussions, so please don't sleep, eat, talk, read newspaper, or prepare for another class.
7. Turn-off **COMPLETELY** your cell phone upon entering the class. It is not enough to place your phone on the “vibration” mode. If you are expecting a call which you absolutely have to take please notify before the class.
8. During the computer session you can use the computer to work **EXCLUSIVELY** on the assignment. If I notice that you have other application opened (game, internet browser, email, etc.) or have this application minimized, your participation grade will be decreased by 5 points.
9. See also policies for submitting papers, homework assignments and drafts/parts of the project.

UNIVERSITY POLICIES

All students at St. Lawrence University are bound by honor to maintain the highest level of academic integrity. By virtue of membership in the St. Lawrence community, every student accepts the responsibility to know the rules of academic honesty, to abide by them at all times, and to encourage all others to do the same. Responsibility for avoiding behavior or situations from which academic dishonesty may be inferred rests entirely with the students. Students should be sure to learn from faculty what is expected as their own work and how the work of other people should be acknowledged.

All students are expected to prescribe to the highest possible standards of academic honesty as described in the Academic Honor Code. Academic dishonesty of any form is not tolerated in this class. Students are advised that any type of harassment is not tolerated in this class. If you have any complaint, you may take it up with the instructor, the department chair, or the campus EEO/Affirmative Action office.

REQUIRED READINGS

Hacker, Diana, *A Pocket Style Manual*, 5th Edition, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008. The same book you were using in your FYP class.

FYPR188V: Reading packet (purchase in the Department of Economics office, H 103).

The rest of the readings will be available through Angel or the library website, or distributed in class.

CLASS SCHEDULE

Changes, if any, will be announced in class

Dates	Topic, class content, and readings	Assignment
Week 1: January 19, 21	Introduction: Why do we study human interactions? <u>Topic 1. Altruism</u> Classroom experiment and discussion of the results	HW1 due January 21
Week 2: January 26, 28	Formulating research question Bibliography and citations Readings: Kolm, S. G. (2006). Altruism: Types and causes or reasons. In S. G. Koln & J. M. Ythier (Eds.), <i>Handbook of the Economics of Giving, Altruism and Reciprocity</i> (pp.54-70). The Netherlands: Elsevier. Kolm, S. G. (2006). Altruism and justice: impartial altruism In S. G. Koln & J. M. Ythier (Eds.), <i>Handbook of the Economics of Giving, Altruism and Reciprocity</i> (pp.71-79). The Netherlands: Elsevier.	HW2 due January 26
Week 3: February 2, 4	Individual consultations on the projects Continuation of the readings discussions Movie: "Amelie"	Notes on sources and research question due February 2
Week 4: February 9,11	<u>Topic 2. Competition and cooperation</u> Classroom experiments and discussion of the results Basics of data analysis Research with human subjects and IRB requirements Readings: Hu, Y. & Liu, D. Y. (2003). Altruism versus Egoism in Human Behavior of Mixed Motives. <i>American Journal of Economics & Sociology</i> , 62(4), 677-705. Cooper, R., DeJong, D. V., Forsythe, R., & Ross, T. W. (1996). Cooperation without Reputation: Experimental Evidence from Prisoner's Dilemma Games. <i>Games and Economic Behavior</i> , 12(2), 187-218. What is a good "Literature review"?	Thought paper #1 due February 2 Presentations by Team 1 and Team 2 on February 11
Week 5: February 16, 18	"Game of thrones" (both classes)	HW3 due February 16 Detailed outline due Feb 18

<p>Week 6: February 23, 25</p>	<p>Discussion of the game Introduction into experimental design</p> <p>Discussion on how to design an experiment for this class What constitutes a good “Experimental Design” section? “Beautiful Madness” (documentary on Nash)</p>	<p>Reflection paper #2 due February 23</p> <p>Thoughts on experimental design and hypotheses due February 25</p>
<p>Week 7: March 2, 4</p>	<p><u>Topic 3. Empathy and fairness</u> Classroom experiments and discussion of the results Graphical presentation of the experimental results What constitutes a good “Data Analysis” section?</p> <p>Individual consultations on experimental design and IRB documentation</p>	<p>Draft of the experimental design due March 2</p> <p>Draft of the IRB proposal due March 4</p>
<p>Week 8: March 9, 11</p>	<p>Readings: Singer, T. (2007). The neuronal basis of empathy and fairness. In G. Bock & J. Goode (Eds.) <i>Empathy and Fairness</i> (pp. 20-29). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons. Call, J. & Jensen, K. (2007). Chimpanzees may recognize motives and goals, but may not reckon on them. In G. Bock & J. Goode (Eds.) <i>Empathy and Fairness</i> (pp. 56- 65). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons. De Vignemont, F. (2007). When do we empathize? In G. Bock & J. Goode (Eds.) <i>Empathy and Fairness</i> (pp.181- 190). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons. Finkel, N. J. (2001). What are the types of unfairness? Towards a categorization schemata. In <i>Not Fair! The typology of commonsense unfairness</i> (pp. 65-90). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.</p> <p>Readings: Sanfey, A. G., Rilling, J. K., Aronson, J. A., Nystrom, L. E., & Cohen, J. D. (2003). The Neural Basis of Decision- Making in the Ultimatum Game. <i>Science</i>, 300, 1755-1758. Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J., & Thaler, R. (1986a). Fairness as a constraint on profit-seeking: entitlements in the market, <i>American Economic Review</i>, 76, 728-741. Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J., & Thaler, R. (1986b). Fairness and the Assumptions of Economics <i>Journal of Business</i>, 59(5), 285-300.</p>	<p>HW4 due March 9</p> <p>IRB proposal due March 9</p> <p>Presentations by Team 3 and Team 4 on March 11</p> <p>Experimental Design Section due March 11</p>
<p>Week 9: March 16, 18</p>	<p>SPRING BREAK</p>	

<p>Week 10: March 23, 25</p>	<p><u>Topic 4. Trust and reciprocity</u> Classroom experiment on trust College Success Questionnaire</p> <p>Readings: Kurzban, R. (2003). Biological foundations of reciprocity. In E. Ostrom & J. Walker (Eds.) <i>Trust and reciprocity</i> (pp. 105-127). New York, NY: Russell Sage. De Waal, F. B. M. (2003). The chimpanzee's service economy. In E. Ostrom & J. Walker (Eds.) <i>Trust and reciprocity</i> (pp. 128-144). New York, NY: Russell Sage. McCabe, K. A. (2003). A cognitive theory of reciprocal exchange. In E. Ostrom & J. Walker (Eds.) <i>Trust and reciprocity</i> (pp. 147-169). New York, NY: Russell Sage.</p>	<p>Literature Review section due March 25</p>
<p>Week 11: March 30, April 1</p>	<p>Readings: Eckel C. C. & Wilson, R. K. (2003). The human face of game theory. In E. Ostrom & J. Walker (Eds.) <i>Trust and reciprocity</i> (pp. 245-274). New York, NY: Russell Sage. Harbaugh, W. T., Krause, K., Liday Jr., S. G., & Vesterlung, L. (2003). Trust in children. In E. Ostrom & J. Walker (Eds.) <i>Trust and reciprocity</i> (pp. 302-322). New York, NY: Russell Sage. Fehr, E., List, J. A. (2004). The hidden costs and returns of incentives – trust and trustworthiness among CEOs. <i>Journal of the European Economic Association</i>, 2, 743-771.</p> <p>Additional discussion on the Data Analysis section</p> <p>Individual consultations on data analysis</p>	<p>Presentations by Team 4, Team 5, and Team 6 on March 30</p> <p>Data collected in the experiment due April 1</p>
<p>Week 12: April 6, 8</p>	<p><u>Topic 5. Happiness and friendship</u> 60 minutes: Pursuit of Happiness movie.</p> <p>Readings: Sugden, R. (2005). Correspondence of sentiments: an explanation of the pleasure of social interactions. In L. Bruni and P. L. Porta (Eds.) <i>Economics and happiness: framing the analysis</i> (pp. 29-64). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>What constitutes a good “Conclusions and Policy Applications” section?</p> <p>Readings: Frey, B. S. & Stutzer, A. (2005). Testing theories of happiness. In L. Bruni and P. L. Porta (Eds.) <i>Economics and happiness: framing the analysis</i> (pp. 116-147). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Easterlin, R. A. (2005). Building a better theory of well-being. In L. Bruni and P. L. Porta (Eds.) <i>Economics and happiness: framing the analysis</i> (pp. 29-64). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.</p>	<p>Data Analysis section due April 6</p> <p>HW5 due April 8</p>

<p>Week 13: April 13, 15</p>	<p>Poster workshop (QRC) Readings: Kahneman D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D.A., Schwartz, N., Stone, A.A. (2004). A survey method for characterizing daily life experience: The day reconstruction method. <i>Science</i>, 306, 1776-1780.</p> <p>Individual consultations on the project</p>	<p>Conclusions and Policy Applications section due April 13</p> <p>Presentation by Team 8 on April 13</p>
<p>Week 14: April 20, 22</p>	<p>Readings: Veenhoven R. (2005). Happiness in hardship. In L. Bruni and P. L. Porta (Eds.) <i>Economics and happiness: framing the analysis</i> (pp. 243-266). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Zamagni, S. (2005). Happiness and individualism: A very difficult union. In L. Bruni and P. L. Porta (Eds.) <i>Economics and happiness: framing the analysis</i> (pp. 29-64). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Game “Junta”</p>	<p>Final papers due April 22</p>
<p>Week 15: April 27, 29</p>	<p>Wrap-up: what we learned about human interactions Natalia’s research agenda</p> <p>Poster session: presentations of the projects</p>	<p>Portfolios due April 27</p> <p>Poster presentations on April 29</p>

CONTACTS/ GROUP MEMBERS

Name: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____