Spring Semester 2020

01/15 – Social Resilience Job Candidate Discussion 1
01/22 – STUDENTS ONLY: Lunch with Job Candidate (12:15-1:30, MUEN E214)
01/29 – STUDENTS ONLY: Lunch with Job Candidate (12:15-1:30, MUEN E214)
02/05 – Social Resilience Job Candidate Discussion 2
02/12 – Balbir Singh
02/19 – Brittany Tokasey
02/26 – No Meeting: SPSP (New Orleans, LA)
03/04 – Alex Flores
03/11 – Chris Mellinger
03/18 – Charleen Gust
03/25 – No Meeting: Spring Break
04/01 – Lena Wadsworth
04/08 – Laurel Gibson
04/15 – Jairo Ramos
04/22 – Abby Branch & Dani Grant: First Year Ekstrand Practice Talks (also - MPA: Chicago, IL)
04/29 – Final Meeting: Goodbye/Goodbreak “Party” (also - Ekstrand Mini-Convention: Boulder, CO)
Fall Semester 2019

08/28 – Welcome: Introductions & Professional Issues

09/04 – STUDENTS ONLY: Tim Curran – Director of Graduate Education

09/11 – Lawrence Williams, CU Leeds School of Business:

Meaning and Money Don’t Mix: The Link Between Meaningful Consumption and Frugality

The pursuit of meaning is associated with a desire for self-growth and a belief that larger investments will provide longer-lasting benefits. One might expect, then, that pursuing meaning promotes the choice of higher-quality products. In contrast, 6 experiments reveal that people who are induced to pursue meaning (vs. pleasure) are more inclined towards less expensive, lower-quality options. This effect occurs because the pursuit of meaning increases people’s focus on alternative uses for their money, time, and energy. Hence, there is a disconnect between what people believe brings them meaning in consumption and what they choose to create meaningful consumption.

09/18 – STUDENTS ONLY: Professional Development - Reviewing for Psychological Science

09/25 – Michael Breed, CU Ecology and Evolutionary Biology:

Biological Perspectives on the Evolution of Social Behavior

Most evolutionary analyses of cooperation focus on the fitness costs and benefits of participating in cooperative relationships. Generally speaking, cooperation can be divided between that which occurs in family (or extended family) groups in which the balance between cost and benefit can be analyzed by assessing indirect components of fitness. Kin selection is the most common articulation of an evolutionary mechanism that drives cooperation within extended families or neighborhoods of genealogically connected animals. However, kin selection has been criticized on a variety of bases and alternative models, such as reciprocal altruism, dominance, or even group selection may also play a role in the evolution of cooperation in families. Cooperation among unrelated individuals can often be interpreted using selfish herd models. The concept of public and private information helps to understand the evolution of cooperation, as publicly broadcasted signals, such as alarm calls, may impact both related and unrelated animals. Privately held information, such as food and nest locations, can often lead to deception to either hide such information or to discover the privately held information of other animals. Groups of animals may appear to be cooperating when in fact they are held together by exploitative strategies centered on obtaining information. These models can be used to interpret the behavior of animals which apprehend information and act based on cognitive processes (theory of mind, for example) or of animals whose behavior is thought to be more strongly canalized through genetics.

10/02 – Michael Ranney, UC Berkeley (CU Sabbatical in Spring):

Six Experimentally Vetted Ways to Quickly Reduce Denial of Human-Caused Global Warming (Without Polarization)
Virtually no Americans (i.e., under .5%) can accurately explain global warming’s basic mechanism in a few sentences—or even at a 13-word haiku level (which will be presented). A few “stasis” researchers mistakenly believe that (e.g., scientific) information cannot yield more normative climate change attitudes. Ranney et al. (e.g., 2019) repeatedly disconfirmed this myth, because experiments replicably show that our growing handful of short (1-10 minute) climate change interventions rather durably increase (e.g., mechanistic) global warming understandings and climate change acceptance. (Ranney & Clark, 2016, and Ranney et al, 2016, offer additional details.) The interventions increase recipients’ acceptance that climate change is both occurring and anthropogenic—even upon nine-day and one-month post-tests. Conservatives and liberals alike show such gains, exhibiting no polarization. Stimuli include (1) texts (under 600 words), (2) videos (under 5 minutes’ duration), (3) climate statistics (e.g., about global warming’s observed effects), (4) statistics reducing one’s nationalism, (5) sea-level-rise information, and (6) graphs contrasting financial stocks with global warming (e.g., temperatures since 1880). “Consumer-Reports-type” data show which interventions more efficiently reduce global warming denial. Finally, I discuss HowGlobalWarmingWorks.org—our website for directly enhancing public “climate change cognition,” which provides many of our interventions (in full or in part).

10/09 – Brooke Carter: Preparing an Industry Resume

10/16 – STUDENTS ONLY: Professional Development - Reviewing & Creating a JPSP (also - Person Memory & SESP: Toronto, ON, CA)

10/23 – Karl Hill: Prevention Science: A Discussion of Program and Career Opportunities (also - NSF GRF Due on 10/24: https://www.nsfgrfp.org/applicants/important_dates)

10/30 – Jenny Cole:

*What makes for effective interventions on pro-environmental behavior?*

The theory of wise interventions describes how behavior change interventions are successful when they target the stories that people tell themselves about their self, others, and their situations. Such interventions make lasting differences in behavior by targeting recursive, self-reinforcing processes. However, in the field of environmental behavior change, interventions that target environmental identity, i.e. the stories people tell themselves about their relationships to the environment, are no more likely to lead to positive behavioral spillover than other interventions on pro-environmental behavior. Why? Three potential explanations and methods to empirically test these explanations will be discussed.

11/06 – Courtney A. Rocheleau: Life as an Academic @ Metropolitan State University of Denver

11/13 – Chad Danyluck:

*Improving Interpersonal Interactions and their Outcomes in Diverse Societies*

Interpersonal relationships are an important predictor of health and well-being: People who have stronger relationships survive longer than those who do not and this is true of both close interpersonal relationships with family and friends and of social cohesion within our broader neighborhoods. Despite the importance of interpersonal relationships, they can be challenging
to navigate in our day-to-day lives and this is particularly true in diverse societies where group differences can give rise to discrimination and conflict. In this talk, I will review studies that combine psychological and psychophysiological methods to demonstrate how interpersonal interactions and interpersonal processes promote or detract from wellbeing in Indigenous people and in other social groups. The first part of this talk will show (i) that the relationship between interpersonal discrimination exposure and Indigenous mental health may depend on one’s age at the time of exposure and (ii) that individual differences in mental health can modify how Indigenous people respond physiologically to a discriminatory stressor. The second part of this talk will reveal the role that shared physiological processes can play in contributing to successful interpersonal relationships. Together, this work gives rise to new directions for the study of interpersonal discrimination and Indigenous mental health by underscoring the important role that interpersonal interactions and relationships might play in promoting and detracting from wellbeing in Indigenous communities.

11/20 – Miriam Clayton:

*Fatherhood Role Models, Parenting Intentions, and Expansive Masculinity*

Although gender roles and stereotypes have shifted as women have increasingly participated in the workforce, men remain underrepresented in “feminine” tasks such as childcare, and stereotypes of masculinity are more restrictive, and have shifted less, than stereotypes of femininity. Men’s engagement in non-traditionally masculine roles may be made difficult by various social and psychological barriers. The first half of this talk focuses on two studies which examine one barrier, a dearth of social role models, to test whether exposure to social role models of involved fatherhood can change expectations of future fatherhood caregiving among young adults. Results found role models did not change men’s paternal caregiving intentions or women’s expectations of their partners, but may influence perceived social norms. The second half of this talk will focus on a proposed theoretical model to explain individual differences in expansive masculinity more broadly.

11/27 – No Meeting: Fall Break

12/04 – Tiffany Ito: Social Resilience Job Search Update

12/11 – Final Meeting: Semester Recap