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I. Introduction
II. Classical Conditioning

• Important People
  – Ivan Pavlov
  – John B. Watson
"AND THEN INSTEAD OF FEEDING ME HE WOULD RING A LITTLE BELL."
Limitations: Garcia & Koelling (1966)

Stage 1: All Rats
When rats touch the drinking tube, sweet water is delivered and a light and buzzer turn on.
Stage 1: All Rats
When rats touch the drinking tube, sweet water is delivered and a light and buzzer turn on.

Stage 2

Illness condition

Group 1 rats get nauseating X-rays when they drink.

Fear condition

Group 2 rats get electric shocks when they drink.
Stage 2

**Illness condition**

Group 1 rats get nauseating X-rays when they drink.

**Fear condition**

Group 2 rats get electric shocks when they drink.

Stage 3

Group 1 rats avoid the sweet water and prefer the plain water with the light and buzzer.

Group 2 rats still drink the sweet water, but avoid the plain water with the light and buzzer.
III. Operant Conditioning

• Important People
  – Edward Thorndike
  – B. F. Skinner
IV. Applications of Behavioral Ideas

- Explanations for Psychological Disorders
- Behavior Modification
  - Exposure therapy
  - Parent management training
  - Token economies
"Leave us alone! I am a behavior therapist! I am helping my patient overcome a fear of heights!"
V. Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory

- Learning & Expectation
- Reciprocal Determinism
- Observational Learning
- Self-Efficacy
Learning & Expectation

**Group 1**
- Conditioned stimulus (tone)
- Unconditioned stimulus (shock)
- Conditioning occurs: tone elicits conditioned response of fear

**Group 2**
- Conditioned stimulus (tone)
- Unconditioned stimulus (shock)
- Conditioning does not occur: tone does not elicit conditioned response of fear
Reciprocal Determinism

Environment
Stimuli from social or physical environment
Reinforcement contingencies

Behavior
Nature
Frequency
Intensity

Person
Personality characteristics
Cognitive processes
Self-regulation skills
Observational Learning
Bandura’s Bobo Doll Study Results

- **Model Rewarded**
  - Boys: 3.5
  - Girls: 1.8

- **Model Punished**
  - Boys: 2.5
  - Girls: 0.5

- **No Consequences**
  - Boys: 3.5
  - Girls: 1.8
Bandura’s Bobo Doll Study

• Illustrated the distinction between learning and performing
• Showed it is possible to learn but not perform
Self-Efficacy

• Defined: The belief that we can perform the behaviors necessary to produce a desired outcome.

• Sources:
  – Enactive Mastery Experiences
  – Vicarious Experiences
  – Verbal Persuasion
  – Physiological & Emotional Arousal
VI. Rotter’s Social Learning Theory

• Behavior Potential
• Locus of Control
## Behavior Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Possible Outcome</th>
<th>Expectancy</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Behavior Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask for an apology</td>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insult back</td>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yell at insulter</td>
<td>Ugly scene</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave the party</td>
<td>Feel foolish</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internal versus External Locus of Control

Choose one:

A. The average person can have an influence on government.

B. The world is run by the few people in power, and there isn’t much the little guy can do about it.
Internal versus External Locus of Control

Choose one:

A. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.

B. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
Internal versus External Locus of Control

Choose one:

A. Many times I feel I have little influence over the things that happen to me.

B. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
VII. Strengths
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Cognitive Perspective

I. Kelly’s Theory of Personal Constructs
II. Mischel & Shoda’s Cognitive Affective Personality System (CAPS)
III. Albert Ellis
IV. Aaron Beck
I. Kelly’s Theory of Personal Constructs
Constructive Alternativism

• There is no objective reality or “absolute” truth; there are only alternative ways of construing events
Fundamental Postulate

• A person’s processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he or she anticipates events. (Huh?)

• In other words... personality is a function of the ways a person interprets situations and makes predictions about what is going to happen.
Personal Construct

• Kelly’s basic building block of personality
• Defined: A bipolar cognitive structure that an individual uses to interpret and make predictions about the world.
• Examples:
  – moral-amoral, masculine-feminine, attractive-ugly, funny-boring, talkative-quiet, relaxed-tense, intelligent-stupid
Personality & Personal Constructs

Bob’s Construct System
Attractive-Ugly
Responsible-Irresponsible
Motivated-Lazy

Joe’s Construct System
Funny-Dull
Spontaneous-Predictable
Athletic-Nonathletic
Kelly & Psychopathology
Permeability

• How easy is it to modify the range of convenience of a personal construct?
  – Too permeable: too easily to modify
  – Impermeable: very difficult to modify

• Example: apply construct moral-amoral to plants, pets, buildings (too permeable) versus only religious people but no one else (impermeable)
Problems in Predicting

• Tightening: make same, constant prediction, regardless of the situation (e.g., depressed personal always predicting people will reject him)

• Loosening: make wildly varying, random predictions using the same construct (e.g., manic behavior)
Kelly & Psychopathology

• Kelly believed that people are strongly motivated to reduce or avoid both **anxiety** and **threat**.

• Anxiety: the experience that one’s construct system is not applicable to events (the person can’t understand or predict).

• Threat: The recognition that imminent comprehensive change is needed in a construct system.
The Role Construct Repertory Test
(A.k.a. The REP Test)

Personal Constructs

To begin, write down the names of the following 12 people. Although a person may fit more than one category, you need to compile a list of 12 different people. If there is no one who fits a category, name someone who is similar to the category description. For example, if you do not have a brother, select someone who is like a brother to you.

1. A teacher you liked
2. A teacher you disliked
3. Your wife (husband) or boyfriend (girlfriend)
4. An employer, supervisor, or officer you found hard to get along with
5. An employer, supervisor, or officer you liked
6. Your mother
7. Your father
8. Brother nearest your age
9. Sister nearest your age
10. A person with whom you have worked who was easy to get along with
11. A person with whom you have worked who was hard to understand
12. A neighbor with whom you get along well
The Role Construct Repertory Test
(A.k.a. The REP Test)

Next, take three of these people at a time, as indicated by the numbers in the following list. Then describe in what important way two of them are alike but different from the third. Put a word or phrase describing the two alike people in the Construct list and a description of the remaining person in the Contrast list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 6, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 6, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 7, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 10, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Mischel & Shoda’s Cognitive Affective Personality System (CAPS)
## Cognitive-Affective Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encodings</td>
<td>Categories (constructs) for encoding information about one’s self, other people, events, &amp; situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations &amp; Beliefs</td>
<td>Expectations for what will happen in certain situations, for outcomes for certain behaviors, and for one’s personal efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects</td>
<td>Feelings, emotions, and emotional responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals &amp; Values</td>
<td>Individual goals &amp; values, life projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies &amp; Self-Regulatory Plans</td>
<td>Perceived abilities, plans, and strategies for changing and maintaining one’s behavior and internal states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Albert Ellis

- Model of Emotion
- Rational Emotive Therapy (RET)
Common Irrational Thoughts

• It is a dire necessity for an adult to be loved by everyone for everything he or she does.
• One should be thoroughly competent, successful and achieving in all possible respects.
• Certain people are wicked and villainous when they do not behave as I demand that they should and for this, they should be severely punished.
• If something is threatening, I should be terribly upset about it.
IV. Aaron Beck

• Theory
• Cognitive Distortions
• Cognitive Therapy
  – Cognitive Restructuring
  – Self-Instructional Training
Common Cognitive Distortions

• All or Nothing Thinking
• Overgeneralization
• Mental Filter
• Disqualifying the Positive
• Jumping to Conclusions
• Magnification or Catastrophizing
• Emotional Reasoning
• Should & Must Statements
• Labeling & Mislabeling
• Personalizing
• Depressogenic Attribution Pattern*
• Negative Cognitive Triad*
Personality Disorders

I. Introduction
II. Millon’s Biosocial Learning Theory
III. Personality Disorders
I. Introduction
Common Personality Disorder Characteristics

• Adaptive Inflexibility
• Tendency to foster vicious cycles
• Lack of resiliency
II. Millon’s Biosocial Learning Theory
Millon’s Two Dimensions of Reinforcement Strategies

• Instrumental Behavior Pattern (How is the person pursuing the reinforcement?)
  – Active
  – Passive

• Source of Reinforcement (Where is the reinforcement coming from?)
  – Independent
  – Dependent
  – Ambivalent
  – Detached
III. Personality Disorders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL BEHAVIOR PATTERN (HOW are they seeking reinforcement?)</th>
<th>SOURCE OF REINFORCEMENT (WHERE are they seeking reinforcement?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Forceful personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial Personality Disorder</td>
<td>Histrionic Personality Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid Personality Disorder</td>
<td>Borderline Personality Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Cooperative personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident personality</td>
<td>Narcissistic Personality Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid Personality Disorder</td>
<td>Borderline Personality Disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personality, Emotion, & Health

I. Introduction
II. Lazarus & Cognitive Appraisal
III. Coping Styles
IV. Personality, Stress, & Injury
I. Introduction
II. Lazarus & Cognitive Appraisal
Spiesman et al. (1964)
Types of Cognitive Appraisals

• Primary: appraisal of situational demands
• Secondary: appraisal of personal resources to cope with a situation
• Reappraisal: re-appraisal of situational demands, taking assessment of personal resources into account
III. Coping Styles

- Problem-focused coping: actively trying to change the source of a problem
- Emotion-focused coping: coping with the personal emotions evoked by an event
IV. Personality, Stress, & Coping

- Research of professors Ron Smith & Frank Smoll
High School Sports Injury Study:

Is there a relationship (correlation) between stressful life events and risk of sport injury?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Social Support</th>
<th>Low Social Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Coping Skills</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Coping Skills</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>