

Chapman University

Professor Brennan McDavid
Philosophy
mcdavid@chapman.edu
(562) 453-6384 cell

Professor Jan Osborn
English
josborn@chapman.edu
(714) 270-1015 cell

Course Syllabus

ECON-ENG-PHIL 357 Topics in Humanomics: Trust in Troubling Times AF 206A Spring 2020

Office Hours: TTH 1- 2 p.m. or by appointment (please email both professors to set up appointment)

Course Description

Prerequisites: Permission of instructors

Arguably, trust may be the beating heart not only of healthy relationships but of flourishing societies and even thriving economies. Russian playwright Anton Chekhov's "You must trust and believe in people, or life becomes impossible," and Nobel-laureate economist Ken Arrow's "virtually every commercial transaction has within it an element of trust" capture the importance of trust in human lives. But what is trust? Humanomics courses adopt a distinctively interdisciplinary approach in responding to such an essential question. Through careful conceptual analysis, students in this course will develop a sense of the complexity of trust together with an ability to engage critically with depictions of trust in literature and film and in the web of conceptual constructs in the humanities, economics, and the social sciences.

The complexity of trust can be seen across the disciplines:

[T]he difference between trusting someone and just mechanically relying upon them has something to do with your heightened expectations in trusting, and your reaction if the trustee lets you down. Researchers from different disciplines share this basic view of trust, but they can't agree about what exactly these heightened expectations and reactions are. Economists and social scientists tend to think in terms of rational self-interest: you trust people when you think it's in their own interests for them to help you. . . Philosophers tend to be more touchy-feely: you trust people when you think they are good-natured and caring towards you. Evolutionary psychologists tend to think that trust is about reciprocal altruism: you trust people so long as they don't let you down, since this is a stable, rewarding strategy for all. (Hawley, *Trust*, 5)

Through engagement with Burns' novel *Milkman* and Mazin's film *Chernobyl*, we will see that the arts offer an analysis of trust as well. We will engage the notion of trust through the lenses of art, economics, and philosophy, considering the web of conceptual constructs and metaphors authors draw upon to explore the importance of trust in human lives.

3 credits (SI, VI)

General Education Learning Outcomes

- **SI/Social Inquiry:** Student identifies, frames, and analyzes social and/or historical structures and institutions in the world today.
- **VI/Values/Ethics Inquiry:** Student articulates how values and ethics inform human understanding, structures, and behavior.

Course Learning Outcomes

Student will . . .

- Ask cogent, thought-provoking questions based upon critical engagement with works across a range of genres; e.g., academic papers, literature, film.
- Articulate an account of trust, differentiating between interpersonal trust and other kinds, and accounting for some theories of the origins of trust as well as causes of its erosion, reflecting on the value of trust in the flourishing of both individuals and societies.
- Examine trust in art, particularly fiction, considering how literary form expresses and conveys the human consequences of trust and breach of trust.
- Explain the value of trust according to arguments in philosophy and social science. Reflect on the extent to which communities have realized that value and the place of that value in relation to the flourishing of both individuals and societies.
- Explore and explain the role of trust in human society and interpersonal relationships, as well as the mechanisms by which trust is both created and eroded.
- Demonstrate thoughtful rhetorical choices in creative and expository prose.

Program Learning Outcomes

Economics

- Knowledge of Economics: Each student will demonstrate knowledge of modern microeconomic theory and apply it to analyze economic policies and problems.
- Communication: Each student will be able to communicate clearly, concisely and professionally in both written and oral forms.

English

- Skill in critical reading, or the practice of identifying and interpreting the formal, rhetorical, and stylistic features of a text.
- Write demonstrating proficient use of genre elements, techniques, and conventions to produce a defined work: story, poem, or creative non-fiction.

Philosophy

- Ability to reason logically, effectively, and respectfully about ethical matters
- Writing ability to state and support a thesis, apply knowledge of critical reasoning, accurately interpret philosophical sources, and clearly communicate a balanced account in writing.

Required Books

- Burns, Anna. *Milkman*. Graywolf Press, 2018.
- Hawley, Katherine. *Trust: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2012.
- Hawley, Katherine. *How to be Trustworthy*. Oxford UP, 2019.

Required Scholarly Articles and Other Content

- Ashraf, Nava, Iris Bohnet, and Nikita Piankov. "Decomposing Trust and Trustworthiness."

Experimental Economics Vol. 9.3: 193–208.

- Baier, Annette. “Trust and Antitrust.” *Ethics* 96 (1986): 231–260.
- Berg, Joyce, John Dickhaut, and Kevin McCabe. “Trust, Reciprocity, and Social History.” *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol 10.1 (July 1995): 122–142.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0899825685710275>.
- Botsman, Rachel. (2016, June). We’ve stopped trusting institutions and started trusting strangers [Video file]. Retrieved from
https://www.ted.com/talks/rachel_botsman_we_ve_stopped_trusting_institutions_and_started_trusting_strangers?language=en
- Botsman, Rachel (Host). (2019, November 24). *Doubt: The Vaccine Crisis (Parts I and II)* [Audio podcast]. Retrieved from <https://rachelbotsman.com/podcast/doubt-the-vaccine-crisis/>.
- Cox, James, and Cary A. Deck. “On the Nature of Reciprocal Motives.” *Economic Inquiry*, Vol 43, no 3 (July 2003): 623-635.
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.530.2393&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Mazin, Craig (Producer), & Renck, Johan (Director). (2019). *Chernobyl* [Television series]. Home Box Office.
- McCabe, Kevin A., Mary L. Rigdon, and Vernon L. Smith. “Positive Reciprocity and Intentions in Trust Games.” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Vol 52 (2003): 267-275.
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.507.1048&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- McGeer, Victoria, and Philip Pettit. “The Empowering Theory of Trust” in *The Philosophy of Trust* (eds. Faulkner, Paul, and Thomas W. Simpson) (2017): 14–34. Oxford University Press.
- Yamagishi, Toshio. “Trust as a Form of Social Intelligence.” In *Trust in Society*. Karen Cook, Ed. The Russell Sage Foundation, 2001.

Instructional Strategies

This course includes a variety of instructional strategies, including discussion, question generation, laboratory experiments, demonstration of original thinking in critical and creative papers, writing workshop, and an oral final examination.

Evaluation

1. *Participation in Class Discussions* [10%]

Class discussion provides an opportunity for students to explore questions about trust and the human condition, challenging the common perception of economics as distinct from the

humanities while exploring the concept through artistic, economic, and philosophical frames. Through this shared inquiry, students gain experience reading for meaning and communicating complex ideas; thinking reflectively about an interpretive problem; and supporting and testing thoughts through dialogue with peers. Class discussion fosters the flexibility of mind to consider problems from multiple perspectives and the ability to analyze ideas critically. Students must enter the discussion with specific questions generated by the texts as well as a desire to probe and reevaluate ideas. It is essential that students bring texts and questions to each class session.

2. *Laboratory Experiments* [10%]

Part of the experiential learning in this class involves participating in laboratory exercises involving concepts that we will discuss in a future class. Students are asked to make the decisions they deem best for the situation presented. The laboratory experiments provide students an opportunity to identify and analyze social structures as they play out in individual choices.

3. *Written Questions and Artifacts* [10%]

Shared inquiry is a process for exploring the central ideas of the course. This means students must read for meaning, identifying possible interpretive problems they would like to address in discussion. For each class period with an assignment, students will word process two questions to be handed in before class starts. Asking a good question is harder than providing a good answer. The student's task is to delve into a claim or artistic expression that doesn't appear correct or consistent with their understanding of trust or the human condition. They can explore, through the question, why the claim or artistic expression is surprising, unexpected, or unsettling. In addition, for the assigned class periods, students will bring an artifact, an item specified in the course schedule that will provide evidence of text interpretation.

4. *Writers Workshop* [20%]

Based on the idea that we develop as writers when we write often, the writers workshop provides an opportunity to focus attention on ideas from the readings and discussions immediately preceding the workshop. An important component of the workshop is to provide a space to explore each week's material in its social, scientific, philosophical, and/or artistic context. Students will encounter a variety of writing assignments for workshop, including both critical and creative works. We will use writers workshop to provide touchstones in the process of moving from exploratory thinking and writing to submitted products.

5. *Papers: Creative, Critical* [40%]

Part of the meaning-making process, of discovering meaning in texts in dialogue with one another and with the experiential component of the course, is developing connections in papers of either an expository/analytical or creative nature. The students will be assigned a minimum of two major papers over the semester, each tied to the content and/or form of the texts they are exploring.

6. *Oral Final Examination* [10%]

Students will consider the course objectives for *Humanomics: Trust in Troubling Times* and respond to questions posed by the professors in an individual oral examination.

Because of the interactive nature of the class, attendance is an essential component. Excessive tardies constitute absences; six absences may result in failure (Undergraduate Catalog 2019-2020, "Academic Policies and Procedures"). Please keep this in mind. Missed in-class work cannot be made up.
[Chapman University Policies](#)

Academic Integrity Policy

Chapman University is a community of scholars that emphasizes the mutual responsibility of all members to seek knowledge honestly and in good faith. Students are responsible for doing their own work and academic dishonesty of any kind will be subject to sanction by the instructor/administrator and referral to the University Academic Integrity Committee, which may impose additional sanctions including expulsion. Please see the full description of Chapman University's policy on Academic Integrity at:

www.chapman.edu/academics/academicintegrity/index.aspx.

Students with Disabilities Policy

In compliance with ADA guidelines, students who have any condition, either permanent or temporary, that might affect their ability to perform in this class are encouraged to contact the Disability Services Office. If you will need to utilize your approved accommodations in this class, please follow the proper notification procedure for informing your professor(s). This notification process must occur more than a week before any accommodation can be utilized. Please contact Disability Services at (714) 516-4520 or visit <https://www.chapman.edu/students/health-and-safety/disability-services/> if you have questions regarding this procedure or for information or to make an appointment to discuss and/or request potential accommodations based on documentation of your disability. Once formal approval of your need for an accommodation has been granted, you are encouraged to talk with your professor(s) about your accommodation options. The granting of any accommodation will not be retroactive and cannot jeopardize the academic standards or integrity of the course.

Equity and Diversity Policy

Chapman University is committed to ensuring equality and valuing diversity. Students and professors are reminded to show respect at all times as outlined in Chapman's Harassment and Discrimination Policy.

Please see the full description of this policy at <http://www.chapman.edu/faculty-staff/human-resources/eoo.aspx>

Any violations of this policy should be discussed with the professor, the dean of students and/or otherwise reported in accordance with this policy.

Tentative Course Schedule

Weeks		Dates	Reading/Writing	Assignments
1	M	Feb 3	Introductions, Course Overview, <i>What is Trust?</i>	
	W	Feb 5	Burns, <i>Milkman</i> , Ch. 1, 2 (1-68)	2 Questions WW - Middle Sister ¹
2	M	Feb 10	Hawley, <i>Trust: A Very Short Introduction (AVSI)</i> , Intro, Ch. 1, 2 (1-21) Rachel Botsman [TED talk]. "We've stopped trusting institutions and started trusting strangers." Rachel Botsman. <i>Trust Issues</i> [podcast]. "Doubt: The Vaccine Crisis (Part I)."	2 Questions are due any day there is reading
	W	Feb 12	Experiment 1: Trust Game	WW in-class – Trust Is
3	M	Feb 17	McCabe, Rigdon, and Smith. "Positive Reciprocity and Intentions in Trust Games." <i>Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization</i> , Vol 52 (2003): 267–275.	
	W	Feb 19	Burns, <i>Milkman</i> , Ch. 3, first part (69-93)	WW – The Metaphorical
4	M	Feb 24	Hawley, <i>Trust: AVSI</i> , Ch. 3, 4, and 5 (21–63) Rachel Botsman. <i>Trust Issues</i> [podcast]. "Doubt: The Vaccine Crisis (Part II)."	
	W	Feb 26	Hawley, <i>Trust: AVSI</i> , Ch. 6,7, Conclusion Cox, James, and Cary A. Deck. "On the Nature of Reciprocal Motives." <i>Economic Inquiry</i> , Vol 43, no 3 (July 2005): 623-635. http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.530.2393&rep=rep1&type=pdf	
5	M	Mar 2	Burns, <i>Milkman</i> , Ch. 3, middle (93–134)	WW - Risk
	W	Mar 4	Hawley, <i>Trustworthiness</i> , "Trust and Distrust" (1–26) McGeer, Victoria, and Philip Pettit. "The Empowering Theory of Trust."	
6	M	Mar 9	Burns, <i>Milkman</i> , Ch. 3, end (134–166)	Paper 1 Due Critical

¹ WW = Writers Workshop

	W	Mar 11	Hawley, <i>How to Be Trustworthy</i> , “Promising” (27–47)	
7	M	Mar 16	Burns, <i>Milkman</i> , Ch. 4 (166-213)	
	W	Mar 18	<p><i>Chernobyl</i>, HBO, Episodes 1, 2</p> <p>Writers Workshop: <i>Chernobyl</i> opens with a provocative question – “What is the cost of lies?” and gives the answer – “It’s not that we’ll mistake them for the truth. The real danger is that if we hear <i>enough</i> lies, then we no longer recognize the truth at all.” Write a short paper (250 words) in which you consider how Anna Burns might answer that question and what leads you to that conclusion?</p> <p>Submit in Google Drive, 03.18.20 WW <i>Cost of Lies</i> folder</p>	WW – Truth Telling
8	M	Mar 23	Spring Break	
	W	Mar 25	Spring Break	
9	M	Mar 30	<i>Chernobyl</i> , HBO, Episodes 3–5	
	W	Apr 1	Burns, <i>Milkman</i> , Ch. 5 (214–242)	
10	M	Apr 6	<p>Creative Project Prompt: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Xl2HtC-9YY6Zgvi5wmnFk0V0W5ItVp4g Submit in Google Drive, 04.06.20 Creative Project Folder by 11:59 a.m.</p>	Paper 2 Due: Creative Project
	W	Apr 8	Ashraf, Bohnet, and Piankov. “Decomposing Trust and Trustworthiness.” <i>Experimental Economics</i> Vol. 9.3: 193–208.	
11	M	Apr 13	Hawley, <i>How to Be Trustworthy</i> , “Telling” (48–71)	
	W	Apr 15	<p>Burns, <i>Milkman</i>, Ch.6, first half (243–276)</p> <p>Writers Workshop: <i>Hawley examines both promising and telling – with their norms of competence and sincerity - as important elements of how we live together. Write a short paper (250 words) exploring how the vulnerable state of the community in Milkman complicates these elements.</i></p> <p>Submit in Google Drive, 04.15.20 WW <i>Vulnerability</i> folder.</p>	WW: Vulnerability
12	M	Apr 20	Burns, <i>Milkman</i> , Ch. 6, second half (276–300)	

	W	Apr 22	<p>McSweeney's <i>The End of Trust</i> Case Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sara Wachter-Boettcher, "Everything Happens So Much" (33-42) • Ethan Zuckerman, "The Economics of Mistrust" (95-108) • Ben Wizner, "Edward Snowden Explains Blockchain to His Lawyer—and the Rest of Us" (115-132) <p>Case studies available in Google Drive, Readings</p>	
13	M	Apr 27	<p>Baier, Annette. "Trust and Antitrust." (Sign up for Case Study Topics on Google Drive – 04.27.20)</p>	
	W	Apr 29	<p>Sign up for your case study on the spreadsheet in the Google Drive folder 04.29.20 WW Case Study</p> <p>Writers Workshop: The editors of the new book <i>The End of Trust</i> describe our era as an "era of constant low-level distrust—of our tech companies and our peers, of our justice system and our democracy—we can't be sure who's watching us, why they know, and how they'll use it." The case studies you have read in the collection exemplify the distrust to which they refer.</p> <p>For this writers workshop, find your own case study, one that exemplifies a current problem with trustworthiness. In your paper (500 words), situate <i>trustworthiness</i> as a concept and show how your case exemplifies a current problem within this conceptualization.</p> <p>Submit in Google Drive, <i>04.29.20 WW Case Study</i> by 11:59 a.m.</p> <p>You will share your case study in small groups during today's session.</p>	WW-Case Study
14	M	May 4	<p>Hawley, <i>How to Be Trustworthy</i>, "Trustworthiness" (72–94)</p>	
	W	May 6	<p>Yamagishi, Toshio. "Trust as a Form of Social Intelligence." <i>In Trust in Society</i>. Cook, Karen, Ed. The Russell Sage Foundation, 2001.</p>	
15	M	May 11	<p>Hawley, <i>How to Be Trustworthy</i>, "Obstacles to Trustworthiness" (95–119)</p>	
	W	May 13	<p>Burns, <i>Milkman</i>, Ch. 7 (301–348)</p>	
	TH	May 14	<p><u>Paper 3 Prompt:</u> You have spent this semester thinking about the concept of trust and its expression in various communities, but communities are not static; they change.</p> <p>In your last paper for the class, explain how trust and trustworthiness might evolve for our community in light of changing technologies, political realities, and global relationships.</p>	Paper 3 Due

			<p>Be sure to use our course texts to describe a conceptual framework as you work with the dynamism of trust.</p> <p>Submit your paper (750 words) in Google Drive, <i>05.14.20 Paper 3</i> by 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, May 14.</p>	
16	T H	Ma y 21	<p>Final Examination</p> <p>Thursday, May 21, 10:45 a.m. – 1:15 p.m.</p>	

Syllabus Prepared by B. McDavid and J. Osborn, Summer/Fall 2019