

Psy 630: Graduate Seminar in Intergroup Relations

Professor: Allen McConnell
E-mail: mconnar@muohio.edu
Office: 213 Psychology Building
Phone: 529-2407

Class meets in 343 Psychology, Tuesdays, 3:00-5:30 p.m.
Webpage: www.users.muohio.edu/mconnar/psy630-intergroup.html

Course prerequisite

- Graduate standing in psychology or the professor's permission

Readings

- Course readings in PDF format available on Blackboard.

Course overview

The area of intergroup relations focuses on the psychological processes involved with how individuals in groups perceive, judge, remember, reason about, feel, and behave toward people in other groups. Social groups can take many forms, ranging from classic social groups (e.g., race, gender, age, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation) to minimal groups. Intergroups research in social psychology began in earnest in 1954 when Gordon Allport published his highly-influential book, *The Nature of Prejudice*, which was an eclectic treatise that considered the psychological effects of prejudice on stigmatized individuals. The book offered a perspective that was both scientifically grounded and action oriented. Some of the key elements of this book, such as the idea that prejudice can be reduced by encouraging people to recategorize others using larger and more inclusive groups and that aspects of religion can play a central role in perpetuating group-based antipathy are still central to the field today (as we will see in our reading list). In addition, Allport viewed intergroup conflict as a product of cognitive, motivational, and personality components, which is yet another perspective that lives on nearly 60 years later in the field of psychology.

Most of the success in this course rests with the students and their preparation. The format of the course involves students leading discussions each week, with a pair of students (facilitators) determining how to best organize and facilitate discussion of the week's topics. Because this is a small class, involvement in group discussion is essential. Moreover, it is through the process of discussion and debate that one's research acumen becomes defined and sharpened. One of the major goals of this class is to help develop one's thinking and research ideas, and this is best accomplished by expressing one's ideas in writing and in class discussions.

Course evaluation

Facilitation during the semester	20%	
Weekly reaction papers (2% per paper, 7 papers maximum).....	14%	
Research workshops (2x; 5% one's idea, 5% feedback to others).....	20%	March 1 and April 26
Class participation (when not facilitating)	10%	
Research proposal	40%	Due by Monday, May 2, 2011

Facilitating

During the semester, students will facilitate class discussion (in all likelihood, 2 classes, but the number of times will be a function of class size). Facilitators will determine how best to accomplish this goal for the readings. As facilitators, it is *not* your responsibility to explain the readings to others or review the important points of each paper. Instead, your role is to provide a framework that is sensible for discussing the topic. For example, one may want to circulate an e-mail before class to pose questions of your colleagues. Perhaps one might present an initial framework at the beginning of class to highlight common (or divergent) themes that run throughout the readings. There are no right or wrong ways to facilitate. The goal of facilitation is to provide structure and direction for fellow students during discussion, not *be* the discussion.

Reaction papers

Each week, students may submit a brief reaction paper (2-3 double-spaced pages) describing their reactions to the week's readings during weeks when they do not facilitate class discussion (up to a maximum of 7 papers total). This assignment is very open-ended and subject to latitude in interpretation. Because some students may specialize in different disciplines (e.g., clinical, cognitive psychology), they may want to "spin" the week's themes in a reasonable fashion toward their interests, which is fine. The goal is to make sure that students not only complete the readings but put some degree of thought into the implications of, and interconnections among, the readings before class begins.

Each acceptable reaction paper contributes 2% to the overall grade. Students must submit their reaction papers by e-mail attachment to the professor before 5 p.m. of the day before class (i.e., by Monday at 5 p.m.). The professor will return them at the beginning of class (i.e., Tuesday afternoon) with comments. Late reaction papers, regardless of the circumstances, will not be accepted.

Research workshops

To help encourage the development of new research ideas and to gain practice in presenting and critiquing research, there are two days (i.e., March 1st and April 26th) devoted to in-class research workshops. On each of day, there are no readings assigned. Instead, each student will (before coming to class) identify an interesting research question, describe it and its import, briefly outline an appropriate methodology to address it, and present the anticipated results (in either table or graph form). Thus, students will develop at least two research ideas in the course (one for March 1, a different one for April 26) before the research proposal is submitted.

Before arriving in class, each student will prepare a document that is no longer than 1 page (single spaced) and provide a graph or figure (page 2). A copy of each student's pre-class work should be emailed to the professor by the normal reaction paper deadline (i.e., Monday by 5 p.m.). On the day of the in-class workshop, students should bring 1 paper copy of their proposal for each student in the class. Students will circulate their documents and have other students read their proposal and provide feedback on it. Next, students will present their ideas orally without the benefit of computers, powerpoint slides, etc. for approximately 5-10 minutes. Other students will provide feedback during this presentation. Student evaluations will consist of the quality of the pre-class product (5% of total grade per workshop) and their feedback to other students (5% of total grade per workshop).

Additional details will be provided once the class composition and number of students are known. Students do not have to base their research proposal (see below) on their research workshop projects, however doing so may be beneficial in that the student's ideas will receive feedback long before the research proposal deadline.

Research proposal

Students will submit a major paper by choosing an area of intergroup relations based on their own interests and developing a research proposal. The topic need not be one that a student facilitated or developed in a research workshop, though doing so may prove beneficial. The research proposal must address an important research question in the area of intergroup relations. Students outside of social psychology are encouraged to relate intergroup relations to their area (e.g., developmental psychologists may want to study the formation of group stereotypes in children, clinical psychologists may want to explore what leads to aggressive behaviors against members of other social groups). Although students will not be required to carry out the research they propose, the opportunity to develop a well-thought-out proposal should be helpful to those who wish to develop new lines of research or explore ideas relevant to theses, minor projects, and dissertations. This paper must take the form of a research proposal: it *cannot* be simply a literature review. The professor will be available to help students refine their ideas and suggest appropriate resources and references.

There is no correct page length (with the exception that only the first 40 pages of material will be evaluated). Papers *must* be written in accordance with APA Style. Students are encouraged to use the 6th Edition of the *APA Publication Manual*, though 5th Edition style will be acceptable. Additional details and guidelines will be provided later this semester. Topics must be approved by the professor no later than Tuesday, April 12, by the end of class. **The paper is due by noon, on Monday, May 2 in the professor's mailbox, Psychology Main Office (please submit a hard copy, not an attachment to avoid any problems with formatting, printing, etc.).** Being late with either deadline (topic approval or submitting the final paper) without documentation of personal emergency or illness will incur a 10% deduction in the paper's final grade for *each* 24-hour period that the relevant assignment is late. More details will be provided in a handout later in the semester.

Statement on academic misconduct

Both Miami University and the Department of Psychology are dedicated to providing a learning environment based not only upon academic excellence but academic integrity as well. In this course it is expected that you will adhere to all Miami University guidelines regarding academic misconduct (for details, see part five of the Miami Student Handbook: Academic Misconduct for details on Miami's policies). Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- Submitting work (tests, homework, papers, etc.) done for another course without gaining approval.
- Submitting the work of another (whether in part or in whole) as one's own.
- Possessing prohibited materials during a test or quiz.
- Providing or receiving assistance from another student unless explicitly permitted to do so by the professor.

Engaging in academic misconduct can result in penalties ranging from a minimum of an F on the assignment to an F in the course, an "AD" signifying academic dishonesty on your Miami transcripts, academic suspension, and expulsion from Miami University. "Misunderstanding of the appropriate academic conduct will not be accepted as an excuse for academic misconduct" (Section 501, Student Handbook). Please feel free to visit the professor if you would like any of the above policies clarified. Also, the professor encourages students to meet with him if they suspect that another student in the course has engaged in academic misconduct.

1/11 — Organizational meeting

1/18 — The basics of social categories

- Bruner, J. S. (1957). On perceptual readiness. *Psychological Review*, *64*, 123-152.
- Macrae, C. N. & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others: *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*, 93-120.
- Cloutier, J., Mason, M. F., & Macrae, C. N. (2005). The perceptual determinants of person construal: Reopening the social-cognitive toolbox. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 885-894.

1/25 — Categorization complexities

- Maurer, K. L., Park, B., & Rothbart, M. (1995). Subtyping versus subgrouping: Processes in stereotype representation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 812-824.
- Smith, E. R., Fazio, R. H., & Cejka, M. A. (1996). Accessible attitudes influence categorization of multiply categorizable objects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 888-898.
- Kunda, Z., & Oleson, K. C. (1997). When exceptions prove the rule: How extremity of deviance determines deviants' impact on stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 965-979.
- Biernat, M., & Eidelman, S. (2007). Standards. In A. W. Kruglanski and E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (Vol. 2, pp. 308-333). New York: Guilford.

2/1 — Expectations produce reality

- Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1997). Nonconscious behavioral confirmation processes: The self-fulfilling consequences of automatic stereotype activation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *33*, 541-560.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 613-629.
- Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Beilock, S. L. (2009). Multiple social identities and stereotype threat: Imbalance, accessibility, and working memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 949-966.
- Diekmann, A. B., Brown, E. R., Johnston, A. M., & Clark, E. K. (2010). Seeking congruity between goals and roles: A new look at why women opt out of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics careers. *Psychological Science*, *21*, 1051-1057.

2/8 — Ingroups and outgroups

- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429-444.
- Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 475-486.
- Ledgerwood, A., & Chaiken, S. (2007). Priming us and them: Automatic assimilation and contrast in group attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 940-956.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 161-186.

2/15 — Intergroup interactions

- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96, 608-630.
- Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and possibilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 316-320.
- Goodwin, S. A., Gubin, A., Fiske, S. T., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2000). Power can bias impression processes: Stereotyping subordinates by default and by design. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 3, 227-256.
- Smith, P. K., & Trope, Y. (2006). You focus on the forest when you're in charge of the trees: Power priming and abstract information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 578-596.

2/22 — Intergroup contact

- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Intergroup biases. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 101-105.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Rust, M. C., Nier, J. A., Banker, B. S., Ward, C. M., Mottola, G. R., & Houlette, M. (1999). Reducing intergroup bias: Elements of intergroup cooperation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 388-402.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 922-934.
- Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 248-264.

3/1 — Research Workshop #1

3/8 — No Class: Spring Break

3/15 — Implicit bias

- McConnell, A. R., & Leibold, J. M. (2001). Relations among the Implicit Association Test, discriminatory behavior, and explicit measures of racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 435-442.
- Amodio, D. M., & Devine, P. G. (2006). Stereotyping and evaluation in implicit race bias: Evidence for independent constructs and unique effects on behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 652-661.
- McConnell, A. R., Rydell, R. J., Strain, L. M., & Mackie, D. M. (2008). Social group association cues: Forming implicit and explicit attitudes toward individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 792-807.
- Kawakami, K., Dunn, L., Karmali, F., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). Mispredicting affective and behavioral responses to racism. *Science*, 323, 276-278.

3/22 — Motivational processes

- Pendry, L. F., & Macrae, C. N. (1996). What the disinterested perceiver overlooks: Goal-directed social categorization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 249-256.
- Jellison, W. A., McConnell, A. R., & Gabriel, S. (2004). Implicit and explicit measures of sexual orientation attitudes: Ingroup preferences and related behaviors and beliefs among gay and straight men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 629-642.
- Sinclair, L., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Reactions to a Black professional: Motivated inhibition and activation of conflicting stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 885-904.
- Kunda, Z., & Spencer, S. J. (2003). When do stereotypes come to mind and when do they color judgment? A goal-based theoretical framework for stereotype activation and application. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 522-544.

3/29 — Affect and intergroup emotions

- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth, then competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 77-83.
- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 708-724.
- Bodenhausen, G. V., Mussweiler, T., Gabriel, S., & Moreno, K. N. (2001). Affective influences on stereotyping and intergroup relations. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Handbook of affect and social cognition* (pp. 319-343). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mackie, D. M., Smith, E. R., & Ray, D. G. (2008). Intergroup emotions and intergroup relations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 1866-1880.

4/5 — Ideologies and belief systems

- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 260-265.
- Jost, J. T., Ledgerwood, A., & Hardin, C. D. (2008). Shared reality, system justification, and the relational basis of ideological beliefs. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 171-186.
- Whitley, B. E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 126-134.
- Diekmann, A. B., Eagly, A. H., & Johnston, A. M. (2010). Social structure. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 209-224). New York: Sage.

4/12 — Values and beliefs

- Hunsberger, B., & Jackson, L. M. (2005). Religion, meaning, and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61, 807-826.
- Feather, N. T., & McKee, I. R. (2008). Values and prejudice: Predictors of attitudes towards Australian Aborigines. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 60, 80-90.
- Pearson, A. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2009). The nature of contemporary prejudice: Insights from aversive racism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3, 314-338.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339-375.

4/19 — Cognitive neuroscience and intergroup relations

Amodio, D. M. (2008). The social neuroscience of intergroup relations. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 19, 1-54.

Dovidio, J. F., Pearson, A. R., & Orr, P. (2008). Social psychology and neuroscience: Strange bedfellows or a healthy marriage? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 11, 247-263.

Trawalter, S., Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2009). Predicting behavior during interracial interactions: A stress and coping approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13, 243-268.

4/26 — Research Workshop #2

5/2 — Last day to submit research proposal (due by noon)