

Wednesday 10:10am-12:30pm
Old Henderson 101A

Instructor:
Kristin Lane
email: lane@bard.edu
Phone: x7224

Office Hours:
Tuesday 12:00-2:00,
or by appointment

The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race. – John Roberts, Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court

The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to speak openly and candidly on the subject of race, and to apply the Constitution with eyes open to the unfortunate effects of centuries of racial discrimination. – Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice of the US Supreme Court

Our Big Questions

How do race and ethnicity influence a person's experience with the American legal system?

How do thought and behavior occur in the absence of control, and sometimes in ways that contradict our intentions?

What psychological processes explain how experiences with the legal system differ depending on race and ethnicity?

What would a legal system that is based on "behaviorally realist" principles look like?

All course materials are on

Bard Moodle

Overview

Recent high-profile deaths of African-Americans have brought issues about how race interacts with the law to the forefront of national dialogue. In this seminar we will explore how cognitive and social psychology, as well as neuroscience, contribute to this conversation. We will consider how research on ordinary human tendencies can help us answer questions such as: Why are we more likely to mistakenly "see" a weapon in the hand of an African-American than a European-American? How and why does sentencing differ based on racial factors? How do deliberations differ based on a jury's racial composition? Broadly, we will grapple with how to reconcile legal doctrine that often demands evidence of conscious, deliberate intent to discriminate or harm with empirical data showing that behavior often operates outside of our awareness, and without intention or control. Although our focus will be primarily on issues of criminal law and law enforcement, we will cover topics such as voting rights and affirmative action as time and student interest provide.

Course Goals

By the end of the course, you should be able to:

1. Articulate the distinction between the *implicit* and *explicit* mental systems.
2. Apply your understanding of basic psychological processes to an analysis of how race interacts with the American legal system.
3. Consume and evaluate empirical psychological research.
4. Conduct data analysis on a large data set and report research findings in a professional manner.
5. Generate novel research questions by integrating multiple perspectives and sources of information; propose methodologies to test them.
6. Communicate ideas clearly orally and in writing, and be skilled at giving and receiving feedback.

Sign up for the course at <http://moodle2.bard.edu>
The enrollment key is **racelawS16**

Policies

Participation & attendance.

Attendance is mandatory. This class is focused on discussion among students, and you can't contribute if you're not here.

Plagiarism. Plagiarism is unacceptable. In its most easily identifiable form, plagiarism represents copying someone else's words. This kind of offense is rare. More common are other, similarly damaging ways to plagiarize. Use of someone else's ideas, arguments (including structure of their literature review), or words without citing them constitutes plagiarism, and is unacceptable. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, work independently on every assignment. Any violation of academic integrity will result at the least in loss of credit for the assignment, and may result in failure in the class.

Late assignments. Late written assignments will immediately lose 15% of their points, and an additional 10% every 24 hours beyond the deadline.

Electronics. Cell phones should be turned off (*off*, not *vibrate*) and placed out of sight. Laptop computers are not allowed. If you text or access non-course materials during our class time, you are mentally absent from class, which will be treated just as a physical absence.

Assessment

Class Participation. Strong participation from everyone is crucial and consists of both thoughtful speaking and careful listening - you should respond thoughtfully to your classmates. Participation includes careful preparation and completion of the reading. Look at the assignments ahead of time and plan accordingly. If you tend to be uncomfortable speaking up in classes, please talk to me early in the semester to discuss ways to help you succeed. **120 points**

Weekly Questions. You will post a discussion question to Moodle by noon on Tuesday in six of the weeks indicated. These provide a jumping-off point for class discussions, and give you an opportunity to engage with the readings prior to attending class. Questions posted after 12:15 on Tuesday will receive no credit. Questions will be graded on a $\sqrt{+}$ / $\sqrt{/}$ / $\sqrt{-}$ scale. (6 questions posted; 10 points each) **60 points**

Shooter bias presentation. You will present a study related to the phenomenon of "shooter bias" to your classmates. In 7-9 minutes, you should describe the study or studies you are assigned. **35 points**

Data analysis. In groups you will analyze a large data set that measures the association between race and weapons. As a group, you will articulate and test a specific hypothesis, and report your findings in APA format. **60 points**

Court case presentation. You will, in groups, present a Supreme Court case to the class and lead discussion about it. More details will be provided in class. **35 points**

Final paper. In your final paper you will propose an experiment to test a novel research hypothesis. More details are at the end of the syllabus. **Proposal 15 points, Peer draft 30 points, Peer review 30 points, Final presentation 35 points, Final paper 80 points. (190 points total)**

Grading Scale

The total number of points earned out of 500 determines your grade, with cutoffs as indicated below. Pluses and minuses will be assigned at the top and bottom of each range.

A-range: 450 points or higher	D: 325-349.99 points
B-range: 400-449.9 points	F: Below 325 points
C-range: 350-399.9 points	

Summary of Due Dates

Weekly questions	As indicated	Court case presentation	April 13
Shooter bias presentation	March 2	Final presentation	April 27
Data analysis paper	March 18**	Peer draft	May 1**
Final paper proposal	March 28**	Final paper	May 24**

**Not a class day. Assignments are due at 11:59 pm.

Schedule and Reading List

FEBRUARY 3: INTRODUCTION

Kindy, K., Fisher, M., Tate, J., & Jenkins, J. (2015, December 26). A year of reckoning: Police fatally shoot nearly 1,000. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/investigative/2015/12/26/a-year-of-reckoning-police-fatally-shoot-nearly-1000/>

Mullainathan, S. (2015, October 16). Police killings of Blacks: Here is what the data say. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/18/upshot/police-killings-of-blacks-what-the-data-says.html>

FEBRUARY 10: BACKGROUND

DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

Krieger, Linda Hamilton; Fiske, Susan T. (2006). Behavioral realism in employment discrimination law: Implicit bias and disparate treatment. *California Law Review*, 94, 997-1062. **READ UP TO THE TOP OF PAGE 1027.**

Levinson, J. S., Young, D. K., & Rudman, L. A. (2012). Implicit racial bias: A social science overview. In J. D. Levinson & R. J. Smith (Eds.), *Implicit racial bias across the law* (pp. 9-24). Cambridge University Press.

Yoshino, K. (2015, June 25). The court acknowledges “unconscious prejudice.” Retrieved from http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/the_breakfast_table/features/2015/scotus_roundup/supreme_court_2015_the_court_acknowledges_unconscious_prejudice.html

FEBRUARY 17: PERCEPTIONS

DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing Black: Race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 876-893.

Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94 (2), 292-306.

Goff, P. A., Jackson, M. C., Di Leone, B. A. L., Culotta, C. M., & DiTomasso, N. A. (2014). The essence of innocence: Consequences of dehumanizing Black children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106 (4), 526-545.

Bem, D. J. (1987). Writing the empirical journal. *The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist.* **SECTION ON WRITING THE INTRODUCTION.**

FEBRUARY 24: INTERACTIONS WITH POLICE AND RACIAL PROFILING

DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

- Gans, J. (2012). Racial profiling (point and counterpoint). In *Society and Culture: Debates on Immigration*. (pp. 491–508). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage. ["Point" by Schuck, P. H.; "Counterpoint" by Martin, K. D., & Glaser, J.]
- Najdowski, C. J., Bottoms, B. L., & Goff, P. A. (2015). Stereotype threat and racial differences in citizens' experiences of police encounters. *Law and Human Behavior*, 39(5), 463-477.
- Hackney, A. A., & Glaser, J. (2013). Reverse deterrence in racial profiling: Increased transgressions by nonprofiled Whites. *Law and Human Behavior*, 37 (5), 348-353.
- Akinola, M., & Mendes, W. B. (2012). Stress-induced cortisol facilitates threat-related decision making among police officers. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 126(1), 167–174.
- Bem, D. J. (1987). Writing the empirical journal. The complete academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist. **SECTION ON WRITING THE METHOD SECTION.**

MARCH 2: SHOOTER BIAS

DUE: SHOOTER BIAS PRESENTATION (NO WEEKLY QUESTION).

- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1314–1329.
- Mekawi, Y., & Bresin, K. (2015). Is the evidence from racial bias shooting task studies a smoking gun? Results from a meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 61, 120–130.
- Plant, E. A., & Peruche, B. M. (2005). The consequences of race for police officers' responses to criminal suspects. *Psychological Science*, 16(3), 180–183.

Presentation Articles

- Unkelbach, C., Forgas, J. P., & Denson, T. F. (2008). The turban effect: The influence of Muslim headgear and induced affect on aggressive responses in the shooter bias paradigm. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(5), 1409–1413.
- Correll, J., Urland, G. R., & Ito, T. A. (2006). Event-related potentials and the decision to shoot: The role of threat perception and cognitive control. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42(1), 120–128.
- Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., Wittenbrink, B., Sadler, M. S., & Keesee, T. (2007). Across the thin blue line: Police officers and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1006–1023. **PRESENT STUDY 2 ONLY.**
- Cox, W. T. L., Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., & Schwartz, L. L. (2014). Toward a comprehensive understanding of officers' shooting decisions: No simple answers to this complex problem. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 36(4), 356–364.
- Fleming, K. K., Bandy, C. L., & Kimble, M. O. (2010). Decisions to shoot in a weapon identification task: The influence of cultural stereotypes and perceived threat on false positive errors. *Social Neuroscience*, 5(2), 201–220.
- Sim, J. J., Correll, J., & Sadler, M. S. (2013). Understanding police and expert performance: When training attenuates (vs. exacerbates) stereotypic bias in the decision to shoot. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(3), 291–304. **PRESENT STUDY 1 IN TWO OR THREE SENTENCES (I.E., JUST DESCRIBE THE INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES AND THE MAIN FINDING); PRESENT STUDIES 2A AND 2B TOGETHER.**
- Schofield, T. P., Unkelbach, C., & Denson, T. F. (in press). Alcohol consumption increases bias to shoot at Middle Eastern but not White targets. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*.

MARCH 9: DATA ANALYSIS

DUE: REVIEW THE GUIDELINES – INCLUDING THE LIST OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE MEASURES - FOR THE ASSIGNMENT BEFORE CLASS, AND COME TO CLASS WITH AT LEAST THREE RESEARCH QUESTIONS WRITTEN DOWN. NO WEEKLY QUESTION DUE.

Nosek, B. A., Smyth, F. L., Hansen, J. J., Devos, T., Lindner, N. M., Ranganath, K. A., ... Banaji, M. R. (2007). Pervasiveness and correlates of implicit attitudes and stereotypes. *European Review of Social Psychology, 18*(1), 36–88. **READ TO THE MIDDLE OF PAGE 45 (STOP AT “A REVIEW OF FINDINGS FOR INDIVIDUAL TOPCIS”) AND ALSO THE ‘RACE-WEAPONS STEREOTYPES’ RESULTS ON P. 55., AND FROM SUMMARY ON P. 75 TO END.**

Annesley, T. M. (2010). Show your cards: The results section and the poker game. *Clinical Chemistry, 56*(7), 1066–1070.

MARCH 16: SAME RACE EFFECT

DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION, DATA ANALYSIS PAPER (MARCH 18, 11PM)

Meissner, C. A., & Brigham, J. C. (2001). Thirty years of investigating the own-race bias in memory for faces: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 7*(1), 3–35.

Wilson, J. P., Hugenberg, K., & Bernstein, M. J. (2013). The cross-race effect and eyewitness identification: How to improve recognition and reduce decision errors in eyewitness situations. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 7*(1), 83–113.

Bem, D. J. (1987). Writing the empirical journal. The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist. **SECTION ON WRITING THE DISCUSSION.**

MARCH 23: NO CLASS (SPRING BREAK)

MARCH 30: JURIES

DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION, FINAL PAPER PROPOSAL (MARCH 28, 11PM)

Mitchell, T. L., Haw, R. M., Pfeifer, J. E., & Meissner, C. A. (2005). Racial bias in mock juror decision-making: A meta-analytic review of defendant treatment. *Law and Human Behavior, 29*(6), 621–637.

Sommers, S. R., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2000). Race in the courtroom: Perceptions of guilt and dispositional attributions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(11), 1367–1379.

Jones, C. S., & Kaplan, M. F. (2003). The effects of racially stereotypical crimes on juror decision-making and information-processing strategies. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 25*(1), 1–13.

Sommers, S. R. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(4), 597–612.

Annesley, T. M. (2010). The abstract and the elevator talk: a tale of two summaries. *Clinical Chemistry, 56*, 521-524.

APRIL 6: SENTENCING

DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

- Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, *17*(5), 383–386.
- Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2014). Racial disparities in incarceration increase acceptance of punitive policies. *Psychological Science*, *25*(10), 1949–1954.
- Glaser, J., Martin, K. D., & Kahn, K. B. (2015). Possibility of death sentence has divergent effect on verdicts for Black and White defendants. *Law and Human Behavior*, *39*(6), 539–546.
- van Prooijen, J. W. (2006). Retributive reactions to suspected offenders: The importance of social categorizations and guilt probability. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*(6), 715–726.
- Bem, D. J. (1987). Writing the empirical journal. The complete academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist. **SECTIONS ON REWRITING AND POLISHING YOUR ARTICLE AND MATTERS OF STYLE.**

APRIL 13: COURT CASES

You will read a summary of the facts and excerpts from a US Supreme Court case. In groups you will present the case to the class and lead us in discussion about how the case and the class material inform our understanding of each other. More details will be provided in class.

APRIL 20: WRAP UP

DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

- Kang, J., Bennett, M., Carbado, D., Casey, P., Dasgupta, N., Faigman, D., ... Mnookin, J. (2012). Implicit bias in the courtroom. *UCLA Law Review*, *59*, 1124–1186. **ONLY SECTION III. Interventions.**
- Kahn, K. B., & Martin, K. D. (2016). Policing and race: Disparate treatment, perceptions, and policy responses. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *10*(1), 82–121. **BEGIN READING AT PAGE 97 (STARTING WITH “PERCEPTIONS OF RACIALLY BIASED POLICING”) SECTION III. Interventions.**
- The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity. (2010). The contract for policing justice. Retrieved from http://cpe.psych.ucla.edu/images/uploads/cple_contract_for_policing_justice.pdf

APRIL 27: PRESENTATIONS

DUE: FINAL PRESENTATION, DRAFT TO KRISTIN AND PEERS (MAY 1, 11PM)

MAY 4: PEER WRITING WORKSHOP

DUE: PEER FEEDBACK

MAY 11: NO CLASS - BOARD WEEK

MAY 18: NO CLASS - COMPLETION DAYS

DUE: FINAL PAPER (MAY 24, 11PM)

WEEKLY QUESTIONS

Beginning the second week of class, you will post questions to Moodle. You must read and consider your classmates' questions before class. Questions are intended to help you organize your thoughts, provoke class discussion, and give you a sense of how your classmates approach the material. Think of your questions like Goldilocks and the three bears – they shouldn't be too small ("The sample size wasn't big enough in Study 1") or too big ("What is memory?"). **For the first two weeks of posting, indicate the type(s) of question you are asking (see below).**

Here are some questions that psychologists ask. They may be a starting point for generating questions:

- Are the hypotheses reasonable? Are they logical, given the literature reviewed? **HYP**
- Do the methods of the study allow the author(s) to test the hypotheses outlined?
METH
- Are the statistical analyses appropriate? **STAT**
- Do the data support the inferences drawn in the article? **INFER**
- Are there alternative explanations for the findings? **ALT**
- Does anything you know (from other classes, other readings in this class, or being human) contradict or limit the theory or data in the article? **CONTR**
- Does the reading suggest any directions for future research or new hypotheses?
FUTURE

While these questions should be well thought-out and follow the basic rules of English grammar, they are not a formal writing assignment, and do not need to be in APA format. This is your chance to share the questions or thoughts you had while completing the reading and to direct class discussion toward the areas that most interest the class. You can also include questions of fact or clarification (i.e., if you didn't know a term or understand some piece of a reading), but these should be in addition to questions intended to generate discussion. Occasionally, you will spend the first fifteen minutes of class writing a response to one of the questions posed by you or your classmates. Your responses to these will count toward your total "question" grade.

- Questions must be posted by noon on Tuesday. Questions posted later than 12:15 pm will not receive credit.
- You must post for the first two weeks of the semester; following that you can skip one week. (Or, you can post every week and your lowest grade will be dropped.)

DATA ANALYSIS PROJECT

In this project you will – working in pairs or small groups – generate and test hypotheses related to implicit racial stereotypes using a large data set. The data set, which is described in more detail below, includes data from over 200,000 visitors to the Project Implicit website who completed the *race+weapons* IAT (described in Nosek et al. [2007], which you will read for this assignment). You will, as a group, hand in a paper that describes the method in your own words, and reports the results of your analyses.

- The Methods section should describe the measures that you are interested in in detail, but does not need to describe every single measure in the data set.
- You must report at least one comparison – do mean levels of implicit and explicit attitudes differ across levels of a categorical variable?
- You must report at least one association – is one (or more) of the individual difference measures correlated with implicit and explicit stereotypes?
 - You will need to create a composite measure of whatever scale(s) you use. You must report a measure of reliability (Cronbach's alpha) for your scale
 - Note that you will almost certainly have to reverse score items for your individual difference scale. Be sure to describe any reverse scoring you do in the methods section.
- Do not limit yourself to what is listed above – I expect you to be creative and ambitious in your analyses. For example, you might combine a group and an individual difference factor to see how they jointly predict implicit and explicit stereotypes, or you might see whether an association differs among different racial or ethnic groups.
- Before you begin analyzing the data, have clearly stated research questions that you want to test. This means reviewing this packet very carefully to understand what the data contain.
- Report effect sizes as well as p-values for all analyses that you report and conduct
- Include your SPSS syntax (we will go over how to generate this) and your SPSS output as appendices in a separate document to your paper.
- Begin your paper with a very brief introduction (1-2 pages) that provides a rationale for your hypotheses. The Method section will probably be about 4-5 pages (but could be longer or shorter), and the results section should be between 3-4 pages.

Grading

Grades will reflect:

- Initiative and independence (while also seeking appropriate guidance) in conducting data analysis
- The quality of the report (e.g., Did you complete all of the items above? Were your analyses completely and competently conducted and reported?)
- Quality of the written report (Did it have all of the required components? Was the writing clear and free of grammatical and typographical errors? Were you thoughtful and accurate in interpreting your results and providing any commentary?)
- Were you an outstanding group member? You will (confidentially) evaluate and grade the other members of your group for their contributions, and will be evaluated for your work in the group.

The data set and related codebook describing each variable are on Moodle. Here is a textual description of what you will find in the data set. Use this when generating your hypotheses before class.

IAT, Session Information, and Attitude/ Stereotype Measures, Demographics

Demographic Questions (e.g., race, religion, gender). See codebook for details and variable names.

Experiment Experience [Variable Names: q3a, q3b, q3c]

Questions about the experience in the experiment (interesting, eye-opening, enjoyable)

Explicit Attitude [Variable Names: tblack, twhite]

Explicit racial attitudes – Feeling thermometer ratings

Explicit Stereotype [Variable Names: sharmless, sweapons]

How much do you associate the following objects (weapons or harmless objects) with Black Americans and White Americans?

IAT Score [Variable Name: D_biep.Black_Weapons_all]

Overall IAT D score (higher numbers mean stronger Black+Weapons implicit stereotype)

Session Info [various variable names]

Information about the session – unique ID number, time, date, etc. See the coding book for details.

Individual Difference Scales – Below are the names of the individual difference scales, followed by the relevant variable names in the data set. Below that are two sample items for each scale.

1. Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Impression Management) bidrim1- bidrim18

I have never dropped litter on the street.

I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.

2. Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Self-Deceptive Positivity) bidrsde1- bidrsde18

I have not always been honest with myself.

It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.

3. Bayesian Racism brs1-brs15

Law enforcement officers should pay particular attention to those social groups more heavily involved in crime, even if this means focusing on members of particular ethnic groups.

If you want to make accurate predictions, you should use information about a person's ethnic group when deciding if they will perform well.

4. Belief in a Just World bjw1-bjw6

People get what they deserve.

Justice always prevails over injustice.

5. Big 5 – Agreeableness bfia1-bfia9

I think of myself as someone who likes to cooperate with others.

I think of myself as someone who starts quarrels with others.

6. Big 5 – Conscientiousness bfic1-bfic9

I think of myself as someone who does things efficiently.

I think of myself as someone who is a reliable worker.

7. Big 5 – Extraversion bfie1-bfie8

I think of myself as someone who generates a lot of enthusiasm.

I think of myself as someone who is reserved.

8. Big 5 – Neuroticism bfin1-bfin8

I think of myself as someone who is emotionally stable, not easily upset.

I think of myself as someone who worries a lot.

9. Big 5 – Openness bfio1-bfio10

I think of myself as someone who likes to reflect, play with ideas.

I think of myself as someone who is inventive.

10. Culture versus Person q2a, q2b, q2c, q2d

The IAT does not reflect anything about my thoughts or feelings - unconscious or otherwise.

11. Extraversion extravert (single item)

I see myself as extraverted, enthusiastic (that is, sociable, assertive, talkative, active, NOT reserved, or shy)

12. Happiness posaffect (single item)

How much did you feel 'happiness' today?

13. Humanitarianism-Egalitarianism he1-he10

There should be equality for everyone because we are all human beings.

Acting to protect the rights and interests of other members of the community is a major obligation for all persons.

14. Need for Cognition nfc1-nfc19

I would prefer complex to simple problems.

The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.

15. Need for Cognition (Close-Mindedness) nfccc1-nfccc8

I dislike questions which could be answered in many different ways.

Even after I've made up my mind about something, I am always eager to consider a different opinion.

16. Need for Cognition (Decisiveness) nfccd1-nfccd7

*When trying to solve a problem I often see so many possible options that it's confusing.
When faced with a problem I usually see the one best solution very quickly.*

17. Need for Cognition (Desire for Predictability) nfccp1-nfccp8

*I enjoy the uncertainty of going into a new situation without knowing what might happen.
I dislike unpredictable situations.*

18. Need for Cognition (Discomfort with Ambiguity) nfcca1- nfcca9

*It's annoying to listen to someone who cannot seem to make up his or her mind.
In most social conflicts, I can easily see which side is right and which is wrong.*

19. Need for Cognition (Preference for Order and Structure) nfcco1- nfcco10

*I think that I would learn best in a class that lacks clearly stated objectives and requirements.
I enjoy having a clear and structured mode of life.*

20. Personal Need for Structure pns1-pns12

*I become uncomfortable when the rules in a situation are not clear.
I hate to change my plans at the last minute.*

21. Protestant Work Ethic pe1-pe11

*Our society would have fewer problems if people had less leisure time.
Life would have very little meaning if we never had to suffer.*

22. Right Wing Authoritarianism rwa1-rwa20

*Obedience is the most important virtue children should learn.
What our country REALLY needs, instead of more "civil rights" is a good stiff dose of law and order.*

23. Right Wing Authoritarianism (Z), Alternate Version rwaz01-rwaz15

*The situation in the society of today would be improved if troublemakers were treated with reason and humanity.
The 'old-fashioned ways' and 'old-fashioned values' still show the best way to live.*

24. Self-Monitoring Scale sm1-sm18

*I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others.
I'm not always the person I appear to be.*

25. Social Dominance Orientation sdo1-sdo12

*It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
All groups should be given an equal chance in life.*

FINAL PAPER - OVERVIEW

In your final paper you will propose an experiment that tests a hypothesis related to race and the law. Your experiment *must* be a true experiment – at least one variable must be manipulated. The study should *not* be a correlational design (i.e., testing whether one variable is associated with another variable). Your project can cover any topic related to what we have covered in class – it may be a focused look at something specific we've looked at in, or it may explore a topic not covered in the syllabus. In either case, you will be expected to complete additional research beyond the readings on the syllabus for your project.

Initial proposal. In this 2 page (double-spaced) proposal, you should present your study to the reader in a condensed way. You should have a minimum of five citations at this point, at least three of which are empirical articles not included in our syllabus. Your proposal should address the following questions:

- What is your research question?
- Why is this research important?
- What previous literature led you to your questions?
- How will you test your hypothesis?
- What are your predicted results?

Draft. Your draft will consist of at least six continuous pages of writing of your final paper, and an outline (that makes very clear to the reader what the final paper will argue and look like) for the unwritten sections. These pages can be any section of the paper. Your methods and results section will include a table **and** a figure that depicts two different aspects of your results. Present these in APA format.

Written paper. This paper will be written like an empirical journal article, although with a “Predicted Results” section rather than an actual Results Section. In the Introduction, provide a clear and logical justification. It should review the literature relevant to your study, while leading up to your particular research question. Before you move onto the Method section, you should have clearly stated your study’s aims and hypotheses. The Method section should be detailed enough that a reader would actually be able to conduct your study. Include all materials (in Appendices if needed) that you would use in your study. The Results section should describe the analytical techniques and predicted results for your study (include at least one figure and one table in APA format). In the Conclusion, restate your aims, and “findings.” How does your study answer your question, and what inferences can be drawn from this research?

Additionally, you should include a cover memo that 1. Summarizes any questions and concerns that arose during the review process; and 2. Describes how you addressed these concerns in the final draft (or, if you made a principled decision NOT to address a particular concern, describes your rationale). For example, here is a portion of a response I wrote in a revision of a journal article:

Additionally, you requested that we “explain why your study is important to readers from many countries. ... Explicitly note, early in the Introduction, that you are looking at attitudes of U.S. college students...” and suggested that we “add a sentence very early in the paper that all studies discussed are U.S. studies of college students unless otherwise noted.” In a similar vein, Reviewer 2 noted that there was “No discussion of the race/ethnicity of your participants. These are primarily white students, a percentage of Asian students and a few Latino/African American” and asked “How does this influence what you found?” Similarly, she or he noted that we “need to discuss differences in science fields - biology vs. physics.”

We have taken several steps to address these issues. As you suggested, we noted early on (p. 6) that the studies reviewed were based on American or Canadian samples. Where possible, we also added work describing the role of stereotypes about science and gender in locations other than North America, which included the following changes:

- Discussion of studies investigating stereotype threat that used samples comprised of populations other than American or Canadian residents (p. 7)
- An expanded discussion of the magnitude and influence of implicit stereotypes about gender and science in a large, cross-national study (pp. 8-9)
- Addition of a "Caveats" section to the General Discussion (pp. 30-32), in which we describe reasons to think that the same processes we observed would (or would not) emerge in other cultural contexts. This section also discusses differences in our results by participants' ethnicity, and acknowledges Reviewer 2's excellent observation that specific science subfields may differ in their gendered stereotypes.

Additional guidelines

- Papers should be between 12 and 14 double-spaced pages of text, plus a Title Page, Abstract, References, and Appendices. Page numbers should be included in the top right-hand corner
- Papers should follow APA style
- All papers should be carefully proofread for spelling and grammar before being turned in
- Papers should reflect substantial outside research
- You must work independently on this paper

Oral presentation. Finally, at the end of the semester you will share your research proposals with your classmates. In these 12-14 minutes presentations, you will describe your research question, and the study you've designed to test it. The presentation should be well-organized and engaging, and should use Powerpoint or its equivalent. Time will be allotted for discussion and feedback from me and your peers.

FINAL PAPER – PEER WRITING WORKSHOP

During the end of the semester, we will switch from emphasizing reading others' research to producing original work. The final project will culminate in a written research proposal. You will have ample opportunity for feedback on your final paper via an initial proposal, a writing workshop based on a draft, and an oral presentation to your peers.

You will make written comments on your classmates' peer drafts, and your work will be graded. I take your work on this assignment extremely seriously for two reasons. First, your ability to constructively evaluate others' work is a crucial part of your own intellectual development. Second, this process can be enormously valuable to writers but only if the editors do their jobs well. I expect that, like other seminars I've taught at Bard, our class will develop a lovely and supportive community; this is the assignment where maintaining those norms of care, respect, and a willingness to constructively challenge one another are the most crucial.

PEER EDITING

SUBMISSION OF DRAFTS

- A. Submit your peer draft and self-reflection worksheet to Kristin and your group members.
- B. Review your notes on good writing for Psychology from our work throughout the semester.

PEER EDITING

- C. Print out hard copies of each peer draft.
- D. Read the first peer draft.
 - a. Skim it the first time you read it – don't make any notes in the margins.
 - b. Complete the top half of the peer evaluation worksheet (posted on Moodle).
 - c. Reread the draft in more detail. Go slowly through the draft and make comments in the margins if needed. While you can comment on features such as APA style, grammar, and spelling, the more important comments focus on logic, clarity, organization, and use of evidence.
 - d. Complete the rest of the peer evaluation worksheet.
 - e. Write a cover memo to your peer summarizing your overall evaluation of the paper. You can think of these as being similar to the end-of-paper comments you get from me at the end of your written work.
 - f. Bring two copies of your in-text comments to the peer writing workshop (one for the writer, and one for me).
 - g. Bring one copy of your peer evaluation worksheet and cover memo to class (for the writer). The cover memo will comment on general qualities of the draft, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement. More details will be on the evaluation worksheet.
 - h. Bring another copy of your peer evaluation worksheet and cover memo to class (for me). This copy **ONLY** should include a recommended grade for the paper.
- E. Come to the workshop prepared to discuss your own and others' work in your writing groups.
- F. In all aspects of this assignment, remember that you are speaking to a peer and colleague and your goal is to deliver constructive feedback in a way that enables the writer to improve rather than to show how smart you are (we all know you're very smart). For example, writing "The language of this paper is a barrier to the reader." without noting places where the paper is clear and giving specific suggestions for improvement does not facilitate revision.

CHECKLIST: MAKE SURE YOU HAVE COMPLETED ALL OF THE FOLLOWING PARTS OF THE ASSIGNMENT!

Writers: Submit the following to your group members and to Kristin by May 1 (11pm) by email

- Peer draft
- Self-reflection worksheet (on Moodle)

Editors: Bring the Following materials to the writing workshop on May 4 in hard copy

- Two copies (one for the writer, one for Kristin) of your in-text comments
- One copy of your peer evaluation worksheet and cover memo for the writer
- A second copy of the peer evaluation worksheet and cover memo with a suggested grade for Kristin)

FINAL PAPER – GRADING CRITERIA

Clear statement of question	Your question should be easily identifiable to the reader. Moreover, it should remain the focal point of your argument. At the end of the paper, if someone asked a casual reader “What was the author’s point?” he or she should be able to answer.
“Thesis-like” quality of question.	The central question should: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Be the basis for your argument and proposed study• Be compelling• Provide evidence of originality of thought, and integration of the material beyond what we’ve discussed in class or covered in the readings
Evidence that there is empirical support for thesis	Your argument should be based on empirical evidence that comes from studies that are clearly described. The evidence to support your assertions should be clear. (If you make assumptions, be explicit that they are assumptions and that your argument rests on their validity.) You should have at least eight empirical sources that are NOT from our class readings.
Logic of argument	Your argument should be clear and logical. An excellent paper will avoid sweeping generalizations, will be objective in considering evidence, and will carefully address counterarguments to the thesis. Ideas should progress linearly.
Study design	Your proposed study should be a good test of your hypothesis. It should be well-thought-out, and free of any major confounds or artifacts.
Overall writing style	Prose should be straightforward, clear, and easy to follow. Your paper should be well-organized and written for a professional audience. The paper should be carefully proofread before turning it in.
APA style	The paper should follow APA format. In particular, in-text citations and your reference list should be accurate.
Response to feedback	Your cover memo for the final paper thoroughly describes how you addressed the feedback you received, and the final paper incorporates suggestions from your peer editors and me.