

## **Psychology 337: Psychology of Prejudice and Stereotyping**

**Bard College, Spring 2014**

**Wednesday 10:10-12:30; Hegeman 201**

*Instructor* Kristin Lane

*Office* 106 Preston (Phone: x7224)

*Email* [lane@bard.edu](mailto:lane@bard.edu)

*Office Hours* Office Hours: Tuesday 4:00-5:00; Friday 1:00-2:00; and by appointment

### **OVERVIEW**

This course focuses on the empirical study of intergroup relations. It is designed to provide an overview of the social psychological study of issues in prejudice and stereotyping. The bulk of the course will examine the cognitive, affective, and motivational origins of stereotyping and prejudice, but we will also explore the experience of being a target of prejudice – how are members of disadvantaged groups affected by cultural stereotypes and prejudice? Finally, we will discuss scientifically-based means of prejudice reduction.

In addition to generating interest in and knowledge about the material, the broader aims of this course are to help you to 1. become critical consumers of research in stereotyping and prejudice, as well as social psychology; 2. increase your effectiveness in oral and written communications; and 3. improve your ability to defend an argument using empirical data. To achieve these goals, the course requires both substantive written work and extensive oral contributions (class discussions, presentations, organizing and leading group discussions).

### **PREREQUISITES**

As an upper-level conference course in Social Psychology, this course is open to moderated Psychology students. Other students should talk to me about enrollment. PSY 203 and 204 (Statistics and Research Methods in Psychology) or the equivalent are strongly encouraged - this suggestion is intended to ensure that the replication and final projects can be undertaken without too much angst. If you have any questions about the prerequisites, please talk to me.

### **POLICIES**

*Weekly expectations.* This class will be conducted as a seminar, and is intended to provide a forum where you can express your thoughts and analyses on the material. The only way this can happen effectively is if you complete the reading thoroughly. It is not likely that you will be able to read, digest, and reflect on all of it if you begin it at the last minute. Look at the assignments ahead of time and plan accordingly. Our reading load is particularly heavy at the beginning of the semester, which will allow us to gain a breadth of foundational knowledge fairly rapidly.

*Participation & attendance.* Attendance is mandatory. As a seminar, this class is founded on discussion among students, and you can't contribute if you're not here! Consequently, participation grades will be lowered for each absence.

*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 or words without citing them constitutes plagiarism, and is unacceptable. When in doubt, check with me. No one ever got in trouble for citing too often. Unless explicitly stated, you must work independently on every assignment. Violations of academic integrity will result at a minimum in loss of credit for the assignment, and could result in failure in the course. You are responsible for knowing the College's policies on plagiarism and academic dishonesty: <http://inside.bard.edu/dosa/handbook/index.php?aid=1201&sid=705>

*Late assignments.* Late written assignments will immediately lose 10% of their point value, and an additional 5% every 24 hours beyond the original deadline. Your written assignments will be posted on Moodle. For assignments due the day of class, they must be posted before the start of class time.

## REQUIRED TEXTS

You should sign up for the class on Moodle – the course code is prejS14 [case-sensitive]. You are expected to print out and bring all of the readings each week. If you have an e-reader that lies flat (like an iPad) you can bring that with the readings. Laptop computers won't be allowed – the screen creates a barrier for discussion.

## **Assignments & Grading**

*Class Participation.* Because this is a seminar, participation from everyone is crucial. The best participation is not necessarily the most talking. Class participation consists both of thoughtful speaking and careful listening - as a member of our group, you should also respond with thought to your classmates' comments. The nature of this course lends itself to provocative discussions; I hope that you will feel free to disagree with one another (and with me!) while treating all ideas and people with respect. 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. **100 points**

*Weekly Questions.* In seven of the weeks (you must post for February 5 and 19 (indicated on the reading list, you will post a discussion question to Moodle by **10am on Tuesday**. These questions will provide a jumping-off point for class discussions, and give you an opportunity to engage with the readings prior to attending class. Late questions will earn you goodwill, but they will not earn you credit. More details on this requirement are below. Questions will be graded on a  $\sqrt{+}/\sqrt{-}$  scale. **10 points each (70 points total)**

*Replication Project.* See end of syllabus for details. **75 points**

*Final Paper (guidelines at the end of the syllabus)*

*Initial proposal.* **20 points**

*Peer draft.* **25 points**

*Peer feedback.* **25 points**

*Final presentation.* **25 points**

*Final paper.* **50 points**

*Leading a section of class.* In pairs (or threes, depending on numbers), you will have 45 minutes of a class session to present supplemental material to the class (indicated as **\*\*readings** on the syllabus) and to lead class discussion on it. You will indicate your preferences for weeks early in the semester. Further information on this assignment is available at the end of the syllabus. **50 points**

Additionally, during the week in which we cover “stereotype threat,” you will present an article (to be assigned based on student interest) in pairs to the class. **35 points**

## GRADING

Grading is on a 475-point scale. Grades will be assigned based on total points earned within the following ranges – pluses and minuses will be assigned at the top and bottom of each range.

A-range 427 points and higher

B-range 380-426 points

C-range 332-379 points

D 308-331 points

F Fewer than 308 points

## SUMMARY OF DUE DATES

February 3, February 19, and five other weeks as indicated of your choosing	Discussion question
Friday, March 14 (5pm)	Replication final report and group evaluations due (post to Moodle – only one member of each group needs to post)
Friday, March 21 (5pm)	Proposal for final paper due (post to Moodle)
Wednesday, April 2 (in class)	Stereotype threat presentation
Wednesday, April 23 (in class)	Final presentations
Friday, April 25 (5pm)	Peer draft due (email to members of your group and Kristin)
Wednesday, April 30 (in class)	Peer draft feedback due

Wednesday, May 14 (5pm)  
To be assigned

Final paper due (post to Moodle)  
Lead class discussion

## READINGS & ASSIGNMENTS SCHEDULE

**N. B.** READINGS ARE LISTED IN A SUGGESTED ORDER

ALL READINGS ARE AVAILABLE ON MOODLE

\*\*INDICATES SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS REQUIRED ONLY OF THE DISCUSSION LEADERS

### **January 29: Introduction to the Course**

No readings or assignments

### **February 5: What is Prejudice/ Historical and Current Approaches to Prejudice and Stereotyping**

#### ASSIGNMENT DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION, LIST OF MEASURES FOR REPLICATION

Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Welsey. Selections from Chapter 1.

Devine, P. G. & Elliot, A. J. (1995). Are racial stereotypes really fading? The Princeton trilogy revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 22-37.

Fiske, S. T. (2012). Managing ambivalent prejudices: Smart-but-cold and warm-but-dumb stereotypes. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 639, 33–48.

Cikara, M., Bruneau, E. G., & Saxe, R. R. (2011). Us and them: Intergroup failures of empathy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 149–153.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 16474–16479.

### **February 12: Getting Started on your Replications**

Open Science Collaboration. (2012). An open, large-scale, collaborative effort to estimate the reproducibility of psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 657-660.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A New source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 3–5.

Read your assigned journal article VERY carefully.

I will be out of town at a conference. Don't worry, you will still be able to work! In your groups, you should meet during class time and program the study that you plan to replicate using surveygizmo – you may need to meet after class as well. See the end of the syllabus for instructions.

Email me an update on how things went by the end of class time, and the following by Friday, February 14: 1. A link to your study (if you have multiple conditions, you may have multiple links to send); 2. A description of any problems you have had in programming your study that you'd like my help in troubleshooting.

## February 19: Implicit Bias, Neuroscientific Approaches

**Before starting the reading for this week, visit <http://implicit.harvard.edu> and complete any two of the tests under the “Demonstration” side of the site. Jot your reactions down. Were you surprised by your findings? Why or why not?**

### ASSIGNMENT DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

REPLICATION PROJECT: You will finish programming your replication studies by Friday, February 24 and send me the links to the completed study. I will then launch them on mTurk. You will also submit your group replication “prepaper.”

- Banaji, M. R. (2001). Ordinary prejudice. *Psychological Science Agenda, American Psychological Association, 14 (Jan-Feb)*, 8-11.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R., (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 17-41. Read the NON-TECHNICAL summary posted on Moodle (both the article and the summary are posted).
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., West, T. V., Gaertner, S. L., Albrecht, T. L., Dailey, R. K., & Markova, T., (2010). Aversive racism and medical interactions with Black patients: A field study. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 436-440.
- Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2012). Of animals and objects: Men’s implicit dehumanization of women and likelihood of sexual aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*, 734–746.
- Molenberghs, P. (2013). The neuroscience of in-group bias. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 37*, 1530–1536.

## February 26: Cognitive Bases and Consequences of Prejudice and Stereotyping

### ASSIGNMENT DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 204-222. READ ONLY UP TO P. 209.
- Hugenberg, K. & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2003). Facing prejudice: Implicit prejudice and the perception of facial threat. *Psychological Science, 14*, 640-643.
- 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*, 383-386.
- Anzures, G., Quinn, P. C., Pascalis, O., Slater, A. M., Tanaka, J. W., & Lee, K. (2013). Developmental origins of the other-race effect. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*, 173–178.
- Johnson, K. L., Freeman, J. B., & Pauker, K. (2012). Race is gendered: How covarying phenotypes and stereotypes bias sex categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 116–131.
- \*\*Dunham, Y., Baron, A. S., & Carey, S. (2011). Consequences of “minimal” group affiliations in children. *Child Development, 82*, 793–811.
- \*\* Bernstein, M. J., Young, S. G., & Hugenberg, K. (2007). The cross-category effect: Mere social categorization is sufficient to elicit an own-group bias in face recognition. *Psychological Science, 18*, 706–712.

## March 5: Replication Project: Data Analysis and Replication

REPLICATION PROJECT: Your data collection should be complete this week. We will spend the class period conducting data analysis.

## March 12: Motivational Processes in Prejudice and Stereotyping

ASSIGNMENTS DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

REPLICATION PROJECT FINAL REPORT DUE (March 14 at 5pm)

- Fein, S. & Spencer, S. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 31-44.
- 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.
- Monin, B., & Miller, D. T. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 33-43.
- \*\*Das, E., Bushman, B. J., Bezemer, M. D., Kerkhof, P., & Vermeulen, I. E. (2009). How terrorism news reports increase prejudice against outgroups: A terror management account. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 453-459. Describe Study 1 in detail; describe just the main findings of Studies 2 and 3
- \*\*Ratcliff, J. J., Lassiter, G. D., Markman, K. D., & Snyder, C. J. (2006). Gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: The role of motivation to respond without prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1325-1338. When presenting the results for the relationships among the variables (i.e., the correlational and regression analyses), focus most of your attention on the mediational analyses depicted in Figures 1, 2, and 3.

## March 19: The Target's Perspective I

ASSIGNMENTS DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION, PROPOSAL FOR FINAL PAPER (Due Friday, March 21 at 5pm to Moodle).

- Woo, E. (2005, May 3). Kenneth Clark, 90; His studies influenced ban on segregation. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from articles.latimes.com/2005/may/03/local/me-clark3
- Shelton, J. N., Alegre, J. M., & Son, D. (2010). Social stigma and disadvantage: Current themes and future prospects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 618-633.
- Woodzicka, J. A. & LaFrance, M. (2001). Real versus imagined sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 15-30.
- \*\*Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Dovidio, J. (2009). How does stigma “get under the skin”? The mediating role of emotion regulation. *Psychological Science*, 20, 1282-1289. Briefly describe the results from Study 1, describe Study 2 in detail.
- \*\* Craig, M. A., DeHart, T., Richeson, J. A., & Fiedorowicz, L. (2012). Do unto others as others have done unto you?: Perceiving sexism influences women's evaluations of stigmatized racial groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1107-1119. Briefly describe the results from Studies 1 and 2, describe Study 3 in detail.

**March 26: NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK!**

## April 2: The Target's Perspective II: Stereotype threat, interventions for reducing achievement gaps

### ASSIGNMENT DUE: STEREOTYPE THREAT PRESENTATION (NO WEEKLY QUESTION)

- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual performance of African-Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 797-811.
- Schmader, T. (2010). Stereotype threat deconstructed. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *19*, 14-18.

**Students with last names L-N:** Cohen, G. L., Garcia, J., Apfel, N., & Master, A. (2006). Reducing the racial achievement gap: A social-psychological intervention. *Science*, *313*, 1307-1310.

**Students with last names R-S:** Miyake, A., Kost-Smith, L. E., Finkelstein, N. D., Pollock, S. J., Cohen, G. L., & Ito, T. A., (2010). Reducing the gender achievement gap in college science: A classroom study of values affirmation. *Science*, *330*, 1234-1237.

Shnabel, N., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Cook, J. E., Garcia, J., & Cohen, G. L. (2013). Demystifying values-affirmation interventions: Writing about social belonging is a key to buffering against identity threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*, 663-676.

### **Presentation articles to be assigned based on student interest**

## April 9: Intergroup Interactions

- Word, C. O., Zanna, M. P., & Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *10*, 109-120.
- Richeson, J. A., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Negotiating interracial interactions: Costs, consequences, and possibilities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 316-320.
- Trawalter, S., & Richeson, J.A. (2008). Let's talk about race, baby! When whites' and blacks' interracial contact experiences diverge. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 1214-1217.
- Bijleveld, E., Scheepers, D., & Ellemers, N. (2012). The cortisol response to anticipated intergroup interactions predicts self-reported prejudice. *PLoS ONE*, *7*, e33681.
- Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *104*, 504-519.
- Trawalter, S., Adam, E. K., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Concerns about appearing prejudiced get under the skin: Stress responses to interracial contact in the moment and across time. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 682-693.
- \*\*Mendes, W. B., Blascovich, J., Hunter, S. B., Lickel, B. & Jost, J. T. (2007). Threatened by the unexpected: Physiological responses during social interactions with expectancy-violating partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 698-716. Briefly describe the results of Studies 1 and 2, and describe Study 3 in detail.
- \*\*Mallett, R. K., & Wilson, T. D. (2010). Increasing positive intergroup contact. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 382-387. Briefly describe the results from Study 1, and describe Study 2 in detail.

### **April 16: Reducing Prejudice**

#### ASSIGNMENT DUE: WEEKLY QUESTION

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1145-1158.

Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 574-587.

Legault, L., Gutsell, J. N., & Inzlicht, M. (2011). Ironic effects of antiprejudice messages: How motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice. *Psychological Science, 22*, 1472-1477.

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 1267-1278.

### **April 23: Final Presentations**

#### ASSIGNMENT DUE: PRESENTATION; FINAL PAPER PEER DRAFT (due Friday, April 25 at 5pm)

See instructions for final presentations.

### **April 30: In-class Writing Workshop**

#### ASSIGNMENT DUE: PEER FEEDBACK

See instructions for peer editing assignment.

### **May 7: NO CLASS (Board Week)**

### **May 14: NO CLASS (Completion Days)**

#### ASSIGNMENT DUE: FINAL PAPER (5pm)



## GUIDELINES: WEEKLY QUESTIONS

Beginning the second week of class, you will post questions to the class website. You are also responsible for reading and considering all of your classmates' questions before class. Questions are intended to help you organize your thoughts, serve as a basis for class discussion, and allow you to get 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 prejudice, really?") but should be "just right" – somewhere in between. **For the first two weeks of question-posting, you should indicate which type(s) of question you are asking by labeling it with one or more of the labels below.**

Here are some questions that psychologists ask when analyzing literature. 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 literature you've read suggest any new directions, or hypotheses, that research might take? **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. Occasionally, you will spend the first fifteen minutes of class writing a response to one of the questions posed by you or your classmates.

## **GUIDELINES: REPLICATION PROJECT**

In this assignment, you will be performing a replication of a recently published study related to prejudice and stereotyping. This assignment is inspired the recent initiatives related to open science.

“The gold standard for reliability is independent replication ... Replicating and extending allows researchers to create an interlocking edifice of findings, rather than an array of unconnected phenomena (Newell, 1973). What better way to promote this kind of cultural shift than to instill our students the values that we want our young scientists to hold?” (Frank & Saxe, 2012)

Replicating an existing study provides the opportunity to get to know a particular study very well, and to build on the skills you developed in Statistics and Research Methods in study design and data analysis. I hope this assignment will provide you as an individual and us collectively as a class the opportunity to practice psychological science, and to be active producers as well as consumers of knowledge

You will be assigned (based on your expressed interest, as well as skills and desired areas for development) a recent article for replication, and placed into a group. Your group will then create an online version of the study, and I will launch it on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (mTurk), which “is a novel, open online marketplace for getting work done by others.” (Buhrmester et al., 2011). You will then analyze the data and complete the report.

### **Steps of the Replication Project**

#### **January 29 – Description of replication project in class, assignment of articles**

I will describe the replication project in class and the selected articles, and will assign groups based on student interest, skills, and desired development.

#### **February 5 – Complete list of measures for replication project**

Your group will submit a complete list of all measures, questions, instructions, and other materials that will be used in your replication. See “Sample Complete Set of Measures” on Moodle for an example of what I might submit if I were conducting a replication of Moss-Racusin et al. (2012), which we will read for February 5.

#### **February 12 – Program replications in class**

I will be at a conference this week, but you will meet in your groups during class time to program your replications. To program the study, you should:

1. Visit surveygizmo.com and sign up for a free account
2. Program your study using surveygizmo. I have tried to select studies that will be straightforward to program, but you may well find that you need to problem solve and make decisions. You will need to make a separate surveygizmo survey for each condition. I will then set it up so participants are randomly assigned to receive one and only one of the surveys. I will be travelling during most of class time on Wednesday. To the extent that my travel goes smoothly and my flight offers wifi, I will be available by email to help you.
3. By Friday, February 14 (so you might need to meet outside of class to finish) email me a link to your study (if you have multiple conditions, you will have multiple links to send); 2. A

description of any problems you have had in programming your study that you'd like my help in troubleshooting. Of course, you can email me before Friday and I will do my best to help you from afar.

### **February 24 – Finish programming replications, hand in “prepaper”**

By Friday, February 24 you will finish programming your replications and I will launch them on Mechanical Turk. You will also submit your replication “prepaper” which will consist of : 1. A very short introduction to the study; 2. A description of the method (including power analysis, description of your planned sample, materials, procedures, analysis plan, and description of any differences from the original study). You must follow the replication template posted on Moodle for this assignment. There is also an example report of a replication to give you a sense of the amount of detail required. Each group only needs to submit one paper.

### **March 5 – Data analysis (in class)**

We will conduct data analysis in class on March 5.

### **March 14 – Replication “postpaper” due**

Your replication “postpaper” is due on March 14. This paper should include: 1. The text of your prepaper, with edits based on my feedback (but not based on your data).; 2. Your results (including description of how the data were prepared, a description of the results of your confirmatory analyses that conduct the tests you detailed in your prepaper analysis plan, and any exploratory analyses you chose to conduct); 3. Discussion (including a summary of the replication attempt and commentary). Again, you must follow the replication template posted on Moodle for this assignment. You may again find the also an example report of a replication useful.

### **Grading**

Grades will be assigned based on:

- Initiative and independence (while also speaking appropriate guidance) on programming the study and conducting data analysis
- The quality of the replication (e.g., Did you include all needed measures? Did you have the appropriate measures? 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.

## GUIDELINES: LEADING CLASS DISCUSSION

In groups of twos or threes, you will have 45 minutes to present supplemental material classmates and lead class discussion one week. You should spend no more than 15 minutes presenting the new articles – the majority of your time should be spent facilitating discussion among the class.

Presentations will be graded on the following criteria:

- **Organization.** Does the presentation effectively and clearly communicate the main findings from the supplemental papers? Is the level of detail appropriate for the time constraint?
- **Clarity.** Is the talk clear to the audience and well-rehearsed? Are slides/ handouts/ use of board effective and engaging for the audience?
- **Discussion Facilitation.** Do the presenters engage the class in meaningful discussion? Are they prepared with different questions or activities that connect the supplemental readings to other readings for the week (or the course)?
- **Other.** Were the presenters prepared with a sketch of a lesson plan for their pre-class meeting? Is there evidence that all group members contributed equally and worked well together?

Suggestions for leading discussion:

- Prepare! Leading discussion takes effort and energy. You should have a well-developed plan for how you would like your session to go. It is better to overprepare rather than underprepare.
- Be judicious in deciding which details of the supplemental articles to present.
- Connect the supplemental readings to the main readings (for that particular week and across weeks).
- Be creative! You can assign a SMALL (< 10 minutes) assignment for your classmates to complete ahead of time. Handouts, visual aids, and demos are encouraged.
- This is a collaborative assignment, and there should be evidence that all members contributed in substantial ways to generating the materials and leading the discussion. Domination of the presentation and discussion by one team member will impair both team members' grades.
- You must meet with me prior to your assigned week – at this meeting you should be prepared with potential activities or directions for discussion. Bring a tentative outline so that we can discuss which areas might be fruitful and potential directions for conversation. I can also help you brainstorm activities to include during class.

Class Date	Meet with Kristin By ...	Topic	Presenters
26-Feb	21-Feb	Cognitive Basis	
12-Mar	7-Mar	Motivational Processes	
19-Mar	14-Mar	Intergroup Interactions	
2-Apr	29-Mar**	Target's Perspective	
16-Apr	11-Apr	Reducing Prejudice	

\*\*This is the Friday of Spring Break, so in this case we may need to meet later.

## GUIDELINES: FINAL PAPER

In your final paper you will propose an experiment that tests a hypothesis related to stereotyping and prejudice. 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 in prejudice and stereotyping – 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 an important area of research?
- What previous literature led you to your questions?
- How will you test your hypothesis?
- What are your predicted results?

Written paper. This paper will be written like an empirical journal article, although with a “Predicted Results” section rather than actual results. In the Introduction, provide the reader with a clear and logical introduction to your study. It should review the literature relevant to your study, while leading up to your particular research question. Before you move on to the Method section, you should have clearly stated your study's aims. 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 how you would analyze the data, and the predicted results. In the Conclusion, restate your aims, and “findings.” How does your study answer your question, and what inferences can be drawn from this research?

### Additional guidelines

- Papers should be between 10 and 12 double-spaced pages of text, plus a Title Page, Abstract, References, and Appendices.
- The paper should follow APA style
- You must work independently on this paper

<b>Clear statement of question</b>	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.
<b>“Thesis-like” quality of question.</b>	The central question should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be the basis for your argument and proposed study</li> <li>• Be compelling</li> <li>• Provide evidence of originality of thought, and integration of the material beyond what we’ve discussed in class or covered in the readings</li> </ul>
<b>Evidence that there is empirical support for thesis</b>	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.)
<b>Logic of argument</b>	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.
<b>Study design</b>	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.
<b>Overall writing style</b>	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 <b>carefully</b> proofread before turning it in!
<b>APA style.</b>	The paper should follow APA format. In particular, in-text citations and your reference list should be accurate.

Oral presentation Finally, at the end of the semester you will share your research proposals with your classmates. In these 8-10 minute 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 can use Powerpoint, interactive activities or other aids (but these are not required). More details will be available in class.

## GUIDELINES: PEER EDITING ASSIGNMENT

In the semester's final weeks, you will switch from reading original articles to producing original work based on the course content. The final project will culminate in a written proposal. You will have ample opportunity for feedback via an initial written proposal, a writing workshop based on a draft, and an oral presentation to me and your peers.

You will make written comments on your classmates' peer drafts, and this 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. You should maintain norms of care, respect, and a willingness to constructively challenge each other.

### FOR WRITERS

You will distribute (via email) the following materials (see groups below).

1. To Kristin and your peers (via email): Your peer draft. This should be at least six continuous pages of your final paper. I recommend – but do not require – that it be the first six pages of your paper, because I think peer feedback is most useful on the Introduction and Literature Review. There should be an outline for the rest of your paper, and the outline should make your argument transparent to the reader.
2. To Kristin and your peers (via email): Your self-reflection. See handout posted on Moodle.

### FOR EDITORS

- A. Reread Daryl Bem's article *Writing the empirical journal article* (posted on Moodle).
- B. For each draft:
  - a. Skim it the first time you read it – make very few (if any) marginal comments
  - 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. You can comment on features such as APA style, grammar, and spelling, but 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. See the worksheet for more details.
  - f. Remember that writers want not only to hear what can be improved but also how it can be improved.
  - g. Bring four hard copies of your in-text comments to class (for your other group members and Kristin).
  - h. Bring one hard copy of your peer evaluation worksheet and cover memo to class (for the writer).
  - i. Bring another hard copy of your peer evaluation worksheet and cover memo to class (for me).  
This copy ONLY should include a recommended grade for the paper.
- C. Come to class prepared to discuss your classmates' work in your groups.
- D. 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 specific places where the paper is unclear and giving specific suggestions for improvement, does not facilitate revision.

### GROUPS

Group A

Group B

Group C