

The Psychology of Stereotyping and Prejudice

Instructor: Professor Ryan Lei, Ph.D

Office: Sharpless 412

Office hours: Thursdays, 1-2pm in office; Wednesdays 12-2pm in Coop

Email: rlei1@haverford.edu

Course Description:

It seems almost paradoxical that despite growing diversity in the United States and the world, group-based divides persist. This course focuses on the scientific research of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination to begin examining and explaining the underlying processes of why this might be. We will examine experimental evidence investigating phenomena and processes associated with beliefs about members of social groups (stereotypes), evaluative attitudes toward social group members (prejudice), and behavioral responses toward individuals due to their group membership(s) (discrimination). We will examine these processes from a variety of approaches, ranging from basic perceptual and categorical processes that start early in development (i.e., cognitive and developmental approaches), to motivational processes that widen intergroup divides (i.e., social psychological and sociological approaches). We will also discuss strategies for minimizing expressed bias in interpersonal situations as well as how to confront bias.

It is important to note that the goal of this course is to give you the *foundational* tools to assess any form of inequality in society. Thus, while the content of the course will not examine any particular form of social inequality in great detail (e.g., racism, sexism, homophobia, etc.), we will still use examples of these forms of inequality to demonstrate the underlying processes. Finally, students will also have the opportunity throughout the course to apply theoretical and experimental research findings to understand current events and social issues that are important to them, as well as consider how research can inform public policy

Learning Objectives

- Students will be able to critically evaluate the current scientific literature on stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination.
- Students will be able to articulate how and why stereotyping and prejudice can occur with and without intent in real-world situations.
- Students will be able to apply research in stereotyping and prejudice to predict how contexts or policies may influence intergroup bias in interpersonal or institutional setting

Required Reading

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*.

Other readings will be posted on the course website.

An Advisory

In this course, we will explore a variety of socially sensitive topics. For instance, we will consider and evaluate how specific group memberships influence psychological processes, and what it means to be a minority group member versus a majority group member. Thus, it will be important to follow the ground rules for these discussions:

- **Listen actively and respectfully.** In this class, we will engage with sensitive social topics directly to explore important mechanisms and theories that underlie stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. To facilitate discussion, it will be necessary to listen actively and not interrupt others while they are making their point. By active listening, I mean truly paying attention to what the speaker is saying and considering their perspective. Oftentimes we are already thinking of our response while others are talking, which inhibits true conversation and communication.
- **Critique ideas, not people.** We will examine the impact that important social policies have had, or are likely to have, on different groups in society. People from different backgrounds are likely to have different perspectives on these issues. The goal is to foster greater understanding – a goal which can only be accomplished when we do not attack the person.
- **Step up and step back.** Part of an effective discussion is allowing all members of the group to speak and offer their perspective. Even though silences can feel a little awkward, sometimes people need the space to gather their thoughts before they speak. Allow them that space. We will endeavor to accomplish this goal by being aware of when we should step back from the discussion if we have made our point, as well as stepping up if we feel we have something important to add.

These are not an exhaustive list of ground rules, but a starting point to facilitate civil and thought-provoking conversations to deepen our understanding of complex social issues. It is my sincere hope and belief that you will leave this course considerably richer and better equipped with strategies for thinking about important and complex social issues throughout your life—as well as how to navigate these conversations at Thanksgiving, should they come up.

Other course policies

Policy on absences. Because this is a seminar course, your attendance is vital to the success of the class. I have not included a grade percentage for participation, because you are (generally) upperclassmen and are hopefully intrinsically motivated to contribute to the class discussion. That being said, I recognize that sometimes things come up. If you miss one or two classes, this will not adversely affect your grade. However, if you are missing more than 2 classes, this will negatively impact your grade in the class.

For assignments and assessments, if you are going to miss the exam, for whatever reason, notify me by emailing me before the time of the exam. If you have legitimate health-related or personal problems, you **MUST** make appropriate arrangements **BEFORE** the date of the examination. For instance, if you feel ill the night before or the day of an exam, please go to the health services and have them document that you were seen. Absences due to other reasons must also be documented prior to the exam. If you miss the exam for an illegitimate reason, you will receive a zero. If you miss a class, you are responsible for doing the readings and getting course notes from a classmate to ensure that you are caught up.

Policy on plagiarism. Students are required to abide by Haverford College's Honor Code and academic integrity policies, which can be found online at <http://honorcouncil.haverford.edu/the-code/>. If you are in doubt about what constitutes academic dishonesty, speak with me before the assignment is due and/or examine the College's web site. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating on an exam (e.g., copying others' answers, providing information to others, using a cheat sheet) or plagiarism of a paper (e.g., taking material from readings without citation, copying another student's paper). Failure to adhere to this policy may result in a failing grade in the class and/or disciplinary action from the College. For this course, you should not produce identical final project reports. Similarly, all assignments should be completed independently.

Policy on late assignments. All assignments are due on the date specified, at the time specified. Late assignments will be docked one letter grade per day.

Magic Genie. Life happens, and sometimes you need a little bit of magic to make life a little easier. This policy serves to provide you with **ONE** extension of 48 hours, no questions asked. It is in your best interest to treat this

genie like the magical being it is; save it for when you might really need it and not just because you can. (But also, let me know you're using the genie).

Students with disabilities. I encourage students with disabilities, including non-visible disabilities like chronic diseases or learning disabilities, to meet with me early in the semester to discuss accommodations. You should also contact Access and Disability Services as soon as possible to verify eligibility for academic accommodations.

Grading & Evaluation

Facilitating Class Discussion (20%): For the last third of the course, you will take greater ownership of the course and run class discussion in the same vein that I will have run class in the preceding two-third of the course. You may opt to run a class discussion by yourself, or with one other person.

Two weeks before you are due to lead a class discussion, please plan to submit an annotated bibliography of 1-3 papers you plan to present.

A week before you are due to lead class discussion, please plan to meet with me to go over preliminary slides and background information you plan to cover.

Reading reactions (15%): Every week, you will need to turn in a reading reaction by **Monday at 5pm** for the week's readings. The reading reactions should only be 1-2 pages double spaced and should reflect your reactions to that week's broad topic.

For Week 1, please have reading reactions for Thursday's class posted by 5pm on Wednesday, Sept 4th.

From Week 2 (Sept. 10th) and beyond, reading reactions should be posted to the relevant discussion board **by 5pm on Monday of that week**.

Midterm: (25%): There will be one midterm in the course and cover both lecture material and readings. Midterm questions will be a series of short answer questions. By short answer, I mean 2-3 paragraph answers that demonstrate integration of ideas that we have discussed in class or in the readings.

Final Project: (40%): The final project is designed for you to demonstrate your understanding of the material covered in this class and consists of two parts.

Part I: Understanding inequality. You will take a real-world phenomenon and develop a rich analysis using an integrated perspective on how and why the phenomenon occurs. For example, a student might explore the question of "Why do police disproportionately target Black men?" and consider cognitive factors (e.g., stereotypes of threat), affective factors (e.g., racial bias), or situational ones (e.g., in an environmental that seems dangerous or unknown). You should pick an issue that you find intrinsically interesting and important, since you will be thinking and writing about it for the majority of the course! You may (and are encouraged to) use readings included in the course as part of your final project/paper, but please also try to find 3-5 relevant papers not covered in class to discuss.

Part II: Addressing gaps and/or proposing solutions. After explaining the issue, you will then identify gaps in our understanding of the how the inequality you are interested in continues to be perpetuated today, or you can propose a solution based on your understanding of why an equality persists. If you choose this latter option, you should also explain why you think the aspect that you have chosen to intervene on is the most important element. Any proposed solution or intervention must be based on the theory and readings covered in this class.

Format: The format of this final project is a bit more open-ended than is typical. Two options:

Multimedia project: If you choose to create a multimedia project, it must address all the same aspects outlined above. However, the format is largely up to you. A final project could be a video, like Franchesca Ramsey's popular decoded series for MTV. It could also be a graphic novel, where you create a story line that

incorporates cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of stereotyping and prejudice. For example, you could explain why the X-Men serve as an analogy for many marginalized group and explain why broader society fears them, as well as what could be done to address anti-mutant bias (based off human theories and established research, of course). It could be a podcast episode. Regardless of format, you will still turn in drafts and outlines to make sure you are on track and within guidelines.

Traditional paper: If you choose to complete a final paper, it must also address all the aspects outlined above. Final papers should be between 10-15 pages, without references. It would be difficult for an excellent paper to achieve the goals outlined above in less than 10 pages, and anything over 15 pages would be unnecessarily verbose. I encourage students who choose this option to visit the Writing Center on campus to hone their written communication skills. After all, writing is a skill that everyone—including me!—can always work to improve.

**Note: if you are a sophomore or junior and considering doing a thesis with me, I would encourage you to take this option (especially if you want to do a developmental thesis).*

Grade scale

A	=	94-100
A-	=	90-93.99
B+	=	87-89.99
B	=	83-86.99
B-	=	80-82.99
C+	=	77-79.99
C	=	73-76.99
C-	=	70-72.99
D+	=	67-69.99
D	=	60-66.99
F	=	59.99 and below

Course Schedule:

Note – It is possible that we may go slightly slower or more quickly through the material depending on the pace of our class. As such, I may not adhere stringently to the schedule of topics. Additionally, it is always possible that I will switch out certain readings for ones I decide will be better for our class given student interest and recent publications.

Generally speaking, I see the course as covering three broad topics.

Weeks 1-5 cover the *how* of stereotyping and prejudice. What is happening in the mind? After seeing another person, how do we engage in processes of categorization that activate negative feelings and lead to discriminatory behavior?

Weeks 6-10 cover the *why* of stereotyping and prejudice. Are we conditioned to always think in terms of us and them? What purpose (if any) does stereotyping and prejudice serve? What are the developmental inputs and changes that might result in more or less stereotyping and prejudice? What are the broader social forces and structures that influence how we think about others?

Week 11 & 12 are student choice weeks, where we'll dive deeper into topics that are of interest to a majority of students. Below are a few examples of topics we could explore (but is by no means exhaustive):

- Political stereotyping & prejudice
- Being a member of a stereotyped group
- Evolutionary perspectives on stereotyping and prejudice
 - Group-specific stereotyping and prejudice (e.g., anti-gay prejudice, anti-Latino prejudice)

Finally, **Weeks 13-15** are geared towards understanding what we might be able to do to minimize the impact of stereotyping and prejudice

Week	Date	Broad Topic	Specific Topics	Readings	Assignment Due
Week 1	Sept. 3	Introduction	Overview & Syllabus	(Optional #1)	(in class) what topics interest you?
	Sept 5.		Scientific study of stereotyping, prejudice and inequality	Chps. 1 & 6	
Week 2	Sept. 10	Theories & Methods	The Psychologists' Toolbox	#2, #3	IAT assignment (see handout)
	Sept. 12		Theories of Race & Racism	Chp. 13, #4, #5 [optional – p. 107-110]	
Week 3	Sept. 17	Cognitive Approaches & Processes	Perception, Categorical Thinking & Minimal Groups	Chps 2 & 3, #6	
	Sept 19		Stereotype Structure and Accuracy	Chp. 12, #7, #8	Final Project Topic Ideas Due (2-3 ideas)
Week 4	Sept 24	Affective Approaches & Processes	Emotion-based Approaches	Chp. 5, #9, #10	
	Sept 26		Implicit and Explicit Bias	#11, #12	
Week 5	Oct. 1	Integrating Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination	The Links Between Stereotypes, Attitudes, and Behavior I – Implicit & Explicit	#13, #14	
	Oct. 3		The Links Between Stereotypes, Attitudes, and Behavior II - Blatant	#15, #16	Extended outline for Final Project Part I due
Week 6	Oct. 8	Developmental & Personality Perspectives I	IN CLASS MIDTERM		
	Oct. 10		Authoritarianism and Social Dominance as facets of personality	Chps 25 & 27, #17	
FALL BREAK					
Week 8	Oct. 22	Developmental & Personality Perspectives I	Cognitive development and the propensity for stereotyping and prejudice	Chp. 18, #18, #19	
	Oct. 24		Environmental influences	Chp. 19, #20	Comments on extended outline returned Friday
Week 9	Oct. 29	Diversity & Intergroup Dynamics I	Intersectional approaches – development & adulthood	#21, #22	
	Oct.31		Biracial, multiracial categorization and identity	#23, #24	
Week 10	Nov. 5	Diversity & Intergroup Dynamics II	“Threats” of changing demographics	Chp. 14, #25, #26	

	Nov. 7		Intraminority intergroup relations	#27, #28	
Week 11	Nov. 12	Student Choice	Political stereotyping and prejudice	See Moodle	Completed Rough Draft of Part I and Outline of Part II on Monday the 11th
	Nov. 14		Stereotyping in the classroom	See Moodle	
Week 12	Nov. 19	Normative Influences	Group social norms	#29, #30	
	Nov. 21		Broad social norms	#31, #32	Comments returned on Friday
Week 13	Nov. 26	Peer Feedback	Peer Feedback on Final Projects		
	Nov. 28	THANKSGIVING			
Week 14	Dec. 3	Controlling bias within the person	Controlling bias, conditioning, suppression	Chp. 20, #33, #34	
	Dec. 5		Contact Theory	Chp. 16, #35, #36	
Week 15	Dec. 10	Confronting bias in situations	Allyship, confronting bias	#37, #38	
	Dec. 12		Wrap up and Reflections		Final Paper/Projects Due

Readings

- (OPTIONAL) Sue, D. W. (2013). Race talk: the psychology of racial dialogues. *American Psychologist*, 68(8), 663.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the implicit association test. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 74(6), 1464
- Yong, E. (2015). How reliable are psychology studies? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2015/08/psychology-studies-reliability-reproducibility-nosek/402466/>
- Richeson, J. A., & Sommers, S. R. (2016). Toward a Social Psychology of Race and Race Relations for the Twenty-First Century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 439-463.
- Salter, P. S., Adams, G., & Perez, M. J. (2018). Racism in the structure of everyday worlds: A cultural-psychological perspective. *Current directions in psychological science*, 27(3), 150-155.
- Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. *Annual*

- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878.
- Jussim, L., Crawford, J. T., & Rubinstein, R. S. (2015). Stereotype (in) accuracy in perceptions of groups and individuals. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(6), 490-497.
- Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D. A., Knobe, J., & Bloom, P. (2009). Disgust sensitivity predicts intuitive disapproval of gays. *Emotion*, 9(3), 435.
- Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: a sociofunctional threat-based approach to "prejudice". *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 88(5), 770.
- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2014). Implicit and explicit evaluation: A brief review of the associative-propositional evaluation model. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8(8), 448-462.
- Devine, P. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5-18.
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 92(4), 631.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(1), 62.
- Bruneau, E., Kteily, N., & Laustsen, L. (2018). The unique effects of blatant dehumanization on attitudes and behavior towards Muslim refugees during the European 'refugee crisis' across four countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(5), 645-662.

- Goff, P. A., Jackson, M. C., Leone, D., Lewis, B. A., 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.
- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Levin, S., Thomsen, L., Kteily, N., & Sheehy-Skeffington, J. (2012). Social dominance orientation: Revisiting the structure and function of a variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(5), 583-606.
- Rhodes, M. (2019). Are humans born to hate? Three myths and three developmental lessons about the origins of social categorization and inter-group bias. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/znu2h>
- Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (2007). Developmental intergroup theory: Explaining and reducing children's social stereotyping and prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(3), 162-166.
- Mandalaywala, T. M., Ranger–Murdock, G., Amodio, D. M., & Rhodes, M. (2019). The nature and consequences of essentialist beliefs about race in early childhood. *Child development, 90*(4), e437-e453.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles, 59*(5-6), 377-391.
- **Perszyk, D. R., Lei, R. F., Bodenhausen, G. V., Richeson, J. A., & Waxman, S. R. (2019). Bias at the intersection of race and gender: Evidence from preschool–aged children. *Developmental science, e12788*.
- Gaither, S. E. (2015). “Mixed” results: Multiracial research and identity explorations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24*(2), 114-119.
- **Roberts, S. O., & Gelman, S. A. (2015). Do children see in Black and White? Children's and adults' categorizations of multiracial individuals. *Child Development, 86*(6), 1830-1847.
- **Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). On the precipice of a “majority-minority” America: Perceived status threat from the racial demographic shift affects White Americans’ political ideology. *Psychological Science, 25*(6), 1189-1197.

- **Wilkins, C. L., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Racial progress as threat to the status hierarchy implications for perceptions of anti-White bias. *Psychological Science*, 25(2), 439-446.
- **Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences intraminority intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(4), 759.
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2016). Stigma-based solidarity: Understanding the psychological foundations of conflict and coalition among members of different stigmatized groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(1), 21-27.
- Jacoby-Senghor, D. S., Sinclair, S., & Smith, C. T. (2015). When bias binds: Effect of implicit outgroup bias on ingroup affiliation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 109(3), 415.
- **Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development*, 76(3), 652-663.
- **Crandall, C. S., Miller, J. M., & White, M. H. (2018). Changing norms following the 2016 US presidential election: the Trump effect on prejudice. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(2), 186-192.
- **Tankard, M. E., & Paluck, E. L. (2017). The effect of a Supreme Court decision regarding gay marriage on social norms and personal attitudes. *Psychological science*, 28(9), 1334-1344.
- Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 67(5), 808.
- **Monteith, M. J., Ashburn-Nardo, L., Voils, C. I., & Czopp, A. M. (2002). Putting the brakes on prejudice: On the development and operation of cues for control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(5), 1029-1050

- **Broockman, D., & Kalla, J. (2016). Durably reducing transphobia: A field experiment on door-to-door canvassing. *Science*, 352(6282), 220-224.
- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Psaltis, C., Schmid, K., Popan, J. R., ... & Hughes, J. (2010). Secondary transfer effects of intergroup contact: Alternative accounts and underlying processes. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 99(2), 282.
- **Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(4), 532-544.
- **Korver, K. (2019, Apr. 8). Privileged. *The Players' Tribune*. Retrieved from: https://www.theplayerstribune.com/en-us/articles/kyle-korver-utah-jazz-nba?fbclid=IwAR23qGZr1NxsoM4-zQO8wlujiiBedEEQOcZNWKXkDLcxbgDi29_XpQ3fIjk