

Psy 630

Foundations of Social Psychology: Intergroup Relations

Professor: Allen McConnell
E-mail: mcconnar@miamioh.edu
Office: 316 Psychology Building
Phone: 513.529.2407
Office hours: Mondays at 9 a.m. and at other times by appointment

Course location, meeting time, and resources

Class meets in 227 Psychology Building on Mondays, 2:30-5:45 p.m.

The class's Canvas site has all of the assigned readings in PDF format. All class assignment documents should be uploaded to Canvas in either PDF, RTF, or DOC formats (see *files* tab).

Overview

Like all sections of Foundations of Social Psychology (PSY 630), this course provides an introductory survey of a core theme in social psychology. At the end of this course, you should be able to:

- 1) Describe and analyze relationships between the actual, implied, or imagined presence of others and individuals' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors
- 2) Describe and analyze the common research methods used in social psychology
- 3) Apply the knowledge gained in this course across topics in social psychology and to other disciplines (e.g., clinical psychology, developmental psychology, cognitive psychology)
- 4) Communicate and create innovative research hypotheses that would further our understanding of core themes of social psychology

Course readings, discussions, and assignments are structured to facilitate the mastery of these student learning outcomes. Namely, students will read, analyze, and discuss primary research that emphasizes both classic and cutting-edge approaches to social aspects of behavior. Students will also engage in hypothesis generation, research design, and scientific proposal writing.

This section of PSY 630 is intended to provide a foundation in understanding a core issue in social psychology, intergroup relations, which focuses on the psychological processes involved with how individuals in groups perceive, judge, remember, reason about, feel, and behave toward people in social groups. Social groups can take many forms, ranging from classic social groups (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation) to minimal groups where membership is arbitrary. Intergroup research in social psychology began in earnest in 1954 when Gordon Allport published his highly-influential book, *The Nature of Prejudice*, which was an eclectic treatise that considered the psychological effects of prejudice on stigmatized individuals. The book offered a perspective that was both scientifically grounded and action oriented. Some of the key elements of this book, such as the idea that prejudice can be reduced by encouraging people to re-categorize others into more inclusive groups and that aspects of religion can play a central role in perpetuating group-based antipathy are still central to the field today (as evidenced by the reading list). In addition, Allport viewed intergroup conflict as a product of cognitive, motivational, and personality components, which is yet another perspective that lives on 60-plus years later in the field and in our seminar. Finally, Allport called on social scientists to leverage their research to help make the world a better place, which is also an aspect of the current course (e.g., improving learning outcomes in classrooms, reducing lethal force applied resulting from racial bias).

Assignments

1) Student facilitation (twice during course, 10 points each, 20 points max)

Twice during the semester, students will facilitate class discussion and determine how best to accomplish this goal each week. As facilitators, it is *not* your responsibility to explain the readings to others or review the important points of each paper. Instead, your role is to provide a framework that is productive for discussing the topic. For example, facilitators may circulate e-mails before class to pose questions to ponder beforehand. Perhaps they might present an initial framework at the beginning of class to highlight common (or divergent) themes that run throughout the readings. There are no right or wrong ways to facilitate (one exception would be starting class by saying, "Well, what did you think of this week's readings?"). The goal of facilitation is to provide structure and organization for fellow students during discussion, not *be* the discussion. Facilitators should emphasize analysis of readings and integration of readings within any given week and across weeks.

2) Weekly reaction papers (up to 7 papers per semester, 2 points each, 14 points max)

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

Each acceptable reaction paper contributes 2 points to the overall grade. Students must upload their reaction papers on the Canvas site (*assignments* tab) before noon on the day before class (i.e., by Sundays at 12 noon). At the very beginning of class (i.e., on Monday), the professor will provide comments and feedback before class discussion begins. Late reaction papers, regardless of the circumstances, will not be accepted.

3) Research workshops (twice during course, 10 points per workshop, 20 points max)

To encourage the development of new research and to gain practice in presenting and critiquing research, there are two days (i.e., October 24, December 5) devoted to in-class research workshops. On these days, there are no readings. Instead, each student will (before coming to class) identify an interesting research question, describe it and its import, briefly outline an appropriate methodology to address it, and present the anticipated results (in either table or graph form). Thus, students will develop at least two research ideas in the course (one for October 24, a different one for December 5) before the research proposal is submitted.

Before arriving in class, each student will prepare a document that is no longer than 1 page (single spaced) and provide a graph or figure (page 2). A copy of each student's pre-class work should be uploaded to Canvas by the Saturday before class by 6 p.m. These documents will be circulated to all class participants during the weekend, providing students with the opportunity to read each proposal and develop feedback for it (to be shared in class). In class, students will present their ideas orally without the benefit of computers, powerpoint slides, etc. for approximately 5 minutes (amount of time TBD based on the number of students enrolled). Other students will provide feedback during this presentation. Student evaluations will consist of the quality of the pre-class document (5 points per workshop) and feedback to other students (5 additional points).

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

4) Research proposal (paper is due at end of semester, 40 points)

Students will submit a major paper by choosing an area of intergroup relations based on their own interests and developing a research proposal. The topic need not be one that a student facilitated, though doing so may be beneficial. The research proposal must address an important research question from the perspective of intergroup relations. Students outside of social psychology are encouraged to relate intergroup relations to their area (e.g., clinical psychologists may want to explore how racial prejudice affects clients in therapy, developmental psychologists may examine the formation of intergroup cooperation in children). Although students will not be required to carry out the research they propose, the opportunity to develop a well-thought-out proposal should help those who wish to develop new lines of research or explore ideas relevant to theses, minor projects, and dissertations. This paper must take the form of a research proposal (e.g., it *cannot* be simply a literature review). The instructor will be available to help students refine their ideas and suggest resources. There is no correct page length (but only the first 30 pages of any paper will be evaluated). Papers *must* be written in accordance with APA Style. The **research proposal is due no later than 12 Noon on Monday, December 12** (late papers receive a 10% deduction for each 24-hour period that they are late). More details will be provided in a handout later in the semester.

5) Class participation (every class, 1 point per class, 11 points max)

Because the success of this course rests with the students and their preparation, students are evaluated for class participation. Because this is a small class that focuses on discussion of research material and ideas, active participation in group discussions is essential. Moreover, it is through the process of discussion and analysis that one’s research acumen is defined and sharpened. Thus, students are evaluated for their participation each class meeting (1 point per class day with a reading assignment).

Course evaluation summary

1) Facilitation during the semester (2x; 10 points per class)	20	
2) Weekly reaction papers (2 points per paper, 7 papers maximum)	14	
3) Workshops (2x; 5 points for one’s idea, 5 points feedback to others) ...	20	October 24, December 5
4) Research proposal (40 points total).....	40	Due Monday, December 12
5) Class participation (1 point per class)	11	

Letter grades are assigned based on standard 10 percent gradients, including plus and minus designations (e.g., 105 ≤ A ≤ 93, 92 ≤ A- ≤ 90, 89 ≤ B+ ≤ 87, 86 ≤ B ≤ 83, 82 ≤ B- ≤ 80, 79 ≤ C+ ≤ 77, 76 ≤ C ≤ 73).

Statement on academic misconduct

Both Miami University and the Department of Psychology are dedicated to providing a learning environment based not only upon academic excellence but academic integrity as well. In this course, it is expected that students will adhere to all Miami University guidelines regarding academic misconduct (for details, see Part 5, Miami Student Handbook: Academic Misconduct). Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

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

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

Readings

8/29 • Organizational meeting

9/5 • Labor Day holiday

9/12 • Social categorization (Allen)

Tskhay, K. O., & Rule, N. O. (2013). Accuracy in categorizing perceptually ambiguous groups: A review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17*, 72-86.

Freeman, J. B., & Ambady, N. (2011). A dynamic interactive theory of person construal. *Psychological Review, 118*, 247-279.

Kawakami, K., Amodio, D. M., & Hugenberg, K. (in press). Intergroup perception and cognition: An integrative model of the causes and consequences of social categorization. To appear in J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*.

9/19 • Categorization complexities

Maurer, K. L., Park, B., & Rothbart, M. (1995). Subtyping versus subgrouping: Processes in stereotype representation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 812-824.

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.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 61-149.

Smith, P. K., & Trope, Y. (2006). You focus on the forest when you're in charge of the trees: Power priming and abstract information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 578-596.

9/26 • Expectations produce reality

Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 656-666.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52*, 613-629.

Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Beilock, S. L. (2009). Multiple social identities and stereotype threat: Imbalance, accessibility, and working memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 949-966.

Walton, G. M. (2014). The new science of wise psychological interventions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23*, 73-82.

10/3 • Ingroups and outgroups

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 429-444.

Brewer, M. B. (2003). Optimal distinctiveness, social identity, and the self. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 480-491). New York: Guilford.

Hugenberg, K., Young, S. G., Bernstein, M. J., & Sacco, D. F. (2010). The categorization individuation model: An integrative account of the other race recognition deficit. *Psychological Review, 117*, 1168-1187.

Ratner, K. G., Dotsch, R., Wigboldus, D. H. J., van Knippenberg, A., Amodio, D. M. (2014). Visualizing minimal ingroup and outgroup faces: Implications for impressions, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*, 897-911.

10/10 • Intergroup contact

- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 922-934.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2009). Commonality and the complexity of “we”: Social attitudes and social change. *Personality and Social Psychological Review, 13*, 3-20.
- Todd, A. R., & Burgmer, P. (2013). Perspective taking and automatic intergroup evaluation change: Testing an associative self-anchoring account. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 786-802.
- Brannon, T. N., & Walton, G. M. (2013). Enacting cultural interests: How intergroup contact reduces prejudice by sparking interest in an out-group’s culture. *Psychological Science, 24*, 1947-1957.

10/17 • Intergroup interactions and goals

- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Trawalter, S. (2005). Ironic effects of racial bias during interracial interactions. *Psychological Science, 16*, 397-402.
- Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 248-264.
- Murphy, M. C., Richeson, J. A., & Molden, D. C. (2011). Leveraging motivational mindsets to foster positive interracial interactions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*, 118-131.
- Plant, E. A., Devine, P. G., & Peruche, M. B. (2010). Routes to positive interracial interactions: Approaching egalitarianism or avoiding prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 36*, 1135-1147.

10/24 • Research Workshop #1**10/31 • Stigma and intergroup attributions**

- Miller, C. T., & Kaiser, C. R. (2001). A theoretical perspective on coping with stigma. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 73-92.
- Crandall, C. S., Bahns, A. J., Warner, R., & Schaller, M. (2011). Stereotypes as justifications of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 1488-1498.
- Major, B., Kunstman, J. W., Malta, B. D., Sawyer, P. J., Townsend, S. S. M., & Mendes, W. B. (2016). Suspicion of motives predicts minorities’ responses to positive feedback in interracial interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 62*, 75-88.
- Dover, T. L., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2016). Members of high-status groups are threatened by pro-diversity organizational messages. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 62*, 58-67.

11/7 • Ideologies and belief systems

- Hunsberger, B., & Jackson, L. M. (2005). Religion, meaning, and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*, 807-826.
- Jost, J. T., Liviatan, I., van der Toorn, J., Ledgerwood, A., Mandisodza, A., & Nosek, B. A. (2010). System justification: How do we know it’s motivated? In R. Bobocel et al. (Eds.), *The psychology of justice and legitimacy: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 11, pp. 173-203). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., Mendoza-Denton, R., Rheinschmidt, M. L., & Keltner, D. (2012). Social class, solipsism, and contextualism: How the rich are different from the poor. *Psychological Review, 119*, 546-572.
- Diekmann, A. B., Eagly, A. H., & Johnston, A. M. (2010). Social structure. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 209-224). New York: Sage.

11/14 • Implications for education

- Walker, I., & Crogan, M. (1998). Academic performance, prejudice, and the Jigsaw Classroom: New pieces to the puzzle. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 8, 381-393.
- Murphy, M. C., Steele, C. M., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Signaling threat: How situational cues affect women in math, science, and engineering settings. *Psychological Science*, 18, 879-885.
- Okonofua, J. A., Paunesku, D., & Walton, G. M. (2016). Brief intervention to encourage empathic discipline cuts suspension rates in half among adolescents. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 5221-5226.
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. *Science*, 331, 1447-1451.
- Diekmann, A. B., Clark, E. K., Johnston, A. M., Brown, E. R., & Steinberg, M. (2011). Malleability in communal goals and beliefs influences attraction to STEM careers: Evidence for a goal congruity perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 902-918.

11/21 • Race and perceived threat

- 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, 1006-1023.
- Todd, A. R., Thiem, K. C., & Neel, R. (2016). Does seeing faces of young Black boys facilitate the identification of threatening stimuli? *Psychological Science*, 27, 384-393.
- Ma, D. S., Correll, J., Wittenbrink, B., Bar-Anan, Y., Sriram, N., Nosek, B. A. (2013). When fatigue turns deadly: The association between fatigue and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 515-524.
- Correll, J., Hudson, S. M., Guillermo, S., & Ma, D. S. (2014). The police officer's dilemma: A decade of research on racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8, 201-213.

11/28 • Perspective taking and dehumanization

- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 708-724.
- Todd, A. R., & Galinsky, A. D. (2014). Perspective-taking as a strategy for improving intergroup relations: Evidence, mechanisms, and qualifications. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8, 374-387.
- Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and inhumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 399-423.
- Hugenberg, K., Young, S., Rydell, R. J., Almaraz, S., Stanko, K. A., See, P. E., & Wilson, J. P. (2016). The face of humanity: Configural face processing influences ascriptions of humanness. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7, 167-175.

12/5 • Research Workshop #2**12/12 • Last day to submit research proposal (Monday by 12 Noon)**