

## Course Information

- PSY843: Stereotyping, Prejudice, & Discrimination
- Wednesdays, 5:00-7:50, virtual
- Zoom Location:
  - <https://msu.zoom.us/j/95156576589>
  - password: psy843
- Professor: Joseph Cesario
- Office Hours: by appointment
- Contact: [cesario@msu.edu](mailto:cesario@msu.edu)
- Website: [d2l.msu.edu](http://d2l.msu.edu)

## Course Overview

- This course covers the intra- and inter-personal processes underlying stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. Emphasis is placed on understanding core principles of these topics in light of human evolution. Material is organized around three broad questions: *Why do we care about groups and what are the consequences of doing so? How and why do we store information about groups? How do we understand group differences?*

## Course Objectives

- The primary objective is to learn the principles governing intergroup cognition, affect, and behavior. The secondary objective is to learn how to evaluate and present a coherent commentary on stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination research.

## Class Format

- The expectation is that every student will offer some contribution every class, and the quality of the contribution should reflect serious consideration of the week's ideas and readings.
- The format of the course is the following:
  - Before 5:00 Sunday, each student will upload questions/commentary on the assigned readings (maximum one page, double-spaced) and one additional reading related to the week's topics to the d2l dropbox.
  - Each student should be prepared to (1) discuss/defend their comments and (2) give a detailed summary of the reading they uploaded, connecting it to the week's readings.

## Readings

- Readings and other material are posted on D2L. Readings are listed in the calendar below.

# Evaluation

## 1.1 Philosophy

- Evaluation is based on (1) how well you are able to master the material and apply the principles learned to novel questions and situations, as demonstrated in the midterm and final paper; (2) class discussion; and (3) your weekly uploaded contributions.

## 1.2 Grading

- Your grade is:
  - Weekly participation, discussion, uploaded commentary (20%)
  - Midterm Exam (40%)
    - The midterm exam will be a take-home written exam.
  - Final Paper (40%)
    - The final paper will give you the chance to concentrate on theoretical or empirical issues raised during the course. The paper can be:
      - an in-depth and critical analysis of one or a small number of theories presented during the course
      - an original empirical analysis of data dealing with a theoretical or methodological issue raised during the course
      - a research proposal influenced by a theoretical or methodological issue raised during the course
      - The text of your final paper (not including title page, abstract, tables, figures, or references) should be no more than 20 double-spaced pages in length.
  - You will email both your midterm and final paper to a student representative. This student representative will then make all the papers anonymous and send them to me for evaluation. Only after I have graded all the papers will the student representative send me the non-anonymous versions so that I can enter the grades. As we will see in this course, we all have the potential for bias -- beneficial and harmful, positive and negative -- and sometimes external regulations are the most effective means of ensuring against such bias. Whether preventing such bias helps or hurts you, of course, is a different matter.

## Accommodations

- Students who need accommodations should contact me immediately.
- Michigan State University is committed to providing equal opportunity for participation in all programs, services and activities. Requests for accommodations by persons with disabilities may be made by contacting the Resource Center for Persons with Disabilities at 517-884-RCPD or on the web at [rcpd.msu.edu](http://rcpd.msu.edu). Once your eligibility for an accommodation has been determined, you will be issued a Verified Individual Services Accommodation ("VISA") form. Please present this form to me at the start of the term or two weeks prior to the accommodation date (test, project, etc.). Requests received without sufficient lead time will not be honored.

## Make-Up Assignments/Absences

- Allowances for makeup assignments and points are given if you have a valid excuse.
- If you cannot complete an assignment because of a university-scheduled event, a religious holiday, or some other acceptable event that you could have foreseen, please notify me at least one week in advance.

## Academic Honesty

- The following is the academic honesty statement from the Office of the Ombudsperson; all students are required to adhere to this statement:
  - Article 2.3.3 of the Academic Freedom Report states that "The student shares with the faculty the responsibility for maintaining the integrity of scholarship, grades, and professional standards." In addition, the Psychology department adheres to the policies on academic honesty as specified in General Student Regulations 1.0, *Protection of Scholarship and Grades*; the all-University Policy on *Integrity of Scholarship and Grades*; and Ordinance 17.00, Examinations. (See *Spartan Life: Student Handbook and Resource Guide* and/or the MSU Web site: [www.msu.edu](http://www.msu.edu).) Therefore, unless authorized by your instructor, you are expected to complete all course assignments, including homework, lab work, quizzes, tests and exams, without assistance from any source. You are expected to develop original work for this course; therefore, you may not submit course work you completed for another course to satisfy the requirements for this course. Also, you are not authorized to use the [www.allmsu.com](http://www.allmsu.com) Web site to complete any course work in PSY 342. Students who violate MSU rules may receive a penalty grade, including -- but not limited to -- a failing grade on the assignment or in the course. Contact your instructor if you are unsure about the appropriateness of your course work. (See also <https://www.msu.edu/~ombud/academic-integrity/index.html>)
- If you break the academic honesty agreement in any way, you will receive a 0.0 for the course. There are no exceptions.

## The Most Important Part of the Syllabus

- This course covers difficult, challenging, and controversial topics. The stance that all students are required to adopt for this course has two principles: (1) respect for each individual person and (2) free inquiry and intellectual integrity. In other words, personal attacks and dehumanizing statements are not allowed, and neither are attempts to curtail questions or critical thought.
- Criticism, exploration, and scrutiny *of all topics and ideas* are *requirements* for a free and open society as well as for meaningful intellectual development. In this course, such criticism will be undertaken with the *highest standards of intellectual integrity and respect for the person*. Indeed, free inquiry is not only the cornerstone of science and scholarship but is also intimately connected to respect: To critically evaluate someone's beliefs is a sign that you respect that person enough to take their claims seriously and treat them as an intellectual equal, rather than patronizing the person by shielding them from criticism.

## Calendar

- Required readings are listed under the date on which they are due. *Optional* readings/resources are listed in italics and provide more detail on that week's topics.
- **Section I: Why do we care about groups and what are the consequences of doing so?**
  - 1/20: Kin selection, reciprocal altruism, & ingroup/outgroup bias
    - Trivers (1971)
    - Axelrod & Hamilton (1981)
    - Yamagishi et al. (1999)
    - *Optional: Ruffle & Sosis (2006)*
    - *Optional: Mahajan et al. (2011)*
    - *Optional: Hamilton (1963)*
  - 1/27: Ingroup/outgroup bias cont.; sexual selection, SDO, male/female prejudice
    - McDonald, Navarrete, & Sidanius (2011)
    - Navarrete et al. (2010)
    - Olsson et al. (2005)
    - *Optional: Navarrete et al. (2009)*
  - 2/3: Stigma & dehumanization
    - Kurzban & Leary (2001)
    - Haslam (2006)
    - *Optional: Fincher & Tetlock (2016)*
  - 2/10: Prejudice "masked" in symbolic & benevolent cloaks
    - Sniderman & Tetlock (1986)
    - Pearson et al. (2009)
    - Glick et al. (2000)
    - *Optional: Meertens & Pettigrew (1997)*
  - 2/17: Decreasing intergroup prejudice
    - Sherif (1958)
    - Paluck & Green (2009)
    - One of the following:
      - Sidanius et al. (2004)
      - Wolsko et al. (2000)
      - Mendoza-Denton et al. (2002)
      - Putnam (2007)
- **Section II: How, when, and why do we store and use information about groups?**
  - 2/24: Stereotype formation and accuracy
    - Jussim et al. (2009)
    - Fiske et al. (1999)
    - *Optional: Hamilton & Gifford (1976)*
  - 3/3: *No class, break day*
  - 3/10: Conditions of categorical activation and use
    - Kurzban et al. (2001)
    - Brewer (1991)

- Chen et al. (2014)
  - 3/17: Conditions of categorical activation and use cont.
    - Devine (1989)
    - Bargh (1999)
    - Macrae & Bodenhausen (2000)
    - *optional: Kunda & Thagard (1996)*
  - 3/24: Indirect/direct measurement and implicit bias (as an explanations of outcome disparities)
    - Fazio & Olson (2003)
    - Arkes & Tetlock (2004)
    - Oswald et al. (2013)
    - *Optional: Goldin & Rouse (2000)*
    - *Optional: von Hippel (2004)*
- **Section III: How do we understand group differences?**
  - 3/31: Introduction
    - Cesario (in press)
  - 4/7: Sex differences & disparities
    - Sowell (2008a)
    - Valla & Ceci (2014)
    - Cheryan et al. (2016)
    - *Optional: Gino et al. (2015)*
    - *Optional: Stoet & Geary (2018)*
    - *Optional: Su et al. (2009)*
    - *Optional: Su & Rounds (2015)*
  - 4/14: Racial differences & disparities
    - Sowell (2008b)
    - Beaver et al. (2013)
    - Williams (1982), Chpt. 1
    - Heckman (1998)
    - *Optional: Andreoni et al. (2019)*
    - *Optional: Cesario et al. (2019)*
    - *Optional: Gottfredson (1998, 2004)*
  - 4/21: Solutions and failed solutions to disparate outcomes
    - Steele & Aronson (1995)
    - Williams (1982), Chpts. 5-9
    - Sander (2015) and Hsu's post(s) on preferential policies and mismatch, plus one of the following:
      - Arcidiacono & Lovenheim (2015)
      - Heriot (2015)

**FINAL PAPER DUE FRIDAY OF FINALS WEEK.**

## References

- Andreoni, J., Kuhn, M. A., List, J. A., Samek, A., Sokal, K., & Sprenger, C. (2019). Toward an understanding of the development of time preferences: Evidence from field experiments. *Journal of Public Economics*, *177*, 104039.
- Arcidiacono, P., & Lovenheim, M. (2015). Affirmative Action and the Quality-Fit Tradeoff. *Journal of Economic Literature*.
- Arkes, H. & Tetlock, P. E. (2004). Attributions of implicit prejudice, or Would Jesse Jackson fail the Implicit Association Test? *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*, 257-278.
- Axelrod, R., & Hamilton, W. D. (1981). The Evolution of Cooperation. *Science*, *211*, 1390–1396.
- Bargh, J. A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against the controllability of automatic stereotype effects. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 361-382). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Beaver, K. M., DeLisi, M., Wright, J. P., Boutwell, B. B., Barnes, J. C., & Vaughn, M. G. (2013). No evidence of racial discrimination in criminal justice processing: Results from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*(1), 29-34.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 475-482.
- Cesario, J. (in press). What can experimental studies of bias tell us about real-world group disparities? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.
- Cesario, J., Johnson, D. J., & Terrill, W. Is there evidence of racial disparity in police use of deadly force? Analyses of officer-involved fatal shootings in 2015–2016. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *10*, 586-595.
- Chen, J. M., Moons, W. G., Gaither, S. E., Hamilton, D. L., & Sherman, J. W. (2014). Motivation to control prejudice predicts categorization of multiracials. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*(5), 590–603. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213520457>
- Cheryan, S., Ziegler, and S.A., Montoya, A.K., & Jiang, L.(2016). Why Are Some STEM Fields More Gender Balanced Than Others? *Psychological Bulletin*.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *56*, 5-18.
- Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M.A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research. *Annual Review of Psychology* (Vol. 54), 297-327.
- Fincher, K.M., & Tetlock, P.E. (2016). Perceptual dehumanization of faces is activated by norm violations and facilitates norm enforcement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *145*, 131-146.
- Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (Dis)liking: Status and Interdependence Predict Ambivalent Stereotypes of Competence and Warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*(3), 473–489. <http://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00128>
- Gino, F., Wilmut, C. A., & Brooks, A. W. (2015). Compared to men, women view professional advancement as equally attainable, but less desirable. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *112*, 12354–12359.
- Glick, P. et al., (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *79*, 763-775.

- Goldin, C., & Rouse, C. (2000). Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of "blind" auditions on female musicians. *The American Economic Review*, *90*, 715-741.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (1998). The general intelligence factor. *Scientific American*.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (2004). Intelligence: is it the epidemiologists' elusive "fundamental cause" of social class inequalities in health?. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *86*(1), 174.
- Hamilton, D. L., & Gifford, R. K. (1976). Illusory correlation in interpersonal perception: A cognitive basis of stereotypic judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *12*, 392-407.
- Hamilton, W. D. (1963). The Evolution of Altruistic Behavior. *The American Naturalist*, *97*, 354-356.
- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 252-264.
- Heckman, J. J. (1998). Detecting discrimination. *Journal of economic perspectives*, *12*(2), 101-116.
- Heriot, G. (2015). A "Dubious Expediency": How Race-Preferential Admissions Policies on Campus Hurt Minority Students. *The Heritage Foundation*.
- Hsu's blog post(s) on preferential policies and mismatch -- the following plus additional links throughout the article as needed:
  - <http://infoproc.blogspot.com/2015/12/mcwhorter-on-mismatch.html>
- Jussim, L., Cain, T.R., Crawford, J.T., Harber, K., & Cohen, F. (2009). The unbearable accuracy of stereotypes. In Nelson, T. (ed.), *The Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination* (199-227). NY: Psychological Press.
- Kunda, Z., & Thagard, P. (1996). Forming impressions from stereotypes, traits, and behaviors: A parallel-constraint-satisfaction theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*, 284-308.
- Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: The functions of social exclusion. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*, 187-208.
- Kurzban, R., Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2001). Can race be erased? Coalitional computation and social categorization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *98*, 15387-92.
- Macrae, C.N., & Bodenhausen, G.V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*, 93-120.
- Mahajan, N., Martinez, M.A., Gutierrez, N.L., Diesendruck, G., Banaji, M.R., & Santos, L.R. (2011). The evolution of intergroup bias: Perceptions and attitudes in Rhesus Macaques. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*, 387-405.
- McDonald, M.M., Navarrete, C.D., & Sidanius, J. (2011). Developing a theory of gendered prejudice. In *Social cognition, social identity, and intergroup relations: A Festschrift in honor of Marilyn B. Brewer*.
- Meertens, R.W., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Is subtle prejudice really prejudice? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *61*, 54-71.
- Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V.J., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: Implications for African American students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 896-918.

- Navarrete, C. D., McDonald, M. M., Molina, L. E., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Prejudice at the nexus of race and gender: an outgroup male target hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 933–45.
- Navarrete, C. D., Olsson, A., Ho, A. K., Mendes, W. B., Thomsen, L., & Sidanius, J. (2009). Fear Extinction to an Out-Group Face: The Role of Target Gender. *Psychological Science, 20*, 155–158.
- Olsson, A., Ebert, J. P., Banaji, M. R., & Phelps, E. A. (2005). The role of social groups in the persistence of learned fear. *Science, 309*, 785–7.
- Oswald, F. L., Mitchell, G., Blanton, H., Jaccard, J., & Tetlock, P. E. (2013). Predicting ethnic and racial discrimination: a meta-analysis of IAT criterion studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(2), 171–92. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0032734>
- Paluck, E.L., & Green, D.P. (2009). Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 339–367.
- Pearson, A.R., Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (2009). The nature of contemporary prejudice: Insights from aversive racism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3*, 1–25.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). *E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century: The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*, 137–174
- Ruffle, B.J., and Sosis, R. H. (2006). Cooperation and the in-group-out-group bias: A field test on Israeli kibbutz members and city residents. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 60*, 147–163.
- Sander, R. (2015). An emerging scholarly consensus on mismatch and affirmative action (ideologues not welcome). *The Washington Post*:
  - [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2015/12/10/an-emerging-scholarly-consensus-on-mismatch-and-affirmative-action-ideologues-not-welcome/?utm\\_term=.8c0f538477f9](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2015/12/10/an-emerging-scholarly-consensus-on-mismatch-and-affirmative-action-ideologues-not-welcome/?utm_term=.8c0f538477f9)
- Sherif, M. (1958). Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. *American journal of Sociology, 63*, 349–356.
- Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., Levin, S., & Sinclair, S. (2004). Ethnic Enclaves and the Dynamics of Social Identity on the College Campus: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 96–110
- Sniderman, Paul M. and Philip Tetlock. (1986). Symbolic Racism: Problems of Motive Attribution in Political Debate. *Journal of Social Issues, 42*, 129–150.
- Sowell, T. (2008a). Chapter 3: Male-female facts and fallacies. In *Economic Facts and Fallacies* (pp. 55–86). New York: Basic Books.
- Sowell, T. (2008b). Chapter 6: Racial facts and fallacies. In *Economic Facts and Fallacies* (pp. 153–187). New York: Basic Books.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 797–811.
- Stoet, G., & Geary, D. C. (2018). The gender-equality paradox in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education. *Psychological Science, 29*, 581–593.
- Su, R., Rounds, J., & Armstrong, P.I. (2009). Men and Things, Women and People: A Meta-Analysis of Sex Differences in Interests. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*, 859–884.



- Su, R., & Rounds, J. (2015). All STEM fields are not created equal: People and things interests explain gender disparities across STEM fields. *Frontiers in psychology, 6*, 189.
- Trivers, R. L. (1971). The Evolution of Reciprocal Altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology, 46*, 35–57.
- Valla, J. M., & Ceci, S. J. (2014). Breadth-Based Models of Women’s Underrepresentation in STEM Fields: An Integrative Commentary on Schmidt (2011) and Nye et al. (2012). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9*, 219–224.
- von Hippel, W. (2004). Implicit prejudice: Pentimento or inquisition? *Psychological Inquiry, 15*, 302-305.
- Williams, W.E. (1982). *The State Against Blacks*. McGraw-Hill.
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2000). Framing interethnic ideology: Effects of multicultural and color-blind judgments of groups of individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 635–654.
- Yamagishi, T., Nobuhito, J., & Kiyonari, T. (1999). Bounded generalized reciprocity: In-group boasting and ingroup favoritism. *Advances in Group Processes, 16*, 161–197.