

**Prejudice & Conflict: Psychology 375**  
**Summer 2019**  
**Professor Kim Chaney**  
**MTWTH 10:30am – 12:20pm**  
**Tillett 209**

**Kim Chaney**

**Email:** Kimberly.chaney@rutgers.edu

**Office:** Tillet 331

**Office Hours:** By appointment

**Description:**

This course is designed to provide an overview of the psychological bases of prejudice and conflict. Although we will primarily adopt a psychological approach to these phenomena, the material is inherently interdisciplinary and thus draws on a number of related fields such as political science, philosophy, anthropology, sociology, and history.

**Structure**

**Readings:**

All readings will be posted on Sakai. You are expected to complete all of the readings before class and be prepared to discuss them. These readings are primarily journal articles from social psychological journals. Thus, these articles will often present research that has been conducted, including the methodology and results. While the main focus of this readings is the theory and findings presented in the introduction and discussion, I do anticipate you to read the paper in the entirety. The methodologies are often where we may find room to critique or questions the authors' conclusions and determine if this work is a valid test of the authors' hypotheses. You are expected to do your best with the statistics in the results section, but do not worry if you do not understand the analyses.

**Lectures:**

The lectures will blend discussion and material that gives a solid foundation of that topic area. You are strongly encouraged to participate and comment during class.

**Course Expectations**

The purpose of this course is to expose you to a broad spectrum of ideas and perspectives on discrimination, prejudice and racial stereotypes. You are under NO obligation to agree with the authors or the professor. Rather, your obligation is to demonstrate comprehension and thoughtful consideration. At the end of the course you should be able to articulate and effectively argue your own position. Although we may not agree about our interpretations of the various materials, we can agree to commit ourselves to engage course readings, course goals, and each other with openness, careful listening, honesty, and mutual respect. Some of the topics we will discuss may evoke deep emotional feelings in all of us. You and I will view this course as providing a safe environment where students can express their views and openly debate the complicated and multifaceted aspects of the topics we will cover this session.

Therefore, I encourage you to take this opportunity to discuss these issues in an honest and open manner. I must caution, however, that with this openness comes an important responsibility -- that of being respectful of others. While we may disagree and debate, personal attacks on individuals are not allowed. This applies whether the person is a student, a visitor to the class, or the professor. I look forward to hearing your ideas, opinions and working and learning with you.

## Grade Breakdown

Attendance & Participation: 20%

Reading Responses: 20%

Exam 1: 20%

Exam 2: 20%

Group Presentation: 20%

A = 90-100%

B+ = 87-89%

B = 80-86%

C+ = 77-79%

C = 70-76%

D = 60-69%

F = Below 60

\*I will follow conventional rounding – an 89.4 will not be rounded to a 90, an 89.6 will be rounded to a 90

### Attendance:

Attendance and class participation are important for a class of this nature. Attendance will be taken at the start of class. It will be graded as follows: in total we have 22 meetings. If you attend 20 or more of these meetings you will receive the full attendance grade. In other words you have 2 absences before they start impacting your grade. If you miss more than 2 meetings your attendance grade will simply be the number of times you attended divided by the total number of meetings. For example, if you miss 4 class meetings your attendance grade will be:  $18/22 = 23\%$ . Note, *being more than 20 minutes late will count as an absence*.

If you have an illness, religious observance or unexpected emergency, you can excuse your absence by getting a written note from your doctor or dean.

### Reading Responses:

All students are required to complete three “weekly” written assignments. These reflections are intended to be a personal analysis of the assigned reading for the week. They are not intended to be a summary of the reading, but your critical reflection of something you find important, controversial, or troublesome in the reading. In total there will be 3 reflections due. The reflections should be between 1 and 2 pages in length, word processed, double-spaced, size 12 Times New Roman. Longer reflections will be accepted, but are not encouraged.

As you prepare your commentary you are asked to reflect on any combination of the following questions: · What are the key points of the book, chapter, or article? How does the reading relate to the overarching questions of the course? · How does the reading connect to other ideas or information you have learned in the past (either in practice or in other courses)? · How does the reading connect to other information that you are currently exploring in this course? · What did you find most interesting? · What (if anything) do you not understand? ·

What (if anything) do you not agree with? · After having done this reading, what would you like to explore further or learn more about? · How might you apply what you have learned in this reading to your practice or research?

### **Exams:**

There will be two exams, a mid-term and a final. The final will not be comprehensive, but will contain the new information covered since the mid-term. These exams will be a combination of multiple choice and short answer, and the material will include information from both the readings, lectures, and class discussions. More information will be provided prior to each exam.

### **Presentations:**

Each student will be assigned to a group. Each group will be asked to prepare a presentation and lead class discussion on the assigned day. The presentation and discussion will center around an article which the group will read but the class will not. The presentation should provide a thorough review of the article and broader topic (about 20-30 minutes), and then the group will be asked to lead the group in a discussion and/or activity related to the article. Groups are encouraged to meet with the professor prior to the presentation to review the material, discuss activities, and cover critical questions.

### **Cheating & Plagiarism:**

I will not tolerate plagiarism or cheating without exception. All work that students turn in must be their own work. Students *should not* work collaboratively on assignments without prior approval from the instructor. Any outside sources (including help from other people) must be appropriately referenced in all written work. Turning in someone else's work as your own is completely unacceptable. This includes downloading information from the web and pasting or copying it into your paper. I routinely check Google, Wikipedia and other popular websites to check for plagiarism. Additionally, I require that your paper be turned in as electronic copies so that I can check for plagiarism by matching content to information on the web. Any student who plagiarizes will, *at the very least*, receive a failing grade for the course. More severe consequences (e.g., expulsion) are also possible. More about academic integrity can be found at <http://ctaar.rutgers.edu/integrity/policy.html>.

\*\*All papers will be turned in using “turnitin” to check for plagiarism.

\*There will be NO exam makeups\*

\*\*Late work will not be accepted without prior arrangement with the professor\*\*

## **Class Schedule**

### **WEEK 1: Theories of Prejudice**

May 28<sup>th</sup>: Syllabus overview, introductions, definition of terms

May 29<sup>th</sup>: Theories of Prejudices 1

May 30<sup>th</sup>: Theories of Prejudices 2

## **WEEK 2: The -isms**

- June 3<sup>rd</sup>: Racial prejudice; Explicit & implicit attitudes
- June 4<sup>th</sup>: Benevolent & Hostile sexism
- June 5<sup>th</sup>: Intersectionality & Understudied -isms
- June 6<sup>th</sup>: Documentary & Discussion

## **WEEK 3: Stigma & Stereotype Threat**

- June 10<sup>th</sup>: Stigma & Stereotype Threat 1
- June 11<sup>th</sup>: Stigma & Stereotype Threat 2
- June 12<sup>th</sup>: Sample Presentation & Exam Review
- June 13<sup>th</sup>: Exam 1

## **WEEK 4: Interracial Interactions, Conflict, Justice system**

- June 17<sup>th</sup>: Interracial Interactions
- June 18<sup>th</sup>: Bias in the Justice System
- June 19<sup>th</sup>: Intractable Conflicts
- June 20<sup>th</sup>: Discussion & Group 1 Presentation

## **WEEK 5: Prejudice Reduction Strategies**

- June 24<sup>th</sup>: Changing Stereotype Content
- June 25<sup>th</sup>: Awareness & Motivation
- June 26<sup>th</sup>: Intergroup Contact
- June 27<sup>th</sup>: Discussion & Group 2 Presentation

## **WEEK 6:**

- July 1<sup>st</sup>: Video (?)
- July 2<sup>nd</sup>: Exam review
- July 3<sup>rd</sup>: Final Exam

### **Important Dates**

- June 6<sup>th</sup>: Response 1 due at beginning of class via Sakai
- June 13<sup>th</sup>: Exam 1
- June 20<sup>th</sup>: Response 2 due at beginning of class via Sakai
- June 27<sup>th</sup>: Response 3 due at beginning of class via Sakai
- July 3<sup>rd</sup>: Final Exam

\*Dates and assignments subject to change based on pace of course

## Readings

\*\*Subject to change\*\*

### Week 1:

- Prejudice, Stereotype, and Discrimination: Theoretical and Empirical Overview. Dovidio, J.F., Hewstone, M, Glick, P., & Esses, V.M. In SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination. Pg 1-20.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(5), 260-265.
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(1), 204–222. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00066.x
- Chambers, J.R., Schlenker, B.R., Collisson, B. (2013). Ideology and prejudice: The role of value conflicts. *Psychological Science*, 24(2), 140-149.

### Week 2:

- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(1), 5–18. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.56.1.5
- Quinn, D. M., & Chaudoir, S. R. (2009). Living with a concealable stigmatized identity: The impact of anticipated stigma, centrality, salience, and cultural stigma on psychological distress and health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(4), 634–651. doi:10.1037/a0015815
- Sesko, A. K., & Biernat, M. (2010). Prototypes of race and gender: The invisibility of Black women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(2), 356–360. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.10.016

### Week 3:

- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Phelan, J. C., & Link, B. G. (2013). Stigma as a fundamental cause of population health inequalities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(5), 813–821. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.301069.Stigma
- Major, B., Mendes, W. B., & Dovidio, J. F. (2013). Intergroup relations and health disparities: A social psychological perspective. *Health Psychology*, 32(5), 514–524. doi:10.1037/a0030358.Intergroup

### Week 4:

- Trawalter, S., Richeson, J. A. & Shelton, J. N. (2009). Predicting behavior during interracial interactions: A stress and coping approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13(4), 243–268. doi:10.1177/1088868309345850
- Noor, M., Shnabel, N. Halabi, S., & Arie, Nadler. (2012). When suffering begets suffering: The psychology of competitive victimhood between adversarial groups in violent conflicts. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(4), 351-374.
- Walton, A.G. (2015, June). Shoot, or don't shoot? *Chicago Booth Review*.  
<http://review.chicagobooth.edu/magazine/summer-2015/shoot-or-dont-shoot>

*Week 5:*

- Murphy, M. C., Richeson, J. A., & Molden, D. C. (2011). Leveraging motivational mindsets to foster positive interracial interactions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(2), 118–131. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00338.x
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Combating intergroup biases and prejudice, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(4), 101–105.
- Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Vance, S. L. (2002). The regulation of explicit and implicit race bias: The role of motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 835–848. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.82.5.835