

**Columbia University  
Department of Psychology**

**The Psychology of Stereotyping and Prejudice  
PSYC S3610 (3 points), Summer 2017**

**Course Information**

Location: Schermerhorn (Room TBD)  
Term Dates: May 22-June 30  
Mondays and Wednesdays, 5:30pm-8:40pm

**Instructor Information**

Nadav Antebi-Gruszka, PhD  
E-mail: n.antebi-gruszka@columbia.edu  
Office Hours: By appointment only

***Brief Course Description:*** A multidisciplinary review of seminal and current theoretical and empirical writings about stereotyping, prejudice, stigma, and discrimination. Among other topics, we will explore why people hold stereotypes and discriminate others, delve into the nature of implicit and explicit prejudice, and discuss the consequences of prejudice and discrimination. We will also focus on certain social groups that are disproportionately affected by prejudice and discrimination, such as LGBTQ+, fat, and racial/ethnic groups.

***Prerequisites:*** Science of Psychology (PSYC 1001) or Mind, Brain, & Behavior (PSYC 1010), or equivalent introductory psychology course. Students who have not taken one of these courses will require instructor permission. A prior course in research methods is highly recommended, but not mandatory. If you do not have a psychology background and are interested in this course, please contact me to determine fit and obtain permission before enrolling.

***Full Description:*** This course critically reviews seminal and current theoretical and empirical writings about stereotyping, prejudice, stigma, and discrimination. Within the field of psychology, we will review writings primarily from social psychology, but also from cognitive, developmental, and cultural psychology. Since psychological research focuses almost solely on individual- and interpersonal-level processes and consequences of stereotype and prejudice, we will complement our review with readings from other disciplines in the social sciences, including sociology and public health. This multidisciplinary approach will allow us to holistically investigate the individual-, interpersonal-, structural-, and cultural-level processes underlying prejudice and discrimination, as well as the effects of multi-level discrimination on the health and well-being of individuals and populations.

In order to facilitate a better understanding of the psychology of prejudice and discrimination, you will be encouraged to apply the topics explored throughout the course to current events (e.g., Trump's Travel Ban), public discourses (e.g., bathroom use for transgender people), and social movements (e.g., Black Lives Matter). To inform our perspective about these current affairs, we will explore the effects of prejudice and discrimination on the lives of specific social groups from a social justice prism, including racial and ethnic groups, LGBTQ+ communities, and fat people, among others.

It is my sincere belief that the nature and consequences of prejudice and discrimination cannot be fully understood by only reviewing and critically analyzing academic writings on these topics. Therefore, this course will include multiple experiential activities that will be interwoven into the sessions. These activities are designed to encourage a more personal and unmediated analysis on the psychology of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In doing so, it is my

hope that you will gain a profound intellectual and personal understanding of prejudice and discrimination.

This course will consist of short lectures at the beginning of every session, followed by an in-depth critical discussion about the assigned readings and material covered in class. In the first two sessions, I will lead the short lecture and discussion to model the format of presentations that will later be expected from all students enrolled in the course.

***Role of PSYC S3610 in the Psychology Curriculum:*** PSYC S3610 is a seminar designed especially for undergraduates majoring in Psychology and for students participating in the Psychology Post-Baccalaureate Certificate Program. It will fulfill the following degree requirements:

- For the Psychology major or concentration in the College and in the School of General Studies, for the Psychology minor in Engineering, and for the Psychology Post-Baccalaureate Certificate Program, this class will meet the Group 3 distribution requirement.
- For the Psychology Post-Baccalaureate students and for Psychology majors who enter Columbia in Fall 2013 or later, it will fulfill the seminar requirement.
- For the Barnard Psychology major, this class will fulfill the senior seminar requirement.

***Readings:*** No textbook is required for this course. Most weeks the readings will comprise theoretical and empirical articles, literature reviews, and other readings from non-academic sources (e.g., popular media). All assigned readings are listed in the Schedule below and will be posted on CourseWorks.

### ***Course Objectives***

Upon completion of this course, you will be able to:

- Demonstrate broad knowledge about the development, consequences, and various levels of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination
- Apply concepts related to stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination to real-world events
- Gain further insight into the many ways in which stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination affect your life, as well as other people's lives
- Critically analyze theoretical writings and empirical research findings in the social sciences
- Communicate scientific findings related to prejudice and discrimination to broader (non-academic) audiences
- Challenge your own stereotypes, prejudice, and stigma towards yourself and other people in an effort to develop your own social justice agenda

### ***Course Requirements***

**Class Participation:** The assigned readings are designed to expand your current knowledge, spark your curiosity, and improve your critical thinking and analysis skills. The various topics addressed in this course are complex and multidimensional, and thus, “unpacking” them via in-depth discussion is warranted. To that end, you are expected to come prepared to class having read all assigned readings. This will enable you to contribute to class discussion and offer high-level, critical, and thought-provoking commentary.

Discussing topics and participating in class activities related to stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination is very likely to not only spark your intellectual curiosity, but also your personal reflection and emotional reaction and even at times some discomfort. This is expected given the sensitive nature of the topics. As such, apart from being an active and collaborative member of the class group, you are also expected to be respectful and kind towards your fellow classmates.

Please note that class attendance is insufficient for full credit. I acknowledge that we all have different learning practices and personalities, and as such, there is no right or wrong method of participation in class. Generally speaking, effective class preparation and participation could include:

- Asking insightful or clarifying questions
- Connecting the assigned readings to other readings we have reviewed in the course, or reading you have done on your own, while drawing parallels and/or contrasts among findings or concepts
- Actively listening to fellow classmates and responding to their ideas in a constructive and respectful manner
- Offering thoughtful critiques of the reviewed research and providing convincing arguments and suggestions for how it might be improved
- Bringing in other academic and non-academic sources that shed light and facilitate the gaining on new insights on the topics covered
- Applying the various concepts and research findings discussed to current events, domestically and globally, in a way that further illustrates these concepts and findings

Brief Critical Response Papers: Reading can be a passive endeavor. In order to facilitate a more active and thoughtful analysis and integration of the topics discussed in the assigned readings, for each class period, you will be asked to submit a 1-page response paper addressing at least **two** of the assigned readings. The response paper will include two sections. First, you will briefly and **critically** discuss a topic/concept/finding that sparked your curiosity and interest. In this section, you will offer a critique of (at least two of) the readings which is well-rounded and substantial. Simplistic critique, such as about the sample size or study design are insufficient. Second, you will pose at least **two** questions that stem from your critical discussion (i.e., part 1 of the response paper) and are of further interest to you. These questions should demonstrate your **critical analysis and understanding** of the readings and should not be vague, overly general, or simplistic in nature (e.g., “what are the limitations of the study?”, “what is stigma?”). All response papers are to be submitted no later than 10am on the day of class on CourseWorks. Please bring a copy of your questions with you to class as you are encouraged to contribute to the class discussion by posing them to the group. In addition to promoting active engagement, these response papers will help you keep current on course topics and readings, and help me monitor the class’ progress and students’ understanding of the material.

Here are some potential points of focus for your critical response paper:

- Substantive critiques of the reviewed material
- Making connections/links between different concepts, theories, ideas, and findings (within or between class sessions)
- Addressing relationships between the presented material in this course to other academic or non-academic (including fictional) material you were exposed to outside of this course

- Applying the various concepts, and ideally the research findings, to current events, policies, social groups, and social movements
- Well-articulated questions or arguments proposing novel theories or insights
- Most importantly, your response papers should reflect a thoughtful and critical analysis and your questions should be useful in generating in-depth discussion.

Finally, note that the following format should be used for your Brief Critical Response papers: Double-space, 12-point Times New Roman font, 1” margins (Normal in Word).

Session Leadership: You will be responsible for leading the class session for **two** class meetings. Leading a session includes presenting (in a format of your choice) the topics and research covered in the assigned readings, and facilitating a lively and respectful class discussion. In the first two sessions of the course, I will lead the short lecture and discussion to model the format of presentations that will be expected from you as a leader or co-leader.

Having fun while learning allows for better absorption and retention of the material. Additionally, exploring the concepts of prejudice and discrimination through research papers and academic writing is limited in its ability to convey the complex *feeling* of being a target of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination, or being the holder of such biased beliefs. Therefore, you are encouraged to be creative and innovative in your presenting the material and leading the class discussion. Experiential and reflective activities, use of audiovisual media (e.g., short YouTube videos, TED talks), knowledge-based games (e.g., Prejudice Jeopardy) are just a few of the many ways you can enrich and enhance the quality of your presentation. I encourage you to run any ideas you might have by me prior to your presentation. I will circulate a course schedule in the first class for you to sign up for leading your two sessions.

Real-Life Social Experiment Design, Plan, and Execution: They say that seeing is believing, and I will add that seeing is also feeling. In order to witness the effects of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination in action, it will be your responsibility to design, plan, and conduct a real-life social experiment (in contrast to a laboratory-based research study) where you will manipulate a certain interaction/situation and witness how people react to that manipulation. You can find many examples of such social experiments on YouTube and on the show “What Would You Do?” that may spark your own interest about a specific form of prejudice and discrimination. This is your chance to test your own hypothesis about the way that human interaction is biased due to stereotypes or prejudice.

New York City is one of the most diverse (and crowded) cities in the world, and as such, it provides many opportunities for interactions between members of different social groups. You can conduct your social experiment on the subway (or other public transportation), on the street, at Central Park, or at the Morningside campus, among other public and non-public spaces. In addition to your observations, if possible during or after your social experiment, get the personal accounts of the participants. This will enable you to debrief them about the manipulation, to ask how they felt, and what they thought, and gauge their general reaction to the experiment. These reactions will be of high interest during your final presentation.

You will present the initial design of your social experiment in the fifth session (June 5<sup>th</sup>) so your fellow classmates and I can provide constructive feedback. In the sixth session (June 7<sup>th</sup>), you will submit a 1-page plan report of your experiment. This report should include your hypothesis(es), theoretical and empirical literature supporting your hypothesis(es), and methods. Specific instructions will be given in class prior to the due date.

In the final session of the course (June 28<sup>th</sup>), you will give a 10-minute presentation summarizing the design, outcomes, conclusions, and relevance (to material reviewed throughout the course) of your social experiment. Ideally, the presentation will include a video clip of the experiment in action, though photos can be as illustrative when accompanied by your detailed explanation. There is no prescribed format for the final presentation, and your creativity is always encouraged and much appreciated. In the final session, you will also submit a final report describing the social experiment, the findings, broader implications, and a personal reflection (5 pages max). Specific instructions will be given in class prior to the due date.

Op-Ed Article Summary: Clear and succinct writing is one of the main tasks of any scholar. Writing not only allows us to form our ideas in an integrative manner, but also serves as a tool for sharing knowledge with others. It can be quite easy for scholars to limit their audience to their peers by using scientific jargon and inaccessible language. Given the social justice and equity framework of this course, one of our goals will be for you to become better able to share the knowledge you have gained through critical analysis of the readings with other people.

To practice the important skill of being able to communicate complex ideas to the general public, and to further demonstrate your understanding of the readings, you will write **two** Op-Ed style summaries of individual articles you have read. Each summary should include a clear, lay-person narrative of the research described in the assigned reading, as well as an explanation of how the research can be applied to real-life events, situations, or populations.

In preparing your Op-Ed style summary, you can get a sense of the quality and clarity of your essay by sharing it with someone who is not familiar with the topic(s), and asking for their honest and constructive feedback on ways to improve your summary. Fortunately, Columbia University cares greatly about communicating science to the broader public, and to that end, it provides many resources to assist you in this task. Here is a useful webpage with many internal and external links that will provide you with further guidance on best practices in writing an Op-Ed style summary: <http://www.earth.columbia.edu/articles/view/2636>.

I will circulate a course schedule with the assigned readings during the first class for you to sign up for two Op-Ed summaries (of two individual readings). All Op-Ed summaries will be shared with the entire class (on CourseWorks) in order to have a collaborative archive with summaries of all of the assigned readings. The following format should be used for your Op-Ed Article Summary papers: 1,000 words limit, double-space, 12-point Times New Roman font, 1" margins (Normal in Word), and include page numbers.

**Grading:** All assignments will be graded on a 0-100 scale. Final grades will be calculated based on the percentages outlined below.

Class Participation.....	5%
Brief Critical Response Papers.....	20% (Each of the 10 papers is worth 2%)
First Session Leadership.....	10%
Second Session Leadership.....	10%
Initial Design of Social Experiment Presentation.....	5%
Social Experiment Plan Report.....	5%
Final Presentation of Social Experiment.....	5%
Social Experiment Final Report.....	15%
First Op-Ed Article Summary.....	10%
Second Op-Ed Article Summary.....	15%

**Grading Scale:**

97-100= A+	87-89= B+	77-79= C+
94-96= A	84-86= B	74-76= C
90-94= A-	80-83= B-	70-73= C-
		60-69= D

**Class Policies:**

Academic Integrity: As members of this academic community, we are expected to maintain the highest level of personal and academic integrity. Consider this excerpt from the Columbia University Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity: “[E]ach one of us bears the responsibility to participate in scholarly discourse and research in a manner characterized by intellectual honesty and scholarly integrity.... The exchange of ideas relies upon a mutual trust that sources, opinions, facts, and insights will be properly noted and carefully credited. In practical terms, this means that, as students, you must be responsible for the full citations of others’ ideas in all of your research papers and projects... [and] you must always submit your own work and not that of another student, scholar, or internet agent.” More information about Columbia University Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity can be found here:

<https://www.college.columbia.edu/faculty/resourcesforinstructors/academicintegrity/statement>).

Plagiarism – whether intentional or inadvertent – is a serious violation of academic integrity, and will thus not be tolerated. You are required to submit exclusively original work that you wrote, composed, or ideated on your own. If you are uncertain or have any questions about what constitutes plagiarism, I encourage you to read the information provided on Columbia’s website about the various forms of plagiarism and ways to avoid it. Here is the link to a relevant webpage on plagiarism: <https://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/dishonesty-plagiarism>

I am obligated to report any incident of plagiarism to the appropriate channels at the university, which may result in significant penalties that may impact your academic career at Columbia. If you feel overwhelmed, confused, or that you are likely to resort to plagiarism, please talk to me. It is better to inform me beforehand so we can try and remediate the issue, whatever it might be, than to deal with such a serious offense after the fact.

Attendance: Given the seminar style of this course, class participation, and thus attendance, is mandatory. At times, unplanned absences may occur. Such absences will be excused and not affect your final grade as long as they are documented (e.g., a dean’s note). Regardless, you will be responsible for the work due in that class, including reading responses and other requirements. Please inform me of any absences as early as possible so I can plan in advance if any changes might be needed.

Late Assignments: In general, late assignments will not be accepted and graded. Under very certain circumstances, you will be allowed to submit your assignment within 24 hours of the due date. Such circumstances may include a sudden or unplanned event that significantly impacts your ability to submit your assignment on time.

Class Etiquette: If you typically use your laptop for note taking, accessing the assigned readings or response papers, you are welcome to use your laptop for these purposes. In general, as a show of respect to your fellow classmates and instructor, please refrain from using electronic devices

during class, including cell phones and laptops for unrelated reasons. If you find yourself being bored, tired, or overwhelmed, which is only normal, I encourage you to sit down quietly with your laptop closed in order to not disrupt the flow of the class.

Students with Disabilities/Exceptionalities: Students with any disability or exceptionality that may require any accommodations are requested to contact the Office of Disability Services (ODS) in Lerner Hall before the start of the course to register for these accommodations. The procedures for registering with ODS can be found at <http://health.columbia.edu/services/ods> or by calling (212) 854-2388. I also ask that you speak with me on the first class to inform me of any required accommodations, and I would be more than happy to be of service and assistance to address them.

#	Date & Topic(s)	Assigned Readings	Assignment
1	May 22  1. Introductions  2. Defining Terms and Concepts	Major, B., & O'Brien, L.T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> , 56, 393-421.  Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Stigma and prejudice: One animal or two? <i>Social Science &amp; Medicine</i> , 67, 358-367.	
2	May 24  The Development of Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Discrimination	Aboud, F. E. (2003). The formation of in-group favoritism and out-group prejudice in young children: Are they distinct attitudes?. <i>Developmental Psychology</i> , 39(1), 48-60.  Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2006). The development of implicit attitudes: Evidence of race evaluations from ages 6 and 10 and adulthood. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 17(1), 53-58.	Brief Critical Response Paper
3	May 29  Why Do We Adopt Stereotypes and Stigmatize?	Fein, S., & Spencer, S. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 73(1), 31-44.  Jost, J. T. & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. <i>European Review of Social Psychology</i> , 13, 111-153.  Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: The functions of social exclusion. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i> , 127, 187-208.  Macrae, C. N., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Social cognition: Thinking categorically about others. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> , 51(1), 93-120.  <b>Recommended:</b>	Brief Critical Response Paper

		<p>Crandall, C. S. (1994). Prejudice against fat people: ideology and self-interest. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 66(5), 882-894.</p> <p>Eidelman, S., &amp; Crandall, C. S. (2012). Bias in favor of the status quo. <i>Social and Personality Psychology Compass</i>, 6(3), 270-281.</p> <p>Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeder, M., Kirkland, S., &amp; Lyon, D. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 58(2), 308-318.</p> <p>Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. <i>Social and Personality Psychology Compass</i>, 2(1), 204-222.</p>	
4	<p>May 31</p> <p>Implicit and Explicit Prejudice</p>	<p>Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i>, 6(3), 242-261.</p> <p>Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., &amp; Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 82(1), 62-68.</p> <p>Greenwald, A. G., &amp; Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. <i>Psychological Review</i>, 102(1), 4-27.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b>                  Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., &amp; Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 33(5), 510-540.</p> <p>Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., &amp; Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the implicit association test. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 74(6), 1464-1480.</p>	<p>Brief Critical Response Paper</p> <p>IAT Activity in Class (please bring your laptop/tablet with you to class)</p>
5	<p>June 5</p> <p>1. Targets of Prejudice &amp; Discrimination</p>	<p>Bos, A. E., Pryor, J. B., Reeder, G. D., &amp; Stutterheim, S. E. (2013). Stigma: Advances in theory and research. <i>Basic and Applied Social Psychology</i>, 35(1), 1-9.</p> <p>Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Phelan, J. C., &amp; Link, B. G. (2013). Stigma as a fundamental cause of population health</p>	<p>Brief Critical Response Paper</p>

	<p>2. Levels of Stigma &amp; Discrimination</p> <p>3. Students' Presentation of the Initial Design of their Social Experiment</p>	<p>inequalities. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 103(5), 813-821.</p> <p>Kaiser, C. R., &amp; Pratt-Hyatt, J. S. (2009). Distributing prejudice unequally: Do Whites direct their prejudice toward strongly identified minorities?. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 96(2), 432-445.</p> <p>Lick, D. J., Johnson, K. L., &amp; Gill, S. V. (2014). Why do they have to flaunt it? Perceptions of communicative intent predict antigay prejudice based upon brief exposure to nonverbal cues. <i>Social Psychological and Personality Science</i>, 5(8), 927-935.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b>                  Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., &amp; Cogan, J. C. (2009). Internalized stigma among sexual minority adults: Insights from a social psychological perspective. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i>, 56(1), 32-43.</p> <p>Lick, D. J., Johnson, K. L., &amp; Gill, S. V. (2013). Deliberate changes to gendered body motion influence basic social perceptions. <i>Social Cognition</i>, 31(6), 656-671.</p> <p>Major, B., Kunstman, J. W., Malta, B. D., Sawyer, P. J., Townsend, S. S., &amp; Mendes, W. B. (2016). Suspicion of motives predicts minorities' responses to positive feedback in interracial interactions. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 62, 75-88.</p> <p>Parker, R. &amp; Aggleton, P. (2003). HIV and AIDS-related stigma and discrimination: a conceptual framework and implications for action. <i>Social Science &amp; Medicine</i>, 57(1), 13-24.</p>	
6	<p>June 7</p> <p>Consequences of Prejudice and Discrimination</p>	<p>Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Bellatorre, A., &amp; Muennig, P. (2014). Anti-gay prejudice and all-cause mortality among heterosexuals in the United States. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 104(2), 332-337.</p> <p>Hatzenbuehler, M. L., McLaughlin, K. A., Keyes, K. M., &amp; Hasin, D. S. (2010). The impact of institutional discrimination on psychiatric disorders in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: A prospective study. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 100(3), 452-459.</p> <p>Kim, S. H., Vincent, L. C., &amp; Goncalo, J. A. (2012). Outside</p>	<p>Brief Critical Response Paper</p> <p>Social Experiment Plan Report</p>

		<p>advantage: Can social rejection fuel creative thought? <i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: General</i>, 142(3), 605-611.</p> <p>Pascoe, E. A. &amp; Richman, L. S. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 135(4), 531-554.</p> <p>Sawyer, P. J., Major, B., Casad, B. J., Townsend, S. S., &amp; Mendes, W. B. (2012). Discrimination and the stress response: psychological and physiological consequences of anticipating prejudice in interethnic interactions. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 102(5), 1020-1026.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b></p> <p>Blankenship, K. M. (1998). A race, class, and gender analysis of thriving. <i>Journal of Social Issues</i>, 54(2), 393-404.</p> <p>Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Bellatorre, A., Lee, Y., Finch, B. K., Muennig, P., &amp; Fiscella, K. (2014). Structural stigma and all-cause mortality in sexual minority populations. <i>Social Science &amp; Medicine</i>, 103, 33-41.</p> <p>Murphy, P. J., &amp; Hevey, D. (2013). The relationship between internalised HIV-related stigma and posttraumatic growth. <i>AIDS and Behavior</i>, 17, 1809-1818.</p> <p>Napier, J. L., &amp; Jost, J. T. (2008). Why are conservatives happier than liberals?. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 19(6), 565-572.</p> <p>O'Leary, V. E. &amp; Ickovics, J. R. (1995). Resilience and thriving in response to challenge: An opportunity for a paradigm shift in women's health. <i>Women's Health: Research on Gender, Behavior, and Policy</i>, 1(2), 121-142.</p> <p>Raifman, J., Moscoe, E., Austin, S. B., &amp; McConnell, M. Difference-in-Differences Analysis of the Association Between State Same-Sex Marriage Policies and Adolescent Suicide Attempts. <i>JAMA Pediatrics</i>.</p> <p>Townsend, S. S., Major, B., Gangi, C. E., &amp; Mendes, W. B. (2011). From “in the air” to “under the skin”: Cortisol responses to social identity threat. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, 37(2), 151-164.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		Unger, R. K. (1998). Positive marginality: Antecedents and consequences. <i>Journal of Adult Development</i> , 5(3), 163-170.	
7	June 12  Race/Ethnicity Stigma & Discrimination (Racism)	<p>Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., &amp; Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 17(5), 383-386.</p> <p>Maddox, K. B. (2004). Perspectives on racial phenotypicality bias. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Review</i>, 8(4), 383-401.</p> <p>Shih, M. &amp; Sanchez, D. T. (2005). Perspectives and research on the positive and negative implications of having multiple racial identities. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 131(4), 569-591.</p> <p>Williams, D. R. (1999). Race, socioeconomic status, and health: The added effects of racism and discrimination. <i>Annals New York Academy of Sciences</i>, 173-188.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b> Livingston, R. W., &amp; Pearce, N. A. (2009). The teddy-bear effect does having a baby face benefit black chief executive officers?. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 20(10), 1229-1236.</p>	Brief Critical Response Paper
8	June 14  LGBTQ+ Stigma & Discrimination (Heterosexism & Cissexism)	<p>Hughto, J. M. W., Reisner, S. L., &amp; Pachankis, J. E. (2015). Transgender stigma and health: A critical review of stigma determinants, mechanisms, and interventions. <i>Social Science &amp; Medicine</i>, 147, 222-231.</p> <p>Lick, D. J., Durso, L. E., &amp; Johnson, K. L. (2013). Minority stress and physical health among sexual minorities. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i>, 8(5), 521-548.</p> <p>Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i>, 129(5), 674-697.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b> Bockting, W. O., Miner, M. H., Swinburne Romine, R. E., Hamilton, A., &amp; Coleman, E. (2013). Stigma, mental health, and resilience in an online sample of the US transgender population. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 103(5), 943-951.</p> <p>Harper, G. W., Brodsky, A., &amp; Bruce, D. (2012). What's good about being gay? Perspectives from youth. <i>Journal of</i></p>	Brief Critical Response Paper

		<p><i>LGBT Youth</i>, 9(1), 22-41.</p> <p>Herrick, A. L., Stall, R. Goldhammer, H., Egan, J. E., &amp; Mayer, K. H. (2013). Resilience as a research framework and as a cornerstone of research for gay and bisexual men: Theory and evidence. <i>AIDS and Behavior</i>, 18(1), 1-9.</p> <p>Institute of Medicine. (2011). The health of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. Washington: The National Academies Press.</p> <p>Katz-Wise, S. L., &amp; Hyde, J. S. (2012). Victimization experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals: A meta-analysis. <i>Journal of Sex Research</i>, 49(2-3), 142-167.</p> <p>Massey, S., Cameron, A., Ouellette, S., &amp; Fine, M. (1998). Qualitative approaches to the study of thriving: What can be learned? <i>Journal of Social Issues</i>, 54(2), 337-355.</p> <p>Mays, V.M., &amp; Cochran, S.D. (2001). Mental health correlates of perceived discrimination among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 91, 1869-1876.</p> <p>Riggle, E. D. &amp; Rostosky, S. S. (2011). <i>A Positive View of LGBTQ: Embracing Identity and Cultivating Well-being</i>. Lanham: Rowman &amp; Littlefield.</p> <p>Roberts, A. L., Austin, S. B., Corliss, H. L., Vandermorris, A. K., &amp; Koenen, K. C. (2010). Pervasive trauma exposure among US sexual orientation minority adults and risk of posttraumatic stress disorder. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 100(12), 2433-2441.</p> <p>Wight, R. G., LeBlanc, A. J., de Varies, B., &amp; Detels, R. (2012). Stress and mental health among midlife and older gay-identified men. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 102(3), 503-510.</p>	
9	<p>June 19</p> <p>Fat Stigma &amp; Discrimination (Sizeism)</p>	<p>Blodorn, A., Major, B., Hunger, J., &amp; Miller, C. (2016). Unpacking the psychological weight of weight stigma: A rejection-expectation pathway. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 63, 69-76.</p> <p>Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Keyes, K. M., &amp; Hasin, D. S. (2009). Associations between perceived weight discrimination and the prevalence of psychiatric disorders in the general</p>	<p>Brief                  Critical                  Response                  Paper</p>

		<p>population. <i>Obesity</i>, 17(11), 2033-2039.</p> <p>Major, B., Hunger, J. M., Bunyan, D. P., &amp; Miller, C. T. (2014). The ironic effects of weight stigma. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i>, 51, 74-80.</p> <p>Puhl, R. M., &amp; Heuer, C. A. (2009). The stigma of obesity: a review and update. <i>Obesity</i>, 17(5), 941-964.</p> <p>Sutin, A. R., Stephan, Y., &amp; Terracciano, A. (2015). Weight discrimination and risk of mortality. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 26(11), 1803-1811.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b></p> <p>Crocker, J., Cornwell, B., &amp; Major, B. (1993). The stigma of overweight: Affective consequences of attributional ambiguity. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 64(1), 60-70.</p> <p>Hunger, J. M., &amp; Major, B. (2015). Weight stigma mediates the association between BMI and self-reported health. <i>Health Psychology</i>, 34(2), 172-175.</p> <p>Incollingo Rodriguez, A. C., Heldreth, C. M., &amp; Tomiyama, A. J. (2016). Putting on weight stigma: A randomized study of the effects of wearing a fat suit on eating, well-being, and cortisol. <i>Obesity</i>, 24(9), 1892-1898.</p> <p>Puhl, R. M., &amp; Heuer, C. A. (2010). Obesity stigma: important considerations for public health. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 100(6), 1019-1028.</p> <p>Quinn, D. M., &amp; Crocker, J. (1999). When ideology hurts: effects of belief in the protestant ethic and feeling overweight on the psychological well-being of women. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 77(2), 402-414.</p> <p>Tsenkova, V. K., Carr, D., Schoeller, D. A., &amp; Ryff, C. D. (2011). Perceived weight discrimination amplifies the link between central adiposity and nondiabetic glycemic control (HbA1c). <i>Annals of Behavioral Medicine</i>, 41(2), 243-251.</p>	
10	<p>June 21</p> <p>Mental/Physical Disability Stigma</p>	<p>Corrigan, P. W., Markowitz, F. E., &amp; Watson, A. C. (2004). Structural levels of mental illness stigma and discrimination. <i>Schizophrenia Bulletin</i>, 30(3), 481-491.</p>	<p>Brief Critical Response Paper</p>

	<p>&amp; Discrimination (Ableism)</p>	<p>Livingston, J. D., &amp; Boyd, J. E. (2010). Correlates and consequences of internalized stigma for people living with mental illness: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Social Science &amp; Medicine</i>, 71(12), 2150-2161.</p> <p>Yang, L. H., Kleinman, A., Link, B. G., Phelan, J. C., Lee, S., &amp; Good, B. (2007). Culture and stigma: Adding moral experience to stigma theory. <i>Social Science &amp; Medicine</i>, 64, 1524-1535.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b>                  Herman, N. J. &amp; Miall, C. E. (1990). The positive consequences of stigma: Two case studies in mental and physical disability. <i>Qualitative Sociology</i>, 13(3), 251-269.</p> <p>Scambler, G. (2009). Health-related stigma. <i>Sociology of Health &amp; Illness</i>, 31(3), 441-455.</p> <p>Schanke, A. K., &amp; Thorsen, K. (2014). A life-course perspective on stigma-handling: resilience in persons of restricted growth narrated in life histories. <i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i>, 36(17), 1464-1473.</p>	
11	<p>June 26</p> <p>Intersectionality</p>	<p>Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 64(3), 170-180.</p> <p>McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. <i>Signs</i>, 30(3), 1771-1800.</p> <p>Parent, M. C., DeBlaere, C., Moradi, B. (2013). Approaches to research on intersectionality: Perspectives on gender, LGBT, and racial/ethnic identities. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 68(11-12), 639-645.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b>                  Bowleg, L. (2012). "Once You've Blended the Cake, You Can't Take the Parts Back to the Main Ingredients": Black Gay and Bisexual Men's Descriptions and Experiences of Intersectionality. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 68, 754-767.</p> <p>Calabrese, S. K., Earnshaw, V. A., Magnus, M., Hansen, N. B., Krakower, D. S., Underhill, K., ... &amp; Dovidio, J. F. (2017). Sexual Stereotypes Ascribed to Black Men Who Have Sex with Men: An Intersectional Analysis. <i>Archives of Sexual Behavior</i>, 1-14.</p> <p>Fikkan, J. L., &amp; Rothblum, E. D. (2012). Is fat a feminist</p>	<p>Brief                  Critical                  Response                  Paper</p>

		<p>issue? Exploring the gendered nature of weight bias. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 66(9-10), 575-592.</p> <p>Lick, D. J., &amp; Johnson, K. L. (2015). Intersecting race and gender cues are associated with perceptions of gay men's preferred sexual roles. <i>Archives of Sexual Behavior</i>, 44(5), 1471-1481.</p> <p>Narváez, R. F., Meyer, I. H., Kertzner, R. M., Ouellette, S. C., &amp; Gordon, A. R. (2009). A qualitative approach to the intersection of sexual, ethnic, and gender identities. <i>Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research</i>, 9(1), 63-86.</p> <p>Purdie-Vaughns, V. &amp; Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 59(5-6), 377-391.</p> <p>Reisen, C. A., Brooks, K. D., Zea, M. C., Poppen, P. J., &amp; Bianchi, F. T. (2013). Can additive measures add to an intersectional understanding? Experiences of gay and ethnic discrimination among HIV-positive Latino gay men. <i>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology</i>, 19(2), 208-217.</p> <p>Warner, L. R. (2008). A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 59(5-6), 454-463.</p>	
12	<p>June 28</p> <p>Students' Real-Life Social Experiment Presentations</p>	<p>No readings are assigned for the last session</p>	<p>Social Experiment Final Report</p>

**Optional Relevant Readings:**

- Bonet, L., Wells, B. E., & Parsons, J. T. (2007). A positive look at a difficult time: A strength based examination of coming out for lesbian and bisexual women. *Journal of LGBT Health Research*, 3(1), 7-14.
- Crocker, J. & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96, 608-630.
- Dovidio, J. F., Major, B., & Crocker, J. (2000). Stigma: Introduction and overview. In Heatherton, Kleck, Hebl, & Hull (Eds.) *The Social Psychology of Stigma*. (pp. 1-9). New York: Guilford.

- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes of The Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L. (2009). How does sexual minority stigma "Get Under the Skin"? A psychological mediation framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*(5), 707-730.
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., McLaughlin, K. A., Keyes, K. M., & Hasin, D. S. (2010). The impact of institutional discrimination on psychiatric disorders in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: a prospective study. *American Journal of Public Health*, *100*, 452-459.
- Herek, G. M., Chopp, R., & Strohl, D. (2007). Sexual stigma: Putting sexual minority health issues in context. In I. H. Meyer & M. E. Northridge (Eds.), *The Health of Sexual Minorities* (pp. 171-208). New York: Springer.
- Johnson, K. L., Lick, D. J., & Carpinella, C. M. (2015). Emergent research in social vision: An integrated approach to the determinants and consequences of social categorization. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *9*(1), 15-30.
- Jones, E.E., Farina, A., Hastorf, A.H., Markus, H., Miller, D.T., & Scott, R.A. (1984). The dimensions of stigma. In *Social stigma: The psychology of marked relationships*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Jussim, L., Palumbo, P., Chatman, C., Madon, S., & Smith, A. (2000). Stigma and self-fulfilling prophecies. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, and J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Stigma*. New York: Guilford.
- Latner, J. D., Simmonds, M., Rosewall, J. K., & Stunkard, A. J. (2007). Assessment of obesity stigmatization in children and adolescents: modernizing a standard measure. *Obesity*, *15*(12), 3078-3085.
- Lick, D. J., & Johnson, K. L. (2013). Fluency of visual processing explains prejudiced evaluations following categorization of concealable identities. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*(3), 419-425.
- Lick, D. J., & Johnson, K. L. (2014). "You Can't Tell Just by Looking!" Beliefs in the Diagnosticity of Visual Cues Explain Response Biases in Social Categorization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*(11), 1494-1506.
- Lick, D. J., & Johnson, K. L. (2014). Perceptual Underpinnings of Antigay Prejudice Negative Evaluations of Sexual Minority Women Arise on the Basis of Gendered Facial Features. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*(9), 1178-1192.
- Lick, D. J., & Johnson, K. L. (2015). The interpersonal consequences of processing ease: Fluency as a metacognitive foundation for prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *24*(2), 143-148.
- Lick, D. J., & Johnson, K. L. (2016). Straight until proven gay: A systematic bias toward straight categorizations in sexual orientation judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *110*(6), 801-817.
- Lick, D. J., Johnson, K. L., & Rule, N. O. (2015). Disfluent processing of nonverbal cues helps to explain anti-bisexual prejudice. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *39*(3), 275-288.
- Link, B. G. & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*, 363-385.
- Link, B. G. & Phelan, J. C. (2010). Labeling and stigma In T. L. Scheid & T. N. Brown (Eds.), *A Handbook for the Study of Mental Health: Social Contexts, Theories, and Systems*. New York: Cambridge.
- Linley, A. & Joseph, S. (2004). Positive change following trauma and adversity: A review. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *17*(1), 11-21.

- Major B., & O'Brien, L.T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 393-421.
- McGarrity, L. A., & Huebner, D. M. (2014). Is being out about sexual orientation uniformly healthy? The moderating role of socioeconomic status in a prospective study of gay and bisexual men. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 47(1), 28-38.
- Mendes, W. B., Major, B., McCoy, S., & Blascovich, J. (2008). How attributional ambiguity shapes physiological and emotional responses to social rejection and acceptance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 278-291.
- Miller, C. T. & Major, B. Coping with stigma and prejudice. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, and J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Stigma*. New York: Guilford.
- Nesdale, D., Griffith, J., Durkin, K., & Maass, A. (2005). Empathy, group norms and children's ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26(6), 623-637.
- Pachankis, J.E. (2007). The psychological implications of concealing a stigma: A cognitive-affective-behavioral model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133, 328-345.
- 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.
- Shih, M. (2004). Positive stigma: Examining resilience and empowerment in overcoming stigma. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 591(1), 175-185.