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**Course description:**

This course will provide a comprehensive introduction to general theories and methods related to culture and diversity. The principal goals of the course include developing critical thinking skills related to identity-based research. The first half of this course emphasizes psychological theories that link culture to mental processes (i.e., affect, cognition, attitudes). The second half of the course centers on key topics relevant to culture and diversity (what is diversity? How does diversity affect performance?). Papers will be augmented by an intensive writing project where students produce a grant proposal related to the topics discussed in this seminar.

The students who “get the most” out of this course are well-versed in reading and critiquing empirical articles in psychology.

**More about this course:**

Dear Students,

I have been teaching this course for almost 15 years. The course started when I was a young professor at Yale and a recent graduate of Stanford University where I learned about culture from Hazel Markus. My earlier courses were designed after Hazel’s and I dutifully moved from topic to topic to cover foundational theories in cultural (e.g., Margaret Mead, Clifford Geertz) to fundamental studies on culture, self, cognition, motivation, emotion and so on.

Today, this seems like ages ago. Research in cultural psychology has exploded. Moreover, the newer field of diversity science is well established. Diversity science explores how people who are very different from each other can function together in a pluralistic society. This is a topic that graces the front pages of many newspapers daily. It is featured in many recent Supreme Court cases. In short, it too is important. So today, my course has sacrificed some of the research on culture to include this important new field of diversity science. Hence, the title, “The Psychology of Culture and Diversity.”

The title of the course used to be “Methodological Issues in the Study of Culture and Diversity.” No need to discuss why that title was changed! Too long…too boring…not helpful on transcripts to get into medical school, BUT… the spirit of the title has not left us. My goal is for each student to become a critical consumer of research on culture. Just because you value diversity or you belong to a marginalized groups or care about certain issues in society, it does not give you an excuse to read uncritically. Great topics can result in bad science. So, we have an entire class devoted to learning how to critique scientific articles and cultural psychological principles. The core of each class involves critiquing the readings, not just reading the readings. I encourage you to read, critique, and advance the science as we move through the course.

The class has a moderately heavy reading load, writing assignments, and a final exam. This is the second time since I have taught this course that I am including a final exam. *Why?* I have found that over the last ten years, my brilliant students have, in a quest to take more courses in shorter amounts of time, packed in 5-6 courses per semester. What does this mean for effort in my class? Try as students might, they move from reading to skimming about early October and never look back. This used to sadden and frustrate me, but now, I believe it is a detriment to our education. THE IDEAS IN THIS CLASS ARE IMPORTANT FOR EVERYDAY LIVING. Smart people need to know how to slice and dice research on culture and diversity. I invest in this class every week and am hoping that you will too. So, this year, I am adding a final exam. I decided to drastically shorten the grant writing project from 12 pages single-spaced to 6 pages and, of course, I updated the readings so that we will review the classics and work hot off the presses (journal articles are not printed on presses anymore, but you get the point). Deep down inside, you know the mild pressure of the exam will motivate you to read and absorb the information deeply. You don’t want one, but you know it will spur you on to learn.

I do hope that you take this course. I do hope that you learn how to both *appreciate* and *ferociously critique* research on culture and diversity.

Warmly,

VPG

**Overview of Course Requirements and Grading:**

Class participation 20%

Article analysis (5) 20%

Grant Proposal 30%

Final exam 30%

**Assignments and Grading**

**Participation: 20%**

Attendance (10%): You must attend all class sessions. The class sessions provide you with the opportunity to gain a greater understanding of the concepts, theories and studies that are the grounding of this course. Furthermore, it is often *critical for your classmates* that you be there so in your absence, not only will your own learning be diminished, but so will everyone else’s.

Class participation (10%): All students are expected to engage in discussions. This is a class in which students generally participate with ease. Care should be taken to actively build upon classmates’ comments by extending them or respectfully disagreeing and providing supporting evidence of a different perspective. The most valued comments or questions are those that move the class beyond the current discussion toward a deeper level of reflection or understanding. Only consistent performance at this level will earn a perfect score as a participation grade.

**Article analysis (5 analyses): 20%**

**For five (5) of the classes you will write an article(s) analsysis** that critiques the article you have read. The length should be 1.5 pages single spaced. Each analysis will be scored on a scale from 1-5 for a total of 20 pts. The article anslysis is due the SUNDAY NIGHT BEFORE THE CLASS BY 11:59PM. THIS ALLOWS ME (THE PROFESSOR) TO READ AND INCORPORATE YOUR THINKING INTO THE CLASS DISCUSSION.

Be sure to begin by briefly summarizing the article. Next, analyze those aspects of the article that were clear or confusing to you. Conclude by speculating about broader implications and future directions of the research described in the article. This is the most basic suggested plan for your essay:

**First 1-2 paragraphs**: Summarize the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions as the authors have presented them. This section should reflect your understanding of the research presented in the article.

**Next paragraph—the strengths of the article**. Identify and characterize the useful features of the article. That is, what aspects of the article seemed particularly strong? Did you find a certain section of the article (for example, introduction, methods) to be particularly helpful?

**Next paragraph—the weaknesses of the article.** Identify and characterize the confusing aspects of the article. That is, did you find any weaknesses in the study? Was any particular section confusing to you? Why?

**Last paragraph**: Conclude your essay. Speculate about the broader implication of this research (for example, the results might represent breakthroughs, or the results could have far-reaching implications) and try to identify the future directions of this research (go ahead and be creative).

**\*A much better approach would be to integrate at least two articles into your analysis**. More on this when class starts.

**Grant Project: 30%**

The goal of this project is to produce a grant proposal related to the topics we discuss in this seminar. Through the process of writing a proposal, you will gain an understanding and appreciation of all steps of scientific discovery, including the identification of fruitful areas of research, a review of what is known (and, more importantly, what is *not* known) on the topic, and the planning of one well-designed study to explore your issue of interest.

A second goal of the grant project is to familiarize each student with the process of how grants are evaluated and funded. The structure and review process will simulate the National Science Foundation.

* You must submit a full Grant Proposal (10 pages single-spaced, not including references), including:
	+ Significance, Major Aims, & Background: The first section of the grant will explain why your research topic is important (i.e., why anyone should fund your research), what past research has demonstrated with respect to your topic, and why further research (and *your* research in particular) is needed.
	+ Methods: A second section detailing ONE STUDY to address your topic of interest. For your study, you should clearly explain the methods IN DETAIL—experiment, anticipated results, data analysis, and anticipated pitfalls and their solutions.
	+ Timetable, Dissemination plans, etc.
	+ References (not included in page limit)

We will read and discuss each grant (stripped of identifying information) and assign a grade worth 15% of the total grade on the assignment. The top grant will be “funded” (which does not translate into a monetary amount, but you will receive a formal letter awarding you your grant!).

The first step for this grant proposal is to submit a “Letter of Intent." This is a single-page proposal idea explaining the topic, central research questions, general idea for proposed studies, and significance. I will read this and then offer feedback. This will also be sent to two other students in the class and they will offer feedback.

Handouts will be provided to describe the rest of the grant process.

**Final exam: 30%**

The final exam will be a **take-home exam**. It will consist of 8 essay questions and you will have the option to answer 6. Exam questions are meant to be integrative and focus on critical concepts, themes and experiments in cultural psychology and diversity science.

In case you were thinking of questions you might not want to ask:

* Yes, you are responsible for names of researchers, dates, titles of papers, methods, and results in papers.
* Yes, you will be responsible for knowing papers whether we covered them in class or not.
* No, we will not have a review session. This is a graduate course. However, I do encourage you to create study groups.
* Yes, the best way to study is to read the papers carefully before class, participate fully and take notes during class, and then after class, make sure you’ve understood the concepts and discussion.
* No, you will not have to recall exact statistical tests.
* Yes, you should understand the general findings from each study in a paper.

**Course Readings:**

Available on Courseworks/Canvas.

*\*Readings on the assigned day of class should be completed by the start of the class.*

**Statement of Academic Integrity:**

The intellectual venture in which we are all engaged requires of faculty and students alike the highest level of personal and academic integrity. As members of an academic community, each one of us bears the responsibility to participate in scholarly discourse and research in a manner characterized by intellectual honesty and scholarly integrity... 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; you must be scrupulously honest when taking your examinations; you must always submit your own work and not that of another student, scholar, or internet agent.

From the Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity - <https://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/integrity-statement>

Cheating on assignments or exams and plagiarism are very serious violations within the academic community. Students are expected to do their own work on all tests and assignments for this class. You are expected to always act in accordance with the Columbia honor code. Any student found cheating or plagiarizing in this class will be reported to the university for academic discipline. If you have questions about academic integrity at Columbia, please refer to the following link: <https://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/integrity>

**Semester Schedule in Brief**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Class# | Date | Topic |
| 1 |  | **Course Overview**  |
| 2 |  | **What is cultural psychology?** |
| 3 |  | **How to think like a scientist** |
| 4 |  | **Theoretical perspectives: Socio-ecological psychology and social norms** |
| 5 |  | **Theoretical perspectives II: Mutual constitution of culture and psyche** |
| 6 |  | **Culture and self** |
| 7 |  | **Culture and cognition** |
| 8 |  | **Culture and motivation** |
| 9 |  | **Culture betwixt and between: Living in two cultures** |
| 10 |  | **What is diversity science and who is it for?** |
| 11 |  | **Diversity ideologies and what works: colorblindness vs. multiculturalism** |
| 12 |  | **People say that diversity improves performance. Does it?** |
| 13 |  | Grant workshop day |

**ASSIGNMENTS AND DEADLINES**

**Please upload a copy of Article analysis to Canvas in the Sunday night by 11:59PM im advance of the session. Five of these are due for any of the course weeks except week 13.**

**Please UPLOAD all assignments and exams into Canvas.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Due Date** | **Item** |
| TBD | Letter of intent due |
| TBD | Provide feedback to students on “letter of intent” |
| TBD | Full grant proposal due |
| TBD | Grant review day. You will be responsible for reading 3-4 other student grants between 12/4 and 12/8 and critiquing them. |
| TBD | Take-home final distributed |
| TBD | Take home final due |

**MODULE 1: CULTURE, MIND AND THE SOCIAL BRAIN**

**CLASS 1 Course Overview**

*Optional Readings: None*

**CLASS 2 What is cultural psychology?**

*Assigned Readings:*

Cohen, D. & Kitayama, S. (2018) Introduction. Young and still developing: Five Themes, *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, (pp. 1-8). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Shweder, R. A., & Sullivan, M. A. (1993). Cultural psychology: Who needs it? *Annual Review of Psychology, 44,* 497-523.

Shweder, R.A. (2007). "The Revival of Cultural Psychology: Some Premonitions and Reflections.” In Shinobu Kitayama and Dov Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, pp. 821-836. Guilford Press.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Segall, M. H., Lonner, W. J., & Berry, J. W. (1998). Cross-cultural psychology as a scholarly discipline: On the flowering of culture in behavioral research. *American Psychologist*, *53*(10), 1101-1110.
* Zou, X., Tam, K., Morris, M. W., Lee, S., Lau, I. Y., & Chiu, C. (2009). Culture as common sense: Perceived consensus versus personal beliefs as mechanisms of cultural influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 579-597.
* Arnett, J. J. (2008). "The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American" (PDF). *American Psychologist, 63*(7): 602–614.
* Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. *American Sociological Review, 51*(2), 273–286.
* Kashima, Y. (2016). Culture and Psychology in the 21st Century: Conceptions of Culture and Person for Psychology Revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 47*(1), 4-20.

**CLASS 3 How to think like a scientist**

*Assigned Readings:*

Pettigrew, T.F. (1996). *How to Think Like a Social Scientist*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley. [ch.3: “In comparison to what”, pp.37-69 and ch. 4."Searching for causes and changes" pp. 73-93]

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*, 61-83 (target article), 111-135. (Students only read target article)

Funder, D. C., Levine, J. M., Mackie, D. M., Morf, C. C., Sansone, C., Vazire, S., & West, S. G. (2014). Improving the dependability of research in personality and social psychology: Recommendations for research and educational practice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*, 3-12.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Kashy, D.A., Donnellan, B., Ackerman, R. A., & Russell, D. W. (2009). Reporting and Interpreting Research in PSPB: Practices, Principles, and Pragmatics. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 1131-1142.
* Campbell, J. P., Daft, R. L., & Hulin, C. L. (1982). *What to study: Generating and developing research questions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. (chapters 4 & 5)
* Bem, D. J., Utts, J., & Johnson, W. O. (2011). Must psychologists change the way they analyze their data? A response to Wagenmakers, Wetzels, Borsboom, & van der Maas (2011). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(3), 426 – 432.
* Earp, B. D., & Trafimow, D. (2015). Replication, falsification, and the crisis of confidence in social psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 621.

**CLASS 4 Theoretical perspectives: Socio-ecological psychology and social norms**

*Assigned Readings:*

Oishi, S. (2014). Socio-ecological psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 581-609.

Talhelm, T., Zhang, X., Oishi, S., Shimin, C., Duan, D., Lan, X., & Kitayama, S. (2014). Large-scale psychological differences within China explained by rice versus wheat agriculture. *Science, 344*(6184), 603-608.

Gelfand, M. J., Harrington, J. R., & Jackson, J. C. (2017). The strength of social norms across human groups. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(5), 800-809.

Harrington, J., Gelfand, M. (2014). Tightness–looseness across the 50 united states. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(22), 7990-7995.

Eom K, Kim HS. Intersubjective Norms: Cultural and Interpersonal Perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2015;46(10):1313-1316. doi:[10.1177/0022022115600262](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115600262)

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places: Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
* Guillaume, E., Baranski, E., Todd, E., Bastian, B., Bronin, I., Ivanova, C., Cheng, J.T., de Kock, F.S., Denissen, J.J.A., Gallardo-Pujol, D., Halama, Pl, Han, G.Q., Bae, J., Moon, J., Hong, R.Y., Hřebíčková, M., Graf, S., Izdebski, P., Lundmann, L., Penke, L., Perugini, M., Costantini, G., Rauthmann, J., Ziegler, M., Realo, A., Elme, L., Sato, T., Kawamoto, S., Szarota, P., Tracy, J.L., van Aken, M.A.G., Yang, Y., & Funder, D.C. (2016). The world at 7: Comparing the experience of situations across 20 countries. *Journal of Personality, 84*(4), 493-509.
* Spector, P. E., Liu, C., & Sanchez, J. I. (2015). Methodological and substantive issues in conducting multinational and cross-cultural research. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav., 2*(1), 101-131.

**CLASS 5 Theoretical perspectives II: Mutual constitution of culture and psyche**

*Assigned Readings (will add one more):*

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(4), 420-430.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(6), 1245-1267.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings (Focus on social situations):*

* Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*(7), 513-531.
* Cohen, G.L., Garcia, J., & Goyer, J.P. (2017). Turning Point: Targeted, Tailored, and Timely Psychological Intervention, *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* *2nd Edition* (pp. 657-686). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
* Yeager, D. S., Purdie‐Vaughns, V., Hooper, S. Y., & Cohen, G. L. (2017). Loss of Institutional Trust Among Racial and Ethnic Minority Adolescents: A Consequence of Procedural Injustice and a Cause of Life‐Span Outcomes. *Child Development, 88*(2), 658-676.

**CLASS 6 Culture and self**

*Assigned Readings:*

Markus, H R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review, 98*(2), 224.

Cohen, D., & Gunz, A. (2002). As seen by the other : Perspectives on the self in the memories and emotional perceptions of Easterners and Westerners. *Psychological Science, 13*, 55–59.

Kim, H. S., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 785-800.

Kitayama, S., & Park, J. (2010). Cultural neuroscience of the self: understanding the social grounding of the brain. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience, 5*(2-3), 111-29.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Goffman, E. (1961). Characteristics of Total Institutions. In E. Goffman (Ed.), *Asylums: Essays on the Condition of the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* (pp. 68-106). Garden City, NY: Anchor
* Cohen, D., Hoshino-Browne, E., & Leung, A. (2007). Culture and the structure of personal experience: Insider and outsider phenomenologies of the self and social world. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume 39. San Diego: Academic Press.

**CLASS 7 Culture and cognition**

*Assigned Readings:*

Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic vs. analytic cognition. *Psychological Review, 108*, 291-310.

Miyamoto, Y., Nisbett, R. E., & Masuda, T. (2006). Culture and the physical environment holistic versus analytic perceptual affordances. *Psychological Science, 17*(2), 113-119.

Kitayama, S., & Uskul, A.K. (2011). Culture, mind, and the brain: current evidence and future directions. *Annual review of psychology, 62*, 419-49.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Miyamoto, Y. & Wilken, B. (2010). Culturally contingent situated cognition: Influencing others fosters analytic perception in the U.S. but not in Japan. *Psychological Science, 21*, 1616-1622.
* Masuda, T., & Nisbett, R. E. (2001). Attending holistically vs. analytically: Comparing the context sensitivity of Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 922–934.

**CLASS 8 Culture and motivation**

*Assigned Readings:*

Markus, H. R. (2016). What moves people to action?: Culture and motivation. *Current Opinion on Psychology, 8*, 161-166.

Fu, A. S., & Markus, H. R. (2014). My mother and me: Why tiger mothers motivate Asian Americans but not European Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*(6), 739-749.

Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., Johnson, C. S., & Covarrubias, R. (2012). Unseen disadvantage: How the American universities’ focus on independence undermines the academic performance of first-generation college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 1178-1197.

Brannon, T. N., Markus, H. R., & Taylor, V. J. (2015). ‘Two Souls, Two Thoughts’, Two Self-Schemas: Double Consciousness Can Have Positive Academic Consequences for African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108*(4), 586-609.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Shechter, O., Durik, A. M., Miyamoto, Y., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). The role of utility value in achievement behavior: The importance of culture. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 303-317.

**CLASS 9 Culture betwixt and between: Living in two cultures**

*Assigned Readings (Two more TBD):*

Morris, M.W., Chiu, C., & Liu, Zi. (2015). Polycultural psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 66*(1), 631-659.

Bernardo, A. B., Salanga, M. G. C., Tjipto, S., Hutapea, B., Yeung, S. S., & Khan, A. (2016). Contrasting lay theories of polyculturalism and multiculturalism: Associations with essentialist beliefs of race in six Asian cultural groups. *Cross-Cultural Research, 50*(3), 231-250.

**MODULE 2: PSYCHOLOGY OF DIVERSITY**

**CLASS 10 What is diversity science? Why now?**

*Assigned readings (two more to be determined):*

Plaut, V. C. (2010). Diversity science: Why and how difference makes a difference. *Psychological Inquiry, 21*(2), 77-99.

Bell, J. M., & Hartmann, D. (2007). Diversity in everyday discourse: The cultural ambiguities and consequences of “happy talk”. *American Sociological Review, 72*(6), 895-914.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Markus, H. R. (2008). Pride, prejudice, and ambivalence: Toward a unified theory of race and ethnicity. *American Psychologist, 63*(8), 651.
* Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the meanings of diversity and inclusion in organizations. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(2), 212-236.
* Redding, R. E. (2005). Sociopolitical Diversity in Psychology: The Case for Pluralism. In R. H. Wright & N. A. Cummings (Eds.), *Destructive trends in mental health: The well-intentioned path to harm* (pp. 303-324). New York, NY, US: Routledge.
* Abu‐Lughod, L. (2002). Do Muslim women really need saving? Anthropological reflections on cultural relativism and its others. *American anthropologist, 104*(3), 783-790.
* Edelman, L. B., Fuller, S. R., & Mara-Drita, I. (2001). Diversity rhetoric and the managerialization of law. *American Journal of Sociology, 106*(6), 1589-1641.
* Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management: Employer response to antidiscrimination law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*(7), 960-984.
* Tolbert, P. S., & Castilla, E. J. (2017). Introduction to a special issue on inequality in the workplace (“What works?). *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 70*(1), 3-15.
* Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American sociological review, 71*(4), 589-617.
* Dobbin, F., Schrage, D., & Kalev, A. (2015). Rage against the iron cage: The varied effects of bureaucratic personnel reforms on diversity. *American Sociological Review, 80*(5), 1014-1044.
* Roberson, Q., Holmes IV, O., & Perry, J. L. (2017). Transforming research on diversity and firm performance: A dynamic capabilities perspective. *Academy of Management Annals, 11*(1), 189-216.
* Nishii, L.H., Khattab, J., Shemla, M., Paluch, R. (2017). A multi-level process model for understanding diversity practice effectiveness. [*Academy of Management Annals (Links to an external site.)Links to an external site.*](https://journals.aom.org/journal/annals) *12*(1), 37-82.

**CLASS 11 Diversity ideologies and what works: colorblindness vs. multiculturalism**

*Assigned readings:*

Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(1), 12-21.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: how diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 94*(4), 615.

Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Hogan, C. M., & Chow, R. M. (2009). On the malleability of ideology: Motivated construals of color blindness. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 96*(4), 857.

Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). “What about me?” Perceptions of exclusion and Whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 101*(2), 337-353.

*Additional* ***optional*** *readings:*

* Vorauer, J. D., Gagnon, A., & Sasaki, S. J. (2009). Salient intergroup ideology and intergroup interaction. *Psychological Science, 20*(7), 838-845.
* Apfelbaum, E. P., Stephens, N. M., & Reagans, R. E. (2016). Beyond one-size-fits-all: Tailoring diversity approaches to the representation of social groups. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 111*(4), 547-566.
* Wilton, L. S., Apfelbaum, E. P., & Good, J. J. (2018). Valuing Differences and Reinforcing Them: Multiculturalism Increases Race Essentialism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1-9.
* Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science, 20*(4), 444-446.

**CLASS 12 People say that diversity improves performance. Does it?**

*Assigned readings (4 will be chosen from below):*

Sommers, S. R., Warp, L. S., & Mahoney, C. C. (2008). Cognitive effects of racial diversity: White individuals’ information processing in heterogeneous groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*(4), 1129-1136.

Phillips, K.W., Liljenquist, K.A., & Neale, M.A. (2009). Newcomer influence in decision making groups: The effects of opinion and identity agreement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 336-350.

Ely, R. J., Padavic, I., Thomas, D.A. (2012). Racial Diversity, Racial Asymmetries, and Team Learning Environment: Effects on Performance. *Organization Studies, 33*(3), 341-362.

Akinola, M., Page-Gould, E., Mehta, P. H., & Liu, Z. (2018). Hormone-diversity fit: Collective testosterone moderates the effect of diversity on group performance. *Psychological science*, 859-867.

Jang, S. (2017). Cultural brokerage and creative performance in multicultural teams. *Organization Science, 28*(6), 993-1009.

Nielsen, M. W., Alegria, S., Börjeson, L., Etzkowitz, H., Falk-Krzesinski, H. J., Joshi, A., ... & Schiebinger, L. (2017). Opinion: Gender diversity leads to better science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114*(8), 1740-1742.

Tadmor, C. T., Hong, Y. Y., Chao, M. M., Wiruchnipawan, F., & Wang, W. (2012). Multicultural experiences reduce intergroup bias through epistemic unfreezing. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 103*(5), 750-772.

Chang, E. H., Milkman, K. L., Chugh, D., & Akinola, M. (2018). Diversity Thresholds: How Social Norms, Visibility, and Scrutiny Relate to Group Composition. *Academy of Management Journal*, (ja).

Apfelbaum, E. P., Phillips, K. W., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). Rethinking the baseline in diversity research: Should we be explaining the effects of homogeneity?. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9*(3), 235-244.

 **CLASS 13 Grant Proposal Presentation Day**

* Review panel for grant applications
* Student led grant proposal reviews