

Psychology Honors Program
Psych 2991, 3991, 4991, 4996
Kathy Hirsh-Pasek, Ph.D.
Fall 2012

For the first time in U.S. history, whites of European ancestry account for less than half of newborn children, marking a demographic tipping point that is already changing the nation's politics, economy and workforce. Among the roughly four million children born in the U.S. between July 2010 and July 2011, 50.4% belonged to a racial or ethnic group that in previous generations would have classified them as minorities, up from 48.6% in the same period two years earlier.... That was the first 12-month stretch in which non-Hispanic white children accounted for less than half the country's births.

Wall Street Journal. May 17, 2012

Welcome to the psychology honors program. This semester we take on a somewhat controversial topic: prejudice and stereotyping. As you took your finals last semester and headed for your summer job, the nation was changing in character. For the first time, the number of children born to non-whites exceeded the number born to white non-Hispanic groups. This shift happened under the watch of our first black president who will be fighting for re-election as we march through our school term.

Despite the changing make-up of the populace this spring and summer, we were constantly reminded about racial, sexual and gender prejudice. Who among us did not hear about the case of Trayvon Martin? Was George Zimmerman justified in shooting Trayvon on February 26th of last term? Was this a high profile case of racism or was Zimmerman merely acting in self-defense? And what of Tyler Clementi, the Rutgers gay student who killed himself after his roommate Dharun Ravi recorded his behavior on a webcam? Was this a case of prejudice or just insensitivity? At what point do facts become woven into stories and how can we judge which of these stories best captures the evidence?

This class raises a host of questions about the way we view our field and the way we view our neighbors. What is prejudice? Why do we form stereotypes and how can we curb them? A famous song from the Tony award winning musical Avenue Q states, "everyone's a little bit racist." Is that true? Are we all culpable? And even if we are not overtly racist, do we have implicit prejudices that guide our behavior and our interpretation of others' behavior?

These questions become even more poignant when we ask how our study of these issues might pervade the public dialogue in this election season. We will undoubtedly hear much about the Hispanic or Black vote and the role of ethnic minorities in shaping our nation's future. We might participate in debate about reasons for the persistent achievement gap that leaves low-income minority children with fewer opportunities than their middle class peers. We will surely hear public sermons on the role of gay marriage and women's rights.

It is clear that we live in a new America – one more diverse than ever before. Yet, we also live in a world that is plagued by racial and gender bias and discrimination. In this class, we will try to understand the psychology behind the stereotyping and to ask how we might use what the science teaches us to create environments that are more open to variation and opportunity for all.

You will find that the honor's class takes a hot button item like prejudice and then uses that topic as a base camp to explore the field of psychology. How did our field come into being? How did the field mature into the subdisciplines that we have today? What counts as evidence in this field? How do we build a base of understanding about the human condition? And how might we use what we learn to improve the human condition?

In the first semester, we will explore these questions by learning a little about the philosophy of science and how basic assumptions about research have shaped our field. The class is organized as two classes in one. The Tuesday meetings offer a basic course in research methodology, demonstrating how laboratory designs have been used to make progress across all of the subdisciplines within psychology. The Thursday classes use this knowledge as a platform for exploring the nature of science itself. What is science? What makes an inquiry scientific rather than just commonsense or hearsay? How might we temper racial, sexual and gender attitudes using evidence as our guide?

All 2991 and 3991 students must attend both the Tuesday and Thursday lecture/discussion 4991 and 4996 students need only attend the Thursday classes. These students also become elder statespersons who will be there for research and social support. I hope you enjoy the theme this semester. There is so much to say here and so little time to discuss, but at least we will try to better understand our own biases and to comprehend why prejudice remains such an intractable issue even when diversity abounds.

Requirements

Class Meetings: The class meets on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 11:00 til 12:20 in Weiss 711. Students are expected to attend all classes and to have the reading assignments and paper assignments completed for the assigned class.

Blackboard: Students must have a Temple account to register for Blackboard. Then upon registration for the course – you will be automatically put on the blackboard account for the class. Blackboard has a number of exciting features that allow you to download each lecture (located under the course content) and additional course materials (e.g., your syllabus, course readings; located under course information,) and other applications (e.g., e-mail your classmates), etc. Please make sure that you are familiar with Blackboard and registered for the course so you can access information there.

Discussion postings:

Each student is required to post one thoughtful discussion question on blackboard by **8am on Tuesday** (before the discussion class) to assist the discussion leaders for that week. This means you should read the Thursday material by Tuesday morning to post provocative questions and

comments. This posting and familiarity with all class postings will be considered in your class participation grade.

Discussion leaders, please post your discussion leader themes/information for the discussion by **Wednesday night at 8 pm** so all can be prepared to participate on Thursday. All students will be assigned to participate as discussion leaders for particular weeks. All are expected to be familiar with the articles, but discussion leaders should prepare in more depth by gathering additional relevant information about the day's topic (articles, news, etc) as they prepare to lead the class.

NOTE: Under "course information" on blackboard you will find a document with additional information regarding discussion leader requirements, honors' philosophy and goals, and research practicum guidelines/requirements, and evaluations.

There are two required texts for this course:

Rosnow, R. and Rosenthal, R. (2013). *Beginning behavioral research*. 7th Ed. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. (R & R)

students who have already purchased the 2008 edition are not required to purchase the 2013 edition.

Rosnow, R., & Rosnow, M. (2008). *Writing papers in psychology: A student guide* (8th ed.). Pacific Groves, CA: Brooks/Cole.

All other required articles are available on Blackboard under 'course documents.' Remember to check your syllabus each week for your required readings (chapter reading requirements are not listed under 'Course Documents').

**Means optional reading

Grading: Students will have a midterm, a final and two journal synopsis papers for this class. Class participation is also central. Also this is a writing intensive course so writing and rewriting and rewriting is key. And your grade will be based on your very best attempt and on the way you grow as you work through your writing with us.

Midterm: 25%

Final: 25%

Paper 1: 15%

Paper 2: 15%

Class participation: 20%

Reaching me:

My office hours are from 10:30 until 11:00 and 12:30 to 1:15 on Tuesday and Thursdays in 316 Weiss Hall as well as by appointment. I can also be reached by phone at my office phone, 215-204-5243 or at my lab phone in Ambler 267-468-8610. My e-mail address is khirshpa@temple.edu. Jessa will be available on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 9:30-10:30am on the 3rd floor of Weiss Hall. Her email address is jreed@temple.edu.

Note: The syllabi, forms for assignments and some interesting links to other sites can be found on blackboard and on my website - <http://astro.temple.edu/~khirshpa/>

Disability Statement:

Any student who has a need for accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact me privately to discuss the specific situation as soon as possible.

Statement on Academic Freedom: Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. The University has adopted a policy on Student and Faculty Academic Rights and Responsibilities (Policy # 03.70.02) which can be accessed through the following link: http://policies.temple.edu/getdoc.asp?policy_no=03.70.02
http://policies.temple.edu/getdoc.asp?policy_no=03.70.02

Orientation. A place for psychology among the sciences: The birth of a field

Week 1

August 28: Introduction to the class

Where knowledge about the human condition meets science.

What science can and cannot address.

Goals of the course: The IDEO model

August 30: What is prejudice?

Who among us has escaped prejudice? For some prejudice occurs in the inconsequential jokes about minorities. For others, it might be evident in newscasts and blogs that discuss the upcoming Supreme Court reviews of affirmative action. Others hear stereotypes and prejudice on the airwaves in commentary by Rush Limbaugh or in national discussions about gay marriage. This first class puts this area of study in perspective as we read the classic in the field, Alport's 1954 treatise on prejudice. It is here that we first ask how we might operationally define the term. We also explore corollary terms like stereotypes and in group/out group behavior as ways to explain the human tendency to form categories of people and to act on these tendencies.

Reading:

Alport, G. (2000). The nature of prejudice. In C. Stangor (Ed). *Stereotypes and prejudice*, Edwards Bros, Ann Arbor, MI (pp 20-48)

Week 2

September 4: The Romantic meets the Rationalist: Understanding the human condition through art and science

What is art? What is science? Is racial prejudice best understood through the arts or through the sciences? What role could and should science play in understanding the human condition?

On questions raised by movies like *The Matrix* and *Inception*

On scientific truth versus social constructivism

For this class, each of you is asked to bring in a poem, song or work of art that speaks to our understanding of human nature. One that speaks to prejudice would be particularly appreciated!

Reading:

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 211-246.

September 6: Analyzing Prejudice: The Help

Psychology exists not only in textbooks, but in the everyday world that we live in. One of the great challenges of our education is to explore how our theories work and explain conditions beyond the classroom. Today, we discuss the movie based on Karen Stockett's best selling novel, *The Help*. Arts and literature offer one commentary on human behavior that compliments what we study in science. How do we see Allport's theory at play?

Reading:

Watch *The Help* (discussion board post expected)

Week 3

September 11: Psychology takes its slice of the pie: Just what does psychology consider to be its purview within the sciences? How do we see ourselves? Do we use the logico-mathematical or the narrative approach the way we represent our field?

Even within science itself, there are different ways in which we can do our business. You will see this in depth as we move through our discussion of the science of learning and the ways in which we think about educating the next generation of citizens. For today, however, I ask you to become the hunters and gatherers within the field of psychology so that you can see these philosophical approaches (logico-mathematical and narrative) play out in the way we teach and represent our science.

You are each asked to look at the table of contents for 3 introductory textbooks and for 3 syllabi in introductory psychology (e.g., At Temple, Harvard, University of Pennsylvania, Brown, etc.) You can easily get this information from the web and you are to discover which texts are out there. What do these books and syllabi contain as subject matter? Are all people in all universities studying exactly the same topic areas when they study psychology? Do all syllabi and texts start with biological and move to social? Is the philosophy of the course or the orientation of the instructors evident from the books they chose and the syllabi they used? You are to examine what you find and to address these questions with respect to the assumptions about science that we have been studying. You are to produce notes that give a review of the books and syllabi that you found as well as a 1-page descriptive response to what you found. Do the syllabi that you found even discuss the construct of prejudice?

Reading:

See the *Analyzing Syllabi* sheet under Course Content on Blackboard.

September 13: It is not just about content: Content is packaged in a theoretical perspective

If even textbooks are written from a perspective and with a philosophical approach in mind, so too is the research we do that will be the foundation for our evidence-based study of prejudice. Three scholars who are philosophers of science frame our discussion: Popper, Kuhn and Lakatos.

Popper was one of the first philosophers to define the boundary lines of what we call science. It was Popper who set forth the ideas of disconfirming evidence as central to the enterprise. We use him not as the holy grail but as a thoughtful scholar who set the standard that much of science followed and that became the beacon for newer responses on the nature of science and the scientific perspective. We will leave this class with the uneasy, but important perspective that science is less about the discovery of truth than about a coherent understanding of an area and a progression of knowledge that helps to cement that understanding.

Readings:

Karl Popper from the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

Please concentrate on sections 2, 3 and 4 and bring some of the text with you for discussion. Available on the web at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/>

Thomas Kuhn from the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

Please concentrate on sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 and bring some of the text with you for discussion. Available on the web at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/thomas-kuhn/>

Lakatos, I. Science and Pseudoscience. Transcript from the London School of Economics. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/lakatos/science>
AndPseudoscienceTranscript.htm

**Kuhn, T. (1970). Reflections on my critics. Criticism and the growth of knowledge. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. Please read pages 235-249.

For those of you who want to better meet the philosopher, take a peek at Kuhn thru the eyes of his graduate student Errol Morris and learn about the day Kuhn threw an ashtray at him –

Morris, E. The ashtray: Ultimatum (Part 1):

<http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/03/06/the-ashtray-the-ultimatum-part-1/>

Week 4**September 18: And our perspectives fall out in a historical context**

Around the turn of the century, the study of psychology was moving out from English and Philosophy departments to establish itself as an independent discipline. One of the primary goals at this time was to ensure that psychology could achieve status within the “real” sciences. In this class we look at some of those attempts and ask whether decisions about the field made at this time shaped the way in which the field looks today. We also examine the force that certain philosophical assumptions about the human condition have on the way we craft our theories and gather our data. We will see that the assumptions we bring about the science guides our implicit orientation to our field. It guides the kinds of questions that can be asked within the science and even the subdiscipline within which we feel comfortable. These philosophical assumptions and the historical context in which they arise shape our view of the field. Every article and every textbook has an author that brings with him/her certain assumptions about the field. The grid they use frames the way in which the field is presented and the data interpreted. In this class, I ask you to begin to see the grid that authors bring and the grid that you bring to everything that you read. Did you know that you can diagnose an author’s perspective early in a research article?

Reading:

Eysenck, M. (1994). *Perspectives on psychology*. Mahwah, Erlbaum, pp. 15-58.

September 20: Prejudice then and now

Historically, the study of prejudice moved from a look at the macro level that examined the phenomena through group level dynamics (Prison experiment, Robber’s Cave experiment) to the study of the mechanisms that underlie stereotyping and prejudice. Today we look at a few of the classics and then examine the why behind the what.

Readings:

Sherif, M. H., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. 1954. *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Norman: University Oklahoma. Please read Ch. 4 (<http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Sherif/chap4.htm>) and Ch. 5 (<http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Sherif/chap5.htm>)

Tajfel, H., Forgas, J. P. (2000). Social categorization: cognitions, values, and groups. In C. Stangor (Ed) *Stereotypes and prejudice*, Edwards Bros, Ann Arbor, MI (pp 49-64)

Fein, S., & Spencer, S. (2000). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. C. Stangor (Ed). *Stereotypes and prejudice*, Edwards Bros, Ann Arbor, MI (pp 172-190).

Week 5**September 25: Will the real psychology please stand up: Is behaviorism the gold standard?**

Putting Popper to work in psychology. We have seen the textbooks. And we have been reading about the history of psychology along with essays on science and the scientific method. No one exemplifies the hallmark of the scientific method in psychology like B.F. Skinner. Skinner outlined a program of research that was consistent with Popper's philosophy, pushing psychology to the forefront as a major and respectable science. One could argue that Skinner's main philosophical approach helped shape the way in which we think about the science of our field.

Readings:

Skinner, B.F. (1956) A case history in scientific method. *American Psychologist*, 11, 221-233.

**Skinner, B.F. (1971). *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. New York: NY: Vintage Books, pp. 175- 206.

September 27: Prejudice inborn or manufactured?

"You have to be taught to hate and fear. It has to be drummed in your dear little ear."

These words from Roger's and Hammerstein's South Pacific suggest that prejudice must be carefully groomed. Dr. Phil Zimbardo offers a similar view. The society in which we live shapes (as Skinner might say) our perceptions of others and our actions. In this chilling discussion from his book, *The Lucifer Effect*, Zimbardo challenges us telling us that any one of us can become evil under just the right circumstances. Think about the society we live in today – the negative adds that pelt us every day in the election campaign. They shape our views and our reactions. How much do they and can they contribute not only to the way we vote, but to the way we view others in our midst?

Reading:

Zimbardo, P. (2007) *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding how good people turn evil*. Random House: NY. Chapter 1, 3-22.

Week 6**October 2: The many faces of psychology: A struggle defined**

We have now gained some background in the history of our field and in the philosophical assumptions that ground us and that shape the development of our science. Today we look at how writers specializing in two subspecialties viewed the philosophical disputes within a historical context: Social psychology and Clinical psychology. In what ways can we apply what we have learned up until now to the birth of these subdisciplines. How did the assumptions that governed these subfields at the turn of the last century sculpt who we are today?

Readings:

Moraski, J. (2000). Social psychology a century ago. *American Psychologist*, 55, 427-430.

Taylor, E. (2000). Psychotherapeutics and the problematic origins of clinical psychology in America. *American Psychologist*, 55, 1029-1034.

Fancher, R. (2000). Snapshots of Freud in America, 1899-1999. *American Psychologist*, 55, 1025-1029.

Rychlak, J. (2000). A psychotherapist's lessons from the philosophy of science. *American Psychologist*, 55, 1126-1131.

October 4: The IQ debates: Where politics and science collide

Perhaps one of the more contentious debates in the history of psychology concerns that over the nature of intelligence. The many faces of psychology pit the inborn "nature" view against the view that much of our intelligence is molded through the environment, through "nurture." While to be sure, it is a little bit of both, the historic discussions quickly became political when IQ was used as a justification to keep immigrants out of the country and when discussions ensued regarding the relationship between ethnicity and IQ. This literature is troubling not only for some of the extreme claims that were made, but also because of the misinterpretation of the data that resulted. Here, we read a recent incarnation of this historical debate brought to us by Herrnstein & Murray's book *The Bell Curve* and the reaction to this book that was published by acclaimed scientists writing as a task force for The American Psychological Association.

Herrnstein, R. & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and class structure in American Life*. The Free Press: NY, Introduction pp. 1-28.

Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T., Boykin, A., Brody, N., Ceci, S., Halpern, D., Loehlin, J., Perloff, R., Sternberg, R., & Urbina, S. (1996). Intelligence: Known and unknowns. *American Psychologist*, 51, 77-101.

II. Preparation for the study of psychology in the 21st century

The first part of this class allowed you to dissect the birth of a field -- to understand the issues and forces that shaped who we are today. It forced you to ask about the support ideas that mold a field and that lie beneath the surface of what you usually study. Equipped with these tools, we now ask how we go about our science. In the remainder of the class for this semester, we use what we have learned to look at lab research and true experimental design. Laboratory research in psychology forms the basis for much of what we learn in introductory psychology. One could make a strong case that we became a real science when we were able to apply true experimental design to the study of the human condition; when we could use lab research to better understand what makes us human.

Week 7

October 9: Origins of research ideas

We come to every research endeavor with a backdrop of assumptions and with a history of what has gone before us. But how do we move from where we start to a question that is both psychologically interesting and researchable? How would we or could we or SHOULD we research ideas like “god,” “love,” “creativity,” “prejudice” and “imagination?” And where do our ideas come from in the first place? Today we explore this idea as we focus on the origins of research ideas. We start with your lay ideas that are grounded in folk psychology, we look at the news and then we refine what counts as a good idea within science and an idea that might be interesting but is not scientifically based. What is within and outside of our purview?

Readings:

Rosnow and Rosenthal (2008), Chapter 2, 24-47
Rosnow & Rosenthal (2013), Chapter 2

MIDTERM WILL BE AVAILABLE AFTER CLASS TODAY. YOUR MIDTERM WILL BE ON BLACKBOARD AND MUST BE COMPLETED BY THE START OF CLASS ON OCTOBER 18. THE MIDTERM IS TO BE TYPED AND HANDED TO ME IN PRINTED FORM. YOU ARE GIVEN 3 HOURS TO TAKE THIS ESSAY TEST.

October 11: Trayvon Martin, Amadou Diallo and other outrageous cases

The real world offers a banquet of ideas for research. Those of us who scan the news cannot help but see connections between the theories we read about and their instantiation in our community. One recent example comes from the hotly debated case of Trayvon Martin. Reports tell us that Trayvon was far from a poster child. But did he do anything on that fateful day that justified Zimmerman's behavior? Did he deserve to die because he looked suspicious? Or was Zimmerman merely acting in self-defense? Today we discuss this case and a similar one that sparked a now classic study by Correll and colleagues.

Readings:

Peralta, E. & Memmott, M. (2012) Trayvon Martin shooting: What if shooter was black? <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2012/03/20/149006684/trayvon-martin-shooting-what-if-shooter-was-black>

Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C., & Wittenbring, B. (2002) The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1314-1329

Correll, J., Wittenbrink, B., Park, Judd, B. & Sadler, M. (2007) Across the thin blue line: Police officers and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 1006-1023.

Week 8

October 16: From ideas to research questions and hypotheses

One of the hardest processes in research concerns the movement from ideas to the construction of research questions that are clearly motivated and that have clearly defined constructs. In the next couple of classes we examine how one achieves this task. The first place to start is at the library or with computer searches. How can we use the many tools like on-line computer library searches to refine our questions and to ensure that they are not just interesting ideas, but ideas that are psychologically and scientifically interesting? We learn how to ask whether a question fits into a program of research. Our goal is to find pertinent articles published in good sources that are on-point and up-to-date. We will also learn how to become explorers who find the authors doing the research and then learn more about what they are currently researching.

****MIDTERM MUST BE TURNED IN TODAY BEFORE CLASS.****

October 18:

Thus far, we have discussed more explicit stereotyping and prejudice, but many of the effects we witness come from more implicit views that we hold. Even when we think there is no prejudice involved and we are certainly not biased, we find out otherwise. Check out the findings of these studies that speak to the biases we hold. One question to ask is whether these biases remain simply biases or whether they convert into real action? And what do we have to do to keep our biases in check? Take a moment here to explore the website Project Implicit and take a test to see where you fall:
<https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/>.

Readings:

Milkman, K., Akinola, M. & Chugh, D. (in press). Temporal distance and discrimination: An audit study in academia. *Psychological Science*.

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.

Darley, J. & Gross, P. (1983) A hypothesis-confirming bias in labeling effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 44, 20-33.

Week 9**October 23: Reading primary research**

Finding the research on a question is part of the task. Learning how to read it and to reap the benefits of the research is another challenge. What is the structure of a research article? How does the article expose the question being asked and the possible answer to the question posed? How can we get to the main message and evaluate for ourselves whether the data really offer the best evidence for the question? In this class you will be introduced to my “hour glass” system of reading scientific articles. You will become critical readers of research. We will be reading a recent article that explores a concept related to our 6Cs framework and you are to come to class with the synopsis complete. We will go over this in class and then swap papers with a friend so that we all learn how to edit and read primary literature. Be sure to consult and take seriously the piece under Course Documents that tells you how to write a journal synopsis. I promise you that this looks deceptively easy. It is not.

Reading to be analyzed for 1st Journal Synopsis:

Mazerolle, M., Regner, I., Morisset, P., Rigalleau, F., & Huguet, P. (2012). Stereotype threat strengthens automatic recall and undermines controlled processes in older adults. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*.

****FIRST JOURNAL SYNOPSIS DUE BEFORE CLASS.****

October 25: From external to internal biases

Today, Dr. Karpinski will discuss the Implicit Attitude Tests.

Readings to be determined.

Week 10**October 30 : Writing in psychology and other sciences**

Writing is not a single verb. When we write a literature paper, an opinion piece or a persuasive argument, we use different styles. So, what makes scientific writing good or bad? Today we review the current Supreme Court case on affirmative action at the University of Texas: Fisher et al. v. University of Texas.

Readings:

http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/administration-urges-justices-to-continue-college-affirmative-action-admissions/2012/08/13/6c5285da-e55e-11e1-8f62-58260e3940a0_story.html?hpid=z4 and <http://www.scotusblog.com/?p=150505>, the first article:

Denniston, L. (August 13, 2012) Government backs U. Texas on use of race. *Scotus blog*.

Other readings are available at http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/fisher-v-university-of-texas-at-austin/?wpmp_switcher=desktop and on the class blackboard

Please read the amicus briefs by: Thernstrom, Thernstron, Nagal and Nieli; Putnam; and Empirical Scholars.

November 1

So here we sit, just days before the election. Surely there will be some prejudice involved. Conservatives think that the liberals are going to destroy the nation. Liberals think that conservatives come from a foreign planet and each day advertisements reinforce our stereotypes. Talk shows make the situation even worse as Rush Limbaugh's message collides with Jon Stewart's.

The prejudices we develop do not stop with the overt opinions and actions. Implicit attitudes might also play a key role as they did in the last election. What do you think? Will the Obama election be helped or hindered by attitudes towards blacks? Read some of the scientific debate to find out.

Readings:

Pasek, J., Tahk, A, Lelkes, Y., Krosnick, J., Payne, B. K., Akhtar, O., & Tompson, T. (2009). Determinants of turnout and candidate choice in the 2008 U.S. Presidential election: Illuminating the impact of racial prejudice and other considerations. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73, 943-994.

Kalmoe, N., & Piston, S. (in press). Is implicit prejudice against blacks politically consequential? Evidence from the AMP. *Public Opinion Quarterly*.

Luguri, J.B., Napier, J., & Dovidio, J. (In press). Reconstructing intolerance: Abstract thinking reduces conservatives' prejudice against nonnormative groups. *Psychological Science*.

Week 11**November 6: A word on ethics**

Once you have defined the question, you need to explore various methodological options so that you can ethically and optimally research the question. Today we begin to look at issues in the treatment of subjects and design. Every research question we ask needs to be reviewed by the IRB. What is the IRB? What are the ethical obligations of the professor? The student? Are there constraints on the types of participants I can use to address my question? In this class we examine these issues and get familiarized with the IRB process. We also examine a recent ethical disaster: The case of well-known morality researcher Marc Hauser. What went wrong here and how could it have been avoided. You will see that the number of these cases is growing. Why?

Readings:

Rosnow and Rosenthal (2008), Chapter 3, pp. 49-73

Rosnow & Rosenthal (2013), Chapter 3

The case of Dirk Smeesters and other claims against social scientists from the Wall Street Journal Blogs, July 3, 2012 (http://blogs.wsj.com/ideas-market/2012/07/03/scandals-in-social-psychology-spreading/?blog_id=182&post_id=3627)

John, L. K., Loewenstein, G. & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the Prevalence of Questionable Research Practices with Incentives for Truth-telling. *Psychological Science*, 23, 524-532.

Shea, C. (July 3, 2012). Scandals in social psychology spreading. Wall Street Journal. http://blogs.wsj.com/ideas-market/2012/07/03/scandals-in-social-psychology-spreading/?blog_id=182&post_id=3627

November 8: Progress Reports.**III. Choosing a design: The true experimental design**

Once we have a hypothesis and have looked at ethical considerations, we can choose a research design. This semester, we will focus on only one type of design, the true experimental design. This is the design most closely linked with lab research. It is the design that comes closest to the promise of finding cause and effect and of placing psychology within the realm of the hard sciences. The true experimental design is widely used and embraces a number of assumptions about how evidence should be collected and weighed.

Week 12**November 13: True experimental design I**

In this class we begin our investigation of true experimental designs or what are sometimes called, “randomized experiments.” What is the framework for this research? Can we truly discern cause and effect in these designs?

Reading:

Rosnow and Rosenthal (2008), Chapter 7, pp. 150-176
Rosnow & Rosenthal (2013), Chapter 7

November 15: Progress Reports**Week 13****November 20: True experimental design II**

Here we delve deeper into the structure of true experimental designs and learn about ways to prevent alternative explanations about cause and effect. We also try to construct designs and to find flaws in already existing designs.

Reading:

Please revisit Rosnow and Rosenthal, Chapter 7 for this class.

November 22: No class – Thanksgiving.**Week 14****November 27: Prediction and control**

How much can we really control? What does it mean to be double-blind? To counterbalance? And what can we really say about our findings once we collect them? In this class, we finish issues of design and move to questions of interpretation. Can we ever know truth? Can we approximate truth? These questions force us to reconsider some of the issues we visited in our philosophical discussions. I also ask that we look at an article and diagnose how we can be certain that they found what they said they found. What is the design and what controls were put into the design to make us confident of their result?

Reading (and to be analyzed for Journal Synopsis #2):

Su, W. & DiSanto, A. (2011). Preschool children’s perceptions of overweight peers. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 10, 19-31.

****SECOND JOURNAL SYNOPSIS DUE BEFORE CLASS.****

November 29: Progress Reports

Week 15**December 4: Re-examining the move from philosophy to science to psychology: Some conclusions and projections for next term.**

And so the term comes to a close and we ask what we have learned about the field by looking at a deeper level. Is psychology a loosely fit coalition of topics? Is there something that links the neuropsychologist and the social psychologist beyond the binding of the text? If so, what is that link? Were you convinced? Is there an alternative to what you saw? In this class, I suggest that there is such an alternative -- indeed there may be at least three answers to this question.

December 6: Re-examining prejudice

We have spent this term studying how the arts and sciences dovetail with public issues – issues that affect everything from our everyday interactions with our neighbors to our workplaces to the election of our leaders. It has been half a century since Allport wrote his classic text. In that time, prejudice has remained a current issue – even as the demographic landscape in our nation has been transformed. Today we ask how the study of the science of prejudice can inform us as we move forward. What have we learned since Allport wrote that book and how might we now use what we know to create a diverse country that lives in true harmony. Roets and Van Hiel offer a view of what has changed in the field since Allport first helped to define it.

Reading:

Roets, A., & Van Hiel, A. (2011). Allport's prejudiced personality today: Need for closure as the motivated cognitive basis of prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 349-354.

FINAL IS AVAILABLE TODAY AFTER CLASS TO BE RETURNED BY DECEMBER 12 AT 12:00 noon.