

## **SOC-S 530: Introduction to Social Psychology (Section 13281)**

Fall 2024

Thursday

9:15 AM-11:15 AM

SISR 100

### **Course Information**

Professor: Steve Benard

Office: BH 748

Office Hours: Tuesday 10:00am-12:00pm or by appointment

Email: [sbenard@iu.edu](mailto:sbenard@iu.edu) (Please put "S530" first in the subject line)

Course webpage: Available on Canvas (<https://canvas.iu.edu/>)

Class Location: SISR 100

### **Course Description**

This course provides a graduate-level introduction to theory and empirical research in sociological social psychology, organized around major theories in the field. Social psychology is an interdisciplinary field that includes contributions from both sociology and psychology. This course will focus on the sociological literature, while reviewing some closely-related work in allied fields.

Given the breadth and depth of research in social psychology, a one-semester course can only scratch the surface of topics and theories. If you are interested in a topic that is not covered, or would like to learn more about a topic that is covered, let me know and I'll help you get started.

### **In Class**

Each class will focus on an in-depth discussion of the issues raised by the readings that week. Classes will generally have three sections. First, I will begin by providing a brief overview of the topic. Second, we will discuss the orienting question for each week. Third, we will turn to discussion leaders, who will provide a short summary of each reading, and then lead the class through a series of discussion questions.

It is important that everyone read the assigned readings each week and come to class ready to actively participate in the discussion – to ask questions, speak to debates that arise in the literature, challenge what class members (including me) have said, and relate the material to your own projects. The more you participate, the more we will all gain from the class. I expect that everyone will actively participate in discussions; not actively participating may reduce your final grade.

## Canvas Page

The course is organized into modules on Canvas. Each module contains everything you need for that week, including the readings, a place to submit your critical analysis paper, and a place to post your discussion questions.

## Contact and Office Hours

My email address is [sbenard@iu.edu](mailto:sbenard@iu.edu). Please put “S530” in the subject line of all course-related emails, this will help me prioritize student emails. I will reply as soon as I can, typically within one business day. It may take slightly longer during busier times in the semester.

My office hours are Tuesdays 10:00am-12:00pm. You can sign up for office hours at <https://prof-benard.youcanbook.me>. You can also walk in, but students with appointments have priority. If you would prefer to meet via Zoom there is a place to indicate this when you sign up for a meeting. If you don't have availability during these times, you can contact me to set up another time to meet.

## Evaluation

Evaluation in the course will be based on three components: (1) serving as a discussion leader (30%), (2) weekly critical analysis papers (30%), and (3) a research proposal (40%).

### *Discussion leaders*

Each week, 2-3 people will sign up to lead the discussion. You can sign up on Canvas in Module 1. Please sign up by 5pm on Friday of the first week of the semester. You'll act as a discussion leader twice during the semester. The discussion leaders should prepare a short handout (~1-page) that summarizes each of the readings in 4-5 *one-sentence* bullet points. Each article summary should be no more than 125 words in total. The goal is to simply capture the main idea behind each paper. These can be uploaded in the “Discussion Leader Questions” section of the module each week.

The discussion leaders should also prepare 2-3 open-ended discussion questions on each of the readings (note this is 2-3 questions *per reading*, not per person per reading, so you can divide the articles among the discussion leaders). These discussion questions **should address what you see as the core theoretical or empirical aspects of the reading**. We have a limited amount of time for addressing each paper and will get more out of the discussion if we don't get too far into the weeds on our feelings about footnote 11 or the second column of Appendix Table A24.

If possible, discussion leaders should review the rest of the class's critical analysis papers for that week. These are available in the “Critical Analysis Paper” section of each Canvas module.

*Seven ways to prepare discussion questions:* The discussion questions should be open-ended, meaning the answer is not obvious and reasonable people might disagree. Effective discussion questions are usually short and to the point.

Here are seven approaches for preparing effective discussion questions to help you get started:

- Propose alternative explanations for the findings of a particular article, and then discuss (as a class) whether the proposed alternative or the author’s original theory better account for the findings.
  - Example: research in social identity theory proposes that people treat ingroup members more favorably than outgroup members because they view ingroup members more positively; an alternative account proposes that individuals do so because they expect ingroup members to reciprocate this favorable treatment.
- Compare two theoretical ideas (either within or across weeks), to discuss whether they are fundamentally similar or different. For example, one might discuss different conceptions of what an emotion is, or how power and status differ.
- Discuss whether there are hidden assumptions in theory or research that might be brought to light. How would you expect different assumptions to affect the theory or empirical findings? For example, much social psychological research is conducted in wealthy, industrialized western democracies, yet this fact is rarely explicitly addressed in theory.
  - As a further note, the generic criticism “how would this apply in another time/place/group/setting?” is very easy to make but harder to answer. If you make this criticism, try to formulate an answer.
- Discuss the scope of a theory. How broadly does the theory apply? Is it universally applicable, or only under certain conditions? What are these conditions? Could the scope of a theory be expanded to cover additional settings or issues, other than what the authors intended? For example, Blumer’s theory of racial prejudice was developed in the context of the US civil rights movement. How well does the theory apply to more modern or more diverse contexts?
  - Again, if you take this route you should be prepared to make an argument about the settings in which the theory does or does not apply.
- Are there ways in which the research could be productively extended? For example, could ideas from one week of the class improve research in another portion of the class? Or, what important questions remain unanswered? For example, exchange theory historically tended to ignore the role of emotions, but more later work focused on incorporating emotions into exchange theory.
- For any of the above, a cross-cutting question is to discuss how new methods or data might resolve the questions above. One productive use of class time is to generate ideas for research studies that students might embark on.
- A discussion of the methods used in the article. Do the methods effectively test the ideas in the way the authors intend? Could they do so more effectively?

In class, you’ll pose the questions you devised, and field and respond to your classmates’ answers. You will receive your classmates’ critical analysis papers before class (see below) to help you anticipate their response to the material.

Please send me your discussion questions 24 hours before class. I’ll check in with you at the beginning of class with any questions or suggestions.

### *Critical analysis papers*

In the weeks that you are not a discussion leader, you will have a critical analysis paper due. The critical analysis paper is a short (2-page, double-spaced) reflection on the readings that week. **Do**

**not summarize the reading.** Try to answer some or all of the orienting questions (listed below) for each week, drawing on the readings to do so. Your analysis paper should demonstrate that you have finished the readings for this week. Papers will be graded on a check/check plus/check minus basis. A check represents a “good” paper, and most papers will receive a check.

You should post your critical analysis papers to Canvas, by the end of the day on Monday, so we will have time to read them before class on Wednesday. Papers submitted after Monday but before class on Wednesday will receive half credit. I don’t accept papers submitted after class except in the case of illness or other mitigating circumstances.

*Sharing response papers:* You can submit your critical analysis paper via Canvas, in the “Critical Analysis Papers” section of the Canvas module for each week. To allow your classmates will be able to see these papers, please submit your CAP by attaching it to a discussion post. Please title your analysis papers: lastname\_weekx\_s530\_cap. (where the “x” in “weekx” is the week number). **Please use .docx format for all papers.**

*A note on criticism:* Conducting high-quality empirical research is challenging, and most research isn’t perfect. As a result, it’s not difficult to identify shortcomings with most articles. Better criticism not only identifies shortcomings, but also identifies effective, realistic ways to address those shortcomings. As an exercise, attempt to hold yourself to the rule of proposing a solution for each criticism you offer.

#### *Research proposal*

For the research proposal, you will develop a theoretical argument grounded in social psychological theory, and propose a method for empirically evaluating this argument, along the lines of a grant proposal. This is intended to help you develop a plan that you can use for your MA thesis, a funding proposal, or another research project.

**The goal of this paper is to help you get your research done.** If you are already engaged in a substantive research project as the primary investigator, completion of the actual research and writing up a paper with findings is an alternative to the proposal requirement. If you have already written a social psychology theory paper for another class, you may use the 15-20 page assignment for developing the methods aspect of your proposal. Talk to me in advance if you want to take either of these options, or if there is another way for the paper assignment to productively advance your research program.

We will devote two class days to presenting and discussing your projects.

A suggested format for your final proposal is given below. The page lengths are just general guidelines; papers should be about 15 pages, but please do not exceed 20 pages (double-spaced).

- Introduction and statement of the research question (~1 page)
- Related research (background and significance): develops your argument, drawing on past literature. This is not simply a summary of past literature, instead, discuss past literature *in the service of making your argument* (4-5 pages).
- Procedures/study design: This includes a description of the type of data you plan to

collect (or use), key concepts you will measure and how you will measure them, your sampling design (or if you are planning to use existing data, the sampling design for the study), units of analysis and how you will gain access to the data or subjects. This section tells the reader what you plan to do and why you plan to do it, and the foundation of the research design for your study. The more detail, the better. If you are developing a survey instrument or interview schedule, you should include it as an appendix. If you are using existing data, you should include the items you will use from the survey in the text or as an appendix (5-9 pages).

- A discussion of any relevant ethical issues, if there are any (1 paragraph – 1 page). Specifically discuss into which category you think your research would fall (exempt, expedited or full) using the definitions from IU’s Office of Human Research Protection and explain why it falls into this category and why (you may find this website helpful in figuring out which category fits your research: <https://research.iu.edu/compliance/human-subjects/review-levels/index.html>; the link at the bottom to the “protocol decision tree” may also be useful). Also discuss whether your research requires any special considerations of informed consent and if so how you will address those.
- A discussion of limitations of the study (1-2 pages).

Note: If you propose to use secondary data you will need to find a data set that will meet your needs, explain what it is and why it best meets your needs. You also want to describe your main concepts and describe the measures that are available to address those questions, and also the sample design. In other words, most of the detail above still applies even if you are not collecting the data yourself.

**Your proposals are due Monday, December 16<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 PM.**

## **Course Policies**

*Academic Integrity:* As a student at IU, you are expected to adhere to the standards contained in the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct* (the *Code*). Holding all students to the standards outlined in the *Code* ensures the value of the degree that you are earning from IU and is valuable training for maintaining ethical standards in the work that you will do in the future for yourself or an employer. Academic misconduct is defined as any activity that tends to undermine the academic integrity of the institution. Academic integrity violations include: cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, interference, violation of course rules, and facilitating academic dishonesty. When you submit an assignment with your name on it, you are signifying that the work contained therein is yours, unless otherwise cited or referenced. Any ideas or materials taken from another source must be fully acknowledged. Students should not share their completed work with any other students. If plagiarism or other cheating occurs, both students involved will be considered responsible even if the student sharing their work was unaware that academic misconduct would occur or had occurred. Ignorance of what constitutes academic misconduct or plagiarism is not a valid excuse. In addition, submitting content generated by another person or via an artificial intelligence program (such as ChatGPT, Bard, Google Translate, Dall-E, etc.), and posting questions from quizzes/exams or assignments or downloading answers from online sources are all considered academic misconduct. All suspected violations of the *Code* will be reported to the Dean of Students (Office of Student Conduct) and

handled according to University policies. Sanctions for academic misconduct in this course may include a failing grade on the assignment, a reduction in your final course grade, or a failing grade in the course, among other possibilities. If you are unsure about the expectations for completing an assignment or taking a test or exam, be sure to seek clarification from your instructor in advance.

*Generative AI:* According to the *Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct*, plagiarism is “presenting someone else’s work, including the work of other students, as the submitting student’s own. A student must not present ideas or materials taken from another source for either written or oral use without fully acknowledging the source, unless the information is common knowledge.” Cheating is “using, providing, or attempting to use or provide unauthorized assistance, materials, information, or study aids in any form.” (II: Responsibilities B.4,a and c) Your use of anyone else’s (or any AI system’s) words, graphic images, calculations, or ideas should be properly cited. AI generators/programs such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, Spinbot, Dall-E, etc. should not be used for any work for this class without explicit permission of the instructor and appropriate attribution. AI text generators should not be used for:

- Creating or revising drafts
- Editing your work
- Reviewing a peer's work

The use of generative AI platforms will be considered plagiarism and/or cheating and will be reported to the Dean of Students (Office of Student Conduct) and handled according to University policies. Sanctions for academic misconduct in this course may include a failing grade on the assignment, a reduction in your final course grade, or a failing grade in the course, among other possibilities. Contact your instructor if you have questions.

*Note Selling:* Various commercial services have approached students regarding selling class notes/study guides to their classmates. Selling the instructor’s notes/study guides or uploading course assignments to these sites (even after the course has ended) in exchange for access to materials for other courses is not permitted. Violations of this policy will be reported to the Dean of Students (Office of Student Conduct) as academic misconduct. Sanctions for academic misconduct for this action may include a failing grade on the assignment for which the notes/study guides or assignments have been being uploaded, a reduction in your final course grade, or a failing grade in the course, among other possibilities. Additionally, you should know that selling a faculty member’s notes/study guides individually or on behalf of one of these services using IU email or via Canvas, may also constitute a violation of IU information technology and IU intellectual property policies; additional consequences may result.

*Online Course Materials:* The instructor teaching this course holds the exclusive right to distribute, modify, post, and reproduce course materials, including all written materials, study guides, lectures, assignments, exercises, and exams. Some of the course content may be downloadable, but you should not distribute, post, or alter the instructor’s intellectual property. While you are permitted to take notes on the online materials and lectures posted for this course for your personal use, you are not permitted to re-post in another forum, distribute, or reproduce content from this course without the express written permission of the instructor.

*GroupMe and Other External Messaging Platforms:* Please note that you may receive emails from other students about joining GroupMe, Discord, or similar external group messaging platforms for individual classes via Canvas. Even though invitations to join the group may be issued through Canvas, they do not imply the endorsement of the course instructor. While platforms like GroupMe, Discord, etc. can be an effective way of contacting classmates and clarifying information related to the course, they can also be source of unauthorized information sharing or collaboration among students. Collaborative effort on assignments, quizzes, and exams, including sharing or discussing answers when the instructor has not expressly authorized collaboration, is considered cheating. If academic dishonesty occurs via GroupMe or a similar messaging platform, everyone involved in the thread may be found responsible for academic misconduct since membership in the group suggests that they have been able to view the information shared.

*Respect for others:* In class discussion, it is natural that some people will have different perspectives. It is normal for people to disagree, but it is important to do it in a mature and thoughtful manner. You are expected to be polite and respectful to all members of the class at all times.

*Accessible Educational Services (AES):* Every attempt will be made to accommodate qualified students with disabilities (e.g. mental health, learning, chronic health, physical, hearing, vision neurological, etc.). You must have established your eligibility for support services through the appropriate office that services students with disabilities. Note that services are confidential, may take time to put into place and are not retroactive; captions and alternate media for print materials may take three or more weeks to get produced. Please contact Accessible Educational Services at <http://disabilityservices.indiana.edu> or 812- 855-7578 as soon as possible if accommodations are needed. The office is located in Eigenmann Hall #001.

*Bias Incident Reporting:* Bias-based incident reports can be made by students, faculty, and staff. Any act of discrimination or harassment based on race, ethnicity, religious affiliation, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation or disability can be reported through any of the options: 1) fill out an online report at <https://reportincident.iu.edu>; 2) call the Dean of Students Office at (812) 855-8187. Reports can be made anonymously at <https://reportincident.iu.edu>.

*Sexual Misconduct & Title IX:* IU policy prohibits sexual misconduct in any form, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, sexual exploitation, and dating and domestic violence. If you have experienced sexual misconduct, or know someone who has, the University can help. If you are seeking help and would like to speak to someone confidentially, you can make an appointment with the IU Sexual Assault Crisis Services at (812) 855-8900, or contact a Confidential Victim Advocate at (812) 856-2469 or [cva@indiana.edu](mailto:cva@indiana.edu). University policy requires me to share certain information brought to my attention about potential sexual misconduct with the campus Deputy Sexual Misconduct & Title IX Coordinator or the University Sexual Misconduct & Title IX Coordinator. In that event, those individuals will work to ensure that appropriate measures are taken, and resources are made available. Protecting student privacy is of utmost concern, and information will only be shared with those that need to know to ensure the University can respond and assist. I encourage you to visit <http://stopsexualviolence.iu.edu/index.html> to learn more.

*Digital Access:* Digital devices (like laptops and cell phones) are becoming increasingly important to success in college. In this course, you may need digital devices to access readings, and complete and submit written assignments.

I recognize that some students are unable to afford the cost of purchasing digital devices and that other students rely on older, more problem-prone devices that frequently break down or become unusable. I also recognize that those technology problems can be a significant source of stress for students. Given those challenges, I encourage students to contact me and/or the teaching assistant if they experience a technology-related problem that interferes with their work in this course. This will enable me to assist students in accessing support.

I also encourage students to be aware of the many technology-related resources that Indiana University provides, including:

- Free on-campus wireless internet (wifi) access through the “IU Secure” network.
- Free software for download and for cloud-based use.
- Free unlimited, secure online storage through Box (a great way to back up files).
- Free 24/7 IU tech support (e.g., email, Canvas, wifi, printing, device setup, etc.).
- Discounts on devices from leading technology companies, including Apple, Dell, and Microsoft.

*Student Advocate’s Office:* If you experience a personal issue that affects your academic work, and you do not feel comfortable discussing it with your instructors, the Student Advocate’s Office may be able to help you. Among other services, they can help inform your instructors of issues that may affect your work:

<https://studentaffairs.indiana.edu/student-advocates/>

**The Course Outline Begins on the Next Page →**

## Course Outline

Week 1: Introduction to the course 8/29

Week 2: Background and issues in social psychology 9/5

Orienting Questions: What defines a “face” of social psychology? Is it the research question, theory, method, or some combination of these? If subfields are “silos” with distinct questions, theories, and methods, is this a problem that needs to be solved, or a natural consequence of sociology becoming increasingly specialized? What big questions do you think are interesting or important? How do we define the “micro”, “meso”, and “macro” levels of analysis? Do we need to find a way to balance micro, meso, and macro approaches, or does it make sense to specialize in one of these?

House, J.S., 1977. The three faces of social psychology. *Sociometry*, pp.161-177.

Oishi, S., Kesebir, S. and Snyder, B.H., 2009. Sociology: A lost connection in social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13(4), pp.334-353.

Rogers, K.B., 2020. The problem of order: Understanding how culture predicts social action. *Sociology Compass*, p.e12800

Paluck, E.L., Shepherd, H. and Aronow, P.M., 2016. Changing climates of conflict: A social network experiment in 56 schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3), pp.566-571.

Week 3: Symbolic Interaction 9/12

Orienting Questions: What’s the difference between a theory and a conceptual frame? Which of these categories do Blumer and Goffman’s approaches fall into? Returning to last week’s discussion, do you think of SI as mostly operating on the micro, meso, or macro levels, or something else? Does it need to do a better job incorporating one or more of these levels of analysis, or does it work well as-is?

Blumer, Herbert. 1969. Chapter 1 in *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E., 1978. *The presentation of self in everyday life* (Excerpt). London: Harmondsworth.

Guo, W. and Xu, B., 2022. Dignity in Red Envelopes: Disreputable Exchange and Cultural Reproduction of Inequality in Informal Medical Payment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 85(1), pp.23-43.

Stryker, S., 2008. From Mead to a structural symbolic interactionism and beyond. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 34, pp.15-31.

Orienting Questions: What is a “group”? Are there limiting cases on the edge of our definition of a “group”? How do we define these limiting cases? How do people become influential in groups? What do you think causes the patterns described in the Bales article? Do you think these patterns occur to some extent in all groups, or only in certain kinds of groups? What do you think “collective intelligence” in the Woolley et. al article measures? What factors might improve or diminish team performance?

Benard, S. and Mize, T.D., 2016. Small Groups: Reflections of and Building Blocks for Social Structure. In *Handbook of Contemporary Sociological Theory* (pp. 293-320). Springer, Cham.

Bales, Robert F., et al. "Channels of communication in small groups." *American Sociological Review* 16.4 (1951): 461-468.

Woolley, A.W., Chabris, C.F., Pentland, A., Hashmi, N. and Malone, T.W., 2010. Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. *Science*, 330(6004), pp.686-688.

Kilduff, G.J., Willer, R. and Anderson, C., 2016. Hierarchy and its discontents: Status disagreement leads to withdrawal of contribution and lower group performance. *Organization Science*, 27(2), pp.373-390.

Orienting Questions: How do the sociologists in this section define status? Expectation states theory limits its scope to collectively-oriented task groups. Do you think it would work outside of this scope? Status theories typically assume consensual status hierarchies (i.e., status hierarchies that already exist and are agreed upon). Can we think more about how status hierarchies emerge and are contested? Are there other moderators of status that you think we should study?

Correll, S.J. and Ridgeway, C.L., 2006. Expectation states theory. In *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 29-51). Springer, Boston, MA.

Berger, J., Cohen, B.P. and Zelditch Jr, M., 1972. Status characteristics and social interaction. *American Sociological Review*, pp.241-255

Accominotti, F., Lynn, F. and Sauder, M., 2022. The Architecture of Status Hierarchies: Variations in Structure and Why They Matter for Inequality. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 8(6), pp.87-102.

Bai, F., 2017. Beyond dominance and competence: A moral virtue theory of status attainment. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21(3), pp.203-227.

Orienting questions: How important is it for sociologists to consider morality? Would any particular research questions of interest to you fundamentally change as a result of considering morality? What are some challenges in measuring morality? Are the Haidt versus Hitlin and Vaisey approaches to morality generally similar or different? The theories of morality in the first two papers focus on evolution and socialization – two factors associated with stability. What would a more interactionist approach to morality look like?

Haidt, Jonathan. 2001. “The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment.” *Psychological Review*. 108:814-834.

Hitlin, S. and Vaisey, S., 2013. The new sociology of morality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, pp.51-68.

Frye, M. and Woźny, A., 2021. Moralizing the Production and Sale of Student Papers in Uganda. *American Sociological Review*, 86(3), pp.430-464.

Bartram, R., 2021. Cracks in broken windows: How objects shape professional evaluation. *American journal of sociology*, 126(4), pp.759-794.

Orienting questions: How useful is it to conceptualize social life as exchange? How far can we get in explaining social life this way? What kinds of things would this perspective be good at explaining? What kinds of things would it struggle to explain? What factors facilitate or limit the use of power in everyday social life?

Emerson, R.M., 1962. Power-dependence relations. *American sociological review*, pp.31-41.

Sprecher, S., Schmeekle, M. and Felmlee, D., 2006. The principle of least interest: Inequality in emotional involvement in romantic relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(9), pp.1255-1280.

Tepper, B.J., Carr, J.C., Breaux, D.M., Geider, S., Hu, C. and Hua, W., 2009. Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 109(2), pp.156-167.

Offer, S. and Fischer, C.S., 2018. Difficult people: Who is perceived to be demanding in personal networks and why are they there? *American sociological review*, 83(1), pp.111-142

Orienting questions: If you were writing a paper about emotions, how would you define emotions? Does it matter that emotions are difficult to define, if everyone intuitively understands them? How might we measure emotions? What are advantages or disadvantages of different approaches to measuring emotions? When might you use one measurement approach versus another? What other structural patterns might systematically shape the experience of emotions across demographic categories?

Rogers, K.B. and Robinson, D.T., 2014. Measuring affect and emotions. *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions: Volume II*, pp.283-303.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1979. "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 85:551-575.

Kemper, T.D., 1987. How many emotions are there? Wedding the social and the autonomic components. *American journal of Sociology*, 93(2), pp.263-289.

Collett, Jessica L. and Omar Lizardo. 2010. Occupational status and the experience of anger. *Social Forces* 88:2079-2104.

Orienting questions: What is social identity? How is it similar to or different from other types of identity discussed in social psychology (such as role identities)? How is social identity related to intergroup conflict? Do laboratory experiments on social identity translate outside the laboratory? To what extent can intergroup discrimination be explained by social identity theory?

Hornsey, M.J., 2008. Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and personality psychology compass*, 2(1), pp.204-222.

Weisel, O. and Böhm, R., 2015. "Ingroup love" and "outgroup hate" in intergroup conflict between natural groups. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 60, pp.110-120.

Rivera, L.A., 2012. Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American sociological review*, 77(6), pp.999-1022.

Orienting questions: What does Blumer mean by the term "a sense of group position"? How do groups develop a sense of their social positions? Is a "sense of group position" different from other approaches to identity we've talked about? Or is it essentially the same idea expressed differently? How well does this theory work in more modern contexts? Blumer's theory focuses on the "dominant" group's perspective. Would the theory be different if we examined the perspective of "subordinate" groups?

Blumer, H., 1958. Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific sociological review*, 1(1), pp.3-7.

Bobo, L. and Hutchings, V.L., 1996. Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multiracial social context. *American sociological review*, pp.951-972.

Minescu, A. and Poppe, E., 2011. Intergroup conflict in Russia: Testing the group position model. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 74(2), pp.166-191.

Zhang, N., Gereke, J. and Baldassarri, D., 2022. Everyday discrimination in public spaces: a field experiment in the Milan metro. *European Sociological Review*, 38(5), pp.679-693.

## Week 11: Stereotyping

11/7

Orienting questions: Psychological approaches to stereotyping often focus on cognitive aspects of stereotypes. How do you think these are related to structural or institutional factors? What advantages or disadvantages do you see in the different methods used across the papers in this section? Fiske et. al propose to key dimensions of stereotype content, warmth and competence. Can you propose a third factor that crosscuts these two?

Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J., Glick, P. and Xu, J., 2002. A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82:878-902.

Chavez, K., 2021. Penalized for Personality: A Case Study of Asian-Origin Disadvantage at the Point of Hire. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 7(2), pp.226-246.

Quadlin, N., 2018. The mark of a woman's record: Gender and academic performance in hiring. *American Sociological Review*, 83(2), pp.331-360.

Tropp, L.R., Okamoto, D.G., Marrow, H.B. and Jones-Correa, M., 2018. How contact experiences shape welcoming: Perspectives from US-born and immigrant groups. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 81(1), pp.23-47.

## Week 12: Group culture

11/14

Orienting questions: What is a "toolkit" approach to culture? How is it different from or similar to alternative accounts of culture? What insights can a cultural perspective offer the study of organizations? How could culture inform other topics we've discussed this semester?

Swidler, A., 1986. Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American sociological review*, pp.273-286.

Vaisey, S., 2009. Motivation and justification: A dual-process model of culture in action. *American journal of sociology*, 114(6), pp.1675-1715.

Hallett, T., 2010. The myth incarnate: Recoupling processes, turmoil, and inhabited institutions in an urban elementary school. *American Sociological Review*, 75(1), pp.52-74.

Calarco, J.M., 2014. The inconsistent curriculum: Cultural tool kits and student interpretations of ambiguous expectations. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77(2), pp.185-209.

Week 13: Social structure and personality

11/21

Orienting questions: What is the social structure and personality perspective? Is this approach distinct from sociology more broadly? How is organizational culture important for understanding the experiences of tokens? What other factors might moderate tokenism? Are you convinced that SES is a “fundamental cause” of mortality?

McLeod, Jane D. and Kathryn J. Lively. 2006. Social structure and personality. Pp. 77-102 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by John Delamater. New York: Springer.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology* 82, 5: 965-990.

Turco, Catherine J. 2010. Cultural foundations of tokenism: Evidence from the leveraged buyout industry. *American Sociological Review* 75:894-913.

Phelan, J.C., Link, B.G., Diez-Roux, A., Kawachi, I. and Levin, B., 2004. “Fundamental causes” of social inequalities in mortality: a test of the theory. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 45(3), pp.265-285.

Week 14: Thanksgiving recess – NO CLASS

11/28

Week 15: Presentations

12/5

Week 16: Presentations

12/12