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**Course Description**

This course will focus on ethnic prejudice and specifically on the sociological and social psychological understanding of prejudice against different minority groups. We will examine the most influential classical theories of prejudice and will deal with the more recent developments in this field of research. The aim of the course is to introduce the highly diverse and multi-disciplinary field of prejudice research and to show that the notion of prejudice is present in various concepts of nationalism studies as identity-formation, inter-group conflicts and majority-minority relations. While learning about these issues, participants will also familiarize with a wide range of methods of empirical social research.

The course consists of five main thematic blocks focusing on different aspects of prejudice. In the first block the concept of prejudice and the main approaches and dilemmas of prejudice research will be in the focus and we will look at the most influential theoretical approaches in this field. The second thematic block is an overview of the ways in which prejudice is studied. In order to be able to critically review the results of empirical studies and to plan and carry out your own research projects, we will familiarize with a wide range of research methods and will discuss their pitfalls and applicability. We will also learn some hands-on methods for collecting face-to-face qualitative data in interviews and group discussions. In the third thematic block, we look at various forms of prejudice based on results of recent national and international empirical studies. Consequently, in the fourth block, we will seek answers to the question “Why people have prejudices?” looking at prejudice in its complexity by a multi-level approach. The fifth block will conclude the study of prejudice by discussing the possibilities of prejudice-reduction through an overview of various intervention and prevention methods.

**Learning Outcomes**

At the end of the course, students will have a fuller understanding of the extensive and highly multidisciplinary scholarly literature on prejudice in particular regarding the origins and forms of prejudice towards ethnic minority groups. They will have extensive knowledge about empirical studies focusing on various types of prejudice the results of which they will be able to critically discuss. They should also know to take the perspective of the targets of prejudice and to understand how prejudice might affect the identity of the members of stigmatized groups. They will also have an understanding of the role of the institutions of socialization and the media in transmitting norms related to prejudice. Finally, participants of the class will be familiar with the most effective methods of prejudice reduction and will have an understanding of the ethical and normative debates in the field of prejudice studies.

**Course Requirements**

Participants are expected to attend class regularly, read the assigned readings every week, and actively engage in discussions. All students are expected to lead the group discussion about at least two readings and prepare a one-page handout about these.

**Reading comments**

Students are required to send *two short reading comments about each of the obligatory readings* for this class. These can be questions, comments, ideas, or anything that came to your mind while reading the text. Comments should be uploaded to the e-learning and emailed to the presenter(s) of the text by Monday 7PM.

**Reading presentations**

All students need to present a reading at least twice during this course (beyond the presentations in class 7). Presentations of course readings should take not more than five minutes and should not repeat the contents of the reading but should reflect the presenter’s understanding of the reading. It should also include a synthesis of the reading comments from class participants to guide the group discussion about the reading. A one-page handout, summarising the main points of the reading, should be prepared and uploaded to e-learning.

**Research project**

To deepen the knowledge acquired in the course, students will complete a (small) research project in which they will analyse a real-life social problem related to prejudice based on the identification of relevant theories and original empirical research. A detailed research proposal introducing the problem, the theoretical framework, and the planned methods (1-2 double spaced pages) should be prepared by and discussed in class 13. Topics for the research project can be proposed by the students. Group work is possible upon approval of the professor. The research should then be completed (at least a pilot version) and presented to the group in a 20-minute conference style presentation along with a handout including a 250 word abstract, and a 3-page overview. The literature for the final presentation should be based on the class readings and on individual research.

**Assessment**

*Active participation in the discussions:* 15%

Students can collect up to three points in each class for actively participating in the discussions. The overall number of points will be calculated and serve as the basis of the assessment.

*Comments and small assignments:* 20%

Students can collect up to two points per reading and per assignment. The overall number of points will be calculated and serve as the basis of the assessment.

*Reading presentation: 15%*

Students can collect up to fifteen points for the presentation and for the handout (15 points altogether).

*Mid-term project presentation: 15%*

Students can collect up to 10 points for the mid-term project presentation (class 14).

These will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

* Overall concept
* Theoretical foundation
* Realization of the plan
* Quality of the presentation

**Final project:** 35%

Students can collect up to 25 points for their final project.

Projects will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

* Overall concept
* Theoretical foundation
* Realization of the plan
* Quality of the presentation

In order for students to receive a passing grade, their performance should be at least 50% for each type of assessment.

**Grades**

A: Students whose performance is evaluated as 90% or above in each form of assessment.

A-: Students whose performance is evaluated as 81% or above in each form of assessment.

B+: Overall performance 75 – 80%.

B: Overall performance 66 – 74%.

B-: Overall performance 60 – 65%.

C+: Overall performance 51 – 65%.

F: Fail, overall performance 0-50% or performance below 50% on any form of assessment.

**Feedback**: students can ask for individual feedback at any time of the course. Students whose course performance does not seem to be satisfactory, will receive notice by class 12 and areas and options for improvement will be discussed. *All students will receive mid-term feedback in relation to their planned projects.*

**Office hours:** regular office hours take place on Wednesdays from 12.30PM to 13.30PM. Consultations outside the office hours are also possible. Students should register in advance for consultations.

**Electronic device policy:** as described in the Student Handbook laptops and tablets are only allowed for displaying course-related materials (e.g. readings, notes, presentations). Use of the internet, social media, and e-mail are strictly forbidden. Use of cell phones and smart phones is forbidden in the classroom. The improper use of electronic devices will result in a reduced final grade.

### COURSE SCHEDULE

**I. ETHNIC PREJUDICE: CONCEPTS, APPROACHES, DILEMMAS**

**20 September**

1. **How to live with prejudices?**

*Readings:*

Pelinka, A. (2009). How to Live with Prejudices. In A. Pelinka, K. Bischof, & K. Stögner (Eds.), *Handbook of Prejudice* (pp. xi–xxii). Amherst, N.Y: Cambria Press.

PRESENTER:

1. **The concept of prejudice**

*Readings:*

Brown, R. (2010). *Prejudice: Its social psychology* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. *Chapter 1. The Nature of prejudice* (pp. 1–12)

PRESENTER:

Duckitt, J. (2010). Historical overview. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. S. Glick, V. M. Esses, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 29–44). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publ.; SAGE.

PRESENTER:

**27 September**

1. **Stereotypes: what, why, how, and where?**

*Reading:*

Don Operario and Susan T. Fiske (2003). Stereotypes: Content, Structures, Processes, and Context. In R. Brown & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 22–44). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

PRESENTER:

*Assignment: collect 3 stereotypes describing the group(s) you belong to. You can think of your group belongings beyond ethnicity and nationality. Write down the list and upload it to the e-learning. Deadline is the same as for the reading comments.*

1. **Individual and social consequences of prejudice: the targets’ perspective**

*Readings:*

Crocker, J., & Quinn, D. M. (2003). Psychological Consequences of Devalued Identities. In R. Brown & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 238–259). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

PRESENTER:

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop Complaining! The Social Costs of Making Attributions to Discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(2), 254–263.

PRESENTER:

*Video:* American Sociological Association video series: Sociological Insights. Complaining while Black: [*https://vimeopro.com/asasoc/insights/video/266391772*](https://vimeopro.com/asasoc/insights/video/266391772)

**4 October**

1. **Discrimination and antidiscrimination: real-life examples from around the world**

*Assignment: look up a known case of discrimination from your own country / country you are familiar with. Describe the case and its media representation. Explain if and how authorities have dealt with the case and whether this was in accordance with existing legislation.*

*Deadline: same as for reading presentations.*

**II. METHODS OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH OF PREJUDICE**

1. **Qualitative and quantitative methods in prejudice research**

*Readings:*

Correll, J., Judd, C. M., Park, B., & Wittenbrink, B. (2010). Measuring prejudice, stereotypes, and discrimination. In J. F. Dovidio (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 45–62). London, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

PRESENTER:

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Sage. Chapter 10. Generalising from qualitative research.

PRESENTER:

*Assignment:*

Comparison of measures of attitudes towards immigrants from the European Social Survey. Detailed description on the e-learning site.

**11 October**

1. **Qualitative methods – student presentations**

*Readings (select two readings from the list the methods of which are the closest to your own project/interest):*

\*Semi-structured qualitative interviews with 202 participants

Clark McKown. (2004). Age and ethnic variation in children’s thinking about the nature of racism. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *25*(5), 597–617.

\*Group discussions

Váradi, L., Simonovits, B., Szilasi, B., Kende, A., Braverman, J., & Simonovits, G. "Personally, I feel sorry, but professionally, I don't have a choice." Understanding the drivers of anti-Roma discrimination on the rental housing market. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 8, 1223205.

\*Life history interviews

Karen Ross. (2014). Narratives of belonging (and not): Inter-group contact in Israel and the formation of ethno-national identity claims. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*

\*Mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative)

Kucia, M., Duch-Dyngosz, M., & Magierowski, M. (2014). Anti-Semitism in Poland: survey results and a qualitative study of Catholic communities. *Nationalities Papers*, *42*(1), 8–36.

\*In-depth interviews with 11 participants

Spanierman, L. A., Oh, E., Poteat, V. P., Hund, A. R., McClair, V. L., Beer, A. M., & Clarke, A. M. (2007). White University Students' Responses to Societal Racism: A Qualitative Investigation. *The Counseling Psychologist.*

\*Linguistic discourse analysis of supremacist rhetoric based on a documentary film

Szilágyi, A. (2017). Discourse and discrimination in Charlottesville: The rhetoric of white supremacists during the violent unrest in August 2017. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, 13(2)*.

\*Analysis of 2700 online comments

Pavasovic Trost, T., & Kovacevic, N. (2013). Football, hooliganism and nationalism: the reaction to Serbia’s gay parade in reader commentary online. *Sport in Society, 16(8), 1054–1076*.

\*Comparative analysis of media representation

Kovács, A., & Szilágyi, A. (2013). *Variations on a theme: The Jewish “Other” in Old and New Antisemitic Media Discourses in Hungary in the 1940s and in 2011* (pp. 203-227). New York, NY: Routledge.

\*A list of further literature explaining the use of specific qualitative research methods can be found on the e-learning site of the course.

1. **So how does a (quantitative) study of prejudice look like? (Everything you don’t read about in research papers)**

*Readings:*

Váradi, L. (2014). *Youths Trapped in Prejudice: Hungarian Adolescent's Attitudes towards the Roma*. *Politische Psychologie*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS. *Chapter 4:Methods of the Present Study.* (pp 85–96)

PRESENTER:

*Deadline of the “Opposite of prejudice” assignment*

**III. FORMS OF ETHNIC PREJUDICE**

**18 October**

1. **Anti-Roma prejudice in Hungary**

*Readings:*

Váradi, L. (2014). *Youths Trapped in Prejudice: Hungarian Adolescent's Attitudes towards the Roma*. *Politische Psychologie*. Springer. Chapter 3: A Society trapped in prejudice: the case of Hungary. (pp 61–84); Chapter 5: Becoming prejudiced / becoming tolerant. (pp 97–124)

PRESENTER:

*Suggested:*

Váradi, L., Simonovits, B., Szilasi, B., Kende, A., Braverman, J., & Simonovits, G. " Personally, I feel sorry, but professionally, I don't have a choice." Understanding the drivers of anti-Roma discrimination on the rental housing market. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *8*, 1223205.

*Videos:*

Rosa Parks Foundation: Systemic racism against the Roma in Hungary <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z-nrKyz3vpo>

Misrecognition of Minorities in Europe (MiSMiE): Everyday Obstacles faced by Roma in Hungary

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCCJAouIqw0BDiPBAVsn6gRA/videos>

PRESENTER of the two videos:

1. **Anti-Semitism in Europe**

*Readings:*

Bergmann, W. (2009). Anti-Semitism. In A. Pelinka, K. Bischof, & K. Stögner (Eds.), *Handbook of prejudice.* Amherst, N.Y: Cambria Press.

PRESENTER:

Applebaum, Anne (2013). *Letter from Budapest. Anti-Semite and Jew*. The New Yorker

PRESENTER:

*Recommended:*

Kovács, A., & Fischer, G. (2021). Antisemitic Prejudices in Europe: Survey in 16 European Countries. Volumes I. and II.

**25 October**

1. **Xenophobia / Anti-immigrant prejudice**

*Readings:*

Wagner, U., Christ, O., & Heitmeyer, W. (2010). Anti-Immigration Bias. In J. F. Dovidio (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 361–376).

PRESENTER:

Messing, Vera; Ságvári, Bence. (2018). Looking behind the culture of fear. Cross-national analysis of attitudes towards migration. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Retrieved from library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/budapest/14181.pdf

PRESENTER:

*Recommended:*

Kende, J., Sarrasin, O., Manatschal, A., Phalet, K., & Green, E. G. (2022). Policies and prejudice: Integration policies moderate the link between immigrant presence and anti-immigrant prejudice. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *123*(2), 337.

*Video:*

American Sociological Association video series: Sociological Insights. Strangers in a Familiar Land: <https://vimeopro.com/asasoc/insights/video/341688415>

1. **Prejudice around us**

Presentations by students looking at four specific casesfrom around the world – details to be discussed in class

PRESENTER:

PRESENTER:

PRESENTER:

PRESENTER:

**8 November**

1. **Presentation of project ideas for the final project**

**IV. WHY DO PEOPLE HAVE PREJUDICES?**

1. **Integrative approaches to the study of prejudice**

*Readings:*

Bar-Tal, D. (1997). Formation and change of ethnic and national stereotypes: An integrative model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *21*(4), 491–523.

PRESENTER:

Heitmeyer, W., Küpper, B., & Zick, A. (2009). Prejudices and Group-Focused Enmity––A Socio-Functional Perspective. In A. Pelinka, K. Bischof, & K. Stögner (Eds.), *Handbook of prejudice.* Amherst, N.Y: Cambria Press.

PRESENTER:

**15 November**

1. **Personality-based approaches**

*Readings:*

Brown, R. (2010). *Prejudice: Its social psychology* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. *Chapter 2. Prejudiced Individuals* (pp. 13–34)

PRESENTER:

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(4), 741–763.

PRESENTER:

1. **Prejudice, conformity, and ingroup dynamics**

*Reading:*

Crandall, C. S., & Stangor, C. (2005). Conformity and prejudice. In J. F. Dovidio, P. S. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the Nature of Prejudice. Fifty Years after Allport* (pp. 295–309). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

PRESENTER:

*Recommended:*

Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*(3), 574–587.

**22 November**

1. **Data collection workshop 1: interviews**
2. **Data collection workshop 2: group discussions**

**V. POSSIBILITIES OF PREJUDICE REDUCTION**

**29 November**

1. **Reducing prejudice through contact**

*Readings:*

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). Allport’s Intergroup Contact Hypothesis: Its History and Influence. In J. F. Dovidio, P. S. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the Nature of Prejudice. Fifty Years after Allport* (pp. 272–277). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

PRESENTER:

White, F. A., Borinca, I., Vezzali, L., Reynolds, K. J., Blomster Lyshol, J. K., Verrelli, S., & Falomir-Pichastor, J. M. (2020). Beyond direct contact: The theoretical and societal relevance of indirect contact for improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, *10*.

PRESENTER:

*Podcast:*

[Opinion Science Podcast Episode 41](http://opinionsciencepodcast.com/episode/the-contact-hypothesis/?fbclid=IwAR2y4ZaqXCAnw4OFMu2ATxP_BH3wI7ZQhrep1sVxtfYY_oETEs1IKb1S8hg) (August 2021): The Contact Hypothesis with Tom Pettigrew, emeritus professor of psychology at University of California, Santa Cruz, Linda Tropp, professor of social psychology at University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Shreya Bhattacharya, economist; PhD from the University of Houston, Salma Mousa, as assistant professor of political science at Yale University.

*Recommended readings:*

Mousa, S. (2020). Building social cohesion between Christians and Muslims through soccer in post-ISIS Iraq. *Science*, *369*(6505), 866-870.

Bhattacharya, S. (2021). *Intergroup contact and its effects on discriminatory attitudes: Evidence from India* (No. 2021/42). WIDER Working Paper.

1. **Prejudice Reduction: What Works?**

*Readings:*

Paluck, E. L., Porat, R., Clark, C. S., & Green, D. P. (2021). Prejudice reduction: Progress and challenges. *Annual review of psychology*, *72*, 533-560.

PRESENTER:

Čehajić-Clancy, S., & Bilewicz, M. (2021). Moral-Exemplar Intervention: A New Paradigm for Conflict Resolution and Intergroup Reconciliation. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 30(4), 335–342.

PRESENTER:

*Media report of the first reading:*

Porat, Roni (2021): You Can't Train People to Be Less Racist, Israeli Researchers Find. Haaretz. <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium.MAGAZINE-you-can-t-train-people-to-be-less-racist-israeli-researchers-find-1.10004349>

*Recommended:*

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 339–367.

FINAL CONFERENCE

**6 December**

1. **Student presentations**
2. **Student presentations + feedback**