

**Proposed Diversity Requirement**  
2014 UCLA College Diversity Initiative Committee<sup>1</sup>  
*Revised June 9, 2014 per College FEC discussion*  
*Evidence section updated August 19, 2014*

***Summary***

A diversity requirement in the College of Letters and Science is predicated on the belief that in an increasingly diverse, complex, and interconnected global society a modern university must provide its students with the ability to understand the perspectives of others whose views, backgrounds, and experiences may differ from their own. It is also based on evidence that this ability, achieved through curricular opportunities, contributes positively to individual development and campus climate. Indeed, this capability must now be considered a core competency if our students are to thrive, function and lead in today's and tomorrow's world. Like most of our peer institutions both in- and outside of California, the College proposes that its students be required to complete and pass a course, with a minimum C grade, that takes seriously issues of diversity with respect to race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, religion, disability, age, language, nationality, citizenship status and/or place of origin. These courses, across disciplines, which may be traditional in format, experientially based, or centered on engaged and intensive dialogue, will promote a better understanding of and appreciation for the complex differences students will encounter both in the United States and around the world.

This requirement may be satisfied by taking a minimum four unit course, approved by an Undergraduate Council (UgC)-appointed Diversity Requirement Committee (DRC), with content that substantially focuses on diversity issues. These courses may be offered through the College and other Schools at UCLA and may also satisfy other parts of the student's overall program: 1) General Education courses; 2) courses in the major or minor; 3) selected elective courses, including community-based service learning courses, internships, or discussion-based seminars. As such, students are not required to complete an additional course in order to satisfy the diversity requirement.

***Goals***

The proposed College Diversity Requirement has four goals:

1. To teach undergraduates to better understand the perspective of others whose histories, experiences, cultures, and social conditions may differ. Frames of difference include but are not limited to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, age, language, nationality, citizenship status, and place of origin.

---

<sup>1</sup> See full committee membership as well as the Student Advisory Committee members in Appendix A.

2. To provide undergraduates with the analytical skills needed to develop critical and reflective perspectives on difference within both domestic and global spheres—including the structural processes, along with representational and embodied practices, that promote inequities and those that support fairness and inclusiveness.
3. To prepare undergraduates to function, thrive, and provide leadership in multicultural, multiethnic, transnational, and interconnected global societies.
4. To reduce prejudice on campus with regard to difference.<sup>2</sup>

### ***Rationale***

In 2010, UCLA formally embraced a set of guidelines to demonstrate the university's commitment to ensuring "a welcoming and inclusive environment for all." Three of these *Principles of Community* (UCLA, 2014) form the foundation for the proposed requirement by delineating both the basis of our efforts and the values we wish to instill in our undergraduates.

- We acknowledge that modern societies carry historical and divisive biases based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation and religion, and we seek to promote awareness and understanding through education and research and to mediate and resolve conflicts that arise from these biases in our communities.
- We affirm our responsibility for creating and fostering a respectful, cooperative, equitable and civil campus environment for our diverse campus communities.
- We value differences as well as commonalities and promote respect in personal interactions.

In order to maximize student preparedness for our global society, we must enhance student awareness, understanding, and acceptance or at least tolerance of difference through socializing experiences and through our pedagogy. Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, and Cuellar (2008) have defined the competencies required to ensure success in a multicultural world, which include the ability to interact with individuals from different social identity groups, and to make ethical decisions in a society marked by inequality and conflict. Although the UCLA student body is highly heterogeneous, comprising individuals from varied backgrounds, characteristics, and cultures, many come from more homogenous environments and have little familiarity with those from other histories, traditions, and experiences. The proposed College Diversity Requirement will be one strategy among others meant to encourage communication and understanding across difference.

---

<sup>2</sup> This proposal fully acknowledges the press of recent reports and events as context for this effort (e.g., the Moreno Report on climate for faculty of color; racists attacks on students; perceived discrimination results from the UCOP Climate Survey, etc.). These incidents have heightened our collective consciousness regarding bias, especially on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, citizenship, and religion.

The multicultural nature of the UCLA student body also underscores the fact that our undergraduates will be living and working in far more complex societies within a global economy. As reported in a survey conducted by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (See Appendix B: AACU LEAP Employers' Views Chart), employers want secondary institutions to place more emphasis on the acquisition of proficiencies such as awareness of cultural diversity in the United States and other countries, intercultural knowledge (specifically as it relates to international issues), and an ability to work well in diverse groups. Increasingly, businesses and professions are seeking university graduates who have studied issues of diversity both at home and abroad.

### ***Evidence*** (Section updated on 8/19/2014)

There is substantial evidence that a curriculum that addresses diversity and inclusion contributes positively to **individual development and the campus environment**. Reviews of the rapidly expanding literature on outcomes of diversity requirements demonstrate overall that these requirements produce a more tolerant, less prejudiced student body with a greater capacity for changing perspectives and that coursework that addresses diversity is associated with greater cognitive gains (c.f., Bowman, 2010; Denson, 2009; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012).

#### *Attitudes about race*

Research has focused in particular on a diversity curriculum's impact on **racial attitudes**, an important outcome for both individual development and the campus environment. Among the earliest clear demonstrations of this effect is a study by UCLA scholar Mitchell Chang (2002). Students in a Northeastern public university who had completed a required diversity course made more favorable judgments of Blacks (using the Modern Racism Scale) than those who had just begun the course. Brantmeier (2012) obtained similar results in her mixed-methods dissertation on changing attitudes toward Native Americans as a consequence of taking a Native Studies course.

Similar findings are evident in studies examining racial attitudes more broadly. Denson (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature on precisely that question by examining empirical studies designed to test the impact of multicultural course interventions in the U.S. (including required and non-required diversity courses, women's and ethnic studies courses, etc.), as well as other co-curricular activities (e.g., intergroup dialogue, diversity workshops, etc.) on racial bias. She found 27 studies that met criteria, which included the use of an "attitude/cognition/emotion" racial bias indicator as an outcome measure. Her analyses demonstrated an overall positive effect of curricular and cocurricular diversity activities on the reduction of racial bias. The study also found that the effect sizes were largest for White students (indicating a greater impact on their attitudes) and that the impact on racial attitudes was greatest when curricular interventions were accompanied by cross-racial interaction. Studies since Denson's review continue to confirm this association. For example, You and Matteo (2013) compared pre- and post-measures of multicultural competency for undergraduate students taking any of six diversity courses at their university and found significantly higher scores on multicultural competency in post-measures. Similarly, Neville, et al (2014) examined factors related to changes in White

students' Color Blind Racial Ideology (i.e., "beliefs that serve to deny, minimize, and/or distort the existence of racism") during college. They found greater decreases in CBRI scores among students who had taken larger numbers of diversity courses/activities over their four years of enrollment.

### *Civic Engagement and Cognitive Development*

Other research shows that a diversity course's impact is felt well beyond the domain of race/ethnic attitudes, affecting in particular one's **openness to diverse viewpoints and citizenship**, as well as **cognitive development**. Gurin, Nagda & Lopez (2004) examined college seniors who as first-year students took an initial course in an Intergroup Relations program. Compared to seniors who did not take such a course, they displayed higher values on a host of "democratic sentiments" including greater motivation to take the perspective of others, a greater sense of commonality in work/family values with other groups, a greater sense of mutuality in involvements with other groups, and more involvement in political activities. Again, there is more recent evidence to bolster the earlier findings. Silvia Hurtado and her associates at the UCLA Higher Education Learning Institute have conducted since 2011 the Diverse Learning Environments Survey at colleges and universities around the nation, which examines both structural and curricular components of educational settings. Hurtado, Ruiz and Whang (2012) found that students exposed to diversity in curriculum and pedagogy displayed a more pluralistic orientation (as represented by a measure of students' perspective-taking, tolerance of different beliefs, openness to having their views challenged, the ability to negotiate controversial issues, and the ability to work cooperatively with diverse people). Taking ethnic studies courses was related to greater critical consciousness and integration of learning; and taking women's studies courses was related to increased social agency and higher critical consciousness and action. Finally, cross-racial interaction (which we hope would occur in a diversity course) was related to greater civic engagement, social agency, and political engagement. Data gathered here at UCLA in 2011 demonstrated significant gains among students taking diversity-related coursework in pluralistic orientation with respect to race, privilege, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, and disability (UCLA Student Affairs Information and Research Office, 2014). Additional coursework was associated with even greater gains in these areas.

A particularly fruitful area of study has been the impact of a diversity curriculum on cognitive outcomes. Bowman (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of 23 studies that examined whether there is an overall effect of curricular and cocurricular diversity experiences on cognitive development in undergraduates in the U.S. Two types of cognitive outcomes were included: 1) cognitive skills (skills and abilities in thinking, reasoning and processing information) and 2) cognitive tendencies (an inclination toward certain types or styles of thinking). The study showed that in general, having experienced diversity coursework, diversity workshops or interpersonal interactions with racial diversity had positive effects on cognitive skills and tendencies, including critical thinking, attributional complexity, and disposition toward complex thinking.

### Moral Development

Diversity experiences on campus (including diversity courses) have also been found to have far-reaching effects on **moral development** in students by promoting re-evaluation of prejudicial beliefs and perspectives, increasing the complexity of student response to challenging social situations, furthering cognitive development in areas such as tolerance, perspective taking, critical appraisal of stereotypes, empathy, and a desire for public good (reviewed in Engberg and Porter, 2013). In particular, Hurtado, Mayhew & Engberg (2012) found that students enrolled in a diversity course developed greater levels of moral reasoning (measured by the Defining Issues Test 2) than those enrolled in a management course.

Even more striking evidence of the impact of diversity curricula is provided by Bowman, Brandenberger, Hill, and Lapsley (2011). In a longitudinal study of 416 college students, structural equation modeling results indicated that 13 years later, the impact of college diversity experiences remained. Specifically, participation in a racial/cultural awareness workshop had a significant indirect impact on personal growth and engaged purpose later in life. Perhaps more notable, taking even one ethnic studies course had a significant indirect impact on recognition of racism and engaging in volunteer activities and a marginally significant impact on personal growth and engaged purpose 13 years later.

### Beyond the Classroom: Institutional Effects

Finally, Denson and Chang (2009) provide strong evidence of institutional effects from curricular diversity. Using data from the HERI's Cooperative Institutional Research Program on 236 institutions (involving approximately 20,000 students), they examined impacts on both individual and institutional levels. Curricular diversity was a composite measure of three items: having taken an ethnic studies course, attended a racial-cultural awareness workshop, or participated in an ethnic-racial student organization in college. In educational institutions where the average level of curricular diversity engagement was higher, there were positive educational effects: i.e., both general academic skills and racial-cultural engagement were higher. Importantly, as the authors note, this means that students in colleges and universities where a substantial proportion of the students participated in workshops or classes concerned with diversity issues were more likely to report higher levels of general academic skills, regardless of whether or not they personally were involved in such classes or workshops. Hurtado, et. al. (2012) note that university climate is also improved when the school displays strong commitment to diversity issues—often realized in part through adoption of a diversity requirement. This action serves to legitimize knowledge surrounding inequality and social justice.

The notion of diversity engagement more broadly (i.e., beyond coursework) has been linked to other key aspects of scientific inquiry. Scott Page (2007) has made a compelling case for the power of diversity to spur innovation; in some respects, even outweighing the contribution of “ability” in problem solving. He demonstrates that “diverse perspectives and tools enable collections of people to find more and better solutions and contribute to overall productivity” (p. 13). Identity diversity is one aspect of this phenomenon. Medlin and Lee (2012) have further asserted that diversity is “intrinsic to the process of scientific inquiry.” They demonstrate how unique cultural perspectives have led to advancements on

critical scientific questions and note that developing a robust epistemology of science is contingent upon contestation (more likely when participants come from different perspectives and backgrounds).

### *Summary*

In sum, there is strong empirical evidence that diversity curricula have a positive impact on an individual's racial and ethnic attitudes, pluralistic orientation, openness to diverse viewpoints, citizenship, critical consciousness, social agency, cognitive skills and tendencies, and moral development, with some effects observed as long as 13 years later. On an institutional level, greater student participation in diversity curricula predicts greater academic skills and racial-cultural engagement in the school as a whole (even among people who did not participate in diversity experiences). Notably, meta-analyses demonstrate that though the role of diversity courses in these effects is strong and meaningful, it is enhanced by cross-group interactions. To achieve maximum results, UCLA must not view the Diversity Requirement as the sole vehicle for developing a more supportive and respectful community. There are synergies to be derived from enacting a complex of activities, including intergroup initiatives that jointly will optimize the UCLA experience for all. Such efforts are underway.

### *Criteria*

Courses fulfilling the Diversity Requirement provide a minimum of four units and would be expected to meet the following criteria:

1. Course must substantially address conditions, experiences, perspectives, and/or representations of at least two groups using difference frames that include but are not limited to race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, religion, disability, age, language, nationality, citizenship status and/or place of origin.
2. Course must incorporate analytical skills needed to develop critical and reflective perspectives on difference within domestic and/or global spheres. The course should include a focus on the structures, processes, and practices that promote inequities or conflicts as well as those that support fairness and inclusiveness.

Appendix C provides examples of exemplary courses.

### *Experiential Learning*

We wish to encourage the use of academic experiential learning opportunities as mechanisms for fulfilling the Diversity Requirement, as long as they meet the Diversity Requirement criteria. The Center for Community Learning in the Office of Undergraduate Education Initiatives has developed a very effective system of oversight that ensures academic content in community-based learning experiences. Existing vehicles such as Service Learning courses, Academic Internship courses, Astin Civic Engagement program

enrollment, and Americorp program participation, that have approved academic components, should be considered as ways to fulfill the requirement. Many of these courses carry the designation 195CE. Similarly, in terms of course goals and content, the Intergroup Dialogue Program would appear to be an especially appropriate mechanism for fulfilling the Diversity Requirement. As noted on the program website, participants learn to “effectively communicate with highly diverse populations and to work through conflict productively.” However, IGD is currently only a 2-credit course. Strategies for expanding the program to meet Diversity Requirement criteria should be explored.

### ***Implementation, Continuing Review and Assessment***

A key component of this proposal is the development of a structure for determining qualifying courses for the requirement, continual review and assessment of course criteria, and, in partnership with the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Office of Instructional Development, relevant student organizations and other key stakeholders, evaluation of the requirement’s impact. We propose that this responsibility reside with the Diversity Requirement Committee (DRC), an Undergraduate Council (UgC) committee, which will advise the UgC on matters pertaining to the undergraduate diversity requirement. The DRC will be charged with the following duties:

1. With appropriate consultation with the College and Schools that have adopted the College’s diversity requirement or have classes considered for diversity requirement credit, determine whether courses meet the requirement. This determination will include examination of course proposals, syllabi, and an explanation of how the course meets the diversity requirement criteria.
2. Provide feedback to interested faculty on how to adapt existing courses or create new courses that meet the diversity requirement criteria and send periodic email invitations to all UCLA faculty and departments to submit courses they wish to be considered for the requirement.
3. Direct any and all approved courses to the appropriate Faculty Executive Committee(s) and to the UgC for review and final approval, and maintain records, in cooperation with the Registrar’s Office, of approved courses and course materials.
4. Review and recommend to the UgC suspension or rescission of diversity requirement credit for courses found to be noncompatible with the requirement(s)’s principles and practices.

The DRC will compile a list of courses and present it to the UgC for approval no later than Spring 2015.

*Changes to the Structure of the Regulations.* Current College requirements are addressed in Senate Regulation A-458. The addition of a Diversity Requirement will necessitate adding the following language to A-458 (C):

*(6) Diversity Requirement. One course selected from a faculty-approved list of diversity courses that is available on the Registrar's web site. The course selected may also satisfy one of the following: (1) a General Education requirement; (2) a major or minor course; or (3) an elective.*

*Effective Date.* The Diversity Requirement will be effective for incoming first-year students in Fall 2015 and for incoming transfer students in 2017.

### ***Resources needed***

In order for the Diversity Requirement to be effectively mounted, while remaining cost neutral for participating departments and programs, we foresee the need for additional resources to support activities in several areas:

#### *Training Opportunities*

Critical to the implementation of the Diversity Requirement is the development of appropriate training opportunities for all persons teaching approved courses, including faculty, adjunct professors, instructors, and graduate teaching assistants. The provision of opportunities to learn more about best practices and appropriate techniques for engaging diversity-related themes that may be sensitive areas of inquiry and discussion is paramount. A number of universities have special offices for this purpose or have developed resources for faculty reference. Examples include:

The University of Colorado Faculty Teaching Excellence Program's compilation of faculty essays on diversity: *On Diversity in Teaching and Learning: A Compendium*

<http://www.colorado.edu/ftfp/publications/diversity.html>

The Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching's webpage on Diversity and Inclusive Teaching:

<http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/diversity/>

#### *New Course Development*

Equally as critical to the implementation process is the development of new courses to fulfill the requirement, particularly in areas where no or few relevant courses exist. Fields in science, technology and math are areas that will likely need special attention. One could foresee a course, for instance, that examines race, biotechnology and genetics, including the misuse of racial categories in medicine and science. Funds to support new course development are needed, which would likely include summer stipends for faculty and Graduate Student Researcher support.



### *Retooling Existing Courses*

A number of existing courses come close to meeting the criteria outlined above, but will need some retooling to be approved as Diversity Requirement offerings. Support for these activities would be similar to those listed above for new course development.

### *Feasibility Study for Fall 2015 Implementation*

In order to better estimate the resource needs for this initiative, we propose that an ad hoc committee be formed this summer (2014), with the responsibility of accomplishing the following tasks by the end of the summer:

- Determine existing courses that fulfill the Diversity Requirement criteria.
- Estimate number of seats provided by these courses.
- Based on this information, determine additional resource needs, including estimated costs, required to mount the requirement for Fall Quarter, 2015.

## References

- Bowman, N. K. (2010). College diversity experiences and cognitive development: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research, 80*, 4-33.
- Bowman, N. A., Brandenberger, J W., Hill, P. L., & Lapsley, D. K., (2011). The long-term effects of college diversity experiences: Well-being and social concerns 13 years after graduation. *Journal of college student development, 52*, 729-739.
- Brantmeier, N. K. (2012). *Undergraduate college students' attitudes toward Native Americans and their Native studies course experiences: A critical mixed methods study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Digitool Library, Colorado State University. PID 186453.
- Chang, M. J. (2002). The impact of an undergraduate diversity course requirement on students' racial views and attitudes. *The journal of general education, 52*, 21-42.
- Denson, N. (2009). Do curricular and cocurricular diversity activities influence racial bias: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research, 79*, 805 – 838.
- Denson, N., & Chang, M. J. (2009). Racial diversity matters: The impact of diversity-related student engagement and institutional context. *American educational research journal, 46*, 322–353.
- Engberg, M. E., & Porter, K. B. (2013). Conceptualizing the linkages between diversity experiences and moral development. *Journal of college and character 14*:289-299.
- Gurin, P., Nagda, B. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of social issues, 60*, 17-34.
- Gurin, P., Nagda, B. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of social issues, 60*(1), 17-34.
- Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C.L. Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M. & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments. Pages 41-122 in Smart, J. C., and M. B. Paulsen, editors. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*.
- Hurtado, S., Mayhew, M. J., & Engberg, M. E. (2012). Diversity courses and students' moral reasoning: A model of predispositions and change. *Journal of moral education, 41*, 201-224. DOI: 10.1080/03057240.2012.670931
- Hurtado, S., Ruiz, A., & Whang, H. (2012). Advancing and assessing civic learning: New results from the diversity learning environments survey. *Diversity and democracy, 15*(3), 10-12.
- Medlin, D. L., & Lee, C. L. (2012). Diversity makes better science (Presidential Column). Association for Psychological Science *Observer, 25*, May/June.
- Neville, H. A., Poteat, V. P.; Lewis, J. A., & Spanierman, L. B. (2014). Changes in White college students' color-blind racial ideology over 4 years: Do diversity experiences make a difference? *Journal of counseling psychology, 61*, Apr 2014, 179-190.
- Page, S. E. (2007). *Difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- UCLA, Principles of Community. Available at <http://www.ucla.edu/about/mission-and-values>
- UCLA, Student Affairs Information and Research Office. (2014). Chart: Pluralistic orientation by diversity-related coursework.

You, D., & Matteo, E. (2013). Assessing the effectiveness of undergraduate diversity courses using the Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire. *Journal of college and character*, 14, 59-66.

**APPENDIX A**

**College Diversity Initiative Committee Members**

**College Diversity Initiative Student Advisory Committee Members**

## **College Diversity Initiative Committee Members**

### *Co-chairs:*

Associate Professor Michael Alfaro (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology)  
Professor M. Belinda Tucker (Vice Provost, Institute of American Cultures)

### *Members:*

Professor Alicia Gaspar de Alba (Chicano/Chicana Studies, LGBT Studies)  
Associate Professor Alicia Izquierdo (Psychology)  
Associate Professor Tracy Johnson (Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology)  
Professor Raymond Knapp (Musicology)  
Professor Paul Ong (Urban Planning, Asian American Studies)  
Professor Jeffrey Prager (Sociology)  
Associate Professor Joseph Teran (Mathematics)  
Professor Russell Thornton (Anthropology)

## **College Diversity Initiative Student Advisory Committee Members & Affiliations**

Altagracia Alvarado, Afrikan Student Union  
Neil Apostol, Samahang Pilipino  
Erika Barbero, MEChA de UCLA  
Kevin Chang, Queer Alliance  
Irmarty Garcia, USAC Cultural Affairs Commission  
Mackenzie Greeley, Pacific Islands' Student Association  
Cheyenne Hawk, American Indian Student Association  
Connie Ho, Asian Pacific Coalition  
Ayesha Ibrahim, Muslim Students Association  
Jazz Kiang, Asian Pacific Coalition  
Cassidy Little, American Indian Student Association  
Devin Murphy, USAC Office of the President  
Teri Nguyen, Vietnamese Student Union  
Marien Ann Padua, Samahang Pilipino  
Harvey Peralta, MEChA de UCLA  
Evelyn Tran, Vietnamese Student Union  
Janay Williams, African Student Union, USAC Academic Affairs Commission  
Veronica Zamani, Pacific Islands' Student Association

**APPENDIX B**

**AACU LEAP Employers' Views Chart**

## *Percentage of Employers Who Want Colleges to “Place More Emphasis” on Essential Learning Outcomes*



### ★ **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World**

• Science and technology	70%
• Global issues	67%*
• The role of the United States in the world	57%
• Cultural diversity in the United States and other countries	57%
• Civic knowledge, participation, and engagement	52%*

### ★ **Intellectual and Practical Skills**

• Written and oral communication	89%
• Critical thinking and analytic reasoning	81%
• Complex problem solving	75%
• Teamwork skills in diverse groups	71%*
• Creativity and innovation	70%
• Information literacy	68%
• Quantitative reasoning	63%

### ★ **Personal and Social Responsibility**

• Ethical decision making	75%
• Intercultural competence (teamwork in diverse groups)	71%*
• Intercultural knowledge (global issues)	67%*
• Civic knowledge, participation, and engagement	52%*

### ★ **Integrative and Applied Learning**

• Applied knowledge in real-world settings	79%
--	-----

Note: These findings are taken from *Raising the Bar: Employers’ Views on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn*, a survey of employers conducted for AAC&U by Hart Research Associates and published in 2010. For a full report on this survey and related employer findings, see [www.aacu.org/leap](http://www.aacu.org/leap).

\*Starred items are shown in multiple learning outcome categories because they apply to more than one.



**APPENDIX C**  
**EXEMPLARY DIVERSITY COURSES**



**Env/UP M167 Environmental Justice Through Multiple Lenses – Fall 2013  
Tuesday & Thursday, 9-10:20am, YRL 11630F (New Classroom)**

Instructor: Professor Paul Ong TA: Adam Dorr

Office Hours: T/Th 11 am – 1 pm (5391 Public Affairs Building, Sign-up Sheet on Door)

**COURSE OVERVIEW**

This upper division course examines the intersection between race, class and the environment in the United States, focusing on issues related to social justice. Because environmental inequality is a highly complex phenomenon, the class takes a multidisciplinary and multi-population approach, utilizing alternative ways of understanding, interpreting and taking action. The course integrates knowledge from ethnic studies, environmental science, and the problem-solving professions such as law and public policy, urban planning, and public health.

The course is organized into four modules. The first two focus on defining and understanding the nature, magnitude and causes of environmental inequality, along with establishing a normative foundation for environmental justice. The second two modules examine actions whose goal is to identify and redress environmental inequality. Each module comprised roughly of three lectures and one discussion. The four are:

Module 1: Environmental and Societal Systems

Module 2: Social and Spatial Construction of Environmental Inequality

Module 3: Generating Local Knowledge

Module 4: Action, Agency and The State

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

Class attendance is mandatory. There will be assigned readings throughout the course in which you are required to write a four to five page, double-spaced, reflection paper for each module EXCEPT for module three and four.

**Grading**

10%	Pop Quizzes: The quizzes will consist of multiple-choice and/or fill-in-the-blank questions. (Top four of five scores.)
15%	Attending Discussion/Participation
25%	Assignment 1 - Analytical Social-Construction Paper
25%	Assignment 2 - Survey of North and South Campus Students
25%	Assignment 3 - EJ Campaign Design

**Required Readings:** Students are expected to do the weekly readings (and in some cases, watch a video). All readings (or links to them) are accessible on the CCLE Class website: <https://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/13F-ENVIRONM167-1>.

**Requirements for Assignment 1, Social-Spatial-Construction of Environmental Inequality Paper:** Students will submit an analysis of the nexus between social construction of groups and environmental justice. The 6-7 page paper has to be typed, double-spaced, in Times New Roman 12-point font with 1-inch margins. The reflection paper must be four to five pages- references do not count as text- and written without subheadings. A good paper addresses the questions for the assignment, includes critical and insightful thoughts, is well organized and has well-formatted paragraph, and uses an appropriate scholarly style. References should be done using an appropriate scholarly style; the references in this syllabus can be used as a model (ask TA for details and information about using Zotero).

## **Requirements for Assignment 2, Creating Local Knowledge through Survey of UCLA**

**Students:** Students will submit an analysis of the relationship between individual characteristics (e.g., gender) and environmental beliefs using primary data. Each student must complete a minimum of 10 surveys of science and engineering students at UCLA, and teams of 5 students will pool the responses for analysis of hypotheses. Students will submit a 6-7 page paper that summarizes the data collection (including impressions of the effort), empirically tests at least one reasonable hypothesis, interprets the results, and discusses the implications. This paper will be 6-7 pages, double-spaced, 12-point font in Times New Roman with 1 inch margins. The completed 10 surveys will be turned in as well. Specific instructions on how to write the report will be given during Module 3.

## **Requirements for Assignment 3 EJ Campaign Design: TBA**

**Plagiarism:** Plagiarism violates the UCLA Student Code of Conduct on Academic Dishonesty, section 102.01(c): Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the use of another's words or ideas as if they were one's own, including, but not limited to, representing, either with the intent to deceive or by the omission of the true source, part of or an entire work produced by someone other than the student, obtained by purchase or otherwise, as the student's original work or representing the identifiable but altered ideas, data, or writing of another person as if those ideas, data, or writing were the student's original work. Penalties for plagiarism can include Suspension or Dismissal from the University.

**Students with Disabilities:** If you qualify for classroom accommodation because of a disability, please submit your Accommodation Authorization to me as soon as possible, preferably within the first two weeks of the quarter.

## **Module 1 (September 26, 2013 – October 3, 2013): Environmental and Societal Systems**

September 26 (Thursday): Course Overview

- Background and foundation
- Introduction, review syllabus
- Class survey

October 1 (Tuesday): The Environment and People

*Readings: Pepper, D. "The Roots of Modern Environmentalism", Chapter 2 and Chapter 3; Liu et al. "Coupled Human and Natural Systems".*

- What is "environment"?
- The human-nature relationship
- Regional and micro environments
- Concepts of nature

October 3 (Thursday): Societal Systems

*Readings: Folmer and Johansson-Stenman, "Does Environmental Economics Produce Aeroplanes Without Engines?"; Jae Hong Kim and Nathan Jurey, "Local and Regional Governance Structures."*

- Human systems, institutions and technology
- Politics, economy, and social relations
- Spatialized/localized patterns
- Influence on environmental behavior

## **Module 2 (Oct. 8, 2013 – Oct. 24, 2013): Social/ Spatial Construction of Inequality**

October 8 (Tuesday): Assignment 1 – Spatial Stratification and Environmental Risk  
*Readings: Andrews, R. "Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves", Chapter 11.*

- Introduction to assignment content and method
- Class discussion

October 10 (Thursday): Difference, Stratification, and Social Construction of Race

*Reading: Omi, M. and H. Winant, "Racial Formations"*

- The social constructions of racial inequality (cultural anchors)
- How human system stratify people: class and race
- Stratification as differentiated economic, social and political power
- Political economic inequality – class divide and conquer
- The genetic challenge

October 15 (Tuesday): Spatialized Stratification

*Readings: Charles, C. Z., "Los Angeles: A Window on the Future of the Nation" and Ong, P, "An ethnic trade: The Chinese laundries in early California"*

- Spatial as social control
- The historical origins of land-use control as social control
- Zoning and restrictive covenants
- The anti-discrimination state and contemporary segregation practices
- Spatial dimension of environmental impacts

October 17 (Thursday): Socioeconomic Intersection with Spatialized Environmental Risk

*Readings: Pastor, M., J. Sadd and J. Hipp, "Which Came First? Toxic Facilities, Minority Move-in, and Environmental Justice"; and Houston, D., J. Wu, P. Ong and A. Winer, "Structural Disparities of Urban Traffic in Southern California: Implications for Vehicle-Related Air Pollution Exposure in Minority and High-Poverty Neighborhoods."*

Overlay of socioeconomic and environmental spaces

- Production and causality: Sorting and NIMBYism
- Review of the evidence

October 22 (Tuesday): Assignment 1 Meta-Analysis

- Class discussion
- DUE: Assignment 1 – Paper on Social Construction of Environmental Justice

October 24 (Thursday): Assignment 2 – Survey of Science and Engineering Students

*Readings: Fowler, "Survey Research Methods", Introduction and Chapter 1.*

- Introduction to assignment content and method
- Class discussion

### **Module 3 (October 29, 2013 – November 12, 2013): Harnessing Science & Engineering**

October 29 (Tuesday): Review of the Scientific Method and Epistemology

- Different forms of knowledge and knowing, and the special role of science
- Technical knowledge (*technis*)
- Neighborhood knowledge and ground-truthing (*metis*) introduced in brief
- Practical knowledge (*praxis*) introduced in brief

October 31 (Thursday): EJ through Lens of Science and Engineering (S/E)

Guest Lecture on Environmental Science and Engineering by Professor Cully Nordby

Reading: Carey, S. S, "Science"

- What is S/E? Similarity/differences across fields/discipline

November 5 (Tuesday): Environmental and Ecological Justice Compared

Readings: Florman, S. C. "Decline and Fall"; Frickel, S. "Who Are the Experts of Environmental Health Justice"; Corburn, J. "Characterizing Local Knowledge"

- Indigenous studies and ecological justice
- Minority position on global environmental issues
- Neighborhood knowledge and ground-truthing (*metis*) revisited in depth
- Practical knowledge (*praxis*) revisited in depth

November 7 (Thursday): Assignment 2 Meta-Analysis

- Class discussion
- Generating local knowledge and understanding EJ opinions
- DUE: Assignment 2 – Survey of Science and Engineering Students

November 12 (Tuesday): Assignment 3

- Introduction to assignment content and method
- Class discussion

#### **Module 4 (November 14, 2013 – December 5, 2013): Action, Agency, and the State**

November 14 (Thursday): EJ as Social/Political Movement

Readings: Winton, S., "Concerned Citizens: Environmental (In)Justice in Black Los Angeles"; Schelly, D., and Stretesky, P. "An Analysis of the 'Path of Least Resistance' Argument in Three Environmental Justice Success Cases"

- Defining Action and Agency

November 19 (Tuesday): State Response

Readings: President William Clinton, "Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations."

- Law, state institutions, Executive Order 12898

November 21 (Thursday): Evaluating EJ policies/programs

Readings: Callahan, C., J. R. DeShazo and C. Kenyon. "UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs Luskin Center for Innovation: Pathways to Environmental Justice: Advancing a Framework for Evaluation." [http://luskin.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/Pathways to Environmental Justice.pdf](http://luskin.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/Pathways%20to%20Environmental%20Justice.pdf); U.S. GAO, "Report to the Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives" <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-77>

November 26 (Tuesday): Preliminary Discussion of EJ Campaigns

November 28 (Thursday): NO CLASS – Thanksgiving

December 3 (Tuesday): Presentations of EJ Campaigns

#### **Wrap Up (June 5, 2013- June 10, 2013)**

December 5 (Thursday): Summing up

- Knowledge and social agency (effective action)

- Defining/differentiating knowledge and belief, basic and instrumental knowledge, evaluation as action-centric knowledge
- How do we envision an environmentally just world?
- From resistance/opposition to philosophies of justice and normative claims

## **COURSE READINGS**

### **Readings for Module 1**

Folmer, Henk and Olof Johansson-Stenman (2011). "Does Environmental Economics Produce Aeroplanes Without Engines? On the Need for an Environmental Social Science," Environmental Resource Economics, 48:337–361.

Kim, Jae Hong and Nathan Jurey (2013). "Local and Regional Governance Structures: Fiscal, Economic, Equity, and Environmental Outcomes," Journal of Planning Literature, 28:111-123.

Pepper, David (1984). The Roots of Modern Environmentalism. Croom Helm Natural Environment--problems and Management Series. London ; Dover, N.H: Croom Helm.

Liu, Jianguo, Thomas Dietz, Stephen R Carpenter, Carl Folke, Marina Alberti, Charles L Redman, Stephen H Schneider, et al. (2007). "Coupled Human and Natural Systems." Ambio 36(8):639–649.

Additional Optional Readings:

Andrews, R.N.L., (2006). Managing the Environment, Managing Ourselves: A History of American Environmental Policy, 2nd ed. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Ruby, Alan P. and Jason Konefal, (2007). "Nature, Sociology, and Social Justice: Environmental Sociology Pedagogy, and the Curriculum," American Behavioral Scientist, 51:495-515.

### **Readings for Module 2**

Charles, C. Z. (2009). Los Angeles: A Window on the Future of the Nation. Won't You be My Neighbor?: Race, Class, and Residence in Los Angeles, Russell Sage Foundation Publications: 6-38.

Fowler, F. J. (2009). Survey research methods (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Houston, D., J. Wu, P. Ong and A. Winer (2004). "Structural Disparities of Urban Traffic in Southern California: Implications for Vehicle-Related Air Pollution Exposure in Minority and High-Poverty Neighborhoods." Journal of Urban Affairs 26(5): 565-592.

Omi, M. and H. Winant (1994). Racial Formations. Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s. M. Omi and H. A. Winant, Psychology Press: 9-15.

Ong, P. (1981). "An ethnic trade: The Chinese laundries in early California." Journal of Ethnic Studies 8(4): 95-112.

Pastor, M., J. Sadd and J. Hipp (2001). "Which Came First? Toxic Facilities, Minority Move-in, and Environmental Justice." Journal of Urban Affairs 23(1): 1-21.

### Readings for Module 3

Carey, S. S. (2011). Science. A beginner's guide to scientific method, Wadsworth Publishing Company: 1-11.

Corburn, J. (2005). Characterizing Local Knowledge. Street science: Community knowledge and environmental health justice, The MIT Press: 47-77.

Florman, S. C. (1996). Decline and Fall. The existential pleasures of engineering, St. Martin's

Frickel, S. (2011). Who Are the Experts of Environmental Health Justice. Technoscience and environmental justice: expert cultures in a grassroots movement. G. Ottinger and B. R. Cohen, MIT Press: 21-39.

### Readings for Module 4

Callahan, C., J. R. DeShazo and C. Kenyon. (2012). "UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs Luskin Center for Innovation: Pathways to Environmental Justice: Advancing a Framework for Evaluation." from [http://luskin.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/Pathways to Environmental Justice.pdf](http://luskin.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/Pathways%20to%20Environmental%20Justice.pdf).

Delegates to the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summer. (1991). "Principles of Environmental Justice." Retrieved March 29, 2013, from <http://www.ejnet.org/ej/principles.html>.

Fixico, D. L. (2011). Healing the Earth in the Twenty-first Century. The invasion of Indian country in the twentieth century, University Press of Colorado: 219-240.

President William Clinton (2008). "Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. February 11, 1994." Executive Office of the President of the United States.

Schelly, David, and Paul B. Stretesky (2009). "An Analysis of the 'Path of Least Resistance' Argument in Three Environmental Justice Success Cases." Society & Natural Resources 22.4:369-380.

United States Government Accountability Office. (2011). "Report to the Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives." Retrieved March 29, 2013, from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-77>.

Winton, S. (2010). Concerned Citizens: Environmental (In)Justice in Black Los Angeles. Black Los Angeles: American Dreams and Racial Realities. D. M. Hunt and A.-C. Ramón, NYU Press: 343, 344-345, 354-355.

**Extra Credit:** Students can earn up to 5% by writing a 4-5 page reflection paper on the definition(s) of justice that incorporates readings from course materials with a personal normative position. The paper should address the following questions:

- (1) Which of the philosophical conceptualization of justice is most aligned to your views? Which ones are not? What forms and types of injustices are addressed and not addressed by your choice?
- (2) What factors influence your choice. Explain in terms of your background, experiences, religious and other beliefs, and education.
- (3) How important is your justice philosophy in your everyday life? If possible, provide examples of putting your belief into practice.
- (4) How does your view of justice relate (or not) to the environment?

The reflection paper has to be typed, double-spaced, in Times New Roman 12-point font with 1-inch margins. The reflection paper must be three to four pages (references do not count as text), and written without subheadings. A good paper addresses the questions for the assignment, includes critical and insightful thoughts, is well organized and has well-formatted paragraph, and uses an appropriate scholarly style. Students may work in groups to produce a paper. References should be done using an appropriate scholarly style; the references in this syllabus can be used as a model (ask TA for details and information about using Zotero).

Professor must be notified by the end of fourth week if students want to turn in an extra credit assignment. The deadline for turning in the extra credit is the end of 8th week.

### **Readings for Extra Credit**

Illinois State University. "Three Theories of Justice: Utilitarianism, Justice as Fairness, and Libertarianism." [http://lilt.ilstu.edu/pefranc/3-ts\\_of\\_justice.htm](http://lilt.ilstu.edu/pefranc/3-ts_of_justice.htm).

Schlosberg, D. (2007). Defining environmental justice: theories, movements, and nature, Oxford University Press New York (particularly "Distribution and Beyond: Conceptions of Justice in Contemporary Theory and Practice." pp 11-41).

## Psychology 188A Special Topics Seminar: Psychology of Diversity

Winter 2014 Wednesdays 1-3:50pm  
1571 Franz Hall

Instructor

Office Hour: Immediately after class or by appointment

Yuen Huo  
4625 Franz Hall  
huo@psych.ucla.edu  
310-794-5305

Course website: <https://ccle.ucla.edu/course/view/14W-PSYCH188A-1>

### Course Overview:

Diversity science is an emerging field that examines how group differences are created, perceived, and maintained. Using readings, media, and discussion, we will sample key research streams from the psychological study of diversity and focus on how the empirical evidence can address challenges in our society including managing diverse workforces, reducing racial disparities in health, law, and education, generating effective responses to rapid demographic changes, and resolving intercultural conflicts.

In each class, we will tackle a specific topic related to the experience of diversity and review the theoretical and empirical evidence available to us. We will also examine related social issues and consider how existing psychological evidence can inform potential solutions.

### Statement on UCLA Letters and Science Diversity requirement:

This course fulfills the UCLA College of Letters and Science diversity requirement. First, we will address the experiences of different groups in the U.S. including ethnic groups, cultural groups, gender, sexual orientation, and class. In addition, students will be encouraged to analyze how structural, interpersonal, and person factors interact to shape how individuals living in diverse contexts respond to perceived differences. Lastly, we will reflect upon evidence-based practices that can contribute to promoting inclusion and the reduction of existing group-based inequities.

### Requirements:

This is an upper division seminar. The class is structured to be student centered. The instructor will begin each class with an overview of the topic and related theory and research. Students are expected to raise questions and share reactions to the ideas presented in the overview and the assigned readings.

Each week after initial meeting, there will be a lead-in article that provides an overview of the topic, followed by 2-3 readings that will form the basis of class discussion. To facilitate active participation, each student will be required to post to the class website two brief reactions to the readings. A discussion team will be assigned to organize student comments and to lead class discussion.



There are four requirements for the course:

### 1. Class Participation (50%)

**General Participation and Written Comments (25%).** Students are required to be active participants in class. Each student will post to the class discussion board **two** brief well thought out reactions and/or critiques based on the day's readings and be prepared to elaborate on and defend their written responses in class. Each comment should be written concisely in no more than two or three sentences (you will be expected to provide additional details in class discussions). **The two written comments must be posted on the course webpage no later than 12:00 noon the day before each class meeting.** It is important to recognize that the most useful contributions should be in the form of a statement reflecting your thoughts and opinions and NOT simply a question. If a question comes to mind, try to formulate an answer, however tentative. Oftentimes there is no "correct" answer. When you share your thoughts, you will give us an opportunity to collectively consider the idea and see whether it holds up or would benefit from modification.

Below are suggestions to keep in mind as you formulate your responses to the readings.

1) **Utility/Application:** To what extent is the current research useful in helping us to understand something new about the human experience in diverse environments? Or in what ways can the research inform practice or policy?

2) **Gaps/Limitations:** What are some limitations about how the research was conducted? What are some assumptions underlying the research and/or its interpretation that you disagree with?

**Leading Class Discussion (25%).** Pairs of students will be assigned to lead class discussion for one week. Discussion leaders will: 1) organize the posted comments; 2) propose a plan for discussing each reading; 3) find ways to integrate themes and ideas across readings.

### 2. Real World Application Presentation (20%):

One goal of this class is to encourage students to consider the translational aspects of research in the psychology of diversity. How might research in this area generate insights for solving problems in contemporary society? Application and intervention will be theme of Week 9 readings.

During Week 10, students will be required to make presentations in small groups (3-4). The presentation will include: 1) identifying a known social problem (e.g., health disparity, policy quandary, diversity strategy); 2) translate how research from the psychology of diversity can inform efforts to find solutions; and 3) propose a next step toward social action (i.e. policy recommendation).

Presentations are limited to 20 minutes with 10 minutes of discussion. Students will prepare PowerPoint slides for their presentations. Groups will be formed by Week 6 based on common interests and students will have time to meet with their group in class. Additional details for the project will be distributed in class.

- 3. Take home, open book written “exam” (30%):** The goal of this last requirement is to assess your ability to synthesize ideas from the course and to apply research insights to social problems. You may use the readings, notes, and other materials available to you. You may brainstorm with your classmates. However, each student must independently formulate their written response. The questions will be available on the last day of class and will **due by noon on Monday of Finals Week.**

## TENTATIVE CLASS SCHEDULE AND READING LIST

*All readings will be uploaded to the course website, organized by meeting weeks.*

### **Week 1            1/8        Course Overview and Introduction to Diversity Science**

*Please read the two brief papers prior to our initial meeting.*

Mendoza-Denton, R., & España, C. (2010). Diversity Science: What Is It? *Psychological inquiry*, 21(2), 140-145.

Fredrickson, G. M. (1999). Models of American ethnic relations: A historical perspective. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 23-34). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

### **Week 2            1/15        Cultural Influences on Psychology**

*Discussion Leaders:*    1. \_\_\_\_\_    2. \_\_\_\_\_

Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and Selves: A Cycle of Mutual Constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5: 420-430.

#### **Discussion Papers:**

Stephens, N. M., Townsend, S. S. M., Markus, H. R., & Phillips, L. T. (2012). A cultural mismatch: Independent cultural norms produce greater increases in cortisol and more negative emotions among first-generation college students. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(6), 1389-1393.

Chiang, J. J., Saphire-Bernstein, S., Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., & Taylor, S. E. (2013). Cultural differences in the link between supportive relationships and proinflammatory cytokines. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4(5), 511-520.

Greenfield, P. M. (2013). The changing psychology of culture from 1800 through 2000. *Psychological Science*, 24(9), 1722-1731.

**Week 3      1/22      Social Class**

*Discussion Leaders:*    1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., & Keltner, D. (2011). Social Class as Culture: the Convergence of Resources and Rank in the Social Realm. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 246-250.

**Discussion Paper:**

Mani, A., Mullainathan, S., Shafir, E., & Zhao, J. (2013). Poverty impedes cognitive function. *Science*, 341(6149), 976-980.

Kraus, M. W., Côté, S., & Keltner, D. (2010). Social class, contextualism, and empathic accuracy. *Psychological Science*, 21(11), 1716-1723.

Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Côté, S., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Keltner, D. (2012). Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109(11), 4086-4091.

**Week 4      1/29      Contemporary Forms of Racial Prejudice**

*Discussion Leaders:*    1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

Pearson, A. R., Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2009). The nature of contemporary prejudice: Insights from aversive racism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3, 314-338.

**Discussion Papers:**

Richeson, J. A., Baird, A. A., Gordon, H. L., Heatherton, T. F., Wyland, C. L., Trawalter, S., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). An fMRI investigation of the impact of interracial contact on executive function. *Nature Neuroscience*, 6(12), 1323-1328.

Payne, B. K. (2006). Weapon bias: Split-second decisions and unintended stereotyping. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(6), 287-291.

Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, 17(5), 383-386.

**Week 5      2/5      Persistence of Gender Inequality**

*Discussion Leaders:*    1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109-118.

**Discussion Papers:**

Biernat, M., Tocci, M. J., & Williams, J. C. (2012). The language of performance evaluations: Gender-based shifts in content and consistency of judgment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*(2), 186-192.

Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2013). Penalizing men who request a family leave: Is flexibility stigma a femininity stigma? *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(2), 322-340.

Ceci, S. J., & Williams, W. M. (2011). Understanding current causes of women's underrepresentation in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 108*, 3157-3162.

**Week 6      2/12      Film: School Colors**

*No readings for this week.*

Meet with group to discuss class presentation.

**Week 7      2/19      Intergroup Contact**

*Discussion Leaders:*    1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

Pettigrew, T. F. (2008). Review: Future directions for intergroup contact theory and research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32*(3), 187-199.

**Discussion Papers:**

Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2006). Ethnic diversity and perceptions of safety in urban middle schools. *Psychological Science, 17*(5), 393-400.

Mendoza-Denton, R., & Page-Gould, E. (2008). Can cross-group friendships influence minority students' well-being at historically white universities? *Psychological Science, 19*(9), 933-939.

Avery, D. R., Richeson, J. A., Hebl, M. R., & Ambady, N. (2009). It does not have to be uncomfortable: The role of behavioral scripts in Black-White interracial interactions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1382-1393.

**Week 8            2/26    Diversity Management**

*Discussion Leaders:*    1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

Dovidio, J. F., Saguy, T., & Gaertner, S. L. (2010). Appreciating the role of the “individual mind” in diversity science: Commonality, harmony, and social change. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(2), 108-

**114. Discussion Papers:**

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 444-446.

Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44, 116-133.

Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Ho, G. C. (2012). Diversity is what you want it to be: How social-dominance motives affect construals of diversity. *Psychological Science*, 23(3), 303-309.

**Week 9            3/5        Using Social Science Evidence to Address Real World Problems**

*Discussion Leaders:*    1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_

Cohen, G. L., Garcia, J., Apfel, N., & Master, A. (2006). Reducing the racial achievement gap: A social-psychological intervention. *Science*, 313(5791), 1307-1310.

**Discussion Papers**

Nier, J. A., Gaertner, S. L., Nier, C. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2012). Can racial profiling be avoided under Arizona immigration law? Lessons learned from subtle bias research and anti-discrimination law. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 12(1), 5-20.

Cheryan, S., Meltzoff, A. N., & Kim, S. (2011). Classrooms matter: The design of virtual classrooms influences gender disparities in computer science classes. *Computers & Education*, 57(2), 1825-1835.

Herek, G. M. (2006). Legal recognition of same-sex relationships in the US: A social science perspective. *American Psychologist*, 61, 607-21.

**Week 10          3/12    Student Presentations**

**\*\* TAKE HOME FINAL EXAMS DUE: NOON, MONDAY 3/17.**