**Political Science 7700: Foundations of Political Psychology**

Prof. Kathleen McGraw Spring 2016

Derby Hall 2066 Wednesdays, 2:00 – 4:45 p.m.

292-3913 Derby 24

mcgraw.36@osu.edu Office Hours: by appointment

**Course Description:** This course is designed to be a broad overview of the field of political psychology. Political psychology is both a ‘field’ in and of itself, as well as a family of approaches used in every other field of political science. At its core, political psychology is concerned with the causes, dynamics, and consequences of human thinking and action in the context of politics. The goal of the course will be to review, discuss and evaluate historically important classics in political psychology as well as contemporary contributions and controversies.

**Readings:** The readings consist of empirical journal articles and book chapters. Many of the chapters are from the *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (2013, edited by Huddy, Sears and Jervis; abbreviated *OHPP* on the syllabus). You must purchase this book. All of the other readings will be posted on the course Carmen site.

**Requirements and Evaluation**:

**1. Class preparation and participation**. There is a lot of reading, and every student is expected to have completed the required readings for each class. You should view our class meetings as opportunities for the scholarly exchange of ideas, and all of us must participate in that scholarly exchange. Preparation and participation contribute 20% (up to 20 points) to your final grade.

Each class will center on a critical analysis of the assigned readings. Much of the class time will be devoted to discussion, but I will also open with a commentary or overview.

The ability to be critical is an important academic skill, but it is equally important to learn how to be constructively critical, and to be appropriately appreciative of high quality work.

**2. Weekly Essays**. Each student will write **seven brief essays** that are thoughtful reactions to the assigned readings. These essays should try to engage the concerns of the readings, by, for example: juxtaposing and commenting on alternative theoretical or methodological approaches to a topic; critiquing methodologies and proposing alternative research strategies; discussing the implications of a set of findings; suggesting new questions or hypotheses for research; developing similarities and contrasts with research found in readings from previous topics in this course, or other courses you have taken. These should not be summaries of the readings. These essays should be one- or two single-spaced pages.

The essays can focus on a single reading, >1 reading, or all of the assigned readings (the latter would be rare and nearly impossible to accomplish in a short essay). As a general principle, I like to see essays that incorporate >1 of the assigned readings, but it is certainly acceptable to focus on one (and no penalty for doing so). However, if I see a pattern developing wherein a given student only discusses a single reading in the essays, I will likely direct him/her to expand the focus.

The essays must focus on readings to be discussed in that day’s class, not previous class readings. I would prefer to receive them via email before class on Thursday, but will accept them at the start of class. You are free to choose the seven weeks of readings (from the 13 class meetings) that are of most interest to you. Each essay is worth 5 points, for a total of 35% of the course grade. You are free to do more than seven essays; I will take the scores from the top seven.

**3. Final Paper**. The final paper will be either a research proposal for a project that might be (and, ideally, will be) carried out at a later point in your graduate career or a report of original research relevant to a political psychology topic that is written in the style of an academic journal article. In either case, you are responsible for demonstrating a thorough understanding of the relevant literature, formulating a research question that is important, and convincing the reader that the research is worth undertaking. If you do a research proposal, it must be doable, within the context of existing resource and practical constraints. (See me if you aren’t sure what is, and is not, “doable”.)

You are encouraged to consult with me earlier in the semester about the paper. I expect that this paper will be original to this course, ie, not submitted as part of a requirement from a different course. I am willing to consider a substantial modification of a paper submitted to another class, but you must consult with me on this first.

The final paper is **due Monday April 25**. You should deliver a hard paper copy to me in my Derby office or place it in my Derby mail box. The paper is worth 45% of your final grade.

**Summary of Course Requirements and Calculation of Final Grade:**

1. Class attendance, preparation, & participation: 20%

2. Weekly essay (one or two pages, single spaced): 7 @ 5% each, or 35%

3. Final paper (Monday, April 25): 45%

**Schedule and Topics**

Class 1: January 13 Introduction to the course

Class 2: January 20 Overview and history of the field

Class 3: January 27 Origins of political preferences and perspectives I: Socialization

Class 4: February 3 Origins of political preferences and perspectives II: Genetics

Class 5: February 10 Personality I: Mass public

Class 6: February 17 Personality II: Elites

Class 7: February 24 Obedience to authority

Class 8: March 2 Cognition and decision-making I

Class 9: March 9 Cognition and decision-making II

March 16 – No class, Spring Break

Class 10: March 23 Affect and emotion

Class 10: March 30 Evolutionary psychology and neuroscience

Class 12: April 6 Elite cognition and decision-making/Foreign policy

Class 13: April 13 Intergroup attitudes

Class 14: April 20 Social identity and intergroup conflict

**Course Schedule and Reading Assignments**

**Class 1: January 13 Introduction to the course**

Huddy, L., D. O. Sears, and J. Levy. (2013) Introduction: Theoretical foundations of political psychology. *OHPP*.

**Class 2: January 20 Overview and history of the field**

 **History and Defining the Field:**

McGuire, W. J. (1993). The poly-psy relationship: Three phases of a long affair (pp. 9-35). In S. Iyengar and W. J. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology*. Duke University Press.

Monroe, K. R., W. Chiu, A. Martin, and B. Portman. (2009). What is political psychology? *Perspectives on Politics* 7:859-882.

Stone, S., K. Johnson, E. Beall, P. Meindl, B. Smith, and J. Graham. (2014). Political psychology. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* 5: 373-385.

Schildkraut, D. J. (2004). All politics is psychological: A review of political psychology syllabi. *Perspectives on Politics* 2: 807-820.

**Handwringing:**

Jervis, R. (1989). Political psychology: Some challenges and opportunities. *Political Psychology* 10: 481-493.

Sears, D. O. (1989). The ecological niche of political psychology. *Political Psychology* 10: 501-506.

Krosnick, J. A., and K. M. McGraw. (2002). Psychological political science versus political psychology true to its name: A plea for balance (pp. 79-94). In K. R. Monroe (Ed.), *Political psychology*. Erlbaum.

Druckman, J. N., J. H. Kuklinski, and L. Sigelman. (2009). The unmet potential of interdisciplinary research: Political psychology approaches to voting and public opinion. *Political Behavior* 31: 485-510.

**Thinking like a Political Psychologist:**

McGraw, K. M. (2006). How and why psychology matters. In R. E. Goodin and C. Tilly (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of contextual political analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Baron, R. M., and D. A. Kenny. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51: 1173-1182.

**Class 3: January 27 Origins of political preferences and perspectives I: Socialization**

Sears, D. O., and C. Brown. (2013) Childhood and adult political development. *OHPP*

Sapiro, V. (2004). Not your parents’ political socialization: Introduction for a new generation. *Annual Review of Political Science 7*: 1-23.

Easton, D. and J. Dennis. (1965). The child’s image of government. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 361*: 40-57.

 Greenstein, F. I. (1975). The benevolent leader revisited: Children’s images of leaders in three democracies. *American Political Science Review 69*: 1371-1398.

 Sears, D. O. and N. A. Valentino. (1997). Politics matters: Political events as catalysts for pre-adult socialization. *American Political Science Review 91*: 45-65.

 Jennings, M. K., L. Stoker, and J. Bowers. (2009). Politics across generations: Family transmission re-examined. *Journal of Politics* 71: 782-799.

 Weaver, V., and A. Lerman. (2010). Political consequences of the carceral state. *American Political Science Review* 104: 817-833.

**Class 4: February 3 Origins of political preferences and perspectives II: Genetics**

Funk, C. (2013). Genetic foundations of political behavior. *OHPP.*

 Alford, J. R., C. L. Funk, and J. R. Hibbing. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted? *American Political Science Review, 99*, 153-167.

 Hatemi, P. K. et al (2009). Genetic and environmental transmission of political attitudes over a life time. *Journal of Politics* 71:1141-1156.

 Hatemi, P. K. et al. (2013). Fear as a disposition and an emotional state: A genetic and environmental approach to out-group political preferences. *American Journal of Political Science 57:* 279-293.

 Charney, E., and W. English. (2012). Candidate genes and political behavior. *American Political Science Review 106*: 1-34.

 Hatemi, P. K., and R. McDermott. (2012). The genetics of politics: Discover, challenges, and progress. *Trends in Genetics* 28: 525-533.

**Class 5: February 10 Personality I: Mass public**

Caprara, G. V., and M. Vecchione. (2013). Personality approaches to political behavior. *OHPP*.

**The Authoritarian Personality:**

Brown, R. (1965). The authoritarian personality and the organization of attitudes. (pp. 477-548). In *Social psychology*. The Free Press.

Hetherington, M. and E. Suhay. (2011). Authoritarianism, threat, and Americans’ support for the war on terror. *American Journal of Political Science 55*: 546-560.

**The Big 5:**

 Mondak, J., M. V. Hibbing, D. Canache, M. A. Seligson,, and M. R. Anderson. (2010). Personality and civic engagement: An integrative framework for the study of trait effects on political behavior. *American Political Science Review 104*: 85-110.

Gerber, A. S., G. A. Huber, D. Doherty, C. M. Dowling, and S. E. Ha. (2010). Personality and political attitudes: Relationships across issue domains and political contexts. *American Political Science Review* *104:* 111-133.

Rentfrow, P. J., et al. (2013). Divided we stand: Three psychological regions of the United States and their political, economic, social, and health correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 105: 996-1012.

Gerber, A. S., G. A. Huber, D. Doherty, and C. M. Dowling. (2011). The big 5 personality traits in the political arena. Annual Review of Political Science 14: 265-287.

**Ideology and Personality:**

Jost, J. T. (2006): The end of ideology. *American Psychologist 51*: 651-670.

Jost, J. T., B. A. Nosek, and S. D. Gosling. (2008). Ideology: Its resurgence in social, personality, and political psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science 3*: 126-136.

Graham, J., J. Haidt and B. Nosek. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 96*: 1029-1046.

**Class 6: February 17 Personality II: Elites**

Winter, D. G. (2013). Personality profiles of political elites. *OHPP*.

Jervis, R. (2013). Do leaders matter and how would we know? *Security Studies 22*: 153-179.

**Quantitative Approaches**:

Winter, David G. (1987). Leader appeal, leader performance and the motive profiles of leaders and followers: A study of American presidents and elections. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52*: 196-202.

 Simonton, Dean K. (1988). Presidential style: Personality, biography, and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 55: 928-936.

 Etheredge, L. (1978). Personality effects on American foreign policy, 1898-1968. *American Political Science Review 72*: 434-451.

 **Psychobiography**:

Post, J. R. (2013). Psychobiography. *OHPP*.

 George, Alexander W. (1968). Power as a compensatory value for political leaders. *Journal of Social Issues 24*: 29-49.

**Class 7: February 24 Obedience to authority**

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. Harper & Row. (Pp. 1-42; 123-164)

 Blass, T. (1999). The Milgram paradigm after 35 years: Some things we know about obedience to authority. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 29: 955-978.

Blass maintains stanleymilgram.com

 Packer, D. J. (2008). Identifying systematic disobedience in Milgram’s obedience experiments: A meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science 4:* 301-304*.*

 Kelman, H. C., and V. L. Hamilton. (1989). *Crimes of obedience: Towards a social psychology of authority and responsibility*. Yale University Press. (Pp.1-22; 46-52; 195-235)

Zimbardo, P. G. (2004). A situationist perspective on the psychology of evil: Understanding how good people are transformed into perpetrators (pp. 21-50). In A. G. Miller (Ed.), *The social psychology of good and evil*. Guilford Press. for more info on the Stanford Prison Experiment, go to <http://www.prisonexp.org/>

 Darley, J. M. (1992). Social organization for the production of evil. *Psychological Inquiry*, 199-218.

 Van der Toorn, J., et al. (2015). A sense of powerlessness fosters system justification: Implications for the legitimation of authority, hierarchy, and government. *Political Psychology* 36: 1-18.

**Class 8: March 2 Cognition and decision-making I**

 **Background/General:**

Taber, C. S., and E. Young. (2013). Political information processing. *OHPP*.

 McGraw, K. M. (2000). Contributions of the cognitive approach to political psychology. *Political Psychology 21*: 805-832.

 Schacter, D. L. (1999). The seven sins of memory. *American Psychologist* 54:182-203.

 Frenda, S. J., et al. (2013). False memories of fabricated political events. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 49: 280-286.

 **Trait Inferences**:

McGraw, K. M. (2003). Political impressions: Formation and management. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, and R. Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

 Todorov, A., et al. (2005). Inferences of competence from faces predict election outcomes. Science 308: 1623 – 1626.

 Todorov et al (2015). Social attributions from faces: Determinants, consequences, accuracy, and functional significance. *Annual Review of Psychology* 66: 519-545.

Hayes, D. (2005). Candidate qualities through a partisan lens: A theory of trait ownership. *American Journal of Political Science* 49:908-923

 **On-Line and Memory-Based Processing:**

 Zaller, J. and S. Feldman. (1992). A simple theory of the cognitive response. *American Journal of Political Science 36*: 579-616.

 Lodge, M. and M. Steenbergen. (1995). The responsive voter: Campaign information and the dynamics of candidate evaluation. *American Political Science Review 89*: 309-326.

**Class 9: March 9 Cognition and decision-making II**

 **Motivated Reasoning:**

Lavine, H., Jost, J. T., and M. Lodge. (2014/in press). Political cognition and its normative implications for the “democratic experiment:” Theory, evidence, and controversy.

In P. Shaver and M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *American Psychological Association Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Jost, J. T., E. Hennes, and H. Lavine. (2013). “Hot” political cognition: Its self-, group-, and system-serving purpose. . In D. Carlson (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 851-875). Oxford University Press.

 Taber, C. S. and M. Lodge. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science, 50*, 755-769.

 Erisen, C., M. Lodge and C. S. Taber. (2012). Affective contagion in effortful political thinking. *Political Psychology* 35: 187-206.

 Druckman, J. N. (2012). The politics of motivation. *Critical Review 24*: 199-216.

 **Decision Making:**

Van Boven, L., M. Travers, J. Westfall, and G. McClelland. (2013). Judgment and decision making. In D. Carlson (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. xxx). Oxford University Press.

 Kahneman, D. (2003). A perspective on judgment and choice: Mapping bounded rationality. *American Psychologist 58*: 697-720.

Redlawsk, D. P. and R. R. Lau. (2013). Behavioral decision making. *OHPP*.

Lau, R. R., and D. P. Redlawsk. (2006). Chapters 1, 2, & 12 of *How Voters Decide: Information Processing during Election Campaigns*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

 Lau, R. R. and D. Redlawsk. (2001). Advantages and disadvantages of cognitive heuristics in political decision-making. *American Journal of Political Science 45*: 951-971.

 Quattrone, G. A., and A. Tversky. (1988). Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice. *American Political Science Review*, 82: 719-736.

**March 16 – No class, Spring Break**

**Class 10: March 20 Affect and emotion**

 **Overviews:**

Brader, T., and G. Marcus. (2013). Emotion and political psychology. *OHPP*.

Lerner, J. S. (2015). Emotion and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology* 66: 799-823.

**Affective Intelligence Model**:

 Marcus, G. E. and M. B. MacKuen. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *American Political Science Review,* 87:672-685.

 Brader, T. (2005). Striking a responsive chord: How political ads motivate and persuade voters by appealing to emotions. *American Journal of Political Science, 49*, 388-405.

 MacKuen, M. B. et al. (2010). Civic engagements: Resolute partisanship or reflective deliberation. *American Journal of Political Science* 54: 440-458.

**Miscellaneous:**

Huddy, L. et al (2005). Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies. *American Journal of Political Science* 49: 593-608.

Banks, A., and N. Valentino. (2012). Emotional substrates of white racial attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science 56*: 286-297.

Halperin, E. (2014). Emotion, emotion regulation, and conflict resolution. *Emotion Review* 6: 68-76.

**Class 11: March 30 Evolutionary psychology and neuroscience**

 **Evolutionary Psychology**:

Sidanius, J., and R. Kurzban. (2013). Towards an evolutionarily informed political psychology. *OHPP*.

Cosmides, L., and J. Tooby. (2013). Evolutionary psychology: New perspectives on cognition and motivation. *Annual Review of Psychology 64*: 201-229.

Peterson, M. B. (2015). Evolutionary political psychology: On the origin and structure of heuristics and biases in politics. *Advances in Political Psychology* 36 (S1): 45-78.

 **Political/Social Neuroscience**

Amodio, D. M., et al. (2007). Neurocognitive correlates of liberalism and conservatism. *Nature Neuroscience 10*: 1246-1247.

Jost, J. T., H. Nam, D. M. Amodio, and J. J. Van Bavel. (2014) Political neuroscience: The beginning of a beautiful friendship. *Advances in Political Psychology* 35 (S1): 3-42. Wiley. **The Beginning of**

**Class 12: April 3 Elite cognition and foreign policy decision-making**

Levy, J. S. (2013). Psychology and foreign policy decision making. *OHPP*.

Herrmann, R. K. (2013). Perceptions and image theory in international relations. *OHPP.*

Stein, J. G. (2013). Threat perceptions in international relations. *OHPP*.

 Levy, J. S. (1997). Prospect theory, rational choice and international relations. *International Studies Quarterly 41*: 87-112.

 Mercer, J. (2005). Prospect theory and political science. *Annual Review of Political Science, 8*, 1-21.

 Jervis, R. (2002). Signaling and perception: Drawing inferences and projecting images (pp. 293-312). In K. R. Monroe (Ed.), *Political psychology*. Erlbaum.

 Tetlock, P. E. (2005). Chapters 1-3 from *Expert Political Judgment: How good is it? How can we know?* Princeton University Press.

 Mellers, B., et al. (2015). The psychology of intelligence analysis: Drivers of prediction accuracy in world politics. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 21: 1-14.

 Those with strong interests in IR and political psychology might want to browse Paul Kowert’s syllabus <http://www2.fiu.edu/~kowert/inr6606.pdf>

**Class 13: April 10 Intergroup attitudes**

Kinder, D. R. (2013). Prejudice and politics. *OHPP*.

Paluck, E. Levy and D. P. Green. (2009). Prejudice reductions: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology* 60:339-367.

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

 Sidanius, J., F. Pratto, C. van Laar, and S. Levin. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology 25*: 845-880.

 Cuddy, A. J., S. T. Fiske and P. Glick. (2007). The BIAS Map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 4:631-648.

 Haslam, N., and S. Loughnan. (2014). Dehumanization and infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology 65*: 399-423.

 Kam, C. D., and D. R. Kinder. (2012). Ethnocentrism as a short-term force in the 2008 American presidential election. *American Journal of Political Science 56*: 326-340.

 **Implicit Attitudes**

 Nosek, B. A., A. G. Greenwald, and M. R. Banaji. (2007). The Implicit Association Test at age 7: A methodological and conceptual review. In J. A Bargh (Ed.), *Automatic processes in social thinking and behavior.* (Pp. 265-292). Psychology Press.

Payne, B. K., J. A. Krosnick, J. Pasek, Y. Lelkes, O. Akhtar, and T. Tompson. (2009). Implicit and explicit prejudice in the 2008 American presidential election. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46:367-374.

Gawronski, B., S. Galdi, and L. Arcuri. (2015). What can political psychology learn from implicit measures? Empirical evidence and new directions. *Political Psychology* 36 1-17.

Arkes, H. R. and P. E. Tetlock. (2004). Attributions of implicit prejudice, or “Would Jesse Jackson ‘fail’ the Implicit Association Test?” *Psychological Inquiry* 15: 257-278.

 Banaji, M. R., B. A. Nosek, and A. G. Greenwald. (2004) No place for nostalgia in science: A response to Arkes and Tetlock. *Psychological Inquiry* 15: 279-310.

 Tetlock, P. E. and H. R. Arkes. (2004). The implicit prejudice exchange: Islands of consensus in a sea of controversy. *Psychological Inquiry* 15: 311-321.

**Class 14: April 7 Social identity and intergroup conflict**

Huddy, L. (2013). From group identity to political cohesion and commitment. *OHPP*.

Spears, R. (2011). Group identities: The social identity perspective. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, and V. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research.* Springer. (Note: the entire volume is downloadable here <http://www.springerlink.com/content/978-1-4419-7987-2/contents/> )

 Brewer, M. B. (2001). The many faces of social identity: Implications for political psychology. *Political Psychology* 22: 115-125.

 Greenwald, A. G., and T. F. Pettigrew. (2014). With malice toward none and charity for some: Ingroup favoritism enables discrimination. *American Psychologist* 69: 669 – 684.

 Weisel, O., and R. Bohm. (2015). “Ingroup love” and “outgroup hate” in intergroup conflict between natural groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 60: 110-120.

 Spinner-Halev, J. and E. Theiss-Morse. (2003). National identity and self-esteem. *Perspectives on Politics* 1: 515-532.

 Herrmann, R. K., P. Isernia, and P. Segatti. (2009). Attachment to the nation and international relations: Dimensions of identity and their relationship to war and peace. *Political Psychology* 30:721 – 754.

Bar-tal, D., and E. Halperin. (2013). The psychology of intractable conflicts: Eruption, escalation, and peacemaking. *OHPP*.

 Paluck, E. L. and D. P. Green. (2009). Deference, dissent, and dispute resolution: An experimental intervention using mass media to change norms and behavior in Rwanda*. American Political Science Review* 103: 622-644.