

## **Political Science 894: Foundations of Political Psychology**

Prof. Kathleen McGraw  
Derby Hall 2066  
292-3913  
mcgraw.36@osu.edu  
Office Hours: by appointment

Spring 2006  
Mondays, 8:30 - 11:18, Derby 0150

**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. This course is a requirement for the Political Psychology graduate minor in the Department of Political Science.

### **Required Text and Readings**

You should purchase *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (2003; eds., David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy and Robert Jervis). Chapters from the Handbook are abbreviated OHPP on the syllabus.

The other readings consist of empirical journal articles and book chapters. Most of the journal articles are available online (marked with an asterisk on the syllabus), you are responsible for obtaining copies of those. All other readings will be available in files outside my office (Derby 2066).

### **Requirements and Evaluation:**

**1. Class preparation and participation.** There is a lot of reading, and every student is expected to have completed the readings for each class. You should view our class meetings as opportunities for the scholarly exchange of ideas, and all of us have should 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. Students will be assigned to present specific empirical pieces.

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 good work. You should not criticize unless you can offer a constructive alternative to the target of your criticism.

**2. Weekly Essays.** Each student will write **five brief essays**. These essays should try to engage the concerns of a set of 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, you can safely assume the reader (me) knows the details. These essays should be one- or two single-spaced pages.

The essays must address the readings to be discussed, not readings we have already discussed. I would prefer to receive them before class Monday morning, but will accept them at the start of class. You are free to choose the five weeks of readings that are of most interest to you. Each essay is worth 8 points, for a total of 40% of the course grade

**3. Final Paper.** The final paper will be a research proposal for a project that might be (and, ideally, will be) carried out at a later point in your graduate career. This is not intended to be a completed research project, but will be the basis and design for a piece of research. Papers will typically be 20 or so pages, and show an understanding of the development of knowledge in a chosen area as well an idea for extending that knowledge. It will include a literature review, a statement of the research problem, and a presentation of the research design. It may or may not include preliminary data analysis (that is, empirical analysis is not required). The design could make use of existing data sources, in which case you should detail the questions you would use, and justify why they are suitable for your problem. Or the design might require original data collection, in which case you should outline and justify your proposed research methods. The proposed research must be doable, within the context of resource constraints. (See me if you aren't sure what is, and is not, "doable".) More generally, see the Guidelines on the next page.

You should feel free to consult with me earlier in the quarter about this 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 an substantial modification of a paper submitted to another class, but you must consult with me on this first.

The final paper is due the Wednesday of Finals week (i.e., June 7th); you should deliver a hard paper copy to me in my office or place in my departmental mail box. The paper is worth 40% of your final grade.

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

- 1. Class attendance, preparation and participation: 20%
- 2. Weekly essay (one or two pages, single spaced): 5 @ 8% each, or 40%
- 3. Final paper: 40%

\*\*\*\*\*

## Guidelines for Final Paper in Political Science 894.01

The paper should consist of a literature review, statement of hypotheses, and proposed research design on some topic in political psychology. The introduction of the paper should tell me, in general, what question you will be addressing, why it is interesting and/or important in advancing knowledge in the field, and the general theoretical framework in which you place the question. In general, I am looking for evidence that you can find and understand the literature in on a question that interests you, can relate existing literature to a research question, and can propose a research question based on that literature.

The literature review should show me that you understand how to find scholarly literature on the topic that interests you, and relate that literature to your research question. You will almost certainly need to move beyond the readings assigned in class.

The literature review should flow into your research question, which should be stated in the form of an hypothesis (or a few hypotheses). In other words, after your review of the existing literature, what outstanding question(s) or puzzles need to be resolved? Why is this question interesting? What are the theoretical, political, and normative implications? How will the answer to the question further our collective knowledge in the field? What contribution will you be making? **You need to convince your reader that the research is worth undertaking.**

From the research question, the paper should flow into the research design which tells me how you will carry out the research. You will need to identify what kind of research method you will be adopting, and justify why that is appropriate to your research question. You need to define the important concepts and describe how you will operationalize (measure) them. Finally you need to describe the sample (if individuals are the unit of analysis).

### Other considerations and a checklist:

1. *Style*: I expect the paper to follow style guidelines for submission to a political science journal (checkout the guidelines for contributors for the *APSR* or *AJPS*). If you are from another discipline (e.g., psychology), adopt your home discipline's style guidelines.

2. *Introduction*: Is the purpose of the paper clearly stated? Is the question placed in some theoretical context or contexts?

3. *Literature Review* :

Does the paper identify and describe the major orientations to the question?

Does the paper properly place major pieces of research into those orientations, and show how each piece fits and contributes to that orientation?

Does the paper identify the major concepts that others have used, and how those concepts are used in the research?

Does the paper reflect the nature of the empirical research (research designs, data) and how that might affect the findings in the field?

4. *Research Question*

Is the research question stated in the form of an hypothesis (or hypotheses), with clearly defined independent and dependent variables?

Does the paper place the research question in the context of the literature that has been reviewed?

5. *Research Design*

Is the chosen research design appropriate for the question being asked?

Does the paper identify the sample that will be used to investigate the question; and is that sample appropriate?

Does the paper discuss how the variables will be measured? If this is secondary analysis, are the items available and suitable for measuring the variables of interest?

Does the paper discuss the kind of analysis that would be appropriate for the data that will be examined?

6. *General Considerations:*

Is the paper well written? Focused? Integrated? Can the reader follow the ideas that are expressed?

Can the research design actually be carried out, given available resources (it is ok to propose designs for which some funding might be required, but please don't propose projects that are inconceivable.)

## Class Schedule and Reading Assignments

### Class # 1, March 27: Introduction to the course (no readings assigned)

\*\*\*\*\*

### Class # 2, April 3: Introduction, History and Hand-wringing

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.

Sullivan, J. L. , W. R. Rahn, and T. J. Rudolph. (2002). The contours of political psychology: Situating research on political information processing (pp. 23-47). In J. H. Kuklinski (Ed.), *Thinking about political psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

McGraw, Kathleen M. (forthcoming). The infrastructure of political psychology. In Linda Valenty (Ed.), *Political Psychology*. Oplanden & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budich Publishers.

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.

Rahn, W. M., J. L. Sullivan, and T. J. Rudolph. (2002). Political psychology and political science (pp. 155-186). In J. H. Kuklinski (Ed.), *Thinking about political psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

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.

Lane, R. E. (2003). Rescuing political psychology from itself (pp. 755-793). OHPP.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Class # 3, April 10: Socialization Processes

Sears, David O. and Sheri Levy. (2003). Childhood and adult political development. OHPP.

Sapiro, Virginia. (1994). Political socialization during adulthood: Clarifying the political time of our lives (pp. 197-223). In M. X. Delli Carpini, L. Huddy, and R. Y. Shapiro (Eds.), *Research in micropolitics* (Vol. 4). JAI Press.

Conover, Pamela Johnston. (1991). Political socialization: Where's the politics? (pp. 125-152). W. Crotty (Ed.), *Political Science: Looking to the future*. (Vol. 3: Political Behavior). Northwestern University Press.

\* Easton, David and Jack Dennis. (1965). The child's image of government. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 361: 40-57.

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

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

#### **Class # 4, April 17: Personality**

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

\* Feldman, Stanley, and Karen Stenner. (1997). Perceived threat and authoritarianism. *Political Psychology* 18: 741-770

\* Feldman, Stanley. (2003). Enforcing social conforming: A theory of authoritarianism. *Political Psychology* 24: 41-74.

Simonton, Dean Keith. (1990). Personality and politics. (pp. 670-692). In L. A. Pervin (ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. Guilford Press.

\* Jost, John T., Jack Glaser, Arie W. Kruglanski, and Frank J. Sulloway. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin* 129: 339-375.

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

Winter, David G. (2003). Personality and political behavior. OHPP.

\* Greenstein, Fred I. (1967). The impact of personality on politics: An attempt to clear away underbrush. *American Political Science Review* 61: 629-641.

\* 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. (Ohiolink)

Lasswell, Harold Dwight. (1948). The political personality (pp. 39-58). From *Power and personality*. Norton.

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

Barber, James D. (1968). Classifying and predicting presidential styles: Two 'weak' Presidents. *Journal of Social Issues* 24: 51-80.

\* Goethals, George R. (2005). Presidential leadership. *Annual Review of Psychology* 56:545-570.

### **Class # 5, April 24: Cognition and Decision-Making (1: Mass public)**

Lau, Richard R. (2003). Models of decision-making. OHPP.

Taber, Charles S. (2003). Information processing and public opinion. OHPP.

McGraw, Kathleen M. (2003). Political impressions: Formation and management. OHPP.

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

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

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

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

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

### **Class # 6, May 1: Cognition and Decision-Making (2: Elites)**

Levy, Jack S. (2003). Political psychology and foreign policy. OHPP.

Herrmann, Richard K. (2003). Image theory and strategic interaction in international relations. OHPP.

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

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

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

Baron, Robert S. (2005). So right its wrong: Groupthink and the ubiquitous nature of polarized group decision making. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (ed. Mark P. Zanna), 37:219-255.

\* Goldgeier, J. M. and Philip E. Tetlock. (2001). Psychology and international relations theory. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4:67-92.

### **Class # 7, May 8 : Authority and Social Influence**

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

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

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

Zimbardo, Philip 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. At <http://www.prisonexp.org/pdf/evil.pdf>; for more info on the Stanford Prison Experiment, go to <http://www.prisonexp.org/>

Tyler, Tom R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*: Yale University Press. (Pp. 3-15; 40-112)

### **Class # 8, May 15: Affect and Emotion**

Marcus, George E. (2003). The psychology of emotions and politics. OHPP.

\* Marcus, George E. (2000). Emotions in politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 221-250.

\* Marcus, George E. and Michael B. MacKuen. 1993. Anxiety, enthusiasm and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *APSR* 87:672-685.

\* Taber, Charles S. and Milton Lodge. Forthcoming. Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *AJPS*.

\* McDermott, Rose. (2004). The feeling of rationality: The meaning of neuroscientific advances for political science. *Perspectives on Politics* 2: 691-706.

### **Class # 9, May 22: Prejudice and Racial Attitudes**

Duckitt, John. (2003). Prejudice and intergroup hostility. OHPP.

David O. Sears, John J. Hetts, Jim Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo. (2000). Race in American politics. (pp. 1-43). In D. O. Sears, J. Sidanius, and L. Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Sniderman, Paul M., Gretchen C. Crosby, and William G. Howell. (2000). The politics of race. (pp. 236-279). In D. O. Sears, J. Sidanius, and L. Bobo (Eds.), *Racialized politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Kinder, Donald R. and Lynn M. Sanders. 1996. The racial divide in public opinion; Subtle prejudice for modern times. Chapters 2 & 5 from *Divided by Color: Racial Politics and Democratic Ideals*. University of Chicago Press.

\* Feldman, Stanley and Leonie Huddy. (2005). Racial resentment and white opposition to race-conscious programs: Principles or prejudice. *American Journal of Political Science* 49: 168-183.

\* Sidanius, Jim, Felicia Pratto, Colette van Laar, and Shana Levin. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology* 25: 845-880.

\* Fazio, Russell H., and Michael A. Olson. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology* 54: 297-307.

\* Vedantum, Shankar. January 23, 2005. See no bias. *The Washington Post* (washingpost.com)

\* Arkes, Hal R. and Philip E. Tetlock. (2004). Attributions of implicit prejudice, or "Would Jesse Jackson 'fail' the Implicit Association Test?" *Psychological Inquiry* 15: 257-278.

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

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

### **Class # 10, May 29: Identity and Intergroup Conflict**

Huddy, Leonie. (2003). Group identity and political cohesion. OHPP.

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

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

\* Brown, Rupert. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems, and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 30: 745-778.

Kelman, Herbert C., and Ronald J. Fisher. (2003) Conflict analysis and resolution. OHPP

Staub, Ervin, and Daniel Bar-Tal. (2003). Genocide, mass killing, and intractable conflict: Roots, evolution, prevention, and reconciliation. OHPP