The Ohio State University
Colleges of the Arts and Sciences Concurrence Form

The purpose of this form is to provide a simple system of obtaining departmental reactions to course requests. A letter may be substituted for this form.

An academic unit initiating a request should complete Section A of this form and send a copy of the form, course request, and syllabus to each of the academic units that might have related interests in the course. Initiating units should be allowed two weeks for responses.

Academic units receiving this form should respond to Section B and return the form to the initiating unit. Overlap of course content and other problems should be resolved by the academic units before this form and all other accompanying documentation may be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs.

A. Information from the academic unit *initiating* the request

Political Science   **02/06/2008**

Initiating Academic Unit   Date

Political Science

Book 3 Listing (e.g., Portuguese)

806   **Foundations of Political Psychology**   **G**   **5**

Course Number   Title   Level   Credit Hours

Type of Request (underlined):   **New Course**   Course Change   Course Withdrawal   Other

Psychology

Academic unit asked to review the request

02/21/2008

Date response is needed (within two weeks of above date)

B. Information from the academic unit *reviewing* the request should include a reaction to the proposal, including a statement of support or non-support (continued on the back of this form or a separate sheet, if necessary).

Signatures

1. Clifford Weary   Professor & Chair   Psychology   4·14·08
    Name   Position   Unit   Date

2. Name   Position   Unit   Date

3. Name   Position   Unit   Date

Political Science 806: Foundations of Political Psychology

Prof. Kathleen McGraw   Spring 2008
Derby Hall 2066   Thursdays, 830 - 11:18
292-3913
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. 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. The other chapters and things not available online will be posted to the Departmental website.

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 Thursday afternoon, 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 last day of Finals' week (i.e., Friday, June 8th); 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%

■ ■

Academic Honesty Policy

I expect all of the work you do in this course to be your own. I will tolerate absolutely no cheating or plagiarism (using someone else's words or ideas without proper citation). I will report any cases of cheating or plagiarism to the University Committee on Academic Misconduct, and they will be handled according to University policy.

Students with Disabilities

If you need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability, you should contact me to arrange an appointment as soon as possible. At the appointment, we can discuss the course format, anticipate your needs and explore potential accommodations. I rely on the Office for Disability Services for assistance in verifying the need for accommodations and developing accommodation strategies. If you have not previously contacted the Office for Disability Services, I encourage you to do so.

Guidelines for Final Paper in Political Science 806

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: Introduction to the course (no readings assigned)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Class # 2: 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.

McGraw, Kathleen M. (2006). 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.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Class # 3: Personality

* Funder, David C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 197-221.

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

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

McGraw, Kathleen M. (2006). 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.

* Winter, David G. (1987). Leader appeal, leader peformance 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.

Class # 4: 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. (2006). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 375-400.

Class # 5: 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: 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.

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

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.

* Hart, Paul 't. (1991). Irving L. Janis' Victims of Groupthink. *Political Psychology, 12*, 247-278.

Class # 7: Affect and Emotion

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

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

* Brader, Ted. (2006) Affective intelligence and beyond: Next steps in research on emotion in politics. At http://www.unr.edu/organizations/pcr/1603_2006_fall/roundtable_brader.html

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

* Loewenstein, George, and Jennifer S. Lerner. (2003). The role of affect in decision making. In R. Davidson, H. Goldsmith, and K. Scherer (eds.), Handbook of affective science (pp. 619-642). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at http://computing.hss.cmu.edu/lernerlab/papers.php

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

* Lieberman, Matthew D. (2007). Social cognitive neuroscience: A review of core processes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*: 259-289.

Class # 8: 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.

* Henry, P. J., and David O. Sears. (2002). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. *Political Psychology, 23*, 253-283.

* 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.

Class # 9: Identity and Intergroup Conflict

Hewstone, Miles, Mark Rubin, and Hazel Willis. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575-604.

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

* Brewer, Marilynn 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

Class # 10: New Directions

(1) Implicit Attitudes

* Nosek, Brian A., Anthony G. Greenwald, and Mazarin R. Banaji. (2007). The Implicit Association Test at age 7: A methodological and conceptual review. In John A Bargh (Ed.), *Automatic processes in social thinking and behavior.* (Pp. 265-292). Psychology Press. Available at http://faculty.washington.edu/agg/bytopic.htm

* Vedantum, Shankar. January 23, 2005. See no bias. *The Washington* Post. Available at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27067-2005Jan21.html

* 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.

(2) Evolutionary (political) psychology

* Cosmides, Leda, and John Tooby. (2007). Evolutionary psychology: A primer. Available at http://www.psych.ucsb.edu/research.cep/primer:html

Sidanius, Jim, and Robert Kurzban. (2003). Evolutionary approaches to political psychology. OHPP.

Alford, John R., and John R. Hibbing. (2004). The origin of politics: An evolutionary theory of political behavior. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2, 707-723.

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