

Politics 304: Topics in Political Psychology

Fall 2006

Michael Parkin

203 Rice Hall

775-6197

michael.parkin@oberlin.edu

Class Meets: Monday, 7:30 – 9:30 in King 121

Office Hours: Monday and Thursday, 2:00 – 4:00 or by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

According to Howard Lavine (2002), “Political psychology, as an interdisciplinary pursuit, applies psychological concepts and methods to test theories about elite and mass political behavior.” In this way, political psychologists have gone “inside the mind” of political elites and average citizens in an attempt to explain a host of political phenomena from how people interpret political information and make political decisions to the role that emotions, identities, and analogies play in forming opinions and evaluating political options.

In this course, we will use leading work in political psychology to investigate critical issues in American politics. After introducing political psychology’s history, methods, and major approaches, we will look at how Americans think about politics and the role that emotions play in political decision-making. We will then focus on questions of civil liberties, intolerance, personality, extremism, and authoritarianism, as well as group identities and inter-group relations. We will conclude by examining the psychology of foreign conflict, at both the elite and mass level.

REQUIREMENTS

You are expected to come to class each week prepared to discuss the issues raised by the *required* readings. You will notice that for each week I have listed both *required* and *optional* readings – you are not obligated to read the *optional* readings, they are there if you are particularly interested in the topic and/or want to write your research paper on that subject. Please see me if you cannot locate any of the *optional* readings as they are not on the Blackboard site for this course.

Please read the *required* readings, in the order they are presented, before the class on the date they are listed. You will be asked to write a short reaction paper most weeks and I expect that you will have something brilliant to say in class about each *required* reading.

The following books are required reading for the course. They are available on reserve in the library or for purchase online or at the college bookstore.

Jost, John T., and Jim Sidanius. 2004. *Political Psychology: Key Readings*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Marcus, George E., John L. Sullivan, Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, and Sandra L. Wood. 1995. *With Malice Toward Some: How People Make Civil Liberties Judgments*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Stenner, Karen. 2005. *The Authoritarian Dynamic*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Gilens, Martin. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Anti-Poverty Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

All other *required* readings (e.g., journal articles) are available on the Blackboard site for this class. Login to Blackboard using your email user name and then select 'Course Materials' to find the required readings. You are expected to do all of these readings although it is up to you whether you print them off or read them from the screen and take notes.

Assignments and Grading

Class Participation:	15%	
Experiment Design:	5%	(due Monday, September 25 th in class)
Reaction Papers:	25%	(due Before 5:00 on Monday)
Exam:	20%	(due Friday, November 17 th via email)
Paper Presentation:	5%	(due Monday, December 4 th in class)
Final Paper:	30%	(due Friday, December 15 th via email)

Class Participation

Your class participation grade will be based on your attendance in class and, more importantly, your ability to discuss the course readings. In terms of your active participation in class, the *quality* of your comments matters much more than their *quantity* – insightful comments that reflect an interest in and understanding of the course material will be rewarded much more than frequent commentary on how this stuff reminds you of a personal anecdote.

Experiment Design

Experiments are an important methodological tool used by political psychologists; they provide significant control over variables although they are not without their problems. Your first formal assignment will be to design an experimental study that addresses a question of interest to political psychologists while avoiding some of the pitfalls of experimental work. Your experiment design should be between 3-5 pages and is due on **Monday, September 25th**. You will also be asked to talk about your proposed experiment during this class meeting.

Reaction Papers

Starting on the fifth week of class (October 9th), you will have the opportunity (i.e., obligation) to reflect on the course readings for the week. You are required to write a *one-page*, single-spaced reaction paper that evaluates the method, argument, and contribution of the week's readings. You do not have to discuss all aspects of that week's readings, just the parts that you find particularly interesting and/or thought-provoking. The goal is to have you think critically about what you have read and express some carefully formed opinions about it. (I will say

more in class about how these papers are to be written.) Your papers must be emailed to me (michael.parkin@oberlin.edu) or dropped off at my office (Rice 203) **before 5:00 on Monday**. You will have the chance to write 7 of these reflection papers throughout the semester and your grade for this part of the course will be based on your top 5 scores.

Exam

There will be a take-home exam near the end of the semester. You are encouraged to use any notes (including your reaction papers and possibly those of others) and course material to answer the questions. I will hand-out the test in class on November 13th and you are to either email or drop-off your answers to me by **4:00 on Friday, November 17th**.

Paper Presentation

During the last few weeks of class, you will present your research paper to the class. Your presentation should be no longer than 10 minutes and you should anticipate answering multiple questions. Do not try to present everything in your paper; focus on providing a succinct overview of your research and highlighting the major points. This is really an opportunity to get helpful feedback before the paper is due. The presentation is worth 5% of your final grade.

Final Paper

Thirty percent of your final grade will be based on a research paper. The paper should be between 17-25 pages, double-spaced and is due on **Friday, December 22nd**. I will offer suggestions, guidelines, and expectations although you will have considerable freedom in choosing a topic that interests you. Indeed, a critical step in the process is selecting an interesting topic. Once you have settled on a topic, you will need to decide how to approach it. There are many things that you could do, including:

A research design in which you pose an interesting question, propose a theory (based on past research) and explain your plan for gathering data and testing hypotheses about causal mechanisms and processes.

A review essay that evaluates and analyzes existing theoretical and/or empirical debates in the literature. In other words, a critical review of a research agenda in political psychology (e.g., authoritarianism, emotions in political reasoning, intolerance). Jordan and Zanna (2004: 468) describe a review article as “an evaluative survey of previously published work, usually organized by a guiding theory or point of view. The author of a review article summarizes previous investigation of a circumscribed problem, comments on what progress has been made toward its resolution, and suggests areas of the problem that require further study.”

An analysis of, or policy recommendation for, a contemporary political situation using insights from political psychology (e.g., immigration, same-sex marriage, detainment of ‘enemy combatants’).

A strategic proposal for political candidates or interest groups regarding how to achieve their electoral or policy goals. In other words, as a consultant with training in political psychology, how would you help this client reach their goals?

TOPICS AND READINGS

Week One (September 11)

Introduction and Course Overview

No reading

Week Two (September 18)

What is Political Psychology? How is it studied?

Political psychology is a relatively 'young' discipline although one that has matured quickly. This week's readings outline the historical development of political psychology while also discussing how political psychologists study the questions that interest them.

Required Readings:

Jost, John T., and Jim Sidanius. 2004. "Political Psychology: An Introduction." In John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius, eds. *Political Psychology*. New York, NY: Psychology Press. 1-18.

Sullivan, John L., Wendy M. Rahn, and Thomas J. Rudolph. 2002. "The Contours of Political Psychology: Situating Research on Political Information Processing." in James H. Kuklinski, ed. *Thinking About Political Psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 23-47.

Jordan, Christian H., and Mark P. Zanna. 2004. "Appendix: How to Read a Journal Article in Social Psychology." in John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius, eds. *Political Psychology* New York, NY: Psychology Press. 467-476.

Lupia, Arthur. 2002. "New Ideas in Experimental Political Science." *Political Analysis* 10(4): 319-324.

McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methodology in Political Science." *Political Analysis* 10: 325-342.

Optional Readings:

Simon, Herbert. 1985. "Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology and Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 79: 293-304

Krosnick, Jon A. and Kathleen M. McGraw. 2002. "Psychological Political Science versus Political Psychology True to its Name: A Plea for Balance." In Kristen Renwick Monroe, ed., *Political Psychology: Classic and Contemporary Readings*. London: Erlbaum. 79-94.

Deutsch, Morton and Catarina Kinnvall. 2002. "What is Political Psychology?" in Kristen Renwick Monroe, ed. *Political Psychology: Classic and Contemporary Readings*. London: Erlbaum. 15-42.

Kuklinski, James H. 2002. "Introduction: Political Psychology and the Study of Politics." in James H. Kuklinski, ed. *Thinking About Political Psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 1-20.

Rahn, Wendy M., John L. Sullivan and Thomas J. Rudolph. 2002. "Political Psychology and Political Science." in James H. Kuklinski, ed. *Thinking About Political Psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sears, David O., Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis. 2003. "The Psychologies Underlying Political Psychology." in David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 3-18

Gibson, James L., Gregory A. Caldeira, and Lester Kenyatta Spence. 2002. "The Role of Theory in Experimental Design: Experiments without Randomization." *Political Analysis* 10(4): 362-375.

Lavine, Howard, Milton Lodge, James Polichak, and Charles Taber. 2002. "Explicating the Black Box through Experimentation: Studies of Authoritarianism and Threat." *Political Analysis* 10(4): 343-361.

McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methods in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 31-61.

Week Three (September 25)

An Overview of Political Psychology Scholarship

Political psychology is a vast discipline, consisting of many approaches to understanding political behavior. This week we will read a series of 'review' essays that will lay the groundwork for our analysis of issues in American politics.

Political Cognition

McGraw, Kathleen M. 2000. "Contributions of the Cognitive Approach to Political Psychology." *Political Psychology* 21: 805-832.

Emotions

Marcus, George E. 2000. "Emotions in Politics." *Annual Review in Political Science* 3: 221-250.

Personality

Winter, David G. 2003. "Personality and Political Behavior." In David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 110-145.

Political Identities

Monroe, Kristen Renwick, James Hankin, and Rene Bukovchik Van Vechten. 2000. "The Psychological Foundation of Identity Politics." *Annual Review in Political Science* 3: 419-447.

Experimental Design Due in Class

Yom Kippur (October 2)

No Class

Week Four (October 9)

Thinking About and Reacting to Politics: Competence, Cognition, Persuasion, and Mass Decision-Making

Political psychologists, especially those in the cognitive tradition, have devoted considerable energy to explaining how people think about politics. Academic debates about how people form political opinions and reason about politics have generated an important normative debate over citizens' abilities to make 'good' political decisions. The 'competency debate' is important because citizens' decisions are the cornerstone of any healthy democracy. This week we will look at how Americans process political information and what this means for American democracy.

Required Readings:

- Druckman, James N., and Arthur Lupia. 2000. "Preference Formation." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 1-24.
- Quattrone, George A., and Amos Tversky. 1988. "Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice." *American Political Science Review* 82: 716-736. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 244-258)
- Zaller, John, and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Model of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 36: 579-616.
- Lodge, Milton, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau. 1995. "The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation." *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 309-326.
- Kuklinski, James H., and Paul J. Quirk. 2000. "Reconsidering the Rational Public: Cognition, Heuristics, and Mass Opinion." in Arthur Lupia, Mathew D. McCubbins, and Samuel L. Popkin, eds. *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 153-182.
- Lau, Richard R., and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making." *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 951-971.
- Chong, Dennis, and Anna-Maria Marshall. 1999. "When Morality and Economics Collide (or not) in a Texas Community." *Political Behavior* 21: 91-121.
- Mutz, Diana C. 1992. "Impersonal Influence: Effects of Representations of Public Opinion on Political Attitudes." *Political Behavior* 14(2): 89-122.

Optional Readings:

- Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In David Apter, ed. *Ideology and Discontent*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, Thomas E. and Jennifer Garst. 2005. "Values-Based Political Messages and Persuasion: Relationships among Speaker, Recipient, and Evoked Values." *Political Psychology* 26(4): 489-515.
- Redlawsk, David. 2002. "Hot Cognition or Cool Consideration? Testing the Effects of Motivated Reasoning on Political Decision-Making." *Journal of Politics* 64: 1021-1044.
- Lupia, Arthur, and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1998. *The Democratic Dilemma: Can Citizens Learn What They Need to Know?* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Arthur Lupia. 2001. "What We Should Know: Can Ordinary Citizens Make Extraordinary Choices?" Prepared for WFCIA Conference.

Lavine, Howard, Eugene Borgida, and John L. Sullivan. 2000. "On the Relationship Between Attitude Involvement and Attitude Accessibility: Toward a Cognitive-Motivational Model of Political Information Processing." *Political Psychology* 21(1): 81-106.

Taber, Charles S., and Milton Lodge. 2006. "Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs" *American Journal of Political Science* 50(3): 755-769.

Popkin, Samuel L. 1994. *The Reasoning Voter: Communication and Persuasion in Presidential Campaigns – Second Edition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tetlock, Philip E. 2000. "Coping with Tradeoffs: Psychological Constraints and Political Implications." In Arthur Lupia, Mathew D. McCubbins, and Samuel L. Popkin, eds. *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 239-263.

Mutz, Diana C. 1998. *Impersonal Influence: How Perceptions of Mass Collectives Affect Political Attitudes*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Fall Recess (October 16)

No Class

Week Five (October 23)

Affect and American Politics

According to McGraw (2000: 815) "It is nearly impossible to study people's understanding of and reactions to the world of politics without considering affect, because the feelings people have about that world—weak or strong, diffuse or specific—inevitably intrude." With this in mind, we will look the role of affect and emotions in American politics as researched by leading scholars in the area.

Required Readings:

Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2005. "The Automaticity of Affect for Political Leaders, Groups, and Issues: An Experimental Test of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis." *Political Psychology* 26(3): 455-482.

Optional Readings:

Marcus, George E., and Michael MacKuen. 1993. "Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns." *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 672-685.

Rahn, Wendy M. 2000. "Affect as Information: The Role of Public Mood in Political Reasoning." In Arthur Lupia, Mathew D. McCubbins, and Samuel L. Popkin, eds. *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 130-151

Dolan, Kathleen A. and Thomas M. Holbrook. 2001. "Knowing Versus Caring: The Role of Affect and Cognition in Political Perceptions." *Political Psychology* 22(1): 27-44.

Week Six (October 30)

Political Tolerance and Civil Liberties

Since the founding, debates about civil liberties have raged in the United States. While academics from many disciplines have illuminated our understanding of these debates, political psychologists have endeavored to explain the internal thought process involved with making civil liberties judgments. This week we will explore the psychological basis of political tolerance to understand how people make judgments about the very political question of civil liberties.

Required Readings:

- Marcus, George E., John L. Sullivan, Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, and Sandra L. Wood. 1995. *With Malice Toward Some: How People Make Civil Liberties Judgments*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (Read Part 1, Part 2 (up to page 83), Skim Part 3, Read Part 4)
- Marcus, George E., John L. Sullivan, Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, and Daniel Stevens. 2005. "The Emotional Foundation of Political Cognition: The Impact of Extrinsic Anxiety on the Formation of Political Tolerance Judgments." *Political Psychology* 26(6): 949-963.

Optional Reading:

- Sullivan, John L., John Piereson, and George E. Marcus. 1982. *Political Tolerance and American Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Week Seven (November 6)

Personality, Extremism, and Authoritarianism

The atrocities of Nazi Germany motivated scholars at UC Berkeley to write The Authoritarian Personality – one of the first great works in political psychology that sought to explain the mindset of mass political allegiance. This work, albeit controversial, pioneered the fascinating study of personality, extremism, and authoritarianism across a wide range of political situations. This week's readings look at authoritarian attitudes in the United States with a particular focus on how perceived external threats impact authoritarian beliefs and behaviors.

Required Readings:

- Stenner, Karen. 2005. *The Authoritarian Dynamic*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (Read Chapters 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9)
- Doty, Richard M., Bill E. Peterson, and David G. Winter. 1991. "Threat and Authoritarianism in the United States, 1978-1987." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61(4): 629-640. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 69-84)
- Alford, John R., Carolyn L. Funk, and John R. Hibbing. 2005. "Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?" *American Political Science Review* 99: 153-169.

Optional Readings:

- Brown, Roger. 1965. "The Authoritarian Personality and the Organization of Attitudes." in Roger Brown, ed. *Social Psychology* New York, NY: The Free Press. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 39-68)

- Altemeyer, Bob. 1996. *The Authoritarian Specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Altemeyer, Bob. 1998. "The Other 'Authoritarian' Personality." *Advances in Experimental Psychology* 30: 47-91. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 85-107)
- Feldman, Stanley, and Karen Stenner. 1997. "Perceived Threat and Authoritarianism." *Political Psychology* 18(4): 741-770.
- Lavine, Howard, Diana Burgess, Mark Snyder, John Transue, John L. Sullivan, Beth Haney, and Stephen H. Wagner. 1999. "Threat, Authoritarianism, and Voting: An Investigation of Personality and Persuasion." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 25: 337-347.
- Petterson, Bill E., Luran E. Duncan, and Joyce S. Pang. 2001. "Authoritarianism and Political Impoverishment: Deficits in Knowledge and Civic Disinterest" *Political Psychology* 23(1): 97-112.
- Martin, John Levi. 2001. "The Authoritarian Personality, 50 Years Later: What Lessons are there for Political Psychology?" *Political Psychology* 22(1): 1-26.

Week Eight (November 13)

Group Identity and Intergroup Relations

Political psychologists have long been interested in the political identities we take and how that structures society and relations between groups. Indeed, the tensions between groups in American society – based on race, gender, sexuality, income, etc. – represent one of this country's most enduring challenges. This week we will examine identity theories and intergroup relations with a focus on what these tensions mean for political opinions and social policies in the United States.

Required Readings:

- Tajfel, Henri and John C. Turner. 1986. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." In Stephen Worchel and William G. Austin, eds. *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 276-293) (skim)
- Rollins, Joe, and Harry N. Hirsch. 2003. "Sexual Identities and Political Engagements: A Queer Survey" *Social Politics* 10(3): 290-313.
- Sidanius, Jim and Felicia Pratto. 2001. "Social Dominance Theory: A New Synthesis." In *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 315-332).
- Gilens, Martin. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Anti-Poverty Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Read Introduction, Chapters 1, 4, 5, 7, 9)
- Sears, David O., Coletter Van Laar, Mary Carrillo, and Rick Kosterman. 1997. "Is It Really Racism? The Origins of White Americans' Opposition to Race-Targeted Policies." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61: 15-53. (in Jost and Sidanius 358-378)

Optional Readings:

- Jost, John T. and Mahzarin R. Banaji. 1994. "The Role of Stereotyping in System Justification and the Production of False Consciousness." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 33: 1-27. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 294-314)

- Bobo, Lawrence. 1988. "Group Conflict, Prejudice, and the Paradox of Contemporary Racial Attitudes." in P.A. Katz and D.A. Taylor, eds. *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy* New York, NY: Kluwer Academic. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 333-357)
- Brewer, Marilynn D. 2001. "The Many Faces of Social Identity: Implications for Political Psychology." *Political Psychology* 22(1): 115-125.
- Huddy, Leonie. 2004. "Contrasting Theoretical Approaches to Intergroup Relations." *Political Psychology* 25(6): 947-967.
- Federico, Christopher M., and Samatha Luks. 2005. "The Political Psychology of Race." *Political Psychology* 26(5): 661-666.
- Mendelberg, Tali. 2001. *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages, and the Norm of Equality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Huber, Gregory A., and John S. Lapinski. 2006. "The 'Race Card' Revisited: Assessing Racial Priming in Policy Contests" *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2): 421-440.
- Sidanius, Jim, Felicia Pratto, Collette van Laar, and Shana Levin. 2004. "Social Dominance Theory: Its Agenda and Method." *Political Psychology* 25(6): 845-880.
- Pratto, Felicia, Debora G. Tatar, and Sahr Conway-Lanz. 1999. "Who Gets What and Why: Determinants of Social Allocations." *Political Psychology*. 20: 127-150.
- Winter, Nicholas J. G., 2006. "Beyond Welfare: Framing and the Racialization of White Opinion on Social Security" *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2): 400-420.
- Feldman, Stanley, and Leonie Huddy. 2005. "Racial Resentment and White Opposition to Race-Conscious Programs: Principles or Prejudice?" *American Journal of Political Science* 49(1): 168-183.
- Federico, Christopher M. 2005. "Racial Perceptions and Evaluative Responses to Welfare: Does Education Attenuate Race-of-Target Effects?" *Political Psychology* 26(5): 683-697.
- Peffley, Mark, and Jon Hurwitz. 2002. "The Racial Components of 'Race-Neutral' Crime Policy Attitudes." *Political Psychology* 23(1): 59-75.
- Appelbaum, Lauren D., Mary Clare Lennon, and J. Lawrence Aber. 2006. "When Effort is Threatening: The Influence in the Belief of a Just World on Americans' Attitudes Toward Antipoverty Policy." *Political Psychology* 27(3): 387-402.
- Lane, Robert E. 2001. "Self Reliance and Empathy: The Enemies of Poverty – and of the Poor." *Political Psychology* 22(3): 473-492.

Take-Home Midterm Distributed in Class

Take-Home Midterm Due on Friday, November 17th before 4:00.

Week Nine (November 20)

The Psychology of International Conflict: Leaders and Decision-Making

Clearly, the decision to go to war is one the state's most fundamental responsibilities. Moreover, since 9/11, the United States has been forced to grapple with the decision of how and where to engage its foreign enemies. This week we will look at how political leaders make the decision to go to war and what effect this can have on the outcome. We will also look at the psychology behind terrorists leaders' strategies and their decisions to attack.

Required Readings:

- Renshon, Stanley A. 2005. "Presidential Address: George W. Bush's Cowboy Politics: An Inquiry." *Political Psychology* 26(4): 585-614.
- Jervis, Robert. 1993. "The Drunkard's Search." in Shanto Iyengar and William J. McGuire, eds. *Explorations in Political Psychology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 338-360. (Reprinted in Jost and Sidanius 259-270)
- Dyson, Stephen Benedict, and Thomas Preston. 2006. "Individual Characteristics of Political Leaders and the Use of Analogy in Foreign Policy Decision-Making." *Political Psychology* 27(2): 265-288.
- Post, Jerrold M. 2005. "When Hatred is Bred to the Bone: Psycho-cultural Foundations of Contemporary Terrorism." *Political Psychology* 26(4): 615-636.
- McCormick, Gordon H. 2003. "Terrorist Decision Making" *Annual Review of Political Science* 6: 473-507.

Optional Readings:

- Lyons, Michael. 1997. "Presidential Character Revisited." *Political Psychology* 18(4): 791-811.
- Khong, Yuen Foong. 1992. *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bruening, Marijke. 2003. "The Role of Analogies and Abstract Reasoning in Decision-Making." *International Studies Quarterly* 47: 229-245.
- Walker, Stephen G., and Mark Schafer. 2000. "The Political Universe of Lyndon B. Johnson and His Advisors: Diagnostic and Strategic Propensities in Their Operational Codes." *Political Psychology* 21(3): 529-543.
- Marfleet, B. Gregory. 2000. "The Operational Code of John F. Kennedy During the Cuban Missile Crisis: A Comparison of Public and Private Rhetoric." *Political Psychology* 21(3): 545-558.
- Garrison, Jean A. 2001. "Framing Foreign Policy Alternatives in the Inner Circle: President Carter, His Advisors, and the Struggle for the Arms Control Agenda." *Political Psychology* 22(4): 775-807.
- Tetlock, Philip E., Randall S. Peterson, Charles McGuire, Shi-jie Chang, and Peter Feld. 1992. "Assessing Political Group Dynamics: A Test of the Group Think Model." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 63: 403-425.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2005. "The Quality of Terror" *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 515-530.

Week Ten (November 27)

The Psychology of International Conflict: Public Reaction

This week's readings investigate the public's reaction to foreign conflict with a focus on 9/11. In particular, we will look at recent scholarship that seeks to explain the public's reaction to the horrific events of 9/11 and the realities of the post-9/11 world.

Required Readings:

- Allen, Barbara, Paula O'Loughlin, Amy Jasperson, and John L. Sullivan. 1994. "The Media and the Gulf War: Framing, Priming, and the Spiral of Silence." *Polity* 27(2): 255-284.

- Schubert, James N., Patrick A. Stewart, and Margaret Ann Curran. 2002. "A Defining Presidential Moment: 9/11 and the Rally Effect." *Political Psychology* 23(3): 559-583.
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. 2002. "The More Things Change... American Identity and Mass and Elite Responses to 9/11." *Political Psychology* 23(3): 511-535.
- Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, Charles Taber, and Gallya Lahav. 2005. "Threat, Anxiety, and Support for Antiterrorism Policies" *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 593-608.
- Li, Qiong, and Marilynn B. Brewer. 2004. "What Does it Mean to be an American? Patriotism, Nationalism, and American Identity after 9/11." *Political Psychology* 25(5): 727-739.
- Small, Deborah A., Jennifer S. Learner, and Baruch Fischhoff. 2006. "Emotion Priming and Attributions for Terrorism: Americans' Reactions to a National Field Experiment." *Political Psychology* 27(2): 289-298.

Optional Readings:

- Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldmen, Theresa Capelos, and Colin Provost. 2002. "The Consequences of Terrorism: Disentangling the Effects of Personal and National Threat." *Political Psychology* 23(3): 485-509.
- Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth. 1993. *The Spiral of Silence: Public Opinion – Our Social Skin, Second Edition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Week Eleven (December 4)

Paper Presentations

Week Twelve (December 11)

Paper Presentations