**Psychology 460/560: POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY seminar**
*2:00 - 3:20 pm, Mondays and Wednesdays, 361 PLC*
**Professor:  Gerard Saucier, Ph.D.**
**Office: 312 Straub**
**E-mail:**  gsaucier@uoregon.edu     **Phone:** 346-4927 with voice mail
**Office Hours:** *Wednesdays 9:30 - 11:30 am*
**Required text:**  Cottam, M., Dietz-Uhler, B., Mastors, E. M., Preston,T. (2004). *Introduction to political psychology.* New York: Psychology Press.
**Other readings** (see page following seminar schedule) **will be made available via blackboard during the term**.

## Course Objectives (or, what's the purpose of this course?)

This is an specialized seminar course on political psychology. It provides in large part a survey of political psychology, but there are some additional emphases this term on topics related to personality, culture, religion, and the sources of sociopolitical violence.  We will take a somewhat unconventional and wide-ranging approach to the subject matter, with the aim of developing uncommon insights and one or more integrative models for understanding the material.

About half of the readings will from a brief (relatively speaking) textbook on political psychology, the remainder being from diverse other sources. Overall, the amount of reading is somewhat larger than the average 400/500-level course, though probably less than the typical graduate course. More like the typical graduate course, the grading is based mainly on written papers and essays rather than multiple-choice-style testing. *Seminar participants are expected to read everything that is assigned.*

Each session will have its own set of assigned readings. Class time will be spent mainly in discussion of issues arising in the readings. Much of the discussion will be initiated by the instructor, but some will be derived from student papers. Seminar participants enrolled in Psychology 560, i.e., as graduate students, will have one or more additional readings and one or more additional meetings during the term.  The instructor will contact 560 students by e-mail during the first half of the term to make these arrangements.

## Assignments and Grading

Participants' ***final course grade*** is based on the following (top of next page):

20% ...turning in and presenting two ICQ papers on assigned dates (10% each)
14% ...turning in two further ICQ papers on dates of participant's choosing (7% each)
 7%…grade on "exploratory analysis" paper due January 26
 4% ...turning in list of ideas for term paper by week 8 of term
25% ...grade on term paper
30% ...score on final exam

What follows in this section is more detail on each of these components.

**ICQ papers** – ICQ papers are brief, and "identify crucial questions" with regard to the readings (or something in the readings) for the date on which they are due.  An ICQ paper need do only one of three alternative things. (a) You might identify a crucial question that the research (or scholarly work) described in the reading is trying to answer, discussing why this is an

important question, and briefly summarizing how it is best answered. (b) You might identify a crucial question about the quality of any of the information presented, such as identifying limitations or necessary caveats on the research (or scholarly work) described in the reading, not only describing the limitation/caveat but also explaining why this limitation or caveat is an important one. (c) You might identify some kind of example that is anomalous and does not fit with (cannot be accounted for by) a particular point of view described in the work, this example perhaps being one that itself identifies a crucial question about the work. ICQ papers are graded on a P/NP basis. ICQ papers should be approximately 1 page in length (double-spaced) with a maximum of 2 pages (double-spaced). ICQ papers, to count for credit, must be brought into class in hard-copy form, and read or summarized when requested (although you still get credit for it if you bring it to class on time but for some reason we never get to it in class). Generally, ICQ papers will be shared and discussed in the first half of, class session, and sometimes at the very beginning of, the class session.  **Two of the ICQ papers must be turned in on *certain assigned class days*, which are different for each seminar participant**.  The purpose of this system is to assure that there is always at least one ICQ prepared for any class session, to stimulate discussion.  ICQ papers for assigned dates will be read (or paraphrased or summarized) in class by the participant (doing so is part of the credit for that ICQ). At the beginning of the term, each participant is randomly assigned a letter (A through Z) and is to present when their assigned letter comes up on the schedule (see end of syllabus). **There are also two ICQ papers on additional dates of the seminar participants' choosing,** thus allowing participants to write on additional topics that particularly engage them during the course of the term.

**"Exploratory analysis" paper**. Each seminar participant is asked to use concepts from the first three weeks of the course to identify and describe what you consider them most important differences and similarities between the two major presidential candidates (Gore and Bush) in the 2000 presidential debates.  This can be done either by examining the video debate highlights found at  http://www.museum.tv/debateweb/html/history/2000/video.htm   or by viewing the transcripts found at http://www.debates.org/index.php?page=debate-transcripts . There may be another option for accessing these 2000 debate materials available by January 14. You should use either the video or the transcripts (don't go overboard and try doing both), and indicate which you used in the paper. If you use the transcripts, it's recommended that you concentrate mostly or entirely on just one of the debates (not all three).

**List of ideas for term paper** - By week 8 of the term (i.e., by Feb. 24) each participant should turn in to the instructor a list of ideas he/she has for a term paper.  Format is up to the participant.  The instructor will review and give feedback on these ideas by the beginning of week 9.  Seminar participants wishing to get an earlier start on the term paper (recommended only if you develop some clear ideas about the term paper prior to week 8) are welcome to submit the list of ideas earlier and will get their feedback earlier.

**Term paper** – The term paper is due by the end of week 10 (Friday, March 11, 4 pm). The final version of this paper must be at least five full double-spaced pages in length (filling a third page completely, no fonts over 12 point), not counting your reference list.  At a maximum, it should not exceed ten full double-spaced pages in length, not counting reference list.  There should be a minimum of three references (not including the course readings) consulted; for most topics it is helpful to consult far more than three references.  At least two references must be from journals or else be chapters in edited books: Such references are distinguishable because they will be cited with a page number range (e.g., pp. 419-434) in on-line indexes.  *Internet sites* (except for on-line journals) do not make reliable sources and do not count toward these minimum three references.  The paper should be typed, readable, free of gross spelling and typographic errors, well-organized and focused.  It will help your paper if you avoid overgeneralizing and oversimplifying, and consider that research evidence can have alternative interpretations.

Generally, term papers should be either critical reviews or proposals of new hypotheses.

Specifically, this means either (a) reviews of the degree to which an idea is or is not supported by research evidence (and/or by rational considerations) or (b) a gathering together of evidence (or arguments) to support a new hypothesis for future research (or perhaps a real-life application that might be tried or 'field-tested').  Thus, the kernel of a good term paper will generally be an idea (or set of ideas) identified by you as being worth some extra attention.  You may have in mind a term paper that does not seem to fit these descriptions, and this may be fine, but it is advisable to discuss this first with the instructor.

**Final exam** – This will be an all-essay exam involving two "big questions" related to the seminar content.  These two questions will be drawn from a list of four "big questions" made available by the instructor at least two weeks prior to the final exam.

The ***final grade*** in the course will be based on the total of your points from ICQ papers, term paper, and final exam.  **A** range is 90% or better, **B** range is 80% to 90%, **C** range 70% to 80%, **D** range 60% to 70%, **F**s are less than 60%.  '+' and '-" are added to grades if they fall in the top 1/3 or bottom 1/3, respectively, of A, B, C, and D range.

## Academic Integrity

The instructor takes academic integrity seriously.  Insuring the "validity" of grades requires seeing that they reflect honest work and learning rather than cheating.  **Cheating** is defined as providing or accepting information on an exam, plagiarism or copying anyone's written work.  Students caught cheating will be given an "**F**" for the course, and UO's student conduct coordinator will be informed.  The instructor retains the right to assign seats for tests, to change individual's seating for test security purposes, to require and check ID for admission to tests.  "**Plagiarism**" is basically a form of theft:  putting your name on work that is (in any part) not yours, where you have not fully identified the source from which you borrowed.  Even taking someone else's ideas or paraphrasing their expression, without acknowledgment, is plagiarism. "Your responsibility, when you put your name on a piece of work, is simply to distinguish between what is yours and what is not, and to credit those who in any way have contributed" (quote is from Nancy Cotton of Wake Forest U.).

## PSYCHOLOGY 410/510 SCHEDULE: What's Happening When
*tentative and subject to change*

**January 4** – Syllabus; introduction to political psychology and to the course

Readings: Cottam et al. chapters 1-2; Houghton ch. 2
**January 6 –** Personality and politics

Readings:  Winter (2003); Saucier (2000)
**January 11** – Personality and politics
ICQ**: A, I

Readings: Sidanius & Pratto (2003); Thorisdottir, Jost, and Kay (2009)
**January 13** – Personality, attitudes and politics
ICQ: B, J

Readings:  Cottam et al. chapter 3; Fiske & Tetlock  (2000)
**January 20**– Cognition, emotion, and attitudes in political psychology
ICQ: C, K

Readings: none
**January 25 –** Work on the "exploratory analysis" paper

Readings: Cottam et al. chapter 4
**January 27** – Political psychology of groups
ICQ: D, L

Readings:  Almond, Sivan, and Appleby (1991); Esmer & Pettersson (2007)
**February 1** – Political psychology of *religious* groups
ICQ: E, M

Readings: Cottam et al. chapter 5; Converse (2004)
**February 3** – Studying political leaders
ICQ: F, N

Readings:  Cottam et al. chapter 6; Markus & MacKuen (2004)
**February 8** – The media, voting, and tolerance
ICQ: G, O

Readings:  Westen (2007); Lakoff (2008)
**February 10** – The media, voting, and tolerance
ICQ: H, P

Readings: Cottam et al. chapter 7
**February 15 -** Race and identity in political psychology
ICQ: A, J

Readings: Renshon (2002); Fuchs (2007); Meloen (2000)
**February 17** – Politics and culture, and political culture
ICQ: B, I

Readings: Cottam et al. chapter 8
**February 22** – Political psychology of civic and ethnic nationalism
ICQ: C, L

Readings: Hassin et al. (2007); Mann (2005)
**February 24** – Political psychology of ethnic nationalism
ICQ: D, K

Readings:  Cottam et al. chapter 9
**March 1** – Psychology of political extremists
ICQ: E, N

Readings: Saucier et al. (2009); Atran (2003); Houghton (2008) ch. 15
**March 3** – Psychology of political extremists
ICQ: F, M

Readings:  Kiernan (2007) ch. 1; Staub (2004); Canovan (1989)
**March 8** – Psychology of genocide and other forms of democide
ICQ: G, P

Readings: Cottam et al. chapter 10; Atran, Axelrod, & Davis (2007); Houghton, ch. 16
**March 10** – Political psychology of international security and conflict
ICQ: H, O

**March 15** (Monday) – final exam at 3:15 pm

**Readings on blackboard are from the following sources:**

Almond, G. A., Sivan, E., & Appleby, R. S. (1991). Fundamentalism: Genus and species. In M. E. Marty & R. S. Appleby (Eds.), *Fundamentalisms comprehended* (pp. 399-424). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Atran, S. (2003). Genesis of suicide terrorism. *Science, 299*, 1534-1539.

Atran, S., Axelrod, R., & Davis, R. (2007). Sacred barriers to conflict resolution. *Science, 317*, 1039-1040.

Canovan, M. (1989). Hannah Arendt on ideology in totalitarianism. In N. O'Sullivan (Ed.), *The structure of modern ideology: Critical perspectives on social and political theory* (pp. 151-171). Hants, England: Edward Elgar.

Converse, P. E. (2004). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (pp. 181-199). New York: Psychology Press. (Originally published in 1964)

Esmer, Y., & Pettersson, T. (2007). The effects of religion and religiosity on voting behavior. In R. J. Dalton & H.-D. Klingemann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political behavior* (pp. 481-503). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Fiske, A. P. & Tetlock, P. E. (2000). Taboo trade-offs: Constitutive prerequisites for political and social life. In S. A. Renshon & J. Duckitt (Eds.), *Political psychology: Cultural and cross-cultural foundations* (pp. 47-65). New York: New York University Press.

Fuchs, D. (2007). The political culture paradigm. In R. J. Dalton & H.-D. Klingemann (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political behavior* (pp. 161-184). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Hassin, R. R. (2007) et al.. Subliminal exposure to national flags affects political thought and behavior. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104, 19757-19761.

Houghton, D. P. (2009). *Political psychology: Situations, individuals, and cases.* New York: Routledge.

Kiernan, B. (2007). *Blood and soil: A world history of genocide and extermination from Sparta to Darfur.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lakoff, G. (2008). *The political mind: Why you can't understand 21$^{st}$-century politics with an 18$^{th}$-century brain.* New York: Viking.

Mann, M. (2005). *The dark side of democracy: Explaining ethnic cleansing.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Marcus, G. E., & MacKuen, M. G. (2004). Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (pp. 163-176). New York: Psychology Press. (Originally published in 1993)

Meloen, J. D. (2000). The political culture of state authoritarianism. In S. A. Renshon & J. Duckitt (Eds.), *Political psychology: Cultural and cross-cultural foundations* (pp. 108-127). New York: New York University Press.

Renshon, S. A. (2002). Lost in plain sight: The cultural foundations of political psychology. In K. R. Monroe (Ed.), *Political psychology* (pp. 121-139). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Saucier, G. (2000). Isms and the structure of social attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 366-385.

Saucier, G., Akers, L. G., Shen-Miller, S., Stankov, L., & Knezevic, G. (2009). Patterns of thinking in militant extremism. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*, 256-271.

Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (2004). Social dominance theory: A new synthesis. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (pp. 315-332). New York: Psychology Press. (Originally published in 1999)

Staub, E. (2004). Good and evil and psychological science. *American Psychological Society Observer, 14* (5), 2-5.

Thorisdottir, H., Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2009). On the social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification. In J. T. Jost, A. C. Kay, & H. Thorisdottir (Eds.), *Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification* (pp. 3-23).

Westen, D. (2007). *The political brain: The role of emotion in deciding the fate of the nation.* New York: Public Affairs.

Winter, D. G. (2003). Personality and political behavior. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political psychology* (pp. 110-145). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.