Psychology 407/507: POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY seminar
10:00 - 11:50 am, Tuesdays, 257 Straub

Professor: Gerard Saucier, Ph.D.
Office: 425 Straub   **E-mail:** gsaucier@uoregon.edu   **Phone:** 346-4927 with voice mail
Office Hours: Mondays 10:30 am – noon, Wednesdays 1-1:30 pm
Required text: none
Readings (see listing following seminar schedule) **will be made available via Canvas during the term**.

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

This is a specialized seminar course on political psychology. While it provides a survey of political psychology, 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 a focus on the global human context rather than merely the narrow American political context; this is with the aim of developing uncommon insights and one or more integrative models for understanding the material. For example, the seminar first examines the extent of widely observed human tendencies toward dictatorship and oligarchy, with a probe of their psychological basis, before delving into the conventional political psychology of behavior in democracies.

The readings are from diverse sources, not only psychology but also political science, anthropology, and sociology. All readings are posted to Canvas. The grading is based on written papers and essays rather than multiple-choice-style testing.

Each session will have its own set of assigned readings. Seminar participants are expected to read everything that is assigned. (There are also very many optional readings posted on Canvas: These may be of intrinsic interest to some students, and may be drawn on for the term paper according to individual student interest, but there is absolutely no requirement to read any particular one of them.) Class time will be spent mainly in presentation and discussion of issues arising in the assigned readings. Some of the discussion will be stimulated from student reading-responses.

Assignments and Grading

Participants' ***final course grade*** is based on the following:

24% ...submitting adequate brief reading responses (submitted via Canvas, at least two hours in advance of *six* of the class sessions; 4% each)
10% ....grade on exploratory paper* due October 16 (in week 4 of term)
  5% ...turning in list of ideas or plans for term paper* by October 30 (in week 6 of term)
  4% ....sufficient participation credit
25% ...grade on term paper* [late policy: 10% off per weekday that it's late]
32% ...score on final exam
*Consult Canvas for up-to-date information on whether paper is submitted on Canvas or in hard-copy

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

Reading responses – These should be short – indeed the standard is about 50 words (more or less what is now a maximum-length tweet); you can go over 50 words, but you shouldn't by much. They are submitted via Canvas. It is best if the response identifies one or more crucial questions. For example: (a) You might identify a crucial question that the research (or scholarly work) described in the readings is trying to answer, discussing why this is an important question, and briefly summarizing how it is best answered. Or (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 a reading, not only describing the limitation/caveat but also explaining why this limitation or caveat is an important one. Or (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. Reading responses are graded on a P/NP basis. Many (though not most) reading responses will be shared in class by instructor, always anonymously. However, you are free to identify yourself (or not) as the author of the reading-response in the ensuing class discussion.

A full allotment of **sufficient participation** credit is assigned to everyone who, by evidence available to the instructor, attends a majority of the class sessions.

The **exploratory paper** is intended to help you develop a more personal connection to the subject matter, applying concepts learned in the course to your personal experience of other people. Papers will have two parts: The first will likely involve your comments on a political-views assessment, based on an experience assessing your own views. The second will likely involve any one of multiple alternatives (you choose among these). Instructions will be placed on Canvas very early in the term. The paper should have complete sentences, good grammar, reasonable organization, and at least 2 complete double-spaced pages of text. It is due October 16.

Term paper – By class in week 6 of the term (i.e., by October 30) you should turn in to the instructor a **list of ideas or plans for a term paper**. The format for list is up to you; one page is usually enough. The instructor will review and give feedback on these ideas by week 7.

The baseline, default format for the *term paper* is a careful critical-thinking consideration of one or two of the optional readings for the course. Choose whichever one (or two that seem to you related to each other somehow) interests you the most. Then, address this sequence of questions about it (or them): *What problem is this work trying to solve (or, what main question is it trying to answer)? How does it purportedly solve the problem (or answer the main question)? In what ways is this reasonable, satisfying, and successful, and in what ways is it not? What are some limitations or shortcomings of the approach (whether conceptually or methodologically) that is taken? How could this be improved upon, or done better?* Among these five questions, responses to the 3rd, 4th, and especially the 5th usually benefit from reference to at least one other source that offers an alternative approach. So, it is recommended that you include citation of and reference to at least one other source (that you are free to identify yourself) – preferably one that is in a peer-reviewed journal. This is not a strict requirement, but it does typically contribute to the quality of the paper.

An alternative approach for the term paper? Write a review of scientific/scholarly literature on an important research question is as follows. If you go this route, you must first identify a question (you can get some feedback from the instructor with regard to how "researchable" various question-possibilities are.) Then search for articles – you can fall back on book sources if you find little in the way of articles – representing (as much as possible) different points of view on the question. You are welcome to use/cite the assigned readings, optional readings, and lecture material in this paper, but here you should use/cite at least three other sources, preferably journal articles. In the paper itself, you should first introduce the question and indicate why it is important, then describe relevant evidence, including at least one paragraph for each of the "other sources" mentioned above. In the last part of the paper, synthesize what you found -- comparing evidence and sources and what is more versus less empirically supported, and therefore what appears to be the best way to answer the question given evidence reviewed.

Whichever direction you take, **the term paper is due by the end of week 10** (Friday, November 30, 5 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. The paper should be typed, readable, free of gross spelling and typographic errors, well-organized and

focused. It helps your paper if you avoid overgeneralizing and oversimplifying, and consider that any research evidence can have alternative interpretations.

Final exam – This will be a mostly-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 10 days prior to the final exam. About 1/5 of the exam content/credit will be questions requiring short answers, based on specific content in readings during the term (designed to reward your conscientiously reading all or most of what is assigned) based on a study guide also distributed by about 10 days prior to the final exam.

The ***final grade*** in the course will be based on the total of your points from all sources (ICQ papers, term paper, final exam, etc.). **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.

Psychology 507 (graduate students)

Seminar participants enrolled in Psychology 507, i.e., as graduate students, will have the same requirements as stated above, but with the following variations. Two of the reading responses for each 507-participant should be longer (up to one page in length) and you can expect they will be read to the class as a start-point for discussion. And, for 507 students, the length requirements for the term paper will be slightly different: minimum seven to maximum 14 pages in length, not counting reference list.

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 407/507 SCHEDULE: What's Happening When
Note: the most frequently used source -- Cottam et al., 2015 -- is abbreviated below as simply "Cottam"
[associated optional readings are referenced in brackets and *italicized* smaller print]

September 25 – Syllabus; broad intro to political psychology; "primate politics". Machiavellianism, potential psychologies underlying the spectrum of political theories [*no assigned reading for session 1, but relevant are optional readings by de Waal (2007), Schubert (1991), Bailey (2001), and Kegley and Blanton (2012)*]

Readings for session 2: Ember et al. (2007); Winters (2011)   [*Dubreuil (2010); Boehm (2012); Swartz (2002); Mendelberg & Karpowitz (2016)*]
October 2 – Anthropology of politics, hierarchy in social evolution, tendencies toward inequality and oligarchy

Readings for session 3: Buena de Mesquita & Smith (2011); Held (2006); Meloen (2000)
[*Svolik (2015); Weeks (2012); Fuchs (2007); Seger (2008)*]
October 9 – Dynamics of dictatorship; political cultures of authoritarianism (autocracy) and democracy

Readings for session 4: Altemeyer (1996); Feldman (2003, pp. 41-52); Malka et al. (2014); Renshon (2002)   [Miller & Hoffmann (1999); Sidanius & Pratto (2004); Jost (2017b); Fetterman, Boyd, & Robinson (2015); Johnston et al. (2015); Ciuk et al., 2018]
October 16 – Individual-level authoritarianism, psychology of social conservatism, "culture wars"

Readings for session 5: Malka & Soto (2015); van Prooijen et al. (2015); Jost (2017a) [Conover & Feldman (1981); Saucier (2013); Converse (1964); Boutyline & Willer (2017); Johnston & Wronski (2015); Jost et al. (2018)]
October 23 – Ideology and public opinion; social movements; system justification

Readings for session 6: Cottam chapter 6 pages 161-183 and chapter 7 pages 197-206; Westen (2007) [Lakoff (2008) pages 43-74 only; Markus & MacKuen (2004); Jones & Song, (2014); Spencer (1973)]
October 30 – Candidate perception in democracies, mass media, psychology of voting

Readings for session 7: Cottam chapter 3 pages 57-62, chapter 8 pages 214-234; Tajfel & Turner (1986); Nash (2010) pages 159-176 [Sears et al. (1997); Sidanius & Pratto (2004); Gawronski et al. (2015); Lundberg et al., 2017]
November 6 – Political psychology of group perceptions: group categorization, stereotyping, prejudice, race, ethnicity, diversity; relation to social dominance theory

Readings for session 8: Cottam chapter 10 pages 293-320 and chapter 13 pages 390-392; Smith (2008); Fox (2011)   [Connor (1994); Wolak & Dawkins (2017); Hofstadter, 1964; Turchin (2012)]
November 13 – National images; variant forms of nationalism; notions of "tribalism" and paranoid style

Readings for session 9: Cottam chapter 9 pages 256-264 and 278-286; Fein (2007); Stanton (2004); [Gerlach, 2010; Mann (2005); Slim (2007); LeaderMaynard & Benesch (2014); Saucier and Akers (in press)]
November 20 – Psychology of democide (genocide, ethnic cleansing, settler violence against indigenous peoples, state terror, etc.)

Readings for session 10: Cottam chapter 12; Atran, Axelrod, & Davis (2007); Nash (2010) pages 106-130; Saucier et al. (2009) [Eckstein (1980); McBride (2011); Skitka & Morgan (2014); Stern (2003)]
November 27 – Psychology of militant extremism (political terrorism, ISIS, etc.) and of (self-) radicalization.

December 3 (Monday) – final exam at 8 am

Assigned readings to be posted on Canvas are from the following sources:

Altemeyer. B. (1996). The authoritarian specter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (pages 6-16 only)
Atran, S., Axelrod, R., & Davis, R. (2007). Sacred barriers to conflict resolution. *Science, 317*, 1039-1040.
Buena de Mesquita, B., & Smith, A. (2011). *The dictator's handbook: Why bad behavior is almost always good politics.* New York: Public Affairs. (pages 1-20 only)
Cottam, M., Mastors, E. M., Preston, T., & Dietz, B. (2015). *Introduction to political psychology (3rd ed.)*. New York: Psychology Press.
Ember, C. R., Ember, M., & Peregrine, P. N. (2007). *Anthropology* (12th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson. (pages 418-430 only, though the entire chapter is posted on Canvas; the rest is optional)
Fein, H. (2007). *Human rights and wrongs: Slavery, terror, genocide.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm. (pages 1-16 only)
Feldman, S. (2003). Enforcing social conformity: A theory of authoritarianism. *Political*

Psychology, 24, 41-74.

Held, D. (2006). *Models of democracy* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (pages 259-271 only)

Jost, J. (2017a). Working class conservatism: A system justification perspective. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 18*, 73-78.

Malka, A. & Soto, C. J. (2015). Rigidity of the economic right? Menu-independent and menu-dependent influences of psychological dispositions on political attitudes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24*, 137-142.

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.

Miller, A. S., & Hoffmann, J. P. (1999). The growing divisiveness: Culture wars or a war of words? *Social Forces, 78,* 721-745.

Nash, K. (2010). *Contemporary political sociology: Globalization, politics, and power* (2nd ed.). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

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

Smith, A. D. (2008). *The cultural foundations of nations: Hierarchy, covenant, and republic.* Malden, MA: Blackwell. (pages 12-17 only)

Stanton, G. H. (2004). Could the Rwandan genocide have been prevented? *Journal of Genocide Research, 6*, 211-228.

Stern, J. (2003). *Terror in the name of God: Why religious militants kill*. New York: Harper-Collins. (pages xiii-xxxiii only)

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Van Prooijen, J. W., Krouwel, A. P. M., Boiten, M., & Eendebak, L. (2015). Fear among the extremes: How political ideology predicts negative emotion and outgroup derogation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41*, 485-497.

Westen, D. (2007). *The political brain: The role of emotion in deciding the fate of the nation.* New York: Public Affairs. (pages 3-23, 145-169 only)

Winters, J. A. (2011). *Oligarchy.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. (pages 1-32)

Optional, non-required readings on Canvas are from these sources (others may be added)**:**

Bailey, F. G. (2001). *Treasons, stratagems, and spoils: How leaders make practical use of values and beliefs.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press. (pages 1-16 only)

Boehm, C. (2012). *Moral origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame.* New York: Basic Books. (pp. 133-178 only)

Boutyline, A., & Willer, R. (2017). The social structure of political echo chambers: Variation in ideological homophily in online networks. *Political Psychology, 38*, 551-569.

Ciuk, D. J., Lupton, R. N., & Thornton, J. R. (2018). Values voters: The conditional effect of income on the relationship between core values and political attitudes and behavior. *Political Psychology, 39*, 869-888.

Conover, P., & Feldman, S. (1981). The origins and meaning of the liberal-conservative self-identification. *American Journal of Political Science, 25*, 617-645.

Connor, W. (1991). *Ethnonationalism: The quest for understanding.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

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)

Dubreuil, B. (2010). *Human evolution and the origins of hierarchies: The state of nature*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. (pp. 1-9 and 84-93 only)

De Waal, F. (2007). *Chimpanzee politics: Power and sex among apes* (25th anniversary edition). Baltimore: Johns

Hopkins University Press. (pages 205-209 only)

Eckstein, H. (1980). Theoretical approaches to explaining collective political violence. In T. R. Gurr (Ed.), *Handbook of political conflict: Theory and research* (pp. 135-166). New York: Free Press.

Fetterman, A. K., Boyd, R. L., & Robinson, M. D. (2015). Power versus affiliation in political ideology: Robust linguistic evidence for distinct motivational signatures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41,* 1195-1206.

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.

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

Gerlach, C. (2010). *Extremely violent societies: Mass violence in the twentieth-century world.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hofstadter, R. (1964). The paranoid style in American politics. In *The paranoid style in American politics and other essays (pp. 4-40).* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Johnston, C. D., & Wronski, J. (2015). Personality dispositions and political preferences across hard and easy issues. *Political Psychology, 36,* 35-53.

Jones, M. D., & Song, G. (2014). Making sense of climate change: How story frames shape cognition. *Political Psychology, 35*, 447-476.

Jost, J. T. (2017b). Ideological asymmetries and the essence of political psychology. *Political Psychology, 38*, 167-208.

Jost, J. T. (2018). How social media facilitates political protest: Information, motivation, and social networks. *Advances in political psychology, 39,* Suppl 1, pp. 85-118.

Kegley, C. W., & Blanton, S. L. (2012). *World politics: Trend and transformation.* Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

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

Leader Maynard, J. & Benesch, S. (2014). Dangerous speech and dangerous ideology: An integrated model for monitoring and prevention. *Genocide Studies and Prevention, 9* (3): 70-95.

Lundberg, K. B., Payne, B. K., Pasek, J., and Krosnick, J. A. (2017). Racial attitudes predicted changes in ostensibily race-neutral political attitudes under the Obama administration. *Political Psychology, 38*, 313-330.

Mann M. (2005). *The dark side of democracy: Explaining ethnic cleansing.* New York: Cambrdige University Press. (pages 1-33 only)

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)

Mendelberg, T., & Karpowitz, C. F. (2016). Power, gender, and group discussion. *Advances in Political Psychology, 37,* Suppl. 1, 23-60.

Saucier, G. (2013). Isms dimensions: Toward a more comprehensive and integrative model of belief-system components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Saucier, G., & Akers, L. G. (in press). Democidal thinking: Patterns in the mindset behind mass killing. *Genocide Studies and Prevention.*

Schubert, G. (1991). Primate politics. In G. Schubert & R. D. Masters (Eds.), *Primate politics* (pp. 37-56). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Sears, D. O., van Laar, C., Carrillo, M., & Kosterman, R. (1997). Is it really racism? The origins of white Americans' opposition to race-targeted policies. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61, 16-53.*

Seger, A. (2008). Corruption and democracy: What are the issues? In *Corruption and democracy* (pp. 9-58). Council of Europe Publishing.

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 1999)

Skitka, L., & Morgan, G. S. (2014). The social and political implications of moral conviction. *Advances in Political Psychology, 35,* Suppl. 1, 95-110.

Slim, H. (2007). *Killing civilians: Method, madness and morality in war.* London, UK: Hurst and Company. (pages 121-179 only)

Spencer, M. E. (1973). What is charisma? *The British Journal of Sociology, 24*, 341-354.

Svolik, M. W. (2015). Which democracies will last? Coups, incumbent takeovers, and the dynamic of democratic consolidation. *British Journal of Political Science, 45*, 715-738.

Swartz. M. J., Turner, V. W., & Tuden, A. (2002). Political anthropology. In J. Vincent (Ed.), *The anthropology of politics: A reader in ethnography, theory, and critique*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Turchin, P. (2012). Dynamics of political instability in the United States, 1780-2010. *Journal of Peace Research, 49*, 577-591.

Weeks, J. L. (2012). Strongmen and straw men: Authoritarian regimes and the initiation of international conflict. *American Political Science Review, 106, 326-347.*

Wolak, J., & Dawkins, R. (2017). The roots of patriotism across political contexts. *Political Psychology, 38*, 391-408.