

Political Science 319: Political Psychology
Autumn 2016
M/W 9:40-11:10 AM

Professor Erik Tillman
Department of Political Science
Office: 990 W. Fullerton Bldg., Room 2204
Office Hours: Wednesdays 1:00-4:00 PM, or by appointment

Email: etillman@depaul.edu
Tel: 773-325-4131

Course Overview and Objectives

This upper-level course is designed to enhance your understanding of the sources of political attitudes and behavior in different contexts. In this course, we will draw upon insights from the study of psychology (both cognitive and social) to explain and understand political outcomes. Thus, political psychology is an interdisciplinary field of study. It also cuts across the traditional subfield boundaries of political science, in that we can use it to understand political phenomena in the US, abroad, and in international politics. The course is designed to give you insight into the sources of political behavior that you can apply to understand a wide range of topics in any part of the world.

This course has several learning objectives:

1. To increase your substantive knowledge about an important subfield of political science—political psychology.
2. To continue the process of developing your ability to think critically about important questions related to political science—including how to assess competing arguments, to draw logical inferences from specific arguments, and to use evidence to assess the accuracy of theoretical arguments.
3. To develop your ability to express complex ideas and information effectively in writing, verbally, and visually.
4. To develop your ability to collect and analyze quantitative evidence and to engage in social scientific research
5. To understand the sources of your own political values and beliefs and to continue the process of preparation for a life of democratic citizenship.

Grading:

Your grade will be determined by your performance on two major writing projects, a series of quizzes, and your efforts to collect and enter survey data that will be shared among the class for the analytical paper project:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| • In-class activities | 10% |
| • Survey Collection | 5% |
| • Survey Reflection Essay | 15% |
| • Survey Analysis Project | 40% |
| ○ Research Design | 5% |
| ○ Final Paper | 25% |
| ○ Presentations | 10% |
| • Final Take-Home Exam | 30% |

In-Class Activities: We will have occasional quizzes and in-class individual or group activities designed to assess your understanding of course concepts and to practice working with survey data. These may take place at the start, middle, or end of class. There are no make-up activities; I will excuse missed activities only with documentation from the Dean of Students Office. Finally, there will be a few occasions where I will divide assigned readings

among class members. I may then ask individual students to summarize key points of the reading for the rest of the class. Your ability to do so will reflect on this grade.

Survey Collection & Entry: Each student will be responsible for administering a brief political survey to people outside of this class (classmates, relatives, friends, etc.), entering the results of those surveys into a Microsoft Excel file (I will provide a template on D2L), and uploading that file to D2L by the assigned date. Grades will be assigned on a pass/fail basis. You will earn the full 10 points for collecting and entering the information fully, properly, and on time. Doing so late or incorrectly will result in a grade of 5 or less. Because the entire class will rely upon the data you help to collect, it is of the essence that you take this assignment seriously and complete it fully and on time. More details on the specifics of the survey and how to enter the data will be provided later.

Survey Reflection Essay: Early in the quarter, you will fill out a survey (similar to the ones you will administer to others). You will receive back the survey that you completed later in the quarter, along with a key to the responses. Your task is to write a description and analysis of your own survey results, given what you have learned during the course. Your essay should do the following:

- Describe the patterns that appear in your results—how do you score on the different scales of values and attitudes? What are the patterns that appear, and are they strong or weak? Where appropriate, calculate mean scores from scales or batteries of questions. Include tables or figures to illustrate your results. Make it clear that you understand what your survey results mean.
- Analyze the patterns of results. Do your results reflect consistent patterns of personality, values, and political attitudes? Are your personality, values, and political attitudes related in the ways predicted by the readings?
- Finally, reflect critically on these results. Do you believe that the results accurately describe you? If not, explain why the survey measures may have failed to capture your “true” values or attitudes. Think carefully about this before dismissing the survey results; sometimes they shed light on aspects of our political values that we are reluctant to consider!

This essay should be 6-8 pages long. It should cite the relevant assigned course material, but you do not need to consult outside sources. You also do not need to address all aspects of your survey results, but I expect you to describe and analyze the most interesting and important results from each sections of the survey.

Survey Analysis Project: This project builds on the survey data collected by the class. You will work with the data to develop a small research project in which you propose and test a hypothesis derived from course materials using the collected survey data.

The project will proceed in several steps. First, you will develop a research design that includes a research question, a hypothesis (or hypotheses) that is relevant to that question and that can be tested using the survey data, on the assigned topic, and a description of the specific questions and methods you will use to test that hypothesis. Then, you will write the paper describing your research question, your hypothesis, your analysis, and your findings, while also preparing a verbal and PowerPoint presentation. Your presentation will be conducted in a small-group format of 4-6 students.

Research Design: This should be roughly 2-3 pages in length. It will present the specific research question that you wish to examine in this paper. The question must be relevant to the survey data, it must be empirical (i.e., something that can be examined as being true or false in practice), and it must build on a theory or concept that we have studied in the course (i.e., you cannot simply ask “are women and men different on X?”). The research design must contain at least one testable hypotheses, derived from our course materials and extra research that you do on the topic. A hypothesis is a specific, observable prediction that derives logically from a theory (or causal explanation). The hypothesis must be a statement that you can verify as being true or false based on your analysis of the data. Generally, a hypothesis should be a direct and simple statement of fact. You should provide a justification of each hypothesis derived from the readings. To give a (brief, non-related) example:

- Question: How does the weather affect voter turnout?
- Theory: The individual's decision to vote is the result of a cost-benefit analysis. People vote when the benefits that they accrue from voting outweigh the costs of voting. Anything that makes voting more costly or difficult without also increasing its benefit will make people less likely to vote.
- Hypothesis: Voter turnout will be lower in areas where it is raining on Election Day.
- Hypothesis: The further an individual lives from his/her polling station, the less likely s/he is to vote.
- Not a Hypothesis (normative): People should make the effort to vote even if it is difficult. Our forefathers died to give us this right.
- Not a Hypothesis (untestable): More people would vote if the politicians would quit lying to us.
- Not a Hypothesis That You Can Test (No Data): More people would vote if we had more than just two parties between which to choose.

Final Paper: This final part of the assignment requires you to write a paper of 8-10 pages of text describing your question, hypothesis, analysis, findings, and conclusions, in the form of a social scientific research report. Your paper must include the charts and a bibliography of the works that you consulted. This paper requires that you cite at least 5 additional *academic* sources (i.e., those published in a university press book or an academic journal) beyond assigned course material.

Presentation: During the final week, students will present the results of the findings of their project to a small group of class mates. Each presentation should be no longer than 10 minutes. The presentation should be accompanied by slides using Powerpoint. The presentation should guide your classmates through your question and hypothesis, a description of your analysis of the survey data, your findings, and conclusions.

For the final paper and presentation, you will rely on skills that you (should) have developed during your Liberal Studies educations (e.g., LSP 120/121) to develop a series of graphs or charts that display the main findings of your analysis. These should include common graphs such as bar charts, X-Y scatterplots, linear regression trendlines, t-tests, and pie charts. The emphasis in designing the charts should be on the effective and honest communication of results to a viewer/reader.

NOTE: To help you in this process, we will schedule several class meetings (dates TBD) in a computer lab, where you can work directly with the data with guidance from the instructor.

Final Grades: The **minimum** grade needed to earn each letter grade is as follows: A (94.0), A- (90.0), B+ (87.0), B (84.0), B- (80.0), C+ (77.0), C (74.0), C- (70.0), D+ (67.0), D (60.0), F (59.9 and below).

Note that you must receive a grade of C- or higher in order to fulfill the Capstone requirement and graduate!

A Final Note about Grading and Expectations: This is a 300-level university course. It is expected that students enter this course with a strong background in Political Science, including some understanding of political socialization and/or public opinion, and/or a willingness to work independently to obtain that knowledge. In addition, I expect a high standard for classroom discussion, decorum, preparation, and graded work as a matter of course. Regular and informed preparation is considered a necessary component of this course.

Readings:

There is one required book for this course and many required articles available via E-Reserve. Be warned that the readings are occasionally lengthy, typically from academic journals, and often full of statistics. Note that you are not expected to understand all of the statistical analyses contained in the readings (though I am happy to go over any of it with you), but you should not use their presence as an excuse to give up on reading. In short, the readings are nothing that you cannot handle, but you will need to be prepared to read carefully. The required book is:

- Daniel Kahneman. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Policies and Procedures

Instructor Contact: I hold regular weekly office hours at the times listed at the top of the first page of the syllabus. You are strongly encouraged to drop by at any time during these hours; you do not need to make an appointment or let me know in advance. If you cannot drop by during office hours, I am happy to schedule another time that works for both of us. I hope that you will consider coming by at least once during the quarter; I enjoy talking to students and want to help each of you do well in this course. You are especially urged to contact me *as soon as possible* if you have questions or concerns about course material, your performance, my expectations, etc, or if other problems are arising that are affecting your ability to do the coursework. However, I also encourage students to drop by just to discuss interests or topics related to the course.

Excused Absences: If a serious illness or personal emergency causes you to miss an extended amount of class or to be unable to complete assignments on time, you should notify the Dean of Students Office and ask for them to send documentation to me. The Dean of Students Office is located in Student Center Suite 307 (LPC) or DePaul Center Suite 11001 (Loop). Understand that I will not grant extensions or exceptions to course policies without documentation from the Dean of Students.

Desire2Learn: I use D2L as a means to post announcements readings, notes, and other course materials (including a back-up copy of this syllabus). You will also use D2L for submitting memos, papers, and reviews. You should plan on accessing D2L regularly (at least once between each class meeting). Because I will occasionally use D2L to send mass emails to the class, you should make sure that the system has your correct email address and that you check it regularly.

Disabilities: Students who need accommodations for a disability should contact me privately as early as possible during the quarter. I take these concerns seriously and will do what I can within reason and university policy to help. All discussions will remain confidential. In order to receive the most appropriate accommodations, you must also contact either the Plus Program (for LD, AD/HD) or the Office for Students with Disabilities (for all other disabilities) at 773-325-1677 (Student Center #370).

Academic Integrity: In academia, ideas are everything, and so presenting the words or ideas of others as your own is theft. Cheating, plagiarism, or other forms of academic dishonesty will result *at a minimum* in a grade of 0 on the assignment and a report to the Academic Affairs Office. ***Academic dishonesty on any assignment worth 20% or more of the final grade may result in a failing grade for the course, regardless of student performance on other assignments!*** Any work that you submit must be your own, and you must cite the sources of ideas or words that are not your own. If you have doubt about what constitutes a violation, you should consult the *Code of Student Responsibility* in the Student Handbook and/or consult me. Ignorance is never an excuse. Be aware of the following: making slight changes to the wording of another person's work without citing it is plagiarism; rules about plagiarism apply both to published and unpublished works; and submitting work that you have prepared for another course at DePaul or elsewhere in whole or part is cheating.

Classroom Decorum: As one of many students enrolled in this course, you have a shared responsibility to foster a constructive learning environment and to refrain from behavior that would hinder the ability of those around you to learn or for me to teach. At a minimum, you should:

- Arrive on time, stay until the end, and wait until class is over to put away materials
- Turn off the ringer on your mobile phone and put it away for the duration of class
- Refrain from eating food, talking, reading the paper, etc.
- Act respectfully towards your classmates
- Putting your head down on your desk, sleeping, etc.
- Avoid doing anything else that would distract your classmates or me.

*****You may not use laptops, tablets, and mobile phones during class*****

This policy is in place for two reasons. First, study after study shows that “multi-tasking” substantially reduces cognitive performance (and it is only appropriate that we would draw on that insight in this course). In other words, you are not capable of thinking or learning properly if you are distracted. Second, and more importantly, the classroom is a shared learning environment in which each student plays a crucial role. Anything that detracts from that environment harms it for everyone else in the class—and makes it less likely that we will have a productive class meeting.

I will lower your final course grade by up to two “fractions” (i.e., from a B+ to B-) if you fail to observe these guidelines.

Late Assignments: Due dates for assignments are firm, and they are there to provide a fair environment for all students. Unless noted otherwise, late work will be penalized by a minimum of 10 points (i.e., one letter grade) for each 24 hours that it is late. I will not accept any work submitted more than 72 hours after the deadline without prior approval.

Student Responsibility: It is your responsibility as a student to be aware of and understand all requirements, due dates, policies, and announcements that I provide in this syllabus, announce in class or via email, or post on D2L—whether you were in attendance on a given day or not. It is also your responsibility to catch up on missed days; I will not provide one-on-one reviews for students missing class. **Understand that all course requirements, policies, and due dates listed in this syllabus apply to you universally whether I specifically mention it to you or not!** A copy of the syllabus is posted on D2L, and copies of any materials or links that we used in class are either on D2L (after class) or available from me. The full citation for each reading is provided in this syllabus so that you can find the reading directly if the Electronic Reserve system is not working. Finally, please do not wait until the last minute to deal with any concerns or problems with the course. Talk to me early!

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

September 7 (Wed): Course Introduction

I. How We Think: How do human beings actually obtain, organize, and retrieve information about the world? To what extent are humans actually rational and informed? To what extent do these shortcomings in rationality and information actually matter? How should we consider democratic theory given the realities of citizen knowledge?

September 12 (Mon): Dual-Process Theory

- Kahneman, Chapters 1-3

September 14 (Wed): Associations & Judgments

- Kahneman, Chapters 4-6

September 19 (Mon): Biases & Heuristics

- Kahneman, Chapter 11-14, 17-18

September 21 (Wed): Implications

- Gabriel Lenz & Andrew Healy. 2014. "Substituting the End for the Whole: Why Voters Respond Primarily to the Election-Year Economy." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(1): 31-47.

September 26 (Mon): Implications

- Jonathan Haidt. 2001. "The Emotional Dog and Its Rationalist Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment." *Psychological Review* 108(4): 814-34.

September 28 (Wed): Do Voters Really Want Democracy?

- John R. Hibbing & Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6 (pp. 129-59).

II. Ideology and Value Systems: Why do citizens have different value systems? To what extent do most individuals have coherent value systems? Are ideologies cross-national or context-dependent?

October 3 (Mon): Are There Universal Human Values?

- Shalom H. Schwartz. 1994. "Are There Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values?" *Journal of Social Issues* 50(4): 19-45.

October 5 (Wed): Personality & Ideology

- Dana R. Carney, John T. Jost, Samuel D. Gosling, & Jeff Potter. 2008. "The Secret Lives of Liberals and Conservatives: Personality Profiles, Interaction Styles, and the Things They Leave Behind." *Political Psychology* 29(6): 807-40.
- **Finish Survey Collection and Return Results to Prof. Tillman**

October 10 (Mon): Authoritarianism

- Bob Altemeyer. 1996. *The Authoritarian Spectre*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 1 (pp. 6-49).

October 12 (Wed): Authoritarianism & Partisanship in the US

- Marc J. Hetherington & Jonathan D. Weiler. 2009. *Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4 (pp. 63-84).

October 17 (Mon): Authoritarianism & Cross-National Political Attitudes

- Ariel Malka, Christopher J. Soto, Michael Inzlicht, & Yphtach Lelkes. 2014. "Do Needs for Security and Certainty Predict Cultural and Economic Conservatism? A Cross-National Analysis." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 106(6): 1031-51.

III. Group Identity and Conflict: Why do humans self-divide so readily into distinct groups? Why do politics and religion sometimes (but often not) lead to inter-group violence? When does contact between rival groups lead to friction and when does it lead to understanding? Under what conditions are individuals motivated to engage in self-sacrifice for the larger group?

October 19 (Wed): The Good and Bad of Group Identity

- Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2009. *Who Counts as an American? The Boundaries of National Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6 (pp. 163-185).
- **Survey Reflection Essay Due**

October 24 (Mon): Stereotypes and Intolerance

- Martin Gilens. 2009. *Why Americans Hate Welfare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 3.
- Jarret T. Crawford & Jane M. Pilanski. 2012. "Political Tolerance, Right and Left." *Political Psychology* 35(6): 841-51.

October 26 (Wed): Contact and Threat

- Ryan D. Enos. 2016. "What the Demolition of Public Housing Teaches Us about the Impact of Racial Threat on Political Behavior." *American Journal of Political Science* 60(1): 123-42.
- Ryan D. Enos. 2014. "The Causal Effect of Intergroup Contact on Exclusionary Attitudes." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111(10): 3699-3704.
- **Hypothesis and Research Design Due**

October 31 (Mon): The Potential for Cooperation

- Daniel N. Posner. 2004. "Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 529-45.

IV. Threat, Emotions, and Decisionmaking: To what extent is group conflict the result of a failure to perceive motivations correctly? Does the pressure to conform with members of one's own group lead to low-quality decision-making? To what extent is political violence (or other forms of bad behavior) the result of dispositional or situational factors?

November 2 (Wed): Misperceptions and Attributions

- Robert Jervis. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 3.

November 7 (Mon): Groupthink

- Paul't Hart. 1991. "Irving Janis' *Victims of Groupthink*." *Political Psychology* 12(2): 247-78. Only read pages 247-59.

November 9 (Wed): Group Presentations

Your final paper is due at the start of the class meeting when you present

November 14 (Mon): Group Presentations (if needed), Conclusions, Distribute Final Take-Home Exam

November 16 (Wed): Final Exam Due at 5:00 PM

Recommended Additional Readings: These lists are by no means exhaustive, but reading these will give you a starting point to find further research on these topics.

On Biases and Cues:

- Larry Bartels. 2005. "Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind." *Perspectives on Politics* 3(1): 15-31.
- Shai Danziger, Jonathan Levav, and Liora Avnaim-Pesso. 2011. "Extraneous Factors in Judicial Decisions." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108(17): 6889-92.

On Stealth Democracy:

- Michael A. Neblo, Kevin M. Esterling, Ryan P. Kennedy, David M.J. Lazer, and Anand E. Sokhey. 2010. "Who Wants to Deliberate—And Why?" *American Political Science Review* 104(3): 566-83.

On Personality and Political Attitudes:

- Alan S. Gerber, Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, Conor M. Dowling, and Shang E. Ha. 2010. "Personality and Political Attitudes: Relationships across Issue Domains and Political Contexts." *American Political Science Review* 104(1): 111-33.
- Jeffery J. Mondak. 2010. *Personality and the Foundations of Political Behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

On Authoritarianism and Political Behavior:

- Theodor Adorno, Daniel J. Levinson, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Nevitt Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*.
- Marc Hetherington & Elizabeth Suhay. 2011. "Authoritarianism, Threat, and Americans' Support for the War on Terror." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 546-60.
- Karen Stenner. 2005. *The Authoritarian Dynamic*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Erik R. Tillman. 2013. "Authoritarianism and Citizen Attitudes towards European Integration." *European Union Politics* 14(4): 566-89.

On Prejudice:

- Donald R. Kinder & Cindy D. Kam. 2009. *Us Against Them: Ethnocentric Foundations of American Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 3 (pp. 42-69).
- Mark J. Brandt, Christine Reyna, John R. Chambers, Jarret T. Crawford, and Geoffrey Wetherell. 2014. "The Ideological-Conflict Hypothesis: Intolerance among both Liberals and Conservatives." *Current Directions in Psychological Sciences* 23(1): 27-34.

On Political Violence:

- John Mueller. 2000. "The Banality of 'Ethnic War.'" *International Security* 25(1): 42-70.
- Robert A. Pape. 2005. *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*. New York: Random House.