Political Psychology

PLSC433.00

Beecher 101

Monday, Wednesday 1:30–2:50

Prof. John Brehm

Pick 502

702-8075

jjbrehm@uchicago.edu

This class is intended to be a reading seminar at the intersection of two disciplines, psychology and political science. We will do our best in this course to focus on the political, drawing upon more purely psychological work as needed. The purpose of the course is to bring all of us up to speed with one of the fundamental approaches to the study of politics, namely, to regard the actors as under the influence of psychological processes. There are many applications: candidate selection, formation of attitudes about politics, organizational dynamics, voting, and so on. Because Brehm is hopelessly parochial, the material here will be disproportionately drawn from American politics, although he is making an effort to identify relevant comparative and IR articles, too.

There's a lot to read here, and much of it is in the form of articles. Regard tsyllabus as a work in progress. Perhaps some of the material will be out of sequence, some weeks will contain more meat (and more pages) than others, and there will, inevitably, be some topics which we give short shrift.

I would like one student a week to be responsible for opening the discussion with a brief presentation summarizing the key approaches and findings for the week's readings. In addition, I would like one student each week to be responsible for assembling the materials for the subsequent week's readings. (I should have copies of the readings for the following week in folders in my office, but there will always be a few that wander off). All of the readings are currently (or should be) on E-Reserve, and I will cycle a folder of readings for each week through the bins in the PS grad student lounge.

The final assignment for this course is to design an experiment. My hope is that you will be able to follow through on your experimental designs, perhaps as a component of your dissertation research. The format of the experimental design should follow that similar to the write–up of a *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* article (but without the findings, of course): begin with a set–up of the key principles you intend to test, explain why we care about these principles, then write the particulars of your design (nature of manipulation, subject pool, whether deception will/will not be used, then a discussion of how the experiment how only illuminates your principles but how these principles fit into a larger research problem.

General class participation counts for 25%, leadership of your assigned day of the class counts for 25%, and the final experiment counts for 50%.

1   Introduction: What is Political Psychology? (27 September)

1. Jervis, R. (1989). Political psychology: Some challenges and opportunities. *Political Psychology*, 10(3):481–493

2. Kinder, D. R. and Palfrey, T. R. (1992). On behalf of an experimental political science. In Kinder, D. R. and Palfrey, T. R., editors, *Experimental foundations of political science*, chapter 1. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor. JA73.E870

3. Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? distinguishing political psychology from psychological political science. In Kuklinski, J. H., editor, *Thinking about Political Psychology*, chapter 6. Cambridge University Press, New York. JA74.5.T43

Suggested Readings

1. Iyengar, S. (1993). An overview of the field of political psychology. In Iyengar, S. and McGuire, W. J., editors, *Explorations in political psychology*, chapter 1. Duke University Press, Durham. JA74.5.E960

2. McGuire, W. J. (1993). The poly-psy relationship: Three phases of a long affair. In Iyengar, S. and McGuire, W. J., editors, *Explorations in political psychology*, chapter 2. Duke University Press, Durham. JA74.5.E960

3. Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., and Tetlock, P. E. (1991a). Introduction: Major themes. In Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., Tetlock, P. E., Kuklinski, J. H., and Chong, D., editors, *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*, chapter 1. Cambridge University Press, New York. HN90.P8R430

4. Sullivan, J. L., Rahn, W. M., and Rudolph, T. (2002). Political psychology and political science. In Kuklinski, J. H., editor, *Thinking about Political Psychology*, chapter 5. Cambridge University Press, New York. JA74.5.T43

2 Personality (2–4 October)

1. Greenstein, F. I. (1992). Can personality and politics be studied simultaneously. *Political Psychology*, 13(1):105–128

Authoritarianism

1. Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. (1950). In *The Authoritarian Personality*, chapter 1, 7, 19. Harper & Row, New York. HM271.A9

2. Altemeyer, B. (1988). In *Enemies of freedom : understanding right-wing authoritarianism*, chapter 3–5. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco. HM271.A4570

3. Duckitt, J. (1989). Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct. *Political Psychology*, 10(1):63–84

4. Stenner, K. (2005a). *The authoritarian dynamic*, chapter Kindred spirits, common spark: the theory of the authoritarian dynamic. Cambridge University Press, New York. JC480.S84

Suggested Readings

1. McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V. S., and Abalakina-Paap, M. A. (1992). Authoritarianism in the former Soviet Union. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(6):1004–1010

2. Meloen, J.and Van der Linden, G. and De Witte, H. (1996). A test of the approaches of Adorno et al., Lederer and Altemeyer of authoritarianism in Belgian Flanders: A research note. *Political Psychology*, 17(4):643–653

3. Stenner, K. (2005b). *The authoritarian dynamic*, chapter Authoritarianism and conservatism: how they differ and when it matters. Cambridge University Press, New York. JC480.S84

4. Lavine, H., Lodge, M., and Freitas, K. (2005). Threat, authoritarianism, and selective exposure to information. *Political Psychology*, 26:219–244

5. Funke, F. (2005). The dimensionality of right-wing authoritarianism: Lessons from the dilemma between theory and measurement. *Political Psychology*, 26:195–218

Tolerance

1. Sullivan, J. L. (1981). The sources of political tolerance: A multivariate analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 75(1):92–106

2. Marcus, G. E. (1995b). Thinking and mood. In *With malice toward some : how people make civil liberties judgments*, chapter 3. Cambridge University Press, New York. JA74.5.E940

3. McClosky, H. and Brill, A. (1983). *Dimensions of tolerance : what Americans believe about civil liberties*, chapter 8. Russell Sage Foundation, New York. JC599.U5M380

Suggested Readings

1. Marcus, G. E. (1995a). Antecedent considerations and contemporary information. In *With malice toward some : how people make civil liberties judgments*, chapter 2. Cambridge University Press, New York. JA74.5.E940

Obedience

1. Milgram, S. (1974). In *Obedience to authority; an experimental view*, chapter 2, 10. Harper & Row, New York. HM271.M64

3 Social and Political Learning (9–11 October)

1. Liebert, R. M. and Spiegler, M. D. (1997). Social learning theories. In *Personality; strategies and issues*, chapter 20. Wadsworth Publishing, New York

Altruism

1. Monroe, K. R. (1996). *The heart of altruism : perceptions of a common humanity*, chapter 9. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. BJ1474.M740

2. Oliner, S. P. and Oliner, P. M. (1988). In *The altruistic personality: rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*, chapter 2, 3. Free Press, New York. D810.J4O4180

Suggested Readings

1. Teske, N. (1997). Beyond altruism: Identity-construction as moral motive in political explanation. *Political Psychology*, 18(1):71–91

Culture and Politics

1. Hamilton, V. L. and Sanders, J. (1992). *Everyday justice : responsibility and the individual in Japan and the United States*. Yale University Press, New Haven. XXK5064.H360

2. Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3):506–520

3. Markus, H. R. and Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2):224–253

Socialization

1. Jennings, M. K. and Markus, G. B. (1984). Partisan orientations over the long haul: Results from the three-wave political socialization panel study. *American Political Science Review*, 78(4):1000–1018

2. Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P., and Shachar, R. (2003). Voting may be habit-forming: Evidence from a randomized field experiment. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(3):540–550

Suggested Readings

1. Freedman, A. E. and Freedman, P. E. (1975). *The psychology of political control*. St. Martin's Press, New York. JA74.5.F85

2. Sigel, R. S. (1989). *Political learning in adulthood*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. JA76.P59280

Social Networks

1. McClurg, S. D. (2003). Social networks and political participation: The role of social interaction in explaining political participation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(4):449–464

2. Visser, P. S. and Mirabile, R. R. (2004). Attitudes in the social context: The impact of social network composition on individual-level attitude strength. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6):779–795

4   Political Cognition I: Schemas (16–18 October)

1. Srull, T. K. and Wyer, R. S. (1979). The role of category accessibility in the interpretation of information about persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(10):1660–1672

2. Mutz, D. C. (1997). Mechanisms of momentum: Does thinking make it so? *Journal of Politics*, 59:104–125

3. Hurwitz, Jon; Peffley, M. (1997). Public perceptions of race and crime: The role of racial stereotypes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2):375–401

4. Zajonc, R. B. (1985). Cognitive theories of social psychology. In *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Random House, New York. HM251.L721

Suggested Readings

1. Granberg, D. (1993). Political perception. In Iyengar, S. and McGuire, W. J., editors, *Explorations in political psychology*, chapter 4. Duke University Press, Durham. JA74.5.E960

2. Kuklinski, J. H., Luskin, R. C., and Bolland, J. (1991). Where is the schema? going beyond the "S" word in political psychology. *American Political Science Review*, 85(4):1341–1356

3. Judd, C. M. and Downing, J. W. (1995). Stereotypic accuracy in judgments of the political positions of groups and individuals. In Lodge, M. and McGraw, K. M., editors, *Political judgment : structure and process*, chapter 4. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor. JA74.5.P6230

4. Peffley, M., Hurwitz, J., and Sniderman, P. M. (1997). Racial stereotypes and whites' political views of blacks in the context of welfare and crime. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(1):30–60

5. McGuire, W. J. (1968). The structure of human thought. In Abelson, R. P., editor, *Theories of cognitive consistency; a sourcebook*, pages 140–162. Rand McNally, Chicago. BF311.T4

6. Conover, P. J. and Feldman, S. (1984). How people organize the political world: A schematic model. *American Journal of Political Science*, 28(1):95–126

5   Political Cognition II: Heuristics and Biases (23–25 October)

1. Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. *American Psychologist*, 28(2):107–128

2. Nisbett, R. and Ross, L. (1980). Causal analysis. In Nisbett, R. and Ross, L., editors, *Human inference: strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. BF311.N72

3. Taylor, S. and Fiske, S. (1978). Salience, attention and attribution. In Berkowitz, L., editor, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, pages 249–288. Academic Press. HM251.A1A24

4. Kramer, R. M. (1994). The sinister attribution error: Paranoid cognition and collective distrust in organizations. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18(2):199–230

5. Bem, D. J. and McConnell, H. K. (1970). Testing the self-perception explanation of dissonance phenomena: On the salience of premanipulation attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14(1):23–31

6. Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*, chapter 1, 8. Row, Peterson, Evanston, Ill. BF335.F42

7. Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*, chapter 7. Wiley, New York. BF636.H47

Suggested Readings

1. Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., and Tetlock, P. E. (1991b). The role of heuristics in political reasoning. In Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., Tetlock, P. E., Kuklinski, J. H., and Chong, D., editors, *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*, chapter 2. Cambridge University Press, New York. HN90.P8R430

2. Sherman, S. J. and Corty, E. (1984). Cognitive heuristics. In Robert S. Wyer, J. and Srull, T. K., editors, *Handbook of social cognition*, volume 1, pages 245–254, 270–276. L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N.J. HM132.H3330

3. Gilliam Jr., F. D., Valentino, N. A., and Beckmann, M. N. (2002). Where you live and what you watch: The impact of racial proximity and local television news on attitudes about race and crime. *Political Research Quarterly*, 55(4):755–780

4. Huckfeldt, R., Mondak, J. J., Craw, M., and Mendez, J. M. (2005). Making sense of candidates: Partisanship, ideology, and issues as guides to judgment. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 23:11–23

6 Political Knowledge (30 October–1 November)

1. Carpini, M. X. D. and Keeter, S. (1996). Who's informed? In *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*, chapter 4. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. JK1764.D4530

2. Bartels, L. M. (1996). Uninformed votes: Information effects in presidential elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(1):194–230

3. Fiske, S. T., Kinder, D. R., and Larter, W. M. (1983). The novice and the expert: Knowledge-based strategies in political cognition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19(4):381–400

4. McGraw, K. M. and Pinney, N. (1990). The effects of general and domain-specific expertise on political memory and judgment. *Social Cognition*, 8(1):9–30

Suggested Readings

1. Gordon, S. B. and Segura, G. M. (1997). Cross-national variation in the political sophistication of individuals: Capability or choice? *The Journal of Politics*, 59(1):126–147

2. Sidanius, J. (1988). Political sophistication and political deviance: A structural equation examination of context theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(1):37–51

3. Carpini, M. X. D. and Keeter, S. (1993). Measuring political knowledge: Putting first things first. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(4):1179–1206

7 Affect (6–8 November)

1. Marcus, G. E., Neuman, W. R., and MacKuen, M. (2000). *Affective intelligence and political judgment*, chapter 6. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. JA74.5.M36

2. Masters, R. D. and Sullivan, D. C. (1993). Nonverbal behavior and leadership: Emotion and cognition in political information processing. In Iyengar, S. and McGuire, W. J., editors, *Explorations in political psychology*, chapter 6. Duke University Press, Durham. JA74.5.E960

3. Conover, P. J. and Feldman, S. (1986). Emotional reactions to the economy: I'm mad as hell and i'm not going to take it anymore. *American Journal of Political Science*, 30:50–78

4. Ekman, P. (1992). An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 6(3–4):169–200

5. Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist*, 35(2):151–175

6. Burden, B. C. and Klofstad, C. A. (2005). Affect and cognition in party identification. *Political Psychology*, 26:869–886

Suggested Readings

1. Ottati, V. C. and Robert S. Wyer, J. (1993). Affect and political judgement. In Iyengar, S. and McGuire, W. J., editors, *Explorations in political psychology*, chapter 10. Duke University Press, Durham. JA74.5.E960

2. Marcus, G. E. and MacKuen, M. B. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *The American Political Science Review*, 87(3):672–685

3. Ortony, A. and Turner, T. J. (1990). What's basic about basic emotions? *Psychological Review*, 97(3):315–331

4. Roseman, I. J., Abelson, R. P., and Ewing, M. F. (1986). Emotion and political cognition: Emotional appeals in political communication. In Lau, R. R. and Sears, D. O., editors, *Political cognition: the 19th Annual Carnegie Symposium on Cognition*. L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N.J. JA74.5.S970

8 Political decision-making (13–15 November)

1. Simon, H. A. (1985). Human nature in politics: The dialogue of psychology with political science. *The American Political Science Review*, 79(2):293–304

2. Rahn, W. M., Aldrich, J. H., Borgida, E., and Sullivan, J. L. (1990). A social cognitive model of candidate appraisal. In Ferejohn, J. A. and Kuklinski, J. H., editors, *Information and democratic processes*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL. JC423.I490

3. Popkin, S. L. (1991). *The reasoning voter : communication and persuasion in presidential campaigns*, chapter 4. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. JK524.P640

4. Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: A study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(2):196–210

5. Redlawsk, D. P. (2002). Hot cognition or cool consideration? testing the effects of motivated reasoning on political decision making. *Journal of Politics*, 64(4):1021–1044

Suggested Readings

1. Conover, P. J. and Feldman, S. (1989). Candidate perception in an ambiguous world: Campaigns, cues, and inference processes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 33(4):912–940

2. Kinder, D. R., Peters, M. D., Abelson, R. P., and Fiske, S. T. (1980). Presidential prototypes. *Political Behavior*, 2(4):315–337

3. Lau, R. R. (1989). Construct accessibility and electoral choice. *Political Behavior*, 11(1):5–32

9   Groups (20–22 November)

1. Janis, I. L. (1988). Groupthink. In Katz, R., editor, *Managing professionals in innovative organizations: A collection of readings*, pages 332–340. Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., New York. HD62.37.M370

2. Tetlock, P. E., Peterson, R. S., McGuire, C., Chang, S., and Feld, P. (1992). Assessing political group dynamics: A test of the groupthink model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3):403–425

3. Conover, P. J. (1988). The role of social groups in political thinking. *British Journal of Political Science*, 18(1):51–76

4. Brewer, M. B. (1993). Social identity, distinctiveness, and in-group homogeneity. *Social Cognition*, 11(1):150–164

5. Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33:1–39

6. Cohen, G. L. (2003). Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5):808–822

Suggested Readings

1. Sidanius, J. (1988). Political sophistication and political deviance: A structural equation examination of context theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(1):37–51

2. Turner, M. E., Pratkanis, A. R., Probasco, P., and Leve, C. (1992). Threat, cohesion, and group effectiveness: Testing a social identity maintenance perspective on groupthink. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(5):781–796

3. Sapiro, V. (1990). The women's movement and the creation of gender consciousness: Social movements as social agents. In Ichilov, O., editor, *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*, pages 266–280. Teachers' College Press

4. Miller, A. H., Gurin, P., Gurin, G., and Malanchuk, O. (1981). Group consciousness and political participation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 25(3):494–511

5. Conover, P. J. and Sapiro, V. (1993). Gender, feminist consciousness, and war. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(4):1079–1099

10   Memory or On-line (27–29 November)

1. Hastie, R. and Park, B. (1986). The relationship between memory and judgment depends on whether the judgment task is memory-based or on-line. *Psychological Review*, 93(3):258–268

2. Lodge, M., McGraw, K. M., and Stroh, P. (1989). An impression-driven model of candidate evaluation. *The American Political Science Review*, 83(2):399–419

3. Alvarez, R. M. and Brehm, J. (2002b). Predispositions. In *Hard choices, easy answers: values, information, and American public opinion*, chapter 2. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. HM1236.A46

4. Alvarez, R. M. and Brehm, J. (2002c). Why does political information matter? In *Hard choices, easy answers: values, information, and American public opinion*, chapter 3. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. HM1236.A46

Suggested Readings

1. Lodge, M., Steenbergen, M. R., and Brau, S. (1995). The responsive voter: Campaign information and the dynamics of candidate evaluation. *The American Political Science Review*, 89(2):309–326

2. Lodge, M., Stroh, P., and Wahlke, J. (1990). Black-box models of candidate evaluation. *Political Behavior*, 12(1):5–18

3. Alvarez, R. M. and Brehm, J. (2002a). Ambivalence, uncertainty, and equivocation. In *Hard choices, easy answers: values, information, and American public opinion*, chapter 4. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. HM1236.A46

4. Burdein, I., Lodge, M., and Taber, C. (2006). Experiments on the automaticity of political beliefs and attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 27(3):359–371

11 Persuasion (4–6 December)

1. Petty, R. E. and Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: central and peripheral routes to attitude change*, chapter 1, 5. Springer-Verlag, New York. BF637.P4P470

2. Krosnick, J. A. and Kinder, D. R. (1990). Altering the foundations of support for the president through priming. *The American Political Science Review*, 84(2):497–512

3. Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*, chapter 9, 11. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT. XXK250.T950

4. Cialdini, R. B. (1984). *Influence: the new psychology of modern persuasion*, chapter 4, 7. Morrow, New York. BF637.P4C50

Suggested Readings

1. Iyengar, S., Peters, M. D., and Kinder, D. R. (1982). Experimental demonstrations of the "not-so-minimal" consequences of television news programs. *The American Political Science Review*, 76(4):848–858

12 Trust (11–13 December)

1. Feldman, S. (1983). The measurement and meaning of trust in government. *Political Methodology*, 9(3):341–354

2. Brehm, J. and Rahn, W. (1997). Individual-level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3):999–1023

3. Hibbing, J. R. and Theiss-Morse, E. (1995). Focus groups and perceptions of the washington system. In *Congress as public enemy: public attitudes toward American political institutions*, chapter 5. Cambridge University Press, New York

4. Yamagishi, T. and Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18(2):129–166

Suggested Readings

1. Scholz, J. T. and Lubell, M. (1998). Adaptive political attitudes: Duty, trust, and fear as monitors of tax policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42(3):903–920

2. Rahn, W. M., Brehm, J., and Carlson, N. (1999). National elections as institutions for generating social capital. In Skocpol, T. and Fiorina, M. P., editors, *Civic engagement in American democracy*, chapter 4. Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C. JK1764.C5266

3. Hagan, J., Merkens, H., and Boehnke, K. (1995). Delinquency and disdain: Social capital and the control of right-wing extremism among east and west berlin youth. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 100(4):1028–1052