

PO/PS 320 POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY
IES Abroad Amsterdam
Winter 2023**DESCRIPTION:**

Political psychology aims to decipher the underlying reasons for our political convictions, how we arrive at them, and how we choose to act on them. An inherently interdisciplinary field, it is thus well positioned to address political questions both of perennial relevance - e.g. what are the psychological reasons for the differences between liberals and conservatives? are our political beliefs couched in rationality or emotion? - as well as those of more recent provenance, such as how we might explain the rise of populist parties in the Western world, with case studies on Central/Eastern Europe and the US. This course examines the aforementioned in addition to the relation between various types of media and the public, acquainting students with concepts such as information bubbles, issue framing, and explicit and implicit attitudes. With the current emphasis so often placed on individual consumers and citizens, students are also asked to reflect on the difficulties faced by policymakers who must take into account the vagaries of public opinion, not to mention their own psychology.

CREDITS: 3**CONTACT HOURS:** 45**LANGUAGE OF PRESENTATION:** English**ADDITIONAL COST:** None**PREREQUISITES:** Introduction to Psychology**METHOD OF PRESENTATION:**

The methodology will be based on presentations and discussions, video excerpts, case studies, course-related trips, and group work.

ATTENDANCE POLICY:

Since IES Abroad Amsterdam courses are designed to take advantage of the unique contribution of the instructor, and the lecture/discussion format is regarded as the primary mode of instruction, class attendance is mandatory and will be taken for every class. In addition, students are expected to be on time for classes, course-related excursions, and tests. Some courses include mandatory trips outside of regular class hours, i.e., on weekends. Students will be made aware of the specific dates of such trips well in advance and are required to attend.

If a student misses a class without an excuse, this will lead to a deduction of their final grade of one-third of a letter grade for every additional unexcused absence (for example, A- to B+).

Excused absences are permitted only in case of:

- Health issues (including a doctor's note);
- A recognized religious holiday traditionally observed by the particular student;
- A grave incident affecting family members;
- Conflicting academic commitments, only when communicated well in advance;

Any other absences (such as missing a flight) are unexcused.

If a student shows a pattern in (excused and unexcused) absences, students may be subject to an Academic Review including but not limited to a letter sent to their school and a probationary period or exclusion from the program.

REQUIRED WORK AND FORM OF ASSESSMENT:

- Course Participation - 10%
- Midterm Exam - 20%
- Final Exam - 20%
- Research Paper - 25%
- Presentation - 10%
- Homework - 15%

Course Participation

Class attendance is mandatory, and simply being present during class meeting times is not considered in the assessment. Class participation refers to the extent to which students are involved, active, and prepared when coming to class. This includes reviewing the assigned readings before class meetings, preparing relevant discussion questions for the unit, and actively taking part in class discussions and activities online and during class time.

Excellent participation

The student's contributions reflect an active reading of the assigned bibliography. Skillfully synthesizes the main ideas of the readings and raises questions about the applications and implications of the material. Demonstrates, through questions and comments, that he or she has been capable of relating the main ideas in the readings to the other information discussed in the course, and with his or her own life experience. The student makes informed judgments about the readings and other ideas discussed in class, providing evidence and reasons. He/she respectfully states his/her reactions about other classmates' opinions, and is capable of contributing to the inquiry spiral with other questions. The student gets fully involved in the completion of the class activities.

Very good participation

The student's contributions show that the assigned materials are usually read. Most of the time the main ideas are identified, even though sometimes it seems that applications and implications of the information read were not properly reflected upon. The student is able to construct over others' contributions, but sometimes seems to interrupt the shared construction to go over tangents. He/she is respectful of others' ideas. Regularly involved in the activities but occasionally loses concentration or energy.

Regular participation

The participant evidences a regular reading of the bibliography, but in a superficial way. He/she tries to construct over others' ideas, but commonly provides comments that indicate lack of preparation about the material. Frequently, contributions are shallow or unarticulated with the discussion in hand.

Insufficient participation

Consistently, the participant reads in a shallow way or does not read at all. Does not participate in an informed way, and shows lack of interest in constructing over others' ideas.

Midterm & Final Exam

The midterm and final exams consist of short answer questions

Research Paper & Presentation

The written assignment is an in-depth research and personal analysis on a subject matter relevant to the course topic. It comprises three parts: a literature review, a list of references, and a personal analysis based on the literature reviewed, for a total length of 2,000-2,500 words (8-10 pages). The topic must be related to political psychology but is otherwise flexible and can include topics relevant to a student's major. Students are requested to submit their research topic for approval in session 4. A draft version of the paper can be submitted for review up to 5 days before the final submission date. As part of the

evaluation of the paper, students are asked to briefly present selected content from their written assignment during session 16.

Homework

The homework assignments are 3 shorter exercises (maximum 500 words), assigned throughout the semester. These written tasks are intended to further the student's exploration and understanding of class content through the application of theoretical knowledge to current events. An example would be taking the online IAT (Implicit Association Test) to measure one's implicit attitudes concerning groups on the political spectrum and reflecting critically upon the results.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

By the end of the course students will be able to:

- Illustrate the interaction between the disciplines of political science and psychology, the distinction between psychological political science and political psychology, and how advances in these fields can be mutually beneficial.
- Identify the possible influences and contributions of factors such as socialization, emotion and cognition, personality, or genes on the development of ideology, political beliefs and behaviour.
- Explain the role various media outlets (social media, conventional media) play in shaping our opinions about the political realm.
- Critically assess the importance of expert views, cognitive shortcuts, and implicit attitudes in the development of our political views.
- Analyze the rise in right-wing populism in Austria within the broader post-WWII historical and political narrative.
- Apply conceptual knowledge to understand 1) individual and group behaviour (e.g. voting, activism), and 2) contemporary international affairs (e.g. elections, referendums).

CONTENT:

Week	Content	Assignments
Part I – The Psychology of Political Convictions		
Session 1	Introduction The field of political psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huddy, L. et al. (2013). Introduction: theoretical foundations of political psychology. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology</i>. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 1 - pp. 1-19). • Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? In James H. Kuklinski, (ed), <i>Thinking about Political Psychology</i>. New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 6 – pp. 187-216). • Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: would people still obey today?. <i>American</i>

		<p>Psychologist, 64(1), 1-11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charney, E. (2008). Genes and ideologies. <i>Perspectives on Politics</i>, 6(2), 299-319. • Lavine, H., Lodge, M., & Freitas, K. (2005). Authoritarianism, threat, and selective exposure to information. <i>Political Psychology</i>, 26, 219-244.
<p>Session 2</p>	<p>Political Preferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Biological causes of political orientation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., & Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted? <i>American Political Science Review</i>, 99(2), 153-167. • Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C.M. (2011). The big five personality traits in the political arena. <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i>, 14, 265-287.
<p>Session 3</p>	<p>Political Preferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Political socialization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sears, D.O., and Brown, C. (2003). Childhood and adult political development. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology</i>. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 3 - pp. 59-95). <p>Homework 1 due</p>
<p>Session 4</p>	<p>Rationality and Emotion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Rationality in politics, game theory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quattrone, G. A. and A. Tversky. (1988). Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice. <i>American Political Science Review</i>, 82, 716- 736. • Riker, W. H. (1995). The political psychology of rational choice theory. <i>Political Psychology</i>, 16(1), 23- 44. <p>Research Paper Topic Due</p>

<p>Session 5</p>	<p>Rationality and Emotion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Emotions in politics ➤ Populism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demertzis, N. (2014). Political emotions. In Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) <i>The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology</i>. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. (Ch. 13 – pp. 223-241). • Jervis, R. (1993). The drunkard's search. In Shanto Iyengar and William James McGuire, (eds), <i>Explorations in Political Psychology</i>. Durham and London: Duke University Press. (Ch. 12 - pp. 338- 360). • Salmela, M. and C. von Scheve. (2017). Emotional roots of right-wing populism. <i>Social Science Information</i>, 56(4), 564-595.
<p>Part II – Interpreting Political Information</p>		
<p>Session 6</p>	<p>How is Political Information Accessed? Creation of Information Bubbles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Populist media, social media, polarization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hetherington, M. J., & Weiler, J. D. (2009). <i>Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics</i>. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 2 (pp. 15-32) & Ch. 6 (pp. 109-133)
<p>Session 7</p>	<p>How is Political Information Accessed? Creation of Information Bubbles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Elitist, establishment and conventional media 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., & Murphy, C. (2012). Polarized political communication, oppositional media hostility, and selective exposure. <i>The Journal of Politics</i>, 74(1), 174-186. • Bullock, J. G. (2011). Elite influence on public opinion in an informed electorate. <i>American Political Science Review</i>, 105, 496-515.

<p>Session 8</p>	<p>How is Political Information Processed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Issue framing, punditry, closed and open mindedness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Druckman, J. N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: who can frame? <i>The Journal of Politics</i>, 63(4), 1041-1066. • Kruglanski, A. W. and Boyatzis, L. M. (2012). The psychology of closed and open mindedness, rationality, and democracy. <i>Critical Review</i>, 24(2), 217-232. • Tetlock, P. E. (2017). <i>Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?</i> Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Ch. 7 - pp. 189-215) <p>Homework 2 due</p>
<p>Session 9</p>	<p>How is Political Information Processed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Explicit and implicit attitudes ➤ Statistical Inference vs. "Psycho- Logic" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ballew, C.C., and Todorov, A. (2007). Predicting political elections from rapid and unreflective face judgments. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i>, 104(46), 17948-17953. • Cottam, M.L. et al. (2016). <i>Introduction to Political Psychology</i>. 3rd Edition. New York: Routledge. (Ch. 3, pp. 46-78). • Lebow, R. N. (2010). <i>Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations</i>. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Ch. 7, pp. 205-221)
<p>Session 10</p>	<p>Midterm exam</p>	
<p>PART III - THE PSYCHOLOGY OF GROUP ACTION</p>		
<p>Session 11</p>	<p>Individual and collective action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Hashtag activism ➤ Virtue signaling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bode, L., Hanna, A., Yang, J., & Shah, D. V. (2015). Candidate networks, citizen clusters, and political expression: strategic hashtag use in the 2010 midterms. <i>The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i>, 659(1), 149-165. • Dadas, C. (2017). Hashtag activism: the promise and risk of 'attention'. In Douglas M. Walls and Stephanie Vie, (eds), <i>Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, Pedagogies</i>, Colorado: The WAC

		<p>Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado, (Ch. 1 - pp. 17-36).</p>
<p>Session 12</p>	<p>Individual and collective action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Protesting ➤ Voting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dekker, H. (2014). Voting and not voting: the principal explanations. In Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. (Ch. 12 – pp. 204-219). • Gibson, R. K. (2015). Party change, social media and the rise of ‘citizen-initiated’ campaigning. <i>Party Politics</i>, 21(2), 183-197. • Carr, D. (2012). Hashtag activism, and its limits. <i>The New York Times</i>. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/26/business/media/hashtag-activism-and-its-limits.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 • Fang, J. (2015). In defense of hashtag activism. <i>Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs</i>, 2(1), 138-141.

<p>Session 13</p>	<p>Case Studies in Populism – Voting on the fringe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Understanding atypical political outcomes ➤ Central/Eastern Europe ➤ Brexit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faber. S. (2018) Is Dutch Bad Boy Thierry Baudet the New Face of the European Alt-Right? <i>The Nation</i> • Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). <i>Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism</i>. New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 2, p.32-64; Ch. 11, pp. 368-405). • Petsinis, V. (2015). The ‘new’ far right in Hungary: a political psychologist’s perspective. <i>Journal of Contemporary European Studies</i>, 23(2), 272-287. • Vossen. K (2010) Populism in the Netherlands after Fortuyn: Rita Verdonk and Geert Wilders compared. <i>Perspectives on European Politics and Society</i>, Vol 11, issue 1. <p>Homework 3 due</p>
<p>Session 14</p>	<p>Case Studies in Populism – Voting on the fringe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Trump 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). <i>Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism</i>. New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 10, pp. 331- 367). • Oliver, J. E., & Rahn, W. M. (2016). Rise of the Trumpenvolk: populism in the 2016 election. <i>The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i>, 667(1), 189-206.
<p>PART IV - POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY IN DEMOCRACY</p>		

<p>Session 15</p>	<p>An Introduction to Leadership in Democracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Political Psychology of Leaders - Case studies: ➤ The Paradox of Intelligence and Effective Statesmanship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottam, M., Dietz-Uhler, B., Mastors, E. M., & Preston, T. (2004). Introduction to Political Psychology. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (Ch. 5, pp. 97-123) • Jervis, R. (2010). Why intelligence and policymakers clash. Political Science Quarterly, 125, 185-204. <p>Research Paper due</p>
<p>Session 16</p>	<p>Review and Student Presentations</p> <p>The Field of Political Psychology: A Review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lane, R. E. (2003). Rescuing political science from itself. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology. 1st edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 21 – pp. 755-793). <p>Student Presentations</p>
<p>Session 17</p>	<p>Final Exam</p>	

FIELD STUDIES:

- TBC

REQUIRED READINGS:

- Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., & Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted?. *American Political Science Review*, 99(2), 153-167.
- Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., & Murphy, C. (2012). Polarized political communication, oppositional media hostility, and selective exposure. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(1), 174-186.
- Ballew, C.C., and Todorov, A. (2007). Predicting political elections from rapid and unreflective face judgments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(46), 17948-17953.
- Bode, L., Hanna, A., Yang, J., & Shah, D. V. (2015). Candidate networks, citizen clusters, and political expression: strategic hashtag use in the 2010 midterms. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 659(1), 149-165.
- Bullock, J. G. (2011). Elite influence on public opinion in an informed electorate. *American Political Science Review*, 105, 496-515.
- Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: would people still obey today? *American Psychologist*, 64(1), 1-11.
- Charney, E. (2008). Genes and ideologies. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6(2), 299-319.
- Cottam, M., Dietz-Uhler, B., Mastors, E. M., & Preston, T. (2004). Introduction to Political Psychology. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cottam, M.L., Mastor, E., Preston, T., & Dietz, B. (2016). Introduction to Political Psychology. 3rd Edition. New York: Routledge.

- Dadas, C. (2017). Hashtag activism: the promise and risk of 'attention'. In Douglas M. Walls and Stephanie Vie, (eds), *Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, Pedagogies*, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado.
- Dekker, H. (2014). Voting and not voting: the principal explanations. In Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Demertzis, N. (2014). Political emotions. In Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Druckman, J. N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: who can frame? *The Journal of Politics*, 63(4), 1041-1066.
- Hetherington, M. J., & Weiler, J. D. (2009). *Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Faber, S. (2018) Is Dutch Bad Boy Thierry Baudet the New Face of the European Alt-Right? *The Nation*
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2011). The big five personality traits in the political arena. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 14, 265-287.
- Gibson, R. K. (2015). Party change, social media and the rise of 'citizen-initiated' campaigning. *Party Politics*, 21(2), 183-197.
- Huddy, L. et al. (2013). Introduction: theoretical foundations of political psychology. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jervis, R. (1993). The drunkard's search. In Shanto Iyengar and William James McGuire, (eds), *Explorations in Political Psychology*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Jervis, R. (2010). Why intelligence and policymakers clash. *Political Science Quarterly*, 125, 185-204.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? In James H. Kuklinski, (ed), *Thinking about Political Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kruglanski, A. W. and Boyatzi, L. M. (2012). The psychology of closed and open mindedness, rationality, and democracy. *Critical Review*, 24(2), 217-232.
- Lane, R. E. (2003). Rescuing political science from itself. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. 1st Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lavine, H., Lodge, M., & Freitas, K. (2005). Authoritarianism, threat, and selective exposure to information. *Political Psychology*, 26, 219-244.
- Lebow, R. N. (2010). *Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Quattrone, G. A. and A. Tversky. (1988). Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice. *American Political Science Review*, 82, 716-736.
- Petsinis, V. (2015). The 'new' far right in Hungary: a political psychologist's perspective. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 23(2), 272-287.
- Riker, W. H. (1995). The political psychology of rational choice theory. *Political Psychology*, 16(1), 23-44.
- Salmela, M. and C. von Scheve. (2017). Emotional roots of right-wing populism. *Social Science Information*, 56(4), 564-595.
- Sears, D.O., and Brown, C. (2003). Childhood and adult political development. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vossen, K (2010) Populism in the Netherlands after Fortuyn: Rita Verdonk and Geert Wilders compared. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol 11, issue 1.
- Tetlock, P. E. (2017). *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

RECOMMENDED READINGS:

- Carr, D. (2012). Hashtag activism, and its limits. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/26/business/media/hashtag-activism-and-its-limits.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Fang, J. (2015). In defense of hashtag activism. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*, 2(1), 138-141.
- Haidt, J. (2013). *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided By Politics And Religion*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Iyengar, S., and Hahn, K.S. (2009). Red media, blue media: evidence of ideological selectivity in media use. *Journal of Communication*, 59, 19-39.