

## **Political Psychology**

Political Science 259

SSB 104

Darren Schreiber  
Spring 2010  
Social Science Building 367  
(858) 534-1854  
[dmschreiber@ucsd.edu](mailto:dmschreiber@ucsd.edu)

Class Meets: Wednesday, 12:00 p.m. – 2:50 p.m.

Office Hours: Wednesday, 3:30– 4:30 p.m.

### **My Mission as a Teacher:**

“To enable my students to learn joyfully, think clearly, read carefully, and write well.”

### **Abstract**

Beliefs about how people think about politics have been at the core of theories of politics since the ancients. In this course, we will begin with a survey of important theories of political psychology from the past century. We will focus mainly on hypotheses about how people develop their political attitudes and on the methods used to test those hypotheses. Twentieth century researchers were constrained to observing behavior and relied on surveys, interviews, and simple experiments to make inferences about the political mind. The second half of the course will look at the future of political psychology. We will learn about cutting edge insights from fields like neuroscience, genetics, computational modeling, and evolutionary theory. And, we will ask how those insights should inform our understanding of political cognition, affect, and behavior.

### **Books**

The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion (1991) (\$25.00)

John R. Zaller

Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment (2000) (\$15.00)

George E. Marcus, W. Russell Neuman, Michael Mackuen

A General Theory of Love (2000) (\$13.00)

Thomas Lewis, Fari Amini, Richard Lannon

Writing Successful Science Proposals (2000) (\$16.00)

Andrew Friedland and Carol Folt

Political Disagreement: The Survival of Diverse Opinions within Communication Networks

Huckfeldt et al. (2004) (\$26.99)

## Assignments

The two written assignments for this course are aimed at helping you to prepare for the process of writing research grants. The first of these is a brief (~2 pages) letter of intent (due Week 7)(10% of the final grade). The letter should be drafted as if it is written for a funding committee, succinctly explaining the context, goals, importance, methodology, and expected insights of the project you are proposing. The second is an NSF style grant proposal of around 15-20 pages (due Week 10)(90% of the final grade).

My expectation is that you will approach the question you are interested in by utilizing one or more of the methods described in the second half of the course. You will want to practice the art of writing for a grant review committee and thus communicate your ideas to an audience who may be unfamiliar with the literature, questions, and methods you are using. The Friedland and Folk (2000) book is an excellent aid for guiding you in this type of writing.

## Topics & Readings

Meeting 1 (Wednesday, March 31<sup>st</sup>) –

- Vamik D. Volkan. “Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ancient Fuel of a Modern Inferno.” Mind and Human Interaction (1996) 7, p. 110-127 (17 pages)
- Anthony Downs (1957) An Economic Theory of Democracy. Chapters 1 & 3 (31 pages)
- Philip E. Converse. “The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics.” (1964) (55 pages)
- Lewis et al. A General Theory of Love. Chapter 1 (15 pages)

Meeting 2 (Wednesday, April 7<sup>th</sup>) – Schema Theory

- Robert Axelrod (1973) “Schema Theory: An Information Processing Model of Perception and Cognition” The American Political Science Review (19 pages)
- Conover, Pamela and Stanley Feldman (1984) "How People Organize the Political World: A Schematic Model." American Journal of Political Science 28:95-126 (33 pages)
- James H. Kuklinski; Robert C. Luskin; John Bolland (1991) “Where is the Schema? Going Beyond the "S" Word in Political Psychology.” The American Political Science Review, (16 pages).
- Lewis et al. A General Theory of Love. Chapter 2 (18 pages)

Meeting 3 (Wednesday, April 14<sup>th</sup>) – Online and Memory Based Model

- “An Impression-Driven Model of Candidate Evaluation.” Milton Lodge; Kathleen M. McGraw; Patrick Stroh. The American Political Science Review, Vol. 83, No. 2. (Jun., 1989), pp. 399-419 (21 pages)
- Alvarez, R. Michael and John Brehm. (1999) Hard Choices, Easy Answers: Values, Information, and American Public Opinion, Ch 2-4.
- Hastie, Reid and Bernadette Park 1986. "The Relationship Between Memory and Judgment Depends on Whether the Judgment is Memory-Based or On-Line." Psychological Review 93:258-68. (11 pages)
- Lewis et al. A General Theory of Love. Chapter 3 (31 pages)

Meeting 4 (Wednesday, April 21<sup>st</sup>) – Zaller’s Theory

John Zaller (1992) The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion.

Lewis et al. A General Theory of Love. Chapter 4 (34 pages)

Meeting 5 (Wednesday, April 28<sup>th</sup>) – Race Perception I

James Sidanius (1993) “The Psychology of Group Conflict and the Dynamics of Oppression: A Social Dominance Approach.” In S. Iyengar & W. J. McGuire (Eds.), Explorations in Political Psychology pp. 183-219. Durham: Duke University Press. (37 pages)

Sears et al. (1997) “Is it really racism? The origins of white American’s opposition to race-targeted policies.” Public Opinion Quarterly, 61: 16-53 (34 pages)

Sniderman et al. (1996) “Beyond Race: Social Justice as a Race Neutral Ideal.” American Journal of Political Science, 40: 33-55 (23 pages)

Dovidio, John F., Kerry Kawakami, Craig Johnson, Brenda Johnson, and Adiaiah Howard. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 33 (5):510-540 (31 pages)

Lewis et al. A General Theory of Love. Chapter 5 (21 pages)

Meeting 6 (Wednesday, May 5<sup>th</sup>) – Race Perception II

Kurzban et al (2001) “Can race be erased? Coalitional computation and social categorization.” Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences, 98: 15387-15392 (6 pages)

Phelps et al. “Performance on Indirect Measures of Race Evaluation Predicts Amygdala Activation.” Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience (2000) (10 pages)

Golby et al. “Differential Responses in the Fusiform Region to Same-Race and Other-Race Faces.” Nature Neuroscience (2001) (6 pages)

Lieberman et al. “An fMRI investigation of race-related amygdala activity in African-American and Caucasian-American individuals.” Nature Neuroscience (2005) (3 pages)

Choose one from the following to present in class:

Freeman et al. The neural origins of superficial and individuated judgments about ingroup and outgroup members. Human Brain Mapping (2010) vol. 31 (1) pp. 150-9

Platek and Krill. Self-face resemblance attenuates other-race face effect in the amygdala. Brain Res (2009) vol. 1284 pp. 156-60

Xu et al. Do you feel my pain? Racial group membership modulates empathic neural responses. J Neurosci (2009) vol. 29 (26) pp. 8525-9

Lamm et al. How Do We Empathize with Someone Who Is Not Like Us? A Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study. J Cognitive Neurosci (2009)

Krill and Platek. In-group and out-group membership mediates anterior cingulate activation to social exclusion. Front Evol Neurosci (2009) vol. 1 pp. 1

Beer et al. The Quadruple Process model approach to examining the neural underpinnings of prejudice. Neuroimage (2008) vol. 43 (4) pp. 775-83

Van Bavel et al. The neural substrates of in-group bias: a functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation. Psychological science (2008) vol. 19 (11) pp. 1131-9

Rilling et al. Social cognitive neural networks during in-group and out-group interactions. Neuroimage (2008) vol. 41 (4) pp. 1447-61

Harris and Fiske. Dehumanizing the lowest of the low: neuroimaging responses to extreme out-groups. Psychological science (2006) vol. 17 (10) pp. 847-53

Meeting 7 (Wednesday, May 12<sup>th</sup>) – Affective Intelligence

**Letter of Intent Due**

Marcus et al. (2000) Affective Intelligence And Political Judgment.

Meeting 8 (Wednesday, May 19<sup>th</sup>) – Neuropolitics

Schreiber & Iacoboni (2007) Evaluating Political Questions: Evidence from Functional Brain Imaging (42 pages)

Westen et al. (2006) “Neural Bases of Motivated Reasoning: An fMRI Study of Emotional Constraints on Partisan Political Judgment in the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election” (12 pages)

Kaplan et al. (2007) “Us versus them: Political attitudes and party affiliation influence neural response to faces of presidential candidates” (10 pages)

Schreiber & Iacoboni (2005) “Monkey See, Monkey Do: Mirror Neurons, Functional Brain Imaging, and Looking Political Faces.” (29 pages)

Choose one from the following to present in class:

Kato et al. Neural correlates of attitude change following positive and negative advertisements. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* (2009) vol. 3 pp. 6

Zamboni et al. Individualism, conservatism, and radicalism as criteria for processing political beliefs: a parametric fMRI study. *Social neuroscience* (2009) vol. 4 (5) pp. 367-83

Oxley et al. Political attitudes vary with physiological traits. *Science* (2008) vol. 321 (5896) pp. 1667-70

Amodio et al. Neurocognitive correlates of liberalism and conservatism. *Nat Neurosci* (2007) vol. 10 (10) pp. 1246-7

Knutson et al. Politics on the brain: an FMRI investigation. *Social neuroscience* (2006) vol. 1 (1) pp. 25-40

Meeting 9 (Wednesday, May 26<sup>th</sup>) – Genes and Evolution

Alford et al (2005) “Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?” American Political Science Review (15 pages)

Orbell et al. (2004) “‘Machiavellian’ Intelligence as a Basis for the Evolution of Cooperative Dispositions.” American Political Science Review (15 pages)

Hatemi et al “Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Attitudes Over a Life Time.” Journal of Politics (2009) (43 pages)

Mutz & Reeves (2005) “The New Video Malaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust” American Political Science Review (15 pages)

Choose one from the following to present in class:

Fowler & Dawes (2008) “Two Genes Predict Voter Turnout” (37 pages)

Dawes and Fowler “Partisanship, Voting, and the Dopamine D2 Receptor Gene” *Journal of Politics* (2009) (30 pages)

Hatemi et al. (Forthcoming) “A Genome-Wide Analysis of Liberal and Conservative Political Attitudes.” *Journal of Politics*

Hatemi et a. (Forthcoming) “Not by Twins Alone” *American Journal of Political Science.*

Meeting 10 (Wednesday, June 2<sup>nd</sup>) – Networks

Huckfeldt et al. (2004) Political Disagreement : The Survival of Diverse Opinions within Communication Networks.

Mutz (2002) “The Consequences of Cross-Cutting Networks for Political Participation” American Journal of Political Science (18 pages)