POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

INR 5934-0001 | Spring 2021
Mo 2:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Remote

Prof. Marina Duque
Department of Political Science
Florida State University

Email: marina.duque@fsu.edu
Office hours by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This graduate seminar is designed as a broad overview of research at the intersection of political psychology and international relations. The main goal of this course is to introduce you to key debates in the field and to material you might not have encountered elsewhere, in the hopes that it will open up new lines of inquiry and provide inspiration for your own research. The course will examine both foundational works and cutting-edge research that address important questions across disciplines. We will begin the semester with a couple of foundational questions: What is political psychology, and what does it add to the study of international relations? How do political actors process information and make decisions? What role do actors' motivations and emotions play in these processes? Next, we will discuss how individual-level differences—such as personality traits, values, and morality—influence political attitudes and behavior. We will then examine intergroup processes with important implications for international relations. How do political actors form social identities and perceive others? How do symbolic considerations and out-group attitudes shape political attitudes and behavior? To what extent does social identification promote cooperation or conflict? Finally, the course will conclude by considering the relationship between leaders and the public. How do leaders and publics influence foreign policy decision-making? To what extent do they differ in the way they process information and make decisions?

REQUIREMENTS

A total of 100 points can be earned in this course. Your grade will be based on the number of points you earn out of the 100 possible. Grades will be based on three aspects:

1. Class preparation and participation

Every student is expected to have completed the readings before each class. You should view our class meetings as opportunities for the scholarly exchange of ideas, and all of us should participate

in that scholarly exchange. Much of the class time will be devoted to discussion, but I will also open each session with a commentary or overview.

Each class will center on a critical analysis of the assigned readings:

1. What question(s) does the author address?

2. Why do these questions arise? From what literature or real-world events?

3. What answer(s) does the author provide?

4. Does the argument make logical sense? What are its strengths and weaknesses?

5. What is the counter-argument? Do other readings or cases suggest otherwise?

6. Which one is best: the argument or the counter-argument? Why?

7. How does the author reach their answer(s)?

8. Is there reason to doubt this evidence? Can you think of other cases that might support the argument (or not)?

9. If the argument were true, what else would result?

10. How does this tie in with what we discussed before?

The ability to be critical is an important academic skill, but it is equally important to learn how to be constructively critical and to be appropriately appreciative of good work. You should try your best to offer a constructive alternative to the target of your criticism.

Preparation and participation contribute 20% to your final grade.

2. Response Memos

Each student will write **four response memos** (1-2 single-spaced pages) reacting to the material assigned for that week, to be submitted via Canvas by 5 p.m. on the day before class. The memos must focus on readings to be discussed in that week, not previous class readings. You are free to choose the four weeks of readings that are of most interest to you.

The memos are writing and thinking exercises intended to spur discussion of the readings. Everyone is required to read the responses for that week before class and to come ready to discuss them. Rather than summarize the readings, memos should engage the readings, by, for example:

- juxtaposing alternative theoretical or methodological approaches to a topic;

- critiquing methodologies and proposing alternative empirical strategies;

- discussing the implications from a set of findings;

- suggesting new questions or hypotheses for research;

- developing similarities and contrasts with research from previous readings.

Each memo is worth 5 points, for a total of 20% of the course grade.

3. Final Paper

Each student will write an original research paper at the intersection of political psychology and international relations, with the goal of producing something that could eventually be published after some revision. The paper will show an understanding of the development of knowledge in a chosen area and propose an idea for extending that knowledge. It will include **a statement of the research problem, a brief literature review, a presentation of the argument, and a research design.** To help you prepare the paper, I strongly recommend that you consult this book:

- Belcher, W. L. (2019). *Writing Your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, second edition.

We will discuss this further over the course of the semester but the first step will be getting my approval for your paper. This will require the submission of a proposal via Canvas that briefly describes the paper (2 pages, single spaced). The proposal is worth 15% of your final grade.

At the end of the semester, you will present your paper to the class in standard conference format: 12-15 minutes of presentation (including slides), followed by my comments as discussant and a question and answer session. The presentation is worth 10% of your final grade.

A final version that incorporates responses to this feedback will be due at the end of the semester. The paper is worth 35% of your final grade.

Summary of Course Requirements and Calculation of Final Grade:

1. Class attendance, preparation and participation: 20%
2. Response memos (1-2 pages, single spaced): 4 @ 5% each, or 20%
3. Final paper proposal (2 single-spaced pages, due Feb 22): 15%
4. Final paper presentation (12-15 min, due Apr 5, 12): 10%
5. Final paper (15+ double-spaced pages, due Apr 19): 35%

POLICIES

University Attendance Policy: Excused absences include documented illness, deaths in the family and other documented crises, call to active military duty or jury duty, religious holidays, and official University activities. These absences will be accommodated in a way that does not arbitrarily penalize students who have a valid excuse. Consideration will also be given to students whose dependent children experience serious illness.

Academic Honor Policy: The Florida State University Academic Honor Policy outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of students' academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process. Students are responsible for reading the Academic Honor Policy and for

living up to their pledge to "…be honest and truthful and…[to] strive for personal and institutional integrity at Florida State University." See http://fda.fsu.edu/Academics/Academic-Honor-Policy

Americans with Disabilities Act: Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should: (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center; and (2) bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type. Please note that instructors are not allowed to provide classroom accommodation to a student until appropriate verification from the Student Disability Resource Center has been provided. This syllabus and other class materials are available in alternative format upon request. For more information about services available to FSU students with disabilities, contact the Student Disability Resource Center at 874 Traditions Way, 108 Student Services Building, (850) 644-9566, sdrc@admin.fsu.edu, http://www.disabilitycenter.fsu.edu/

Syllabus Change Policy: Except for changes that substantially affect implementation of the evaluation (grading) statement, this syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice.

SCHEDULE

1. Introduction to Political Psychology (Jan 11)

- McGraw, K. M. (2006). Why and How Psychology Matters. In Goodin, R. E. and Tilly, C., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, pages 131–56. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

- Jervis, R. (1989). Political Psychology: Some Challenges and Opportunities. *Political Psychology*, 10(3):481–493.

- Sears, D. O. (1989). The Ecological Niche of Political Psychology. *Political Psychology*, 10(3):501–506.

- Krosnick, J. A. and McGraw, K. M. (2002). Psychological political science versus political psychology true to its name: A plea for balance. In Monroe, K. R., editor, *Political Psychology*. Psychology Press.

- Hafner-Burton, E. M., Haggard, S., Lake, D. A., and Victor, D. G. (2017). The Behavioral Revolution and International Relations. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S1–S31.

Recommended

- Ross, L., Lepper, M., and Ward, A. (2010). History of Social Psychology: Insights, Challenges, and Contributions to Theory and Application. In Fiske, S. T., Gilbert, D. T., and Lindzey, G., editors, *Handbook of Social Psychology*, pages 3–50. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.

- Kertzer, J. D. and Tingley, D. (2018). Political Psychology in International Relations: Beyond the Paradigms. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1):319–339.

2. No class; Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (Jan 18)

3. Cold Cognition: Heuristics, Biases, and Learning (Jan 25)

- Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A., editors (2000). *Choices, Values, and Frames.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, Chapters 2, 8, 12.

- Gigerenzer, G. and Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic Decision Making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62(1):451–82.

- Levy, J. S. (1994). Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield. *International Organization*, 48(2):279–312.

- Saunders, E. N. (2017). No Substitute for Experience: Presidents, Advisers, and Information in Group Decision Making. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S219–47.

- Yarhi-Milo, K. (2013). In the eye of the beholder: How leaders and intelligence communities assess the intentions of adversaries. *International Security*, 38(1):7–51.

Suggested readings

- McGraw, K. M. (2000). Contributions of the cognitive approach to political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 21(4):805–832.

- Levy, J. S. (1997). Prospect theory, rational choice, and international relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(1):87–112.

4. Hot Cognition: Motivated Reasoning and Emotion (Feb 1)

- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3):480–98.

- Taber, C. S. and Lodge, M. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(3):755–769.

- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., and Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6):878–902.

- Haslam, N. and Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65:399–423.

- Lerner, J. S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P., and Kassam, K. S. (2015). Emotion and Decision Making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1):799–823.

Suggested readings

- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., and Nosek, B. A. (2004). A Decade of System Justification Theory: Accumulated Evidence of Conscious and Unconscious Bolstering of the Status Quo. *Political Psychology*, 25(6):881–919.

- Mercer, J. (2010). Emotional Beliefs. *International Organization*, 64(01):1–31.

5. Dispositions I: Personality and Traits (Feb 8)

- Jost, J. T. (2017). Ideological Asymmetries and the Essence of Political Psychology. *Political Psychology*, 38(2):167–208.

- Rathbun, B. C., Kertzer, J. D., and Paradis, M. (2017). Homo Diplomaticus: Mixed-Method Evidence of Variation in Strategic Rationality. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S33–S60.

- Yarhi-Milo, K. (2018). *Who Fights for Reputation: The Psychology of Leaders in International Conflict*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

- Herrmann, R. K., Tetlock, P. E., and Visser, P. S. (1999). Mass Public Decisions to Go to War: A Cognitive-Interactionist Framework. *The American Political Science Review*, 93(3):553–73.

- Kam, C. D. and Kinder, D. R. (2007). Terror and ethnocentrism: Foundations of American support for the War on Terrorism. *Journal of Politics*, 69(2):320–338.

Suggested readings

- Hetherington, M. J. and Suhay, E. (2011). Authoritarianism, Threat, and Americans' Support for the War on Terror. *Journal of Politics*, 55(3):546–60.

- Rathbun, B. C. (2011). Before hegemony: Generalized trust and the creation and design of international security organizations. *International Organization*, 65(2):243–273.

6. Dispositions II: Values and Morality (Feb 15)

- Tyler, T. R. and Van Der Toorn, J. (2013). Social Justice. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, pages 627–61. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, second edition.

- Skitka, L. J. and Morgan, G. S. (2014). The Social and Political Implications of Moral Conviction. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 35(S1):95–110.

- Kertzer, J. D., Powers, K. E., Rathbun, B. C., and Iyer, R. (2014). Moral Support: How Moral Values Shape Foreign Policy Attitudes. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(3):825–840.

- Sagan, S. D. and Valentino, B. A. (2017). Revisiting Hiroshima in Iran: What Americans Really Think about Using Nuclear Weapons and Killing Noncombatants. *International Security*, 42(1):41–79.

- Stein, R. M. (2015). War and Revenge: Explaining Conflict Initiation by Democracies. *American Political Science Review*, 109(3):556–73.

Suggested readings

- Fiske, A. P. and Tetlock, P. E. (1997). Taboo Trade-offs: Reactions to Transactions That Transgress the Spheres of Justice. *Political Psychology*, 18(2):255–97.

- Rathbun, B. C., Kertzer, J. D., Reifler, J., Goren, P., and Scotto, T. J. (2016). Taking Foreign Policy Personally: Personal Values and Foreign Policy Attitudes. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(1):124–137.

7. The (Social) Self: Social Identity and Nation-Building (Feb 22) | **Research proposals due**

- Brewer, M. B. (2001). The Many Faces of Social Identity: Implications for Political Psychology. *Political Psychology*, 22(1):115–125.

- Spears, R. (2011). Group Identities: The Social Identity Perspective. In Schwartz, S. J., Luyckx, K., and Vignoles, V. L., editors, *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*, pages 201–24. Springer, New York, NY.

- Bonikowski, B. (2016). Nationalism in Settled Times. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 42(1):427–49.

- Darden, K. and Mylonas, H. (2016). Threats to Territorial Integrity, National Mass Schooling, and Linguistic Commonality. *Comparative Political Studies*, 49(11):1446–79.

- Schildkraut, D. J. (2011). National identity in the United States. In Schwartz, S. J., Luyckx, K., and Vignoles, V. L., editors, *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*, pages 845–65. Springer.

Suggested readings

- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(6):745–778.

- Brubaker, R. (2002). Ethnicity without groups. *European Journal of Sociology*, 43(2):163–89.

8. Symbolic Politics I (Mar 1)

- Sears, D. O. (1993). Symbolic Politics: A Socio-Psychological Theory. In Iyengar, S. and McGuire, W. J., editors, *Explorations in Political Psychology*, pages 113–49. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

- Bonikowski, B. (2017). Ethno-nationalist populism and the mobilization of collective resentment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 68(S1):S181–S213.

- Suchman, M. C. and Eyre, D. P. (1992). Military procurement as rational myth: Notes on the social construction of weapons proliferation. *Sociological Forum*, 7(1):137–161.

- Manekin, D., Grossman, G., and Mitts, T. (2019). Contested Ground: Disentangling Material and Symbolic Attachment to Disputed Territory. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 7(4):679–97.

- Kaufman, S. J. (2019). War as Symbolic Politics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 63(3):614–625.

Suggested readings

- Sears, D. O. (2001). The Role of Affect in Symbolic Politics. In Kuklinski, J. H., editor, *Citizens and Politics: Perspectives from Political Psychology*, pages 14–40. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.

- Huff, C. and Kertzer, J. D. (2018). How the Public Defines Terrorism. *American Journal of Political Science*, 62(1):55–71.

9. Symbolic Politics II: Social Status (Mar 8)

- Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., Lundberg, K. B., Kay, A. C., and Payne, B. K. (2015). Subjective Status Shapes Political Preferences. *Psychological Science*, 26(1):15–26.

- Thal, A. (2020). The Desire for Social Status and Economic Conservatism among Affluent Americans. *American Political Science Review*, 114(2):426–42.

- Gilady, L. (2018). *The Price of Prestige: Conspicuous Consumption in International Relations*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

- Musgrave, P. and Nexon, D. H. (2018). Defending Hierarchy from the Moon to the Indian Ocean: Symbolic Capital and Political Dominance in Early Modern China and the Cold War. *International Organization*, 72(3):591–626.

- Sambanis, N., Skaperdas, S., and Wohlforth, W. C. (2015). Nation-Building through War. *American Political Science Review*, 109(2):279–96.

Suggested readings

- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., and Anderson, C., editors (2014). *The Psychology of Social Status*. Springer, New York, NY.

- McClendon, G. H. (2018). *Envy in Politics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

10. The Other: Out-Group Attitudes and Perceptions (Mar 15)

- Mansfield, E. D. and Mutz, D. C. (2009). Support for Free Trade: Self-Interest, Sociotropic Politics, and Out-Group Anxiety. *International Organization*, 63(3):425–57.

- Mutz, D. C. and Lee, A. H.-Y. (2020). How Much is One American Worth? How Competition Affects Trade Preferences. *American Political Science Review*, 114(4):1179–1194.

- Hainmueller, J. and Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public Attitudes Toward Immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17(1):225–49.

- Baker, A. (2015). Race, Paternalism, and Foreign Aid: Evidence from U.S. Public Opinion. *American Political Science Review*, 109(1):93–109.

- Herrmann, R. K. (2013). Perceptions and Image Theory in International Relations. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, pages 334–63. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, second edition.

Suggested readings

- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The Psychology of Prejudice: Ingroup Love and Outgroup Hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3):429–444.

- Sagan, S. D. and Valentino, B. A. (2020). Weighing Lives in War: How National Identity Influences American Public Opinion about Foreign Civilian and Compatriot Fatalities. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 5(1):25–43.

11. Identity and Intergroup Conflict (Mar 22)

- Sambanis, N. and Shayo, M. (2013). Social identification and ethnic conflict. *American Political Science Review*, 107(2):294–325.

- Posen, B. R. (1993). Nationalism, the mass army, and military power. *International Security*, 18(2):80–124.

- Bertoli, A. D. (2017). Nationalism and Conflict: Lessons from International Sports. *International Studies Quarterly*, 61(4):835–49.

- Tomz, M. R. and Weeks, J. L. P. (2013). Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review*, 107(04):849–865.

- Andrighetto, L., Mari, S., Volpato, C., and Behluli, B. (2012). Reducing Competitive Victimhood in Kosovo: The Role of Extended Contact and Common Ingroup Identity. *Political Psychology*, 33(4):513–529.

Suggested readings

- Huddy, L. and Khatib, N. (2007). American Patriotism, National Identity, and Political Involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(1):63–77.

- Herrmann, R. K., Isernia, P., and Segatti, P. (2009). Attachment to the nation and international relations: Dimensions of identity and their relationship to war and peace. *Political Psychology*, 30(5):721–754.

12. Leaders and the Public (Mar 29)

- Guinote, A. (2017). How Power Affects People: Activating, Wanting, and Goal Seeking. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68(1):353–381.

- Kertzer, J. D. (Forthcoming). Re-Assessing Elite-Public Gaps in Political Behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*.

- Baum, M. A. and Groeling, T. (2010). Reality Asserts Itself: Public Opinion on Iraq and the Elasticity of Reality. *International Organization*, 64(03):443–479.

- Guisinger, A. and Saunders, E. N. (2017). Mapping the Boundaries of Elite Cues: How Elites Shape Mass Opinion across International Issues. *International Studies Quarterly*, 61(2):425–41.

- Tomz, M., Weeks, J. L. P., and Yarhi-Milo, K. (2020). Public Opinion and Decisions About Military Force in Democracies. *International Organization*, 74(1):119–143.

Suggested readings

- Hafner-Burton, E. M., Hughes, D. A., and Victor, D. G. (2013). The Cognitive Revolution and the Political Psychology of Elite Decision Making. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2):368–86.

- Kertzer, J. D. and Zeitzoff, T. (2017). A bottom-up theory of public opinion about foreign policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 61(3):543–58.

13. Apr 5 | **Paper presentations**

14. Apr 12 | **Paper presentations**

15. Apr 19 | **Research papers due**