

# GOV 50.08: Psychology and International Politics

Professor Kathleen Powers

Email: [kathleen.e.powers@dartmouth.edu](mailto:kathleen.e.powers@dartmouth.edu)

Office: 223 Silsby Hall

Office Hours: Wednesdays 3:30-5:30pm (sign-up sheet on office door; posted 1 week in advance)

Class Meetings: 2A (T/TH 2:25-4:15pm), Rockefeller 002

X-hour: W 4:35-5:25<sup>1</sup>

## Course Description

What, if anything, can psychology tell us about international relations? In a subfield marked by a traditional focus on macro-level theorizing – states and the international system are primary units of analysis – how can research into human brains and social interactions inform big debates about war and peace? This course starts from the observation that international politics fundamentally involves humans interacting with one another. Heads of state, diplomats, members of the military, and mass publics are important parts of the political world, and psychology as a discipline is well-suited to explaining their attitudes and behavior.

This course looks at the various ways in which IR scholars have drawn upon psychology to enhance existing theories and develop new insights into world politics. The course is designed around substantive psychological topics, with reading assignments drawn from IR scholarship. Unit I will focus on introducing political psychology and the rationalist approach from IR. Unit II will apply core ideas from cognitive and personality psychology to understand how leaders process information and how their dispositions shape foreign policy preferences. In unit III we will turn our attention to the masses, and focus on the role of morality, emotions, genes, and social identities in international politics. We conclude the unit by considering how international relations affects individuals.

## Learning objectives

Broadly speaking, the goal of this course is to critically investigate the various ways that research and findings from psychology can help us to make sense of important puzzles in international politics. Upon completing the course, students will have a comprehensive understanding of the major psychological approaches to international politics, and will be able to assess psychological arguments considering alternative rationalist, system, or state-level arguments. Students will improve their ability to read and evaluate scholarly literature, and to construct and communicate an original, theoretically informed argument. Specifically, by the end of this course, you should be able to do the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> Please keep the x-hour open on your calendar; two x-hour sessions are already on the calendar, and will otherwise be used as needed, with plenty of notification.

- Identify assumptions about human behavior that are implicit or explicit in theories and concepts from international relations.
- Evaluate IR theory using contributions from psychology. This includes identifying when arguments from traditional IR and political psychology either compete or overlap.
- Explain the rational actor model, and identify theories and evidence from decision-making research that challenge this model.
- Identify and explain theories/concepts from cognitive, personality, social, and biological psychology that have informed our understanding of international politics.
- Apply psychological theories to new (and old) problems in international relations.
- Evaluate/critique political psychology scholarship in terms of argument, methods (including internal, external, and construct validity), and evidence.

## Course format

This course will combine lectures with discussion and student-centered learning activities. Lectures will be designed to a) introduce the important psychological and/or IR theories central to the course meeting and/or b) highlight and expand on key points from the readings. There will be copious opportunities to ask questions. The remainder of the course period will focus on class discussions and active learning exercises. For this to be successful, students should come to class prepared to summarize and synthesize reading material and participate in discussions having completed the assignments.

## Course Requirements

There are 4 graded components to this course. These include: (1) Participation/Engagement, (2-3) two exams, (4) a final Analytical Paper.

Class Participation: 12%

Exam (x2): 50% (25% each)

Paper Proposal Memo: 3%

Final Paper: 35%

**Reading:** There are no required textbooks for this course. All readings will be posted on the class Canvas site. Readings should be completed in preparation for the day of class on which they are assigned. This course is **reading intensive**, and you should be prepared to read 2-4 full academic articles or chapters for each class meeting. **Reading academic work is not passive** – you should be engaging the material and developing questions and critiques as you read and prepare for class.

**Participation/Engagement (12%):** This course is designed around the expectation that students come prepared to ask questions and react to material from the readings and lecture. In other words, I expect students to be active participants in the learning process. Therefore, 12% of the final grade will be based on in-class participation. **While you must be present to participate in class** (and you cannot make-up work that we complete in class, e.g., individual or group writing, after an unexcused absence), **merely attending class does not constitute participation.**

In grading participation & engagement, I am looking for evidence that you have completed the reading and are engaging intellectually with the course material. Participation can include thoughtful questions and comments during our course meetings, in-class writing activities and discussions, offering examples, making connections between topics, critiquing arguments, discussing news or other articles that illustrate course concepts, presenting arguments grounded in course material.

**Midterm & Final Exam (25% each):** There will be two in-class exams on April 25 and June 3. This exam will include fill-in-the-blank and “short answer” questions. The exams will draw from lectures, reading material, and discussions up to that point.

**Final Paper (35%):** Students are expected to complete a final analytical paper (8-10 pages). This paper will apply one of the psychological theories that we discuss in class to a problem in international politics of the student’s choosing. There’s a lot of latitude in topic selection, but it must a) engage one or more theories from the course and b) international relations. The final written paper will count for 35% of the final course grade.

**Paper Proposal:** 3% of your final grade is allocated to a paper proposal. This proposal should contain 2 things: **(1)** A 1-2 paragraph description of your proposed topic (**no more than 1 double-spaced page**), and **(2)** 5 references listed in the form of an **annotated** bibliography. More information will be posted in a memo on Canvas. The proposal is **due on Monday, April 29 at 11:59pm**. You will submit it to the Canvas assignment box titled “Paper Proposal.”

**Due:** A draft for peer review will be due **Tuesday, May 14**. Peer review comments will be due **Friday, May 17**. I will provide a memo and in-class instructions on the peer review process. The full final paper is due on **Friday, May 24 at 11:59pm**. Submit to the Canvas Assignment box titled “Final Analytical Paper.”<sup>2</sup>

**Grades:** I define grades according to Dartmouth’s official description, posted on the Registrar’s website [here](#), where the key words are that A range grades denote “excellence” (by definition not an average or common quality), B’s suggest “good” work, C’s are for “acceptable” performance, a D conveys “deficient” and E “seriously deficient” work. The Government Department has established a norm under which median grades in introductory and mid-level classes shall not

---

<sup>2</sup> Late papers will be penalized for each day past the deadline. If you leave campus, you are responsible for submitting your paper on time per the correct (EST) time zone. For example, if you travel to the west coast, you should submit your paper by 8:59pm PST. Please don’t ask for extensions except in the case of a true emergency. I will say no, and we will both be disappointed (me, because I understand that the end of term is tough for everyone, and you, because the deadline will still apply). **I will grade whatever you submit – be sure to check that you submit the complete, final draft.**

exceed B+. I'm not the norm entrepreneur, but I do adhere to it – **the median in our class will not be higher than a B+.**

## **Other Course Information:**

**Prerequisites:** A basic knowledge of IR theory and concepts is helpful for students to put the ideas from the course in the context of the broader field and to fully comprehend reading assignments. For this reason, students should ideally have completed GOV 5 in a prior term. Those who need to refresh their memories should consult me for reading suggestions. Knowledge of basic statistics will be helpful since many of the reading assignments will use quantitative data, but Gov 10 is not a required prerequisite. We will spend some time early in the quarter discussing how to read quantitative evidence, and you should reach out if you have other questions or concerns about this.

**Attendance:** You are not “required” to attend class, but since participation accounts for 12% of your course grade, frequent absences will negatively affect your grade for the course. If you have to miss a class meeting for a documented reason (e.g., ROTC, college-sanctioned sports, serious illness that might cause you to miss multiple class periods, etc.), please notify me in advance.

**Technology:** All cell phones and other devices that make noise must be turned off or put on silent (not vibrate), and put away. Using laptops is prohibited in class. Recent research suggests that the use of laptops is associated with reduced learning and lower grades, outcomes directly at odds with my goals for the course. If you have an accessibility issue that requires note-taking via laptop, come and see me as soon as possible so that we can discuss accommodation.

**Communication and Email:** I will provide updates about the course and changes to the syllabus using email and the announcement function in Canvas. **Make sure that you check “announcements” in your Canvas notifications** so that you receive these messages. Before emailing a question, please first check the syllabus and Canvas page to ensure that has not already been addressed – this frees up time so that I can respond to substantive inquiries.

**Academic Honor Principle:** As a Dartmouth student, you have agreed to abide by the College’s [Academic Honor Principle](#). Students should be aware of [proper citation practices](#). Lack of knowledge about what constitutes plagiarism does not excuse a violation – take the time to learn about it, and if you are confused *at all*, please consult with me. I take violations very seriously, but am happy to talk with students about citation practices and offer resources at any time.

**Student Accessibility Needs:** Students with disabilities who may need disability-related academic adjustments and services for this course are encouraged to see me privately as early in the term as possible. Students requiring disability related academic adjustments and services must consult the [Student Accessibility Services](#) office (Carson Hall, Suite 125, 646-9900). Once SAS has authorized services, students must show the originally signed SAS Services and Consent Form and/or a letter on SAS letterhead to me. As a first step, if students have questions about whether they qualify to receive academic adjustments and services, they should contact the SAS office. All inquiries and discussions will remain confidential.

**Religious Observances:** Some students may wish to take part in religious observances that occur during this academic term. If you have a religious observance that conflicts with your participation in the course, please meet with me before the end of the second week of the term to discuss appropriate accommodations.

## Course Outline and Reading List

All readings are required unless specifically identified as optional. This reading list is subject to change, but alterations will come with advanced notice.

### Overview Readings (none of these are required, they are simply resources):

Sometimes, it can be helpful to take a broad look at the field that you are going to spend the term studying. If you would like to read some recent (and not so recent) overviews of psychology & IR, I recommend the items on the list below. None of these are required – they are simply listed for your edification and as potential places to look for references as you research your final paper.

- Goldgeier, J.M., and P.E. Tetlock. 2001. “Psychology and International Relations Theory.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 67-92.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Stephan Haggard, David A. Lake, and David G. Victor. 2017. “The Behavioral Revolution and the Study of International Relations.” *International Organization* 71 (S1): S1-S31.
- Kertzer, Joshua D., and Dustin Tingley. 2018. “Political Psychology in International Relations: Beyond the Paradigms.” *Annual Review of Political Science*.
- Levy, Jack S. 2003. “Political Psychology and Foreign Policy.” In *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, ed. David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDermott, Rose, 2004. *Political Psychology in International Relations*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. (online copy available through the Dartmouth library)
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. 2004. “All Politics Is Psychological: A Review of Political Psychology Syllabi.” *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (4): 807-819.
- Stein, Janice Gross. 2017. “The Micro-Foundations of International Relations Theory: Psychology and Behavioral Economics.” *International Organization* 71 (S1): S249-S263.

### Unit I: “Standard IR” and the Rational Baseline

**Required(ish) Background reading:** If you have recently taken Gov 5 or similar, you should skim this to refresh your memory. If you have not taken Gov 5 – or it’s been a while – you should read it in full.

- Snyder, Jack. "One world, rival theories." *Foreign Policy* 145 (2004): 52-62.

**Week 1 (March 26, 28):** Introduction & Standard IR

**T:** Intro, Course overview, & Individuals in IR

- What is political psychology?
- How can psychology inform our understanding of international politics?
- Does the individual level of analysis matter?
- What IR theories rely – implicitly or explicitly – on assumptions about human cognition, motivation, and/or behavior?
- **Reading:**
  - Jervis, Robert (1976). “Chapter 1: Perception and the Level of Analysis Problem,” *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, pp. 13-31.
  - Kertzer, Joshua D. and Thomas Zeitzoff. (2017). “[Beyond Narcissism: What Political Psychology Tells Us About Foreign Policy Under Trump](#),” *Political Violence @ a Glance*. 13 February.
  - Holmes, Marcus and Keren Yarhi-Milo. “So Trump’s Meeting Kim Jong-Un After All. Here’s Why Face-to-Face Diplomacy Matters,” *The Washington Post’s The Monkey Cage*, June 11, 2018.

#### **TH: Standard IR & “The Rational Baseline”**

- How can psychology inform existing perspectives in international relations?
- What does it mean to assume that actors in international politics are “rational”?
- What is the difference between procedural and instrumental rationality?
- How do rational choice and psychological approaches compete with or complement each other?
- **Reading:**
  - Rathbun, Brian C. "Before hegemony: Generalized trust and the creation and design of international security organizations." *International Organization* 65, no. 2 (2011): 243-273.
  - Mercer, J. 2005. “Rationality and Psychology in International Politics,” *International Organization*, 59(1), 77-106.
  - Rathbun, Brian C., Joshua D. Kertzer, and Mark Paradis. "Homo diplomaticus: Mixed-method evidence of variation in strategic rationality." *International Organization* 71, no. S1 (2017): S33-S60. **(Read pp. S33-S41; skim the empirics if you would like to – we will discuss them briefly in class)**
- **Optional:**
  - Fearon, James, “Rationalist Explanations for War,” *International Organization*, Vol. 49, no. 3 (1995). (pp. 379-390).
  - Schafer, Mark, and Stephen G. Walker. "Democratic leaders and the democratic peace: The operational codes of Tony Blair and Bill Clinton." *International Studies Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (2006): 561-583.

#### **Unit II: Leaders are People, too: How (ir)Rationality, Beliefs, and Personality affect Foreign Policy Decisions**

## Week 2 (April 2, 3): Is anybody rational?

### T: Prospect Theory

- Do foreign policy leaders adhere to instrumental rationality under conditions of risk?
- How do individuals assess risks, gains, and losses? How do these assessments shape foreign policy outcomes?
- **Reading:**
  - McDermott, Rose. "Prospect theory in international relations: The Iranian hostage rescue mission." *Political Psychology*, (1992): 237-263.
  - Farnham, B. (1997). "Roosevelt and the Munich Crisis: Insights from Prospect Theory," *Political Psychology*, 13(2): 205 - 235.
- **Optional:**
  - Levy, Jack S. "Prospect theory and international relations: Theoretical applications and analytical problems." *Political Psychology* (1992): 283-310.
  - Elms, Deborah Kay. "Large costs, small benefits: Explaining trade dispute outcomes." *Political Psychology* 25, no. 2 (2004): 241-270.
  - Haas, M.L. (2001). Prospect Theory and the Cuban Missile Crisis. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45 (2): 241 - 270.
  - Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky, (1979). "Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk." *Econometrica*.
  - Mercer, J. (2005). Prospect theory and political science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8:1–21.

### W (X-hour): Heuristics & Biases in Foreign Policy

- How do common heuristics and biases shape foreign policy decision-making?
- How do leaders learn from history? What shapes their choice of analogies?
- If leaders "learn by analogy," what does this mean for foreign policy decision-making and assumptions about rationality?
- **Reading:**
  - Khong, Y.F. (1992) *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decision of 1965*, Princeton University Press. pp. 2 - 46.
  - Hehir, Aidan. "The impact of analogical reasoning on US foreign policy towards Kosovo." *Journal of Peace Research*, 43, no. 1 (2006): 67-81.
- **Optional:**
  - Levy, Jack S. "Learning and foreign policy: sweeping a conceptual minefield." *International Organization* 48, no. 2 (1994): 279-312.
  - Houghton, David Patrick. "Historical analogies and the cognitive dimension of domestic policymaking." *Political Psychology* 19, no. 2 (1998): 279-303.

## Week 3: Perceptions and Misperceptions in War & Peace

### T: Perceptions, Images, and Motivated Reasoning

- How do stereotypes and motivated reasoning shape foreign policy decision-making?

- Where do images come from? What are the psychological underpinnings and how do different dimensions interact to form each image?
- How do different images of other foreign policy actors shape foreign policy strategies? When and how do images change?
- **Reading:**
  - Herrmann, Richard K., and Michael P. Fischerkeller. "Beyond the enemy image and spiral model: cognitive–strategic research after the cold war." *International Organization* 49, no. 3 (1995): 415-450.
  - Chaban, Natalia, Ole Elgström, and Olga Gulyaeva. "Russian images of the European Union: before and after Maidan." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13, no. 2 (2017): 480-499.
- Optional:
  - Herrmann, Richard K. 2013. "Perceptions and Image Theory in International Relations." In *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, ed. Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy. 2nd ed. ed. Oxford University Press.

#### **Th:** Misperceptions

- How do misperceptions contribute to conflict?
- Can face-to-face diplomacy help leaders overcome problems related to images, biases, and misperceptions? How?
- **Reading:**
  - Duelfer, Charles A., and Stephen Benedict Dyson. 2011. "Chronic Misperception and International Conflict: The U.S.-Iraq Experience." *International Security* 36 (1): 73-100.
  - Holmes, Marcus, and Keren Yarhi-Milo. "The Psychological Logic of Peace Summits: How Empathy Shapes Outcomes of Diplomatic Negotiations." *International Studies Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (2017): 107-122.
- Optional:
  - Búzás, Zoltán I. 2013. "The Color of Threat: Race, Threat Perception, and the Demise of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902-1923)." *Security Studies* 22 (4): 573-606.
  - Holmes, Marcus. "The force of face-to-face diplomacy: Mirror neurons and the problem of intentions." *International Organization* 67, no. 4 (2013): 829-861.

#### **Week 4 (April 16, 18):** Small groups, Leader Personality

##### **T:** Leaders have friends: Decision-making in groups

- Do small groups and advisers exacerbate or ameliorate decision-making biases?
- How do leaders and advisers interact, and how does this affect their foreign policy decisions?
- **Reading:**



- Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign Policy Decisions and Fiascos*. Houghton-Mifflin. Chapters 1, 2, and 8.
- Saunders, E. N. (2017). No substitute for experience: Presidents, advisers, and information in group decision-making. *International Organization*.

### Th: Personality

- Do childhood experiences shape leaders' foreign policy preferences?
- Are some leaders more risk-acceptant than others?
- Can we make generalizable claims about the connection between childhood experiences or personality and foreign policy outcomes?
- Reading:
  - George, Alexander L., and Juliette L. George. "Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House." *A Personality Study (New York, 1956)*. Chapters 1 ("Boyhood") and 11 ("World Liberator") required.
  - Gallagher, Maryann and Susan Allen, (2013). "Presidential Personality: Not Just a Nuisance," *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 1 – 21.
- Optional:
  - Horowitz, Michael, Allan C. Stam, and Cali M. Ellis, 2015. "The Experiences that Matter II: Childhood, Family, and Gender," in *Why Leaders Fight*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 148-177.
  - Weinstein, E. A., Anderson, J. W., and Link, A. S. (1978). Woodrow Wilson's political personality: A reappraisal. *Political Science Quarterly*, 93(4):585–598.
  - Kowert, P. A. and Hermann, M. G. (1997). Who takes risks? daring and caution in foreign policy making. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 41(5):611–637.

### Week 5 (April 23, 25): Personality Part II, and a midterm

#### T: Leadership Trait Analysis

- **There will be a short homework assignment, due in class today (summary of a leader's foreign policy). Details will be provided in class.**
- **Reading:**
  - Dyson, Stephen Benedict. "Personality and foreign policy: Tony Blair's Iraq decisions." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2, no. 3 (2006): 289-306.
  - Keller, Jonathan W. "Constraint respecters, constraint challengers, and crisis decision making in democracies: A case study analysis of Kennedy versus Reagan." *Political Psychology* 26, no. 6 (2005): 835-867.
- Optional:
  - Dyson, Stephen Benedict, and Alexandra L. Raleigh. "Public and private beliefs of political leaders: Saddam Hussein in front of a crowd and behind closed doors." *Research & Politics*, no. 1 (2014): 2053168014537808.

- Renshon, Jonathan. "Stability and change in belief systems: The operational code of George W. Bush." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52, no. 6 (2008): 820-849.
- Dyson, Stephen Benedict, and Matthew J. Parent. "The operational code approach to profiling political leaders: understanding Vladimir Putin." *Intelligence and National Security* 33, no. 1 (2018): 84-100.

**Th: \*\*\*\* In-class Midterm Exam covering everything from day 1 through April 23\*\*\*\*\***

**Part III: Psychology, the Masses, and International Politics: How Emotions, Morality, Social Identity, and Biology Shape Foreign Policy (and how foreign policy shapes people)**

**Week 6 (April 30, May 1): Emotions in IR**

**T: Emotions in International Politics**

- How do specific emotions shape mass preferences for international conflict and cooperation?
- Whose emotions should we study in IR?
- **Reading:**
  - Halperin, Eran, Alexandra G. Russell, Carol S. Dweck, and James J. Gross. "Anger, hatred, and the quest for peace: Anger can be constructive in the absence of hatred." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55, no. 2 (2011): 274-291.
  - Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, Charles Taber, and Gallya Lahav. "Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies." *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, no. 3 (2005): 593-608.
  - Pearlman, Wendy. "Emotions and the Microfoundations of the Arab Uprisings." *Perspectives on Politics* 11, no. 2 (2013): 387-409.
- **Optional:**
  - Renshon, Jonathan, Julia J. Lee, and Dustin Tingley. "Emotions and the micro-foundations of commitment problems." *International Organization* 71, no. S1 (2017): S189-S218.

**W X-hour: Analytical Paper workshop**

- Information forthcoming; you should be prepared to discuss your paper proposal with peers.

**Week 7 (May 7, 9): Morality & Social Identity**

**T: Morality in International politics**

- How do moral intuitions inform foreign policy attitudes?
- What's "fair" in international politics? Do mass attitudes about fairness and retribution shape crisis behavior or conflict initiation?
- **Reading:**

- Joshua D. Kertzer et al. 2014. "Moral Support: How Moral Values Shape Foreign Policy Attitudes," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 63(3).
- Liberman, Peter. "An eye for an eye: Public support for war against evildoers." *International Organization* 60, no. 3 (2006): 687-722.
- Optional:
  - Gottfried, Matthew S., and Robert F. Trager. "A preference for war: how fairness and rhetoric influence leadership incentives in crises." *International Studies Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (2016): 243-257.
  - Kapstein, Ethan B. "Fairness considerations in world politics: lessons from international trade negotiations." *Political Science Quarterly* 123, no. 2 (2008): 229-245.
  - Löwenheim, Oded, and Gadi Heimann. "Revenge in international politics." *Security Studies* 17, no. 4 (2008): 685-724.
  - Stein, Rachel M. "War and revenge: explaining conflict initiation by democracies." *American Political Science Review* 109, no. 3 (2015): 556-573.

### Th: Social Identity & Intragroup Conflict

- What are social identities? How do social identities affect attitudes and behavior?
- Do social identities contribute to civil conflict?
- How does social identification affect counterinsurgency?
- **Reading:**
  - Horowitz, Donald (1985). "Chapter 4: Group Comparison and the Sources of Conflict," *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 141-183.
  - Sambanis, Nicholas, Jonah Schulhofer-Wohl, & Moses Shayo (2012). "Parochialism as a Central Challenge in Counterinsurgency." *Science*, 336: 805-808.
- Optional:
  - Tajfel, Henry, *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, pp. 1 - 36, 239 - 153, 156 - 162.
  - Gaertner, Samuel L., et al. "The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias." *European Review of Social Psychology* 4.1 (1993): 1-26

### Week 8: (May 14, 16): Social Identity, Conflict, and Cooperation

#### T: Social Identity & Interstate Competition

- **Draft paper for peer review due Tuesday May 14 by 11:59pm.**
- Does nationalism cause international competition?
- Can "supranationalism" overcome nationalist competition & promote cooperation?
- **Reading:**

- Mercer, Jonathan (1995). "Anarchy and Identity." *International Organization*, 49(2): 229-52.
- Diana C. Mutz and Eunji Kim, "The Impact of In-group Favoritism on Trade Preferences," *International Organization*, 71 (Fall 2017).
- Bayram, A. Burcu. "Good Europeans? How European identity and costs interact to explain politician attitudes towards compliance with European Union law." *Journal of European Public Policy* 24, no. 1 (2017): 42-60.

**Th:** Social Identity & Status in IR

- When does social identification lead to non-competitive status-seeking?
- Does social identification cause nuclear proliferation?
- **Reading:**
  - Larson, Deborah Welch, and Alexei Shevchenko. "Status seekers: Chinese and Russian responses to US primacy." *International Security* 34, no. 4 (2010): 63-95.
  - Hymans, Jacques EC. *The psychology of nuclear proliferation: Identity, emotions and foreign policy*. Cambridge University Press, 2006. (selection – not the whole book).
- Optional:
  - Gries, Peter Hays. "Social Psychology and the Identity-Conflict Debate: Is a 'China Threat' Inevitable?." *European Journal of International Relations* 11, no. 2 (2005): 235-265.

**Peer review comments due Friday, May 17 at 11:59pm.**

**Week 9 (May 21, 23):** The Super-micro-level and the First Image Reversed

**T:** Genes and Biology

- Do genes affect individuals' propensity to engage in political violence?
- Does testosterone cause foreign policy aggression? What are the implications for feminist IR?
- **Reading:**
  - Hatemi, P. K. and McDermott, R. (2012b). A neurobiological approach to foreign policy analysis: identifying individual differences in political violence. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 8(2):111–129
  - McDermott, Rose, Dominic Johnson, Jonathan Cowden, and Stephen Rosen. "Testosterone and aggression in a simulated crisis game." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 614, no. 1 (2007): 15-33.

**Th:** Reversing the Causal Arrow

- How does international politics affect individuals? In other words, we have evidence for how psychology shapes foreign policy – but how do foreign policy & the international environment shape the masses & future leaders?
- **Reading:**

- Hall, Jonathan, Iosif Kovras, Djordje Stefanovic, and Neophytos Loizides. "Exposure to Violence and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice." *Political Psychology* (2017).
- Getmansky, Anna, and Thomas Zeitzoff. "Terrorism and voting: The effect of rocket threat on voting in Israeli elections." *American Political Science Review* 108, no. 3 (2014): 588-604.
- Horowitz, Michael C., and Allan C. Stam. "How prior military experience influences the future militarized behavior of leaders." *International Organization* 68, no. 3 (2014): 527-559.
- Canetti, Daphna, Brian J. Hall, Carmit Rapaport, and Carly Wayne. "Exposure to political violence and political extremism." *European Psychologist* (2013).

**\*\*\*\* Final analytical paper due Friday, May 24 at 11:59pm. Submit to the Canvas Assignment box titled "Final Analytical Paper."\*\*\*\***

**Week 10 (May 28): Course Wrap-up**

**T:** Unit III & Overall Course discussion

- **Reading:** TBD

**\*\*\*\* Final Exam Monday, June 3, 2019 11:30am (date/time set by the registrar) \*\*\*\***