



---

Report on the 1991 Ohio State University Summer Institute in Political Psychology

Author(s): Jon A. Krosnick and Margaret G. Hermann

Source: *Political Psychology*, Vol. 14, No. 2, Special Issue: Political Theory and Political Psychology (Jun., 1993), pp. 363-373

Published by: [International Society of Political Psychology](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791416>

Accessed: 19/12/2013 19:10

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*International Society of Political Psychology* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Political Psychology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## **Report on the 1991 Ohio State University Summer Institute in Political Psychology**

**Jon A. Krosnick**

**Margaret G. Hermann**

*The Ohio State University*

---

*In July and August 1991, the Ohio State University hosted the first annual Summer Institute in Political Psychology. This program brought 57 scholars (including graduate students, faculty, and professionals) to Ohio State University to study theory and methods for examining the psychological processes involved in political phenomena and political influences on psychological processes. Their one-month intensive training included lectures in basic psychology, basic political science, research techniques, and approaches for successful integration of political science and psychology. Lecturers included faculty from OSU and nearby universities, as well as guest specialists from across the country. Formal and informal evaluations indicated that the institute achieved a variety of its goals and that participants considered it to be a stimulating learning experience. Currently, plans are in place to offer the institute for the next several summers.*

---

**KEY WORDS:** politics; psychology; training.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Between July 15 and August 9, 1991, The Ohio State University offered the first annual Summer Institute in Political Psychology. Directed by Margaret Hermann, Jon Krosnick, and Wendy Rahn, the institute was a collaborative enterprise between the OSU Office of Continuing Education and the OSU Departments of Political Science and Psychology. This article documents the planning and development of the institute, as well as the events that unfolded during the four-week session.

## THE CONCEPT

The idea of establishing a summer training institute in political psychology was initially developed in January 1988 at a “futures conference” directed by Margaret Hermann and sponsored by the International Society of Political Psychology and the Mershon Center. That meeting yielded a 10-year plan for the society’s future, which included a three-pronged set of training goals. The first was to develop model curricula to be used in academic-year courses on political psychology. Second, regional workshops would be held in which students and faculty would work side by side designing and conducting empirical research. Finally, in order to enhance students’ understanding of the literatures and concepts of political psychology, a Summer Institute was to be established. A concrete plan for implementing the Summer Institute for three years was ratified by the ISPP Governing Council at its 1990 midwinter meeting, and Ohio State University was selected as its initial site.

## TRAINING GOALS

The Summer Institute was designed to accomplish three primary goals, the first of which was academic. For graduate students in traditional departments of psychology or political science, it is typically very difficult and time-consuming to acquire expertise in the other discipline through regular academic-year coursework. For example, in order for a political science graduate student to get broad expertise in psychology, it is necessary to take numerous, quarter- or semester-long courses over a period of years. Unfortunately, most graduate curricula do not allow time for such extensive course-taking in an outside area.

This challenge holds true even for some students currently enrolled at universities that have existing concentrations in political psychology. The curricula offered by many such programs emphasize research done by political psychologists. Thus, students are exposed to areas of the two disciplines that have been successfully integrated in past research efforts. But these curricula sometimes do not offer many opportunities for broad yet efficient exposure to areas of the two disciplines that have not been extensively used by political psychologists.

Consequently, we felt that all graduate students interested in political psychology, whether in a formal graduate program or not, could benefit a great deal from a quick, intensive, and broad introduction to the literature of the other discipline. After learning about a variety of subareas of the other discipline, graduate students could select those areas that are most immediately useful and relevant to their interests and could later obtain in-depth training in those areas at their home institutions. This is not to say that we wanted to provide students with only superficial training. Rather, forced to choose between depth and breadth,

we chose to emphasize the latter while being sure that students were given clear and precise training in the other discipline sufficient to facilitate high-quality work in the future.

In providing such broad training, we sought to transcend a pattern that has typified political psychology during this century. We noted early in our planning that although a great deal of exchange has taken place between psychology and political science, there have been clear linkages between certain areas of political science and certain areas of psychology. For example, personality theory has been widely used by scholars studying political leadership, whereas it has been used only minimally in the study of mass politics. Similarly, attitude theory has been utilized much more in the study of mass politics than in other areas. There certainly are exceptions to this pattern, such as the use of schema and consistency theories in both mass and elite political science research. But, in general, there has been substantial pairing of particular literatures in both disciplines.

We hoped to design a curriculum that would provide engaging and useful exposure for all students to as many potentially relevant aspects of the two disciplines, regardless of whether these aspects had been used in previous political psychology research. Thus, rather than encouraging participants simply to perpetuate current lines of political psychology research, we hoped to equip them with skills and perspectives to initiate innovative integrations of the disciplines.

Our second goal was to provide participants with general training in how to successfully integrate psychology and political science in research. Although there is much support for interdisciplinary work throughout the social sciences these days, there are nonetheless numerous practical impediments to doing such work successfully. We wished to expose our participants to examples of successful integration of the two fields, some done by psychologists and others done by political scientists. Furthermore, we wished to provide our participants with exposure to successful career development by political psychologists. By illustrating how individuals' careers unfolded, we hoped that our participants would develop useful ideas about how to organize and direct their own professional development.

Our final primary goal was institution-building. Although there are many individuals doing political psychology currently, there are few training institutions that welcome developing young professionals early in their careers into the international fellowship of political psychologists. Certainly, schools with established political psychology graduate curricula (such as SUNY Stony Brook, Yale University, UCLA, Ohio State University, and others) do just this. But the majority of colleges and universities have no such programs. We therefore sought to establish an institution that would bring together young scholars and senior researchers from around the world, providing opportunities for them to interact and to solidify their shared values and research goals.

## THE TARGET AUDIENCE

In order to most benefit from a training program designed to accomplish these goals, we felt that an individual would need to have a solid background in either psychology or political science and a set of personal research interests in political psychology. We therefore felt that our target audience should be second, third, and fourth-year graduate students in the two disciplines. Furthermore, we suspected that faculty who were either retooling to move into a new area of research or who were at smaller institutions and would value participation in an intellectual "hothouse" might benefit as well. Finally, we hoped to appeal to professionals in government who could make practical use of the knowledge they might gain.

## THE CURRICULUM

Given our goals, we felt it most sensible to conduct the institute for four weeks. We therefore designed a schedule of instructional activities accordingly, as displayed in Table I. The curriculum had five primary components: psychology lectures, political science lectures, discussion groups, methods workshops, and seminars with guest specialists.

**Psychology lectures.** Our goal in providing basic psychology training was to expose participants to a wide range of literatures in psychology that might be of use in studying political phenomena. The 19 topics of these lectures (shown in Table II) were selected from among a wide range of contenders. These topics

Table I. 1991 Schedule of Activities

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
9:00–11:00 am	Psych. lecture	-----	-----	-----	-----
11:00–12:00 pm	Poli. sci. lecture	-----	-----	-----	-----
12:00–1:30 pm	Lunch with morning lecturers	-----	-----	-----	-----
1:30–3:30 pm	Discussion groups	-----	-----	Guest specialist (until 4:30 pm)	-----
4:00–6:00 pm	Research methods seminars	-----	-----	Guest specialist meets with discussion groups	
5:00–6:30 pm				Reception for guest specialist	

Table II. 1991 Psychology Lectures

Date	Lecturer	Topic
July 16	Richard Petty	Attitude formation and change
July 17	Richard Petty	Cognitive consistency theories
July 18	Raymond Montemayor	Socialization and development
July 19	William von Hippel	Knowledge structures and memory
July 22	William von Hippel	Social identity and stereotyping
July 23	Robert Arkin/ Gifford Weary	Attribution theory
July 24	Raymond Montemayor	Moral reasoning
July 25	David Winter	Motivation
July 26	David Winter	Psychodynamic personality theory
July 29	Thomas Nygren	Judgment and decision making
July 30	Herbert Mirels	Contemporary personality theory
July 31	James Voss	Problem representation and problem solving
Aug 1	Robert Billings	Decision making in organizations
Aug 2	Garold Stasser	Group dynamics
Aug 5	William von Hippel	Heuristics and biases
Aug 6	Catherine Heaney	Stress and coping
Aug 7	Timothy Brock	Obedience, conformity, and compliance
Aug 8	Timothy Brock	Aggression
Aug 9	Margaret Clark	Altruism

*Note:* All psychology lecturers were faculty from Ohio State University, with the exceptions of David Winter (University of Michigan), James Voss (University of Pittsburgh), Garold Stasser (Miami University), and Margaret Clark (Carnegie-Mellon University).

included social psychology, developmental psychology, cognitive psychology, personality psychology, organizational psychology, and clinical/counseling psychology.

We asked the psychology lecturers to assume that their audience had no background in their areas and to provide broad introductions to their literatures. Given the time limitations, we felt it would be impractical for the lecturers to provide historical lectures describing all of the developments in a field from its inception. Furthermore, we felt that time limitations would make it difficult for the lecturers to provide any detailed presentations of major areas of controversy. Therefore, we wanted the lecturers to expose participants to the widely accepted and supported findings and areas of agreement in each field. Furthermore, we asked them to give participants reading lists so they could pursue particular writings. We did not expect the psychology lecturers to place special emphasis on areas of their literature that directly involved political behavior—rather, we wanted them to cover their fields broadly with any eye toward those areas of work that were potentially applicable in the study of politics.

**Political science lectures.** In order to provide basic training in political science, we envisioned lectures on a range of basic political science topics (see Table III). These topics addressed political contexts, factors shaping political behavior, public policy making, and international relations. Whereas the first two topics

**Table III.** 1991 Political Science Lectures

Date	Lecturer	Topic
July 16	Wendy Rahn	Belief systems
July 17	Paul Beck	Public opinion
July 18	Paul Beck	Political socialization
July 19	Herbert Weisberg	Voting
July 22	Robert Woyach	Political culture
July 23	John Kessel	Campaigns and elections
July 24	Goldie Shabad	Ethnic, race, and gender issues
July 25	Steven Wright	Political participation
July 26	Filipe Agüero	Authoritarianism and alienation
July 29	Lawrence Baum	Elite decision making
July 30	Samuel Patterson	Leadership
July 31	Donald Sylvan	Definition of the situation
Aug 1	Donald Sylvan	Bureaucratic politics
Aug 2	Charles Hermann	Group decision making
Aug 5	Richard Herrmann	International images
Aug 6	Charles Hermann	Crisis management
Aug 7	Joseph Kruzel	Deterrence
Aug 8	James Harf	International conflict
Aug 9	Margaret Hermann	Bargaining and negotiation

*Note:* All political science lecturers were faculty from Ohio State University.

focused primarily on mass politics, the latter two focused primarily on elite politics. We asked the political science lecturers to take the same approach as employed by the psychology lecturers.

**Discussion groups.** We felt it essential for the curriculum to address the successful integration of psychology and political science. We felt that this integration could be addressed most effectively in the context of small discussion groups (approximately 15 people each). For each group meeting, participants read several journal articles or book chapters, typically reporting empirical investigations employing psychological concepts and theories to study political phenomena. We hoped that discussions of the intent and implications of such work would help to clarify how political psychology could be done most effectively. In addition, we hoped that the discussion groups would serve as forums in which the participants could get to know each other and debate the merits of various approaches to career development. Finally, we intended the discussion groups to provide opportunities for participants to reflect upon and clarify the implications of the morning lectures in political science and psychology. In order to help the discussion groups function effectively, each one had a facilitator who coordinated and directed the discussions. Four advanced graduate students at OSU served in these roles: Juliet Kaarbo, Ryan Beasley, Marijke Breuning (all in political science), and Matthew Berent (in social psychology). Juliet Kaarbo also served as the institute's assistant director, coordinating a range of daily activities.

**Research methods instruction.** Although most graduate programs in political

science and psychology offer courses in mainstream research methods, few offer courses in the nontraditional research methods that are frequently employed in political psychology. Consequently, we felt it essential that our curriculum introduce participants to these research methods. The methods we ultimately chose to offer included survey techniques, experimental design, quasi-experimental design, protocol analysis, elite interviewing, use of archives, interpersonal simulation, and computational modeling (see Table IV). The methods instructors were asked to provide an introduction to their areas for an audience who had little or no familiarity with it. Furthermore, they were asked to provide participants with hands-on experience with the methods.

**Guest specialist seminars.** We felt that perhaps the single most effective way to instruct participants in political psychology would be to expose them to role models. To this end, we selected prominent political psychologists whose work has been recognized internationally as having made important contributions. In order for our participants to most benefit from these individuals, we scheduled each guest speaker to make a presentation on each of two successive days.

On the first day, the guest specialists provided intellectual autobiographies. Sometimes beginning during their graduate school days and sometimes even earlier, they described the development of their lives as political psychologists, whom their important influences were, how various factors shaped their research foci and ideas, and how they matured as political psychologists over the course of

**Table IV** 1991 Research Methods Seminars

Topic	Lecturer	University Affiliation
<i>Week 1</i>		
Surveys	Kathleen Carr	Ohio State University
Observation	Margaret Hermann	Ohio State University
Quasi-Experiments	Robert Billings	Ohio State University
<i>Week 2</i>		
Case Studies	Charles Hermann	Ohio State University
Content Analysis	Margaret Hermann & David Winter	Ohio State University University of Michigan
Focus Groups	Sandra Jones	Ohio State University
<i>Week 3</i>		
Computational Modeling	Donald Sylvan	Ohio State University
Protocol Analysis	James Voss	University of Pittsburgh
Archival Analysis	Cindy Orbovich	Macalester College
<i>Week 4</i>		
Simulation	Margaret Hermann & Richard Herrmann	Ohio State University Ohio State University
Elite Interviewing	Jennie Lincoln	Georgia Tech University
Experiments	William von Hippel	Ohio State University



their careers. In the process, the participants learned about the major areas of research each specialist had conducted, the methods employed, and what the specialist considered her or his principal findings. During the second afternoon, each guest specialist delivered a detailed lecture on a research project that was recently completed or currently ongoing. Thus, participants learned in depth about the intellectual style the specialist brought to his or her work. Following these presentations, the guest specialists met with each discussion group for an extended period of informal exchange and also had numerous opportunities for one-on-one conversations with the participants.

We decided to have a different set of guest specialists each year of the institute. For the first year, we identified five exemplary political psychologists: David Sears (University of California at Los Angeles), Pamela Conover (University of North Carolina), Philip Tetlock (University of California at Berkeley), and the collaborative team of Janice Gross Stein (University of Toronto) and Richard Ned Lebow (University of Pittsburgh).

Although the second-day research presentations were quite similar in structure and approach for all the specialists, the autobiographies were approached quite differently by the various individuals. David Sears's autobiography was chronological and focused on his personal development and the links between his personal life and his major research interests in racial attitudes and race relations. Pam Conover focused on the major research enterprises she had engaged in during her career, describing the issues addressed in each area and how the methods she used became more radical and less traditional over time. She also raised professional issues, such as the challenges posed by doing interdisciplinary research. Phil Tetlock approached his task by addressing a philosophical issue that he has confronted with his research. This issue has yielded the emergence of a new, basic view of human nature that has been underrecognized in the social sciences generally. And Janice Stein and Ned Lebow described the progression of their research programs on international relations using their case studies as illustrations. This variety of approaches was very engaging for the participants.

### ADDITIONAL EVENTS

In addition to these core elements of the curriculum, a number of other events were planned. We held an opening banquet the night before classes began, during which the participants began getting to know each other informally. The first day of the institute included presentations by the directors of their research, discussions of the history and nature of political psychology, an overview of the institute's plan and goals, and an opportunity for the participants to describe their

backgrounds and interests to the group. Every Thursday evening, a wine-and-cheese reception was held for that week's guest specialist on the bank of the Olentangy River. Recreational activities included regular athletics, parties at the homes of Peg Hermann and Michael Young, and organized visits to Columbus's Jazz and Ribs Festival, the Short North Gallery Hop, and Kings Island Amusement Park. The participants organized lots of sports activities as well. A closing banquet was held on the last night, with Alexander George (Stanford University) as the keynote speaker. The participants received certificates signifying completion of the curriculum during this "graduation" ceremony.

### THE PARTICIPANTS

There were 57 participants; their demographics are displayed in Table V. People came from nine countries: The United States, Venezuela, Spain, Italy,

**Table V.** 1991 Summer Institute Participants

Name	Field	L*	Country	Institution
Strydom, S. L.	Anthro	N	S. Africa	S. African Dept. of Foreign Affairs
Carrasquero, Gilberto	Business	3	USA	Stanford University
Philip, Dorrell	Educ	3	USA	University of Maryland
Rodriguez Mojon, Maria	Psych	N	Spain	St. Louis University, Madrid
Cohen, Michael V.	Psych	UG	USA	Brandeis University
Gruenfeld, Deborah	Psych	3	USA	University of Illinois
Ito, Takehiko	Psych	N	Japan	Wako University
Jost, John T.	Psych	2	USA	Yale University
Mercer, Jeffrey J.	Psych	2	USA	California State Univ./Long Beach
Reichl, Arleigh J.	Psych	5	USA	University of Iowa
Saita, Emanuela	Psych	5	Italy	Universita Kattolica Di Milano
Schmitt, David P.	Psych	2	USA	University of Michigan
Schooler, Tonya Y.	Psych	4	USA	University of Pittsburgh
Struman, Ted S.	Psych	3	USA	University of Michigan
Van Der Schyff, G. S.	Psych	N	S. Africa	S. African Dept. of Foreign Affairs
Weisz, Carolyn	Psych	4	USA	Princeton University
Weston, Christine	Psych	2	USA	Boston University
Aziabu, Yao E.	Pol Sci	4	USA	Duke University
Bird, Karen L.	Pol Sci	2	USA	University of Minnesota
Blackwood, J. P.	Pol Sci	1	USA	Ohio State University
Boiney, John	Pol Sci	5	USA	Duke University
Bond, Doug	Pol Sci	N	USA	Harvard University
Briand, Michael K.	Pol Sci	N	USA	Kettering Foundation
Bucholz, Harald	Pol Sci	3	USA	Ohio State University
Clawson, Rosalee	Pol Sci	1	USA	Ohio State University
Delaet, Debra L.	Pol Sci	1	USA	Notre Dame University
Dickson, Joyce	Pol Sci	3	USA	Ohio State University

(continued)

Table V. (Continued)

Name	Field	L*	Country	Institution
Edwards, Pamela J.	Pol Sci	N	USA	Wittenberg College
Filicko, Therese M.	Pol Sci	5	USA	Duke University
Fischerkeller, Michael	Pol Sci	UG	USA	University of Pittsburgh
Golebiowska, Ewa	Pol Sci	2	USA	Ohio State University
Gordon, Diane G.	Pol Sci	N	USA	U.S. State Department
Gueron, Eva	Pol Sci	N	Venezuela	Central Univ. of Venezuela
Healy, Sally	Pol Sci	1	USA	Ohio State University
Hillerbrand, Ronald	Pol Sci	N	Netherlands	University of Leiden
Hinz, Phil	Pol Sci	3	USA	Ohio State University
Holley, Kim M.	Pol Sci	1	USA	Notre Dame University
Hoyt, Paul	Pol Sci	4	USA	Ohio State University
Hudson, Valerie M.	Pol Sci	N	USA	Brigham Young University
Hughes, Elizabeth	Pol Sci	3	USA	Georgia State University
Hughes, Mary M.	Pol Sci	3	USA	Vanderbilt
Hunter, Susan	Pol Sci	N	USA	West Virginia University
Kemper, Mark	Pol Sci	1	USA	Ohio State University
Marshall, Richard H.	Pol Sci	2	USA	University of Illinois
Nwabuzor, Elone	Pol Sci	N	Nigeria	Center for Democratic Studies
Oishi, Koichiro	Pol Sci	N	Japan	Kokushikan University
Roebuck, Josh	Pol Sci	2	USA	Ohio State University
Roncicka, Keith	Pol Sci	1	USA	Ohio State University
Schoebel, Carolin	Pol Sci	N	Germany	German Science Center Berlin
Shahan, Carolyn	Pol Sci	4	USA	Ohio State University
Simon, Adam	Pol Sci	1	USA	UCLA
Van Dooren, Ron	Pol Sci	N	Netherlands	University of Leiden
Young, Michael	Pol Sci	3	USA	Ohio State University
Zilber, Jeremy	Pol Sci	2	USA	Ohio State University
Zurovchak, John	Pol Sci	3	USA	Ohio State University
Florez-Morris, Mauricio	Pub Admin	3	USA	American University
Ruggeri, Ana M.	Pub Admin	N	Venezuela	Central Univ. of Venezuela

\*Level: UG = undergraduate; 1 = first-year graduate student; 2 = second-year graduate student; 3 = third-year graduate student; 4 = fourth-year graduate student; 5 = fifth-year graduate student; N = not a student.

Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, South Africa, and Nigeria. Two students were undergraduates intending to begin graduate studies in political psychology. Eight were first-year graduate students; 10 were second-year graduate students; 11 were third-year graduate students; five were fourth-year graduate students; and four were more advanced graduate students. Ten were faculty members at West Virginia University, Brigham Young University, Wittenberg College, Central University of Venezuela, the University of Leiden, Wako University in Japan, McMaster, and elsewhere. Of the participants, 14 were in psychology; 38 were in political science; one in anthropology; one in business; one in education; and two in public administration. Six participants were professional staff members at research institutions.

## SELF-EVALUATION

During the course of the institute, we had numerous opportunities to speak with participants about their experiences. These conversations provided opportunities to pinpoint aspects of the curriculum that seemed to be working well and aspects that were less successful. We also learned about the participants' reactions to the institute through various formal evaluation procedures. Each week, students filled out questionnaires evaluating the lectures they had heard. At the end of the institute, they filled out overall evaluation questionnaires that asked about possible changes that might be made to the institute in future years. All these sources of information helped us to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the institute's design.

Overall evaluation assessments made it clear that the participants found their experiences to be valuable, worthwhile, and enjoyable. They believed they had gained considerable knowledge in both disciplines and had better ideas about how to integrate the two. Furthermore, large majorities of the participants felt that most aspects of the curriculum should be preserved. However, they did indicate a few aspects of the curriculum that could be improved. Our plans for future institutes were adjusted in response to this evaluation information.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Jon A. Krosnick, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, 1885 Neil Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210, or to Margaret Hermann, The Mershon Center, Ohio State University, 199 West 10th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43201.