We gave examples of the 3 components of attitudes in class Monday evening, using as a starting point the debate over health care that has generated so much controversy this past summer. Build on that discussion by going into more detail for BOTH a person who is for and then one who is against the health care plan. You can base your illustrations on arguments you have heard from both sides. If you have typically only heard one side of the argument, imagine what might be an argument from the other side. (Of course, there are numerous in-between attitudes also but for our purposes here please focus on those with strong attitudes. Be specific in your illustrations (not just "I hate the plan" but "I feel tense, hopeful, etc."). Note. Try to write this so that it is not obvious what you personally believe.

Also, give one possible reason each at the personal and situational/sociocultural levels for someone to be for or against the plan:

**Personal:**
- For:
- Against:

**Sociocultural:**
- For:
- Against:

**3 components:**

**Affective** (feelings and values; emotions, moods, evaluations about the object or idea)
- For:
- Against:

**Behavioral** (observation of behaviors or intentions to behave toward an object or idea)
- For:
- Against:

**Cognitive** (knowledge, meaning, beliefs about rewards & punishments, properties of object)
- For:
- Against:
This past Monday evening we focused on the emotions of fear and anger, along with corresponding behaviors. We also touched on attitudes about and among Americans. How do you think the emotions of fear and anger could be connected to these ant-American attitudes of residents of other countries? Please keep in mind that attitudes may lead from as well as lead to behaviors (e.g., someone may express a prejudiced opinion but not discriminate when serving a person from that particular group in a restaurant).

3 components:

Affect (feelings and values; emotions, moods, evaluations about the object or idea)

Behaviors (observation of behaviors or intentions to behave toward an object or idea)

Cognitions (knowledge, meaning, beliefs about rewards & punishments, properties of object)

Positive Psychology Post 9-11

Building on what was discussed in the Peterson & Park article, how could Americans work to counteract anti-Americanism abroad?
The Seville Statement on Violence declares that it is scientifically incorrect to say that: 1) we have an inherited tendency to make war, 2) war or any other violent behavior is genetically programmed into our human nature, 3) human evolution has been selective for aggressive behavior, 4) humans have a ‘violent’ brain, and 5) war is caused by ‘instinct’ or any single motivation. APA endorsed the Seville Statement in 1987 as a social statement ‘designed to eliminate unfounded stereotypic thinking on the inevitability of war.’

If we were to attempt to break through the stereotypical thinking accompanying the belief that aggression is innate, there could be dramatic differences in not only the way we handled our interpersonal relationships but also in what we believed should happen on the national and international levels. I am not asking you to change your mind in order to agree with the Seville Statement but to roleplay a person who believes in the Seville Statement. What would be different about the assumptions, attitudes, behaviors, and values at each of the following levels of interaction?

NOTE: This activity is not necessarily designed to make everyone “feel good” but to create some tension as you explore the paradigm shift required to change assumptions about aggression/violence being innate. If you already clearly endorse the Seville Statement, imagine what your responses would have to be if you were completing this exercise from the perspective of someone who believes aggression is innate (i.e., having to shift from believing aggression is innate to being a learned response).

3 Levels of Interaction:

Personal/Individual (examining an attitude or behavior that is your own—or that of someone you know):

- a) Attitude/behavior (be specific):

- b) What impact could this paradigm shift have upon the individual if the above attitude or behavior is entirely due to learning and not innate aggression or violence?

Social/Community (attitudes or behaviors that reflect norms and expectations of a social group/family with which you—or someone you know—is associated at the local community level):

- a) Attitude/behavior:

- b) Impact at the local community level if violence or aggression is not innate:

Cultural/Institutional (subtle or indirect attitudes and behaviors that reflect conventional values and everyday practices that are accepted as ‘normal’)

- a) Attitude/behavior:

- b) Impact at the national/international level if violence or aggression is not innate:

Reflections on Roleplaying Activity:
What was the most difficult part of this activity (besides understanding my question)?
In class Monday evening we discussed the effects of intimate (e.g., domestic, sexual) violence as well as being the target of hate crimes due to a combination of sexual orientation, ethnicity, and socio-economic status. Two possibilities for further reflection that build upon our discussion and your readings involve violence perpetrated against newly-arriving immigrants to the US and violence perpetrated against the elderly—whether it be by relatives, aides, or staff at health care institutions. Think also about how it occurs at the structural/institutional level. Using either or both of these (but don’t get carried away and do all aspects for both victim groups), think through how the same issues we raised in class could perpetuate violence or counteract it at each of the following levels of interaction.

Try to think through this issue using examples that are specific as possible (e.g., a family moving in down the street or into an apartment in Parkland; a grandparent within a large suburban or a rural community on Medicare).

3 Levels of Interaction:

**Personal/Individual** (attitudes and behaviors that are direct, involving episodes of acute violence and aggression between 2 people):

a) Attitudes/behaviors encouraging or maintaining the unhealthy situation (be specific):

b) How could you, if you happened to be witness to this situation, interact to break through the cycle of violence?

**Social/Community** (attitudes or behaviors that reflect norms and expectations of a social group/family within the local community):

a) Attitudes/behaviors that perpetuate the problem or lead to it being ignored:

b) What can be done to reduce or eliminate the potential for intimate violence and hate crimes within the local community? Please be specific as well as realistic?

**Cultural/Institutional** (subtle or indirect attitudes and behaviors that reflect conventional values and everyday practices that are accepted as ‘normal’; perpetuating the cycle of violence at a chronic, structural level)

a) Attitudes/behaviors:

b) Changes/challenges required to break through the cycle:
Our guests on Monday evening provided us with several very powerful examples of courageous resistance in action. Think of yourself in a situation that has caused you concern or discomfort because it is not fully in agreement with your values or values and behaviors that you honor (e.g., someone uses distasteful jokes or teases another person who is very awkward in social situations).

**Identify the behavior/situation and the value(s) that you feel are being disrespected:**

Given that you are identifying a behavior or situation that has not yet changed for the better, use the 6 steps in the crossroads model for courageous resistance outlined in the Thalhammer et al. text to propose a plan of action that might lead to success. Keep in mind that this behavior/situation has been occurring for some time now because it is difficult to change circumstances that feed into it (i.e., it has structural and institutional support). Try to anticipate possible obstacles or barriers and how you might counteract them. I’ve provided an extra copy of the handout on the crossroads in our Sakai folder for this week.

**Step One:** Noticing that something is happening

**Step Two:** Interpreting as needing a response (as unacceptable behavior)

**Step Three:** Accepting personal responsibility to do something

**Step Four:** Deciding what to do

**Step Five:** Actually doing what you decided to do

**Step Six:** Deciding to continue, to keep on keeping on

So, where are you in this process of taking action on your intended target behavior?
The concepts of nationalism and patriotism are often confused. Review these concepts from the handouts and class reading assignment in Christie, and then interview 3 people with whom you have at least a casual relationship. With each person go through the following steps: 1) Ask each person to tell you how he/she would define nationalism and patriotism by giving an example, if possible. 2) Explain the differences between nationalism and patriotism to each person you interview. 3) Before continuing on to a second and then a third person, record the ideas each shares with you and the responses to your explanation. Do not identify the people with whom you talk other than to give a general description (e.g., gender, possible age group, occupation).

**Person 1:**

**Nationalism:**

**Patriotism:**

**Response:**

**Person 2:**

**Nationalism:**

**Patriotism:**

**Response:**

**Person 3:**

**Nationalism:**

**Patriotism:**

**Response:**

Why do you think it matters whether or not people can differentiate between these 2 concepts?
During the first half of this course we have looked at a variety of issues, primarily organized around the concept of direct violence but also touching on structural violence. You have had an opportunity to become more familiar with the definitions of terms and may even be more comfortable grappling with the issues that are covered in a psychology of peace course.

What had you **expected** we would be talking about in this course before the first night of class? (Please give an example or specifics so that it is clear what you were thinking.)

How could what **you thought we would be covering** be related to or integrated into what **we are actually covering**? (You may need to look at the topics and course outline to answer this question.)

No class is exactly what every student expected. What has been a surprise in terms of topics, class dynamics, or anything else related to this course this term?

If you could select a topic that we would cover during the last half of the term, what would it be? (If you’d rather state this as a research or discussion question, please do so.) Please explain this in enough detail so that it would be possible for your reader to seriously examine how to add this topic or question into the schedule.

If you could change one thing about this course (other than that it is from 6:00-9:20 on Monday evenings), what would it be?
Last night class focused on the topics of genocide and terrorism. I then introduced Just War Theory. You gave excellent examples of some of the concepts that make up the theory and the handouts then provided further details on the criteria that may be used to justify going to war. (Keep in mind that each criterion by itself is not sufficient for justifying war.)

Use this opportunity to find an article in the news from some time during the past 2 months that you then use to address at least one (but perhaps more?) of the 8 criteria (e.g., just cause, right intention, etc.). This article may also be used in your Current Events portfolio as one of your 10 articles.

Typically our current events articles should be news-related rather than editorials or essays. But for the reflection this week (and this particular current event item), essays and editorials will be suitable. I am attaching a list of newsmagazines and alternative media resources that might help you locate appropriate non-mainstream media sources that may make your search easier.

List the article title and publication source here (and attach a printed copy).

What information on the author of the article is provided, or can you speculate on the background story of the author, in order that you can establish his/her credibility and determine the degree of authority possessed related to the topic? If none is provided, where do you suppose you could go to look for more information?

What is the position of the author related to the conflict/war/police action that is being discussed?

What criterion (criteria) related to Just War Theory is (are) presented or implied in the article? If none, which could you see being applied to this situation?

Explain how these criteria are related to the author’s position (i.e., are they reasonably applied?).

Do you think the author used the criteria appropriately in the article? Why or why not?
There are several really interesting websites that I’ve come across over the past year as the Internet has become a more valuable resource for credible statistics on structural indicators of peace and violence. This is an opportunity for you to explore several resources in order to compare countries (for example, the United States and Canada).

**Global Peace Index:**  [http://www.visionofhumanity.org/gpi/home.php](http://www.visionofhumanity.org/gpi/home.php)

Where does the US rank?

What seem to be the major criteria leading to this ranking for the US?

Select a country that has a ranking that surprises you and compare its ranking with that of the United States. Which country and what is its overall ranking? Did the ranking for New Zealand as #1 surprise you?

Why did you choose the country that you did to compare to the US? Were your assumptions met, or did you find completely different findings?


“It is notable that the countries ranked in the top ten of the Global Peace Index are also ranked as having ‘very high human development’ in the Human Development Index produced by UNDP. That composite index measures average achievement in countries according to three basic dimensions of human development – a long and healthy life; access to knowledge; and a decent standard of living.” From remarks by Helen Clark, Administrator of United Nations Development Programme on “Why Peace Matters for Development” at the Global Symposium of Peaceful Nations Sunday, 1 November 2009, Washington, D.C., 7:30PM

Where do the United States and the other country you mentioned above rank on this index?

What differs for this index compared to the GPI?

Why do you think the countries ranked in the top ten of the GPI are also ranked as having high human development?

**Worldometers:**  (Just watching the numbers go up)  [http://worldometers.info/](http://worldometers.info/)

In order to explore military expenditures, click on the following link for SIPRI instead of the link given on the Worldometers website:

**Stockholm International Peace Research Institute:**  [http://milexdata.sipri.org/](http://milexdata.sipri.org/)

Compare the GDP percentages for expenditures for several countries and years. Identify the countries and percentages. (Note. The GDP takes into account proportionality of budget when making comparisons.)

Do you find the numbers surprising? Why or why not?


The National Index of Violence and Harm (NIVAH) is constructed to measure levels of violence and harm to individuals in the United States in a given year compared to levels observed in 1995. Note the descriptions of personal and societal violence they provide on the first page of the overview. Also, note that the gap between rich and poor increased while the poverty rate declined overall.


What were the major indicators used to represent intrapersonal and interpersonal violence?

What were the indicators used to represent structural and institutional violence?

Is there a relationship between income level and violence, according to the numbers presented here?
The concept of the fundamental attribution error came up in class last night in relation to discussion of the optimism Muslim leaders expressed in promoting understanding of their faith here in the United States (based on Huda, 2006—one of the extra reading articles on our class schedule). This phenomenon states that we have a tendency to overestimate the role that a person’s disposition (i.e., personality) plays in his/her behavior while underestimating the role of the situation. Disregarding the external or situational circumstances responsible for behavior can lead to costly errors in judgment at numerous levels (e.g., counseling clients who have been abused, interpreting the motivations of a single parent dealing with sick children and having to miss work, or understanding the plight of the homeless). Note that we recognize, of course, that there are both internal/personal and external/situational factors involved in most actions.

The fundamental attribution error can also be applied to situations involving courageous leaders/resisters. Using the information from several of the chapters most recently assigned in the *Courageous Resisters* book (i.e., especially chapters 5 and 7), think about ways in which your own perceptions and assumptions have changed.

a) **Personal level:** What assumptions did you make regarding these activist leaders (i.e., courageous resisters) indicating personality or dispositional attributions when first reading about them (assuming little knowledge about the historical events in the first place)?
   1) 
   
2) 

b) **Situational level:** What surprised you (well, at least caught your attention) that indicated more than personality characteristics were involved in any of the resisters’ actions, once you studied these materials further?
   1) 
   
2) 

3) 

c) **Application and Interaction:** The fundamental attribution error also applies when considering our own behaviors and how we interpret them. This means we overestimate the role of situational variables when we are acting in difficult situations, focusing upon the circumstances that lead to our inaction. We can use this to our advantage to recognize that motivational and personality attributes alone (i.e., “being a good person” or “intending to do well”) are NOT enough for us to act consistently on our beliefs and values. Networks, context, and the communal/collective nature of resistance are all important. Based on these elements, give examples from situations in which you find yourself that illustrate that you understand how to build upon these external factors to become more effective in translating your prosocial values into actions, using:

**Networks:**

**Context:**

**Communal/collective nature:**
We have discussed emotions in relation to numerous articles assigned over the past 3 months. Go back over these articles, using the class schedule as a guide, and write down in the space below the authors for at least 5 articles we discussed and how a particular emotion played a role in the events or concepts covered.

1) 

2) 

3) 

4) 

5) 

Now, think about YOUR emotional responses to the topics, films, and discussions we have had in this class (other than being tired, exhausted—if by chance that happens in a night class). Your response was quite likely one you felt inwardly rather than outwardly and you probably did not openly share it with the class at the time. Identify at least 2 of these instances and think about what was said, who said it, and how the conversation in class proceeded from that point onward. (Identify each below.) What were the cognitions & thoughts that went through your mind at that time?

1) 

2)