

RACHEL BERNHARD | TEACHING PORTFOLIO

Statement of Teaching Philosophy	2
Summary of Class Evaluations and Syllabi	4
Class Evaluations	4
Class Syllabi	4
Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness	5
Quantitative Evaluations	5
Qualitative Evaluations	6
Awards and Honors	9
Course Syllabi	10
Undergraduate Seminar on Political Psychology	10
Sample Materials for Political Psychology	17
Graduate Seminar on Computational Methods	20
Sample Materials for Computational Methods	23
Proposed Courses	24

Statement of Teaching Philosophy

As a professor of political science, I have the responsibility to teach my students to think skeptically, communicate competently, and understand how politics shapes their world. The most significant challenge I've encountered to executing this responsibility comes from something I enjoy and value highly: a diverse classroom.

In both the undergraduate and graduate courses I have taught at UC Berkeley, students have had an array of backgrounds and skillsets. In undergraduate classes, many will be first-generation college students or speak English as a second language. In my graduate-level course, which introduces social scientists to computational methods, students' training and fields vary widely. Two solutions, learned from the pedagogy courses and workshops I've taken, have proven effective for me thus far. First, I use tactics like weekly emails and short papers to regularly assess students' progress, which ensures the least-advantaged students are not overlooked. Second, I mentor and collaborate with students who need more challenge than the classroom can offer.

I ground every course in the need for skepticism and scientific thought. In my undergraduate introduction to research design and methods class, the syllabus spends separate weeks covering observational, experimental, and qualitative methods, emphasizing what sorts of questions we can answer with each. In an evaluation, one student wrote that "[the class] helps me be more analytical of Poli Sci... Furthermore, the segment on research design helped me understand how to evaluate the validity and results of research in general." I relish seeing students use these skills in their daily lives: in this class, students began informally sharing popular news articles covering what they determined to be poor-quality research. Likewise, in my undergraduate political psychology seminar, a student wrote "I was able to learn so much about human nature and interactions and beliefs that I can now use day in and day out."

While skepticism comes naturally to many students, competent communication does not. For undergraduates, especially those with language barriers or learning differences, this can manifest in vague prose or discomfort speaking in class. One way I overcome their reticence is to have them email me a question about the readings every week. This lets me track even quiet students' progress and gives students more time to compose. One student wrote: "I liked that there were small assignments...it helped [us] be more engaged throughout the semester. Having us send in reading responses each week was also very good because it made us read." For graduates, I stress pithy, clear communication by having students post code and write-ups of their final projects on GitHub (see https://github.com/ribernhard/PS239T/tree/master/16_final-projects). This exercise has immediate benefits for students: three of my graduate students converted their final projects into successful grant proposals.

Requiring weekly questions from students improves their communication during class, too, creating a more level playing field and enabling efficient use of class time. "Whenever someone had a question about a topic, [Rachel] would first define the topic in question. This was really great because it kept us all on the same page. She encouraged discussion and student answers, and never belittled anyone for not knowing an answer." Another student echoed this sentiment, saying "I struggle with anxiety, but she was able to create a great atmosphere during class - this was one of the few section [sic] where I actually participated in class discussion."

I model honest communication to my students by publicly reporting the results of mid-semester assessments, which lets them know I take their concerns and learning seriously. “After the [mid-semester] eval was done she was asked to give more quizzes, and sure enough she did;” “she was always ready to listen to the students and willing to tailor the class to benefit the student learning.” Accordingly, I am always learning: a student told me after an exercise on sampling—using bags of M&M’s as our sampling populations—that he liked the idea but couldn’t fully participate because he was colorblind. Clear communication from my student helped me fix that mistake going forward.

Student interest in politics often starts with enthusiastic instruction, but the classroom rarely allows engaged students sufficient room to explore their own interests. Mentoring such students via research projects enables me to provide additional instruction while ensuring my scholarship doesn’t suffer. One former student emailed to say “last year I was too timid to reach out to you...But, as I enter my final year at Cal, I am determined to explore the opportunities available to do research” (email shared with permission). I have worked with eight phenomenally talented undergraduate research assistants, all from historically underrepresented groups, and informally mentored others, for which I recently won a SMART Mentoring Award from UC Berkeley. I take great joy in the collaborations and in watching a diverse younger generation of scholars emerge.

Richard Feynman, the Nobel Prize-winning physicist, writes that the hardest and most essential skill one must acquire is “how not to fool yourself, because you are the easiest person to fool.” As a professor, I want to enshrine that same belief in my students, undergraduate and graduate alike. Adapting my classes to the needs of a diverse body of students requires frequent solicitation of input to ensure that every student grows according to their interests. Four years of their feedback and collaboration has made me a more careful and effective teacher, and a better scholar.

Summary of Class Evaluations and Syllabi

Full student evaluations and existing course syllabi can be found at rachelbernhard.com/teaching.

Class Evaluations

“Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and the course, how would you rate the overall effectiveness of this graduate student instructor?”

Overall weighted course evaluation average: 6.66/7

Weighted department average: 6.00/7

Undergraduate (teaching assistant)

Introduction to Research Design and Methods | methods | 6.66/7

Democratic Accountability and Elections | American | 6.55/7

Political Psychology | behavior | 6.81/7

Graduate (lead instructor)

Introduction to Computational Tools and Techniques* | methods | 6.57/7

* Nominated for the Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor Award

Class Syllabi

Syllabi for political psychology (undergraduate) and computational methods (graduate) enclosed. Other syllabi available upon request.

Undergraduate

Introduction to Research Design and Methods | methods

Introduction to American Politics | American

Gender in Western Politics | American/comparative

Political Psychology | behavior

State and Local Campaigns | American/public policy

Graduate

Introduction to Computational Tools and Techniques | methods

Identity in American Politics | American/behavior

Political Psychology | behavior

Research Design | methods

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Quantitative Evaluations

Is/Does this instructor...	My Course	Department Average (scale is 1-7, 7 is best)
Organized?		
Overall (weighted average, n=124)	6.65	5.90
Introduction to Methods (n=35)	6.60	5.75
Democratic Accountability and Elections (n=42)	6.57	5.98
Political Psychology (n=36)	6.83	5.95
Introduction to Computational Tools (n=11)	6.55	5.95
Clear?		
Overall	6.65	5.87
Introduction to Methods	6.49	5.73
Democratic Accountability and Elections	6.64	5.94
Political Psychology	6.86	5.92
Introduction to Computational Tools	6.55	5.92
Helpful in and out of class?		
Overall	6.69	5.86
Introduction to Methods	6.63	5.72
Democratic Accountability and Elections	6.57	5.92
Political Psychology	6.89	5.90
Introduction to Computational Tools	6.73	5.92
Give constructive feedback?		
Overall	6.44	5.62
Introduction to Methods	6.34	5.50
Democratic Accountability and Elections	6.22	5.69
Political Psychology	6.67	5.65
Introduction to Computational Tools	6.82	5.65
Encourage participation?		
Overall	6.64	6.11
Introduction to Methods	6.40	5.93
Democratic Accountability and Elections	6.65	6.24
Political Psychology	6.84	6.13
Introduction to Computational Tools	6.73	6.09

For Introduction to Computational Tools and Techniques, for which I was the course designer:

Is/Does this course...

Effective overall?	6.64	5.85
Well-organized?	6.45	5.89
Develop your skills and abilities?	6.73	5.82
Develop your critical thinking?	6.36	5.88

Qualitative Evaluations

Overall Efficacy

“She is an extraordinary GSI. As a junior, I thought I had seen the good and bad limits of what a GSI could be, but she certainly surprised me with her skill as an instructor and her dedication. She has an intuitive sense for what material is troubling for students, but she also takes the time through various means to assess if her intuitions are correct. She said that our section had higher averages than normal, and I attribute that to her. She handled section in a methodical pace, explaining clearly and slowly without trying to rush. Lastly, I have never come across a GSI who was as invested in her students and genuinely cared that they were doing well personally and academically. She provided students with emotional support through one of the more stressful classes here at Cal. Any institution would be lucky to have her, especially if they are looking for an effective instructor in small settings. She definitely deserves to be going places, as I'm sure she is in academia.”

Class Structure

“It was a nice mixture of reading and work. I liked that there were small assignments in between rather than a couple major ones, because it helped the students be more engaged throughout the semester. Having us send in reading responses each week was also very good because it made us read.”

“Rachel was a GREAT teacher, honestly better than some of the professors I've had (lol). Every question that was thrown at her, she answered very eloquently so it was extremely easy to understand the vast majority - if not all - the material. I really liked how the section was structured, there was a certain flow and routine to it every week, so I knew what to expect coming in. I really thought it was helpful when she "developed our schemas" on the theories by putting them all together on the board and showing how they were connected and related. It could get pretty confusing as the semester went on (not that the material was difficult to understand) but just that there was so much information being thrown at us. Going to section really organized everything for me. The umbrellas [a course activity] were really great. I also liked how she had a general agenda on the board of the stuff we would be going through the day and I liked how she started off every section by asking us what questions we had.”

“Rachel is fantastic. She is at every lecture, taking notes, and figuring out what subjects she thinks should be explained more clearly in section. Absolutely phenomenal sections as well. Very well organized and time is never wasted like in so many other sections. Group activities are well structured so that you actually benefit from them.”

“Rachel clearly has experience teaching the course. She starts off typically asking everyone if they have questions that she can clear up right away before going into a review of the material. Review of the material isn't just her lecturing, but her encouraging us to participate and answer key points.”

“Rachel is very knowledgeable and open to questions. She explains things in a variety of ways and tailors the class/skills to be as helpful to us as possible. Some topics can be a little dry/basic but she makes class as enjoyable as possible. I really like how hands-on the class is and doing exercises on our own computers while she walks around for questions.”

Adaptability

“Absolutely top-notch GSI who was very open to receiving feedback, and did a great job of clarifying concepts.”

“After the original course eval was done she was asked to give more quizzes, and sure enough she did. I think that Rachel responds well to what the students want and is easily adaptable.”

“Rachel was very good at reviewing concepts that had been covered in previous weeks, and she was very accessible in terms of questions and feedback. All of the practice quizzes that we were given and exercises that we did in groups were a lot of extra work on her part, so I appreciate that dedication to her students. Also, her willingness to provide feedback on early drafts for the class paper was useful and also impressive, pedagogically.”

“Rachel was very organized each week! She was always clear and showed a lot of knowledge in the topic. She was always, always ready to help her students and very approachable. She was great about getting students to participate in class without putting anyone on the spot. She was very pleasant to work with and very understandable of everyone's situation. I cannot express how appreciative I am of her willingness to help her students. Her support and readiness to help kept me engaged and motivated throughout the semester even after I hit a road block (bad midterm score). I struggle with anxiety, but she was able to create a great atmosphere during class - this was one of the few sections where I actually participated in class discussion. Furthermore, the discussion was very well structured. The exercises we did in class were very useful. Moreover, she was always ready to listen to the students and willing to tailor the class to benefit the student learning. Overall, very pleased with this course.”

Classroom Style

“Rachel presents the material in a very organized manner and leads the discussion very effectively. She keeps the discussion fun despite the quietness and encourages participation in a non-intimidating way. I personally fear discussions sections sometimes but I looked forward to going to Rachel's discussion.”

“Rachel is one of the best GSIs I have had here at Berkeley. She is well rounded, approachable, and knows the material. The class can be quite difficult and coming to section made me really understand the material. I can say that she is the sole reason I am succeeding in understanding the readings.”

“The GSI was extremely organized and went out of her way to remind students of upcoming office hours and assignments.”

“She did a great job going over the readings and information presented in lecture. I liked how she used the board to put down all her notes and bullet points. Her lectures were very engaging and very tailored to what we asked/were struggling with. Her feedback on our essays and work were also very constructive.”

“I learned a lot about democratic accountability and Rachel is a very effective teacher. I like that she writes all over the board - it makes it fun to be in the class.”

“Rachel is by far the best GSI I've ever had. She was very clear in her explanations, and whenever someone had a question about a topic, she would first define the topic in question. This was

really great because it kept us all on the same page. She encouraged discussion and student answers, and never belittled anyone for not knowing an answer.”

“This is one of the more difficult Political Science classes at Berkeley. Lectures continually build up on material from each other, much like the material in technical subjects like math and computer science. That Rachel was able to consistently articulate all of the material to all of the students in my section was instrumental to my understanding of the material. She is one of the most intelligent GSIs I've ever had and certainly the most apt at facilitating discussion.”

“Section is really helpful for this course because we cover a lot of information in lecture. Rachel does a great job breaking down concepts for us and drawing connections between concepts throughout the course, which I really appreciate. She has also been extremely helpful with questions I have had and with a paper assignment, which I am grateful for. Rachel has been approachable all semester, and I have found her office hours to be enriching to my overall experience in the course. I really appreciate her as a GSI!”

Student Rapport

“She prepared us for all the class work and worked together so every student felt confident in their grade. She was a big influence in my life and I'm thankful to have had such an incredible GSI as far as her teaching style, knowledge of the material, and her motivation and inspiration for the students.”

“Rachel has been one of my favorite GSIs at Berkeley. It's clear she makes an effort to know her students as human beings, and actively engages her students by getting them to volunteer the information they know about readings. She makes discussion enjoyable. She is also very good with providing an overview of the readings and highlighting the points we should take away from them. She also makes efficient use of the hour to cover lots of topics. She comes into each discussion with a set agenda and almost always covers each topic in detail.”

“All in all, I really loved her enthusiasm and passion for the course and the material we were learning. She seemed more than knowledgeable in the material and that made me feel pretty secure and confident going into the paper and test. I hope I get another GSI like this before graduating next semester. I've never been as happy and interested going into class and section ready to learn lol.”

“This was by far one of the most interesting courses I have taken at Berkeley and the way Rachel led the discussion section added so much value and depth to this course. I was disappointed to find out that Rachel will not be a GSI next semester for any of the courses - if she was, I would do all that I can to take the course and be in her section.”

“She is a truly dedicated GSI who cares about her students. In a big research university like Berkeley, sometimes teaching becomes a second priority. With GSIs like Rachel, I really feel like I am getting value for the money I am paying to Berkeley.”

“Rachel is extremely knowledgeable and thorough. She is invested in student learning and open to input from students on course subtopics and instructional approaches. Very helpful in office hours. Open to acknowledging the "whole person" of students, rather than just the intellectual aspects.”

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY



CHARLES & LOUISE TRAVERS
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

210 Barrows Hall, MC 1950
Berkeley, CA 94720-1950
510 642-6323
510 642-9515 fax
<http://polisci.berkeley.edu>

August 20, 2017

Rachel Bernhard
Department of Political Science
University of California, Berkeley 94720

Dear Rachel,

It is my pleasure to inform you that the Department of Political Science is nominating you for the campus Outstanding Graduate Student Instructor Award. This nomination is in recognition of your exceptional work in designing and teaching PS 239T, our graduate Computational Tools and Techniques for the Social Sciences Course.

Under your leadership, the class has been a tremendous success, attracting students from Political Science, Economics, Sociology, and Public Policy, among other units on campus. Indeed, interest in the class was so strong when you taught it this past fall that the Social Science Dean has committed divisional resources to allow us to expand the course so that more students across the division can take it when you teach the class again in spring 2018.

The Department – and the Social Science Division more generally – greatly appreciate your excellent work in teaching this essential class.

Again, as Department Chair, I am delighted to nominate you for this prestigious teaching award.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric Schickler", with a long, sweeping underline.

Eric Schickler
Department Chair and Jeffrey & Ashley McDermott Chair in Political Science

Department of Political Science
210 Barrows Hall
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720
Phone: 510-643-2933
Email: eschickler@berkeley.edu

Course Syllabi

Undergraduate Seminar on Political Psychology

Political Psychology

How do we make up our minds about politics: who to believe, what we stand for, how to vote? In this class, we examine public opinion and political behavior through the lens of psychological theories of personality, learning, cognition, emotion, social influence and group dynamics. The first part of the course focuses directly on psychological theories, illustrated with political science applications. The second part focuses on topics of interest to political scientists, bringing psychological perspectives to bear. There are no prerequisites.

Grades will be determined by regular quizzes and homeworks (25%), 10-page midterm paper (25%), participation in discussion section (25%), and a 5-page final paper, which is a rewrite of the midterm paper (25%). Two books are assigned and available for purchase: *Obedience to Authority* by Stanley Milgram (Harper & Row, 1974), and *Thinking Fast and Slow* by Daniel Kahneman (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2011). The remaining readings will be available in a reader.

Course Outline

Weeks 1-2. Can We Distinguish Nature and Nurture? Theories of Personality

Jackson, Jay W. and Joan R. Poulson. 2005. "Contact Experiences Mediate the Relationship Between Five-Factor Model Personality Traits and Ethnic Prejudice." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35: 667-685.

Brown, Roger. 2004. "The Authoritarian Personality and the Organization of Attitudes." In *Political Psychology*, eds. John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius, pp. 39-68. New York: Psychology Press.

Peterson, Bill E., Lauren E. Duncan, and Joyce S. Pang. 2002. "Authoritarianism and Political Impoverishment: Deficits in Knowledge and Political Interest." *Political Psychology*, 23: 97-112.

Oxley, Douglas R. et al. 2008. "Political Attitudes Vary with Physiological Traits." *Science*, 321 (September 19, 2008), 1667-1670.

John R. Hibbing, John R., Kevin B. Smith, and John R. Alford. 2013. *Predisposed: Liberals, Conservatives, and the Biology of Political Differences*. Routledge. Chapter 7.

Week 3. How'd You Know That? Theories of Behavioral and Social Learning

Michael A. Olson and Russell H. Fazio. 2001. "Implicit Attitude Formation through Classical Conditioning." *Psychological Science*, 12: 413-417.

Bandura, Albert. 1977. *Social Learning Theory*. Preface, pages 1-29, and pages 37 - 55. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Herbert McClosky, John Zaller, and Dennis Chong. 1985. "Social Learning and the Acquisition of Political Norms." In McClosky and Zaller, *The American Ethos*. Harvard University Press.

Weeks 4-5. We Think Therefore We Are? Theories of Cognition

Abelson, Robert. 1959. "Modes of Resolution to Belief Dilemmas." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. Chapters 1-7.

Taylor, Shelley E. and Jennifer Crocker. 1981. "Schematic Bases of Social Information Processing." In *Social Cognition: The Ontario Symposium*, eds. E. Higgins, et. al. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Hamilton, David L. 1979. "A Cognitive Attributional Analysis of Stereotyping." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. Leonard Berkowitz. Vol. 12.

Westen, Drew, Pavel S. Blagov, Keith Harenski, Clint Kilts, and Stephan Hamann. 2006. "Neural Bases of Motivated Reasoning: An fMRI Study of Emotional Constraints on Partisan Political Judgment in the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election." *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 18: 1947-1958.

Lodge, Milton and Ruth Hamil. 1986. "A Partisan Schema for Political Information Processing." *American Political Science Review*, 80:515-519.

Eberhardt, Jennifer L., Phillip Atiba Goff, Valerie J. Purdie, and Paul G. Davies. 2004. "Seeing Black: Race, Crime, and Visual Processing." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87: 876-893.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Joanne Martin. 1987. "Shaping the Organizational Context for Black American Inclusion." *Journal of Social Issues*, 43: 41-78.

Week 6. Why That Attitude? Theories of Affect

Zajonc, Robert B. and Hazel Markus. 1982. "Affective and Cognitive Factors in Preferences." *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 9: 123-131.

Hall, Crystal C., Amir Goren, Shelly Chaiken, and Alexander Todorov. 2009. "Shallow Cues with Deep Effects: Trait Judgments from Faces and Voting Decisions." In *The Political Psychology of Democratic Citizenship*, eds. Eugene Borgida, Christopher M. Federico, and John L. Sullivan. New York: Oxford.

Glaser, Jack and Christopher Finn. 2013. "How and Why Implicit Attitudes Should Affect Voting." *PS*, 46: 537-544.

Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*, Chapter 3 ("Drawing from the Neurosciences") and 4 ("Dual Affective Subsystems: Disposition and Surveillance"). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, and Erin Cassese. 2007. "On the Distinct Political Effects of Anxiety and Anger." In *The Affect Effect*, eds. W. Russell Neuman, George E. Marcus, Ann N. Crigler, and Michael MacKuen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 202-230.

Weeks 7-8. Us vs. Them? Theories of Group Identity and Conflict

Milgram, Stanley. 1974. *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper & Row.

Brown, Rupert. 1988. *Group Process*. Chapters 4 ("Social Influence in Groups") and 8 ("Social Categorization, Social Identification and Intergroup Relations"). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Cialdini, Robert B., Raymond R. Reno, and Carl A. Kallgren. 1990. "A Focus Theory of Normative Conduct: Recycling the Concept of Norms to Reduce Littering in Public Places." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58: 1015-1026.

Tajfel, Henry and John C. Turner. 2004. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." In *Political Psychology*, eds. John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius, pp. 39-68. New York: Psychology Press.

Huddy, Leonie, Lilliana Mason, and Lene Aaroe. 2015. "Expressive Partisanship: Campaign Involvement, Political Emotion, and Partisan Identity." *American Political Science Review*, 109: 1-17.

Citrin, Jack, Amy Lerman, Michael Murakami, and Kathryn Pearson. 2007. "Testing Huntington: Is Hispanic Immigration a Threat to American Identity?" *Perspectives on Politics*, 5: 31-48.

Week 9. Raised Right(-wing)? Theories of Political Socialization

Theodore M. Newcomb. 1965. "Attitude Development as a Function of Reference Groups: The Bennington Study." In *Basic Studies in Social Psychology*, eds. H. Proshansky and B. Seidenberg. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Block, J. and J. Block. 2006. "Nursery School Personality and Political Orientation Two Decades Later." *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(5):734-749.

Jennings, M. Kent, Laura Stoker, and Jake Bowers. 2009. "Politics Across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined." *Journal of Politics*, 71: 782-799.

Peter K. Hatemi, Carolyn L. Funk, Sarah E. Medland, Hermine M. Maes, Judy L. Silberg, Nicholas G. Martin, and Lindon J. Eaves. 2009. "Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Attitudes Over a Life Time." *Journal of Politics*, 71: 1141–1156

Erikson, Robert S., and Laura Stoker. 2011. "Caught in the Draft: The Effects of Vietnam Draft Lottery Status on Political Attitudes." *American Political Science Review* 105(2): 221-37.

Weeks 10-11. Shortcuts to Nowhere? Theories of Bounded Rationality

Converse, Philip. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David Apter.

Quattrone, George A. and Amos Tversky. 1988. "Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice." *American Political Science Review*, 82: 719-736.

Kukinskli, James H., and Paul J. Quirk. 2000. "Reconsidering the Rational Public." In *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice, and the Bounds of Rationality*, edited by Arthur Lupia and Mathew Daniel McCubbins, 153-182. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bartels, Larry M. 2005. "Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind." *Perspectives on Politics*, 3: 15-31.

Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review*, 88: 63-76.

Healy, Andrew and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2014. "Substituting the End for the Whole: Why Voters Respond Primarily to the Election-Year Economy." *American Journal of Political Science*, 58: 31-47.

Week 12. Pigs and Drunkards? Elite Failures in Decision-Making

Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. Chapters 21 and 22.

Jervis, Robert. 2004. "The Drunkard's Search." In *Political Psychology*, eds. John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius, pp. 259-270. New York: Psychology Press.

Kanwisher, Nancy. 1989. "Cognitive Heuristics and American Security Policy." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 33: 33: 652-675

Janis, Irving. 1972. *Victims of Groupthink*. Chapter 1 ("Introduction: Why So Many Miscalculations?") and Chapter 2 ("A Perfect Failure: The Bay of Pigs").

Weeks 13-14. If News Were Fake, Would It Matter? Theories of Political Communication

Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*, chaps 1-3.

Bosso, Christopher J. 1989. "Setting the Agenda: Mass Media and the Discovery of a Famine." In *Manipulating Public Opinion*, eds. Michael Margolis and Gary A. Mauser. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Iyengar, Shanto and Donald R. Kinder. 1987. *News That Matters*. Pages 63 - 65 (defining "priming") and Chapter 11 ("Electoral Consequences of Priming"). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mutz, Diana. 2007. "Effects of In-Your-Face Television on Perceptions of a Legitimate Opposition," *American Political Science Review*, 101.4: 621-635.

Druckman, James, Toby Bolsen and Fay Lomax Cook. 2014. "The Influence of Partisan Motivated Reasoning on Public Opinion," *Political Behavior*, 36(2), 235-262.

Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. 1997. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and its Effect on Tolerance." *American Political Science Review*, 91: 567-583.

Daniel T. Gilbert, Romin W. Tafarodi, and Patrick S. Malone 1993. "You can't not believe everything you read." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 65(2): 221–233.

Flynn, D.J., Nyhan, B. and Reifler, J. 2017. The Nature and Origins of Misperceptions: Understanding False and Unsupported Beliefs About Politics. *Advances in Political Psychology*, 38: 127–150.

Quizzes and Homeworks

25 percent of your course grade is based on quizzes and homeworks. These are short assignments: quizzes will take no more than 15 minutes of class, and homeworks will take no more than two hours. Because there are no exams for the course, this (and section participation, detailed below) are the main ways in which you will regularly demonstrate your mastery of the course material.

Midterm and Final Paper Assignment

50 percent of your course grade is based on your paper, which you will first write in a 10-page format for the midterm, and then re-write into a 5-page format for the final. Prompts and a rubric will be sent out to the class by week 4 of the semester.

Section Participation and Attendance Policies

In section, we'll go over concepts and problems brought up in readings and lecture. The goal is to clarify the material through explanations and examples. Section will generally feature discussions, in-class assignments, and small group work, so please come prepared to participate actively.

25 percent of your course grade is based on section attendance and participation.

Attendance Policy

There is no rule on how many sections you can miss, but attendance is required. Missing section without a valid excuse will negatively impact your grade.

- a) Valid excuses for absences are:
 - i. Health-related emergency
 - ii. Family emergency
- b) If you let me know ahead of time that you will (or even might) miss class for these reasons, I will not require a doctor's or family note. If you are unable to let me know until after you have missed class or an assignment, I will require a note and/or other relevant documentation.

I strongly encourage students to be proactive in letting me know if something happens—a health or family event—that may affect your work, *even if it doesn't result in an absence*. Sometimes, events and situations may affect your work for longer or harder than you initially anticipate, and it is much easier for me to work with you to find solutions ahead of time than try to “fix” things after it has become a problem.

If you are a parent and your childcare falls through, you are welcome to bring your child or infant to class provided they are able to be present without disrupting class. I would much rather bore your child to tears than lose parents' participation because a babysitter had to cancel.

Participation Policy

As an upper-division course, this course requires significantly more participation than a lower-division course. GSIs will be giving participation grades on a **weekly** basis. This means your participation in every class counts. This means quality, not quantity: you do not need to talk repeatedly or at length to get a perfect score. Participation points are awarded for thoughtful questions or answers that show you have done the reading and for helping your classmates during group work. Interrupting, talking over, or being otherwise disrespectful of your classmates will negatively affect your participation grade.

Your participation is counted based on three activities: class discussion, detailed above, attendance at office hours, and participation in the bCourses discussions for our sections (either by posting thoughtful questions or by answering questions). If you are not comfortable speaking much in class, be sure to make use of the second two options, because there are no extra credit assignments available to boost your grade otherwise.

Section Policies

- Please silence and put away your cell phones (including earpieces), and put away MP3 players and headsets. They should be in your backpack or purse, not on your desk or lap.
- Laptops and tablets are permitted if they are silenced, and are not distracting you, the GSI, or anybody else in the class. If you have an internet connection in class, I reserve the privilege of asking you to look things up online, if necessary, and you should perceive your computer screen as “public space” during class time. Please do not load onscreen anything that might be perceived as inappropriate or offensive: do your part to make the classroom a learning environment.
- Please read the week's readings before coming to section. I will call on individuals as necessary to foster group conversation.
- Please arrive on time – by 2:10 for Section 101, 4:10 for Section 104. If your (late) entrance is disruptive to the class, it will negatively affect your participation grade for that day.

Email Policy

Please include **“PSPP” in the subject line of your emails; if you do not, your email is likely to end up in the wrong folder and may be missed.** I will try to respond to emails within 24 hours during the week or 48 hours over the weekend, and I usually respond to student emails each morning. If I need to send you an email, I will use your Bear Facts email address – so please check that account regularly, or have that account’s emails forwarded to your primary email account.

Special Accommodations

If you need disability-related accommodations in this class, and/or if you have emergency medical information that you wish to share with me, and/or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please inform me immediately. Please see me privately after class or during office hours. For disability-related accommodations, you must also obtain an accommodations letter from DSP (<http://dsp.berkeley.edu>).

Student Code of Conduct

As a UC Berkeley student, we trust you to conduct your academic affairs ethically. Betrayal of that trust will not be tolerated. Cheating includes, but is not limited to, bringing notes or written or electronic materials into an exam, using notes or written or electronic materials during an exam, having someone write an exam or assignment for you, or using someone else’s written work or materials without appropriate citations (plagiarism). If you have questions about whether an action qualifies as misconduct, please talk to me or Professor Stoker.

For details on the UC Berkeley Student Code of Conduct, please refer to the website below:
<http://sa.berkeley.edu/code-of-conduct>

Additional Help

UC Berkeley’s Student Learning Center (<http://slc.berkeley.edu>) offers additional support, providing students with tutors, study group sessions, and other resources that might be helpful.

Sample Materials for Political Psychology

Quiz, Week 3

1. ___F___ [True/False] Personality traits are predispositions that are stable since birth.
2. ___T___ [True/False] Research on the Big Five suggests that conscientiousness is positively correlated with conservative views and openness is positively correlated with liberal views.
3. ___F___ [True/False] Freud argues that the authoritarian personality type is caused by early childhood experiences that give rise to a rigid, punitive, externalized superego.
4. Which of the following is an example of an unconditioned stimulus?
 - a. **A slap**
 - b. Pavlov's footsteps in the hallway
 - c. Hunger
 - d. Wearing a striped shirt and blowing a whistle
5. Which of these studies is attempting to address common violations of the Equal Environment Assumption?
 - a. A study comparing MZ twins to DZ twins
 - b. **A study comparing MZ twins separated at birth**
 - c. A study comparing twins to other siblings
 - d. A study comparing adopted twins to biological siblings
6. By simultaneously exposing subjects to images of Pokemon characters and positive or negative words/images, Olson and Fazio found that subjects began to positively or negatively evaluate specific Pokemon characters that were neutral at the beginning of the study. This study was an example of what?
 - a. Social learning
 - b. **Classical conditioning**
 - c. Operant conditioning
 - d. Motivated reasoning
7. Briefly explain the meaning of $B = f(p, e)$ and its importance.

Behavior is a function of person and environment. By this we mean that neither explanation is sufficient on its own; moreover, most theories now accept that the person and environment interact (affect one another).

8. What are the two types of conditioning in behavioral learning theory? Briefly describe them.

Operant conditioning: actor is active (does something), and receives a pain/pleasure stimulus in response.

Classical conditioning: actor is passive, and experiences both an unconditioned (valenced) stimulus and a conditioned (neutral) stimulus.

In both cases, the actor learns to associate the (OC) behavior or (CC) conditioned stimulus with the valenced response/stimulus.

9. [Fill in the blanks] **Social** learning theory, unlike **behavioral** learning theory, argues that people can learn just from observing others' behavior and its consequences. In other words, subjects don't have to experience pain or pleasure, but can learn vicariously.
10. [Fill in the blanks] Researchers find that people holding conservative views are also more likely to have strong **startle** and **disgust** responses, which they measure by exposing subjects to negative or unpleasant imagery, sounds, tastes, and smells.

Handouts for Group Exercise, Week 5

Group 1

Behavioral Learning Theory

Create one example of *classical conditioning*, which is then followed by an example of *higher-order classical conditioning*. Identify the unconditioned and conditioned stimuli, and the innate and learned responses. For the first example, give an example of what would happen if the subject engaged in *stimulus generalization*.

Consistency/Motivated Reasoning Theory

Fabricia is seriously concerned about climate change based on what she has read and seen in the media. She is so passionate about the issue that she frequently gets into fights with her friend Cem, who denies that climate change is occurring. One day, the New York Times posts an article claiming evidence that top climate scientists had falsified some of their findings regarding global warming. Based on this information, please complete the following exercises:

- 1) Draw a motivated reasoning diagram (as seen in lecture) for Fabricia. Now draw one for Cem.
 - 2) How is Cem likely to react to this news?
 - 3) Give one example of each type of resolution mechanism Fabricia might use in reaction to this news (Denial, Bolstering, Differentiation, Transcendence, Rationalization).
 - 4) Which mechanism is Fabricia most likely to use? Which are least likely to be used?
-

Group 2

Behavioral Learning Theory

Create one example of *operant conditioning*, which is then followed by an example of *higher-order operant conditioning*. For each case, identify the unconditioned and conditioned stimuli, and the innate and learned responses. For the first example, describe what is likely to happen if the conditioning operates on a *partial reinforcement schedule*.

Consistency/Motivated Reasoning Theory

Priyanka passionately hates a particular nationally syndicated opinion commentator. Her friend, Carol, loves listening to him. One day, Priyanka hears that this commentator has won an “excellency in broadcasting” award. Based on this information, please complete the following exercises:

- 1) Draw a motivated reasoning diagram (as seen in lecture) for Priyanka. Now draw one for Carol.
- 2) How is Carol likely to react to this news?
- 3) Give one example of each type of resolution mechanism Priyanka might use in reaction to this news (Denials, Bolstering, Differentiation, Transcendence, Rationalization).
- 4) Which mechanism is Priyanka most likely to use? Which are least likely to be used?

Excerpt from Lesson Plan, Week 3

- How to read an academic article (Jackson and Poulson reading)
 - o How many of you start by seeing an article and wonder what the heck you're supposed to get out of it, why it's organized the way it is, which parts you're supposed to remember, etc.?
 - o Academic articles are DIFFICULT – they can't be read like a short story or news article, from beginning to end
 - Read the title: this tells us that the argument will take the form of a mediating variable argument, and what the variables are
 - Author: who is the author? Remember this if they seem to constantly cite themselves
 - Abstract: this is a summary; use this to orient yourself and write your flashcard about key takeaways
 - Two samples, studying similar things, found the same results for both
 - Two traits mediate (in this case, minimize) prejudice
 - o Stop after the abstract and make sure you get this all down! This will help keep you oriented when you get into the weeds of the argument
 - o Next: what does each section do?
 - Intro/Theory/Literature sections: introduce topic and argument, and past evidence that supports or contradicts your idea
 - Go subheading by subheading—should see each chunk of the mediating variable argument
 - Hypotheses/Argument: this is where the author states exactly what they are testing
 - Methods/Data: how was the study conducted? On whom? How were measurements taken? Etc.
 - If someone tells you there's a measurement problem with a study (e.g., acquiescence bias), you will probably find that problem described in the methods section
 - Analysis/Results: what did the study actually find? Usually tables, figures, etc. go in here. This doesn't talk about why we found what we found, just what.
 - *Go over charts and tables with students – what did Jackson and Poulson find?*
 - Discussion: this is where the authors discuss why they think they got the results and what broader implications it may have
 - Some articles will have an additional conclusions section, where they restate this and talk about directions for future research; others will lump them together

Graduate Seminar on Computational Methods

Introduction to Computational Tools and Techniques for Social Science Research

[All materials for this course are available publicly at <https://github.com/ribernhard/PS239T>]

This course provides graduate students the critical technical skills necessary to conduct research in computational social science and digital humanities, introducing them to the basic computer literacy, programming skills, and application knowledge that students need to be successful in further methods work.

The course is currently divided into two main sections: skills (with an emphasis on Python and R), and applications (e.g., webscraping and text analysis). The “skills” portion introduces students to basic computer literacy, terminologies, and programming languages - i.e. Bash, R, Python, and Git. The second part of the course provides students the opportunity to use the skills they learned in part 1 towards practical applications such as automated text analysis, geospatial analysis, data collection via APIs, webscraping, etc.

By the end of the course, students should be able to:

- Understand basic programming terminologies, structures, and conventions
- Navigate and operate effectively in a UNIX environment
- Master basic Git and GitHub workflows
- Write, execute, and debug R code for assignments involving statistical analysis
- Write, execute, and debug Python code for assignments involving data collection and manipulation, as well as other computing tasks
- Collect data through a variety of means, including webscraping and APIs.
- Be familiar with the concepts and tools of a variety of computational social science / digital humanities applications
- Be familiar with the basic guidelines around reproducible research, good scientific computing practices, and ethics/privacy/legal quandaries.
- Learn independently and train themselves in a variety of computational applications and tasks through online documentation

Logistics

Office Hours

By appointment (email or bCourses to set up), 715 Barrows

bCourses

We will use bCourses for communication (announcements and questions) and turning in assignments. You should ask questions about class material and assignments through the bcourse website so that everyone can benefit from the discussion. We encourage you to respond to each other’s questions as well. Questions of a personal nature can be emailed to us directly.

GitHub

All course materials will be posted on Github at <https://github.com/ribernhard/PS239T/>, including class notes, code demonstrations, sample data, and assignments. Students are encouraged to submit pull requests to this repository, for example if they find a particularly helpful resource that would aid other students. Students are required to use GitHub for their final projects, which will be publically available, unless they have special considerations (e.g. proprietary data).

Accessibility

This class is committed to creating an environment in which everyone can participate, regardless of background, discipline, or disability. If you have a particular concern, please come to us as soon as possible so that we can make special arrangements.

Course Requirements and Grades

Final Grades

This is a graded class based on the following:

- Completion of assigned homework (50%)
- Participation (25%)
- Final project (25%)

Assignments

Assignments will be assigned at the end of every session. They will be due at the start of the following class unless otherwise noted. The assignments will be frequent but each of them should be fairly short.

You are encouraged to work in groups, but the work you turn in must be your own. Group submission of homework, or turning in copies of the same code or output, is not acceptable. Remember, the only way you actually learn how to write code is to write code.

Unless otherwise specified, assignments should be turned in as **pdf documents** via the bCourses site.

Class Participation

The class participation portion of the grade can be satisfied in one or more of the following ways:

- attending the lecture and section
- asking and answering questions in class
- contributing to class discussion through the bCourse site, and/or
- collaborating with the campus computing community, either by attending a D-Lab or BIDS workshop, submitting a pull request to a campus github repository (including the class repository), answering a question on StackExchange, or other involvement in the social computing / digital humanities community.

Because we will be using laptops every class, the temptation to attend to other things during slow moments will be high. While you may choose to do so, I do request that you think of your laptop screen as in the public domain for the duration of classtime: please do not load anything that will distract your classmates or is otherwise inappropriate to a classroom setting.

Final Project

The final project consists of using the tools we learned in class on your own data of interest. First- and second-year students in the political science department are encouraged to use this as an

opportunity to gather data to be used for other courses or the second-year thesis. Students are required to write a short proposal by November 7 (no more than 2 paragraphs) in order to get approval and feedback from the instructors.

On December 7 we will have a **lightning talk session** where students can present their projects in a maximum 5 minute talk. Since there is no expectation of a formal paper, you should select a project that is completable by the end of the term. In other words, submitting a research design for your future dissertation that will use skills from the class but collects no data is not acceptable, but completing a viably small portion of a study or thesis is.

Class Activities and Materials

Activities and Guest Speakers

Classes will follow a “workshop” style, combining lecture and lab formats. We envision the class to be as interactive / hands on as possible, with students programming every session. During the “skills” parts of the class, we will be learning how to program in Unix, Python, and R by following a set of course notes with demonstrations.

During the “applications” sections, we will be following a similar structure with the possibility of guest speakers leading the class on specific tools. These guest speakers will be members of campus who are experts in the respective tool that they teaching.

Section

The Wednesday "lab" section will generally be a less formal session dedicated to helping students with materials from lecture and homework, though some weeks (as with Labor Day) it will substitute for lecture. It will be mostly student led, so come with questions. If there are no questions, the lab turns into a "hackathon" where groups can work on the assignments together. It is not required but *strongly* encouraged, especially if you are having difficulty with the assignments. Attending office hours is not a substitute for attending section.

Computer Requirements

The software needed for the course is as follows:

- Access to the UNIX command line (e.g., a Mac laptop, a Bash wrapper on Windows)
- Git
- R and RStudio (latest versions)
- A scientific Python distribution including Python, iPython and iPython notebooks, and major packages.

This requires a computer that can handle all this software. Almost any Mac will do the job. Most Windows machines are fine too if they have enough space and memory. See B_Install.md for more information. We will be having an **InstallFest** on August 26 for those students experiencing difficulties downloading and installing the requisite software.

Books and Other Resources

There are no official textbooks for this class. There is a list of topic-specific tutorials and resources in the GitHub repo in the document C_resources.md. If you find good online resources, you are encouraged to add to the document.

Curriculum Outline / Schedule

1. **Aug 24 / Aug 26** - Introduction and InstallFest (InstallFest is special session, Friday 1-3pm, for those who need extra help)
2. **Aug 29** - Unix, Bash, and Basic Git [No section Aug 31 due to APSA]
3. **Sept 7** - Python 1 (Basics) [No lecture Sept 3 due to Labor Day]
4. **Sept 12 / Sept 14** - Python 2 (Intermediate)
5. **Sept 19 / Sept 21** - Python 3 (Advanced)
6. **Sept 26 / Sept 28** - Python 4 (Information Retrieval)
7. **Oct 3 / Oct 5** - APIs
8. **Oct 10 / Oct 12** - Web Scraping
9. **Oct 17 / Oct 19** - R 1 (Basics)
10. **Oct 24 / Oct 26** - R 2 (Data Analysis)
11. **Oct 31 / Nov 2** - R 3 (Visualization)
12. **Nov 7 / Nov 9** - Text Analysis (Guest Speaker)
13. **Nov 14 / Nov 16** - GeoSpatial Analysis (Guest Speaker) and Qualtrics
14. **Nov 21** - MTurk [No section Nov 23 due to Thanksgiving]
15. **Nov 28 / Nov 30** - Git and Wrap-up
16. **Dec 7** - Final Project Presentations [Note that this is during reading week, not finals]

Sample Materials for Computational Methods

Due to the programming-based nature of the course, it is infeasible to attach samples of course materials, but I recommend two lecture PDFs to get a sense for the dynamics of lecture:

Week 1: introduction to the course at

https://github.com/ribernhard/PS239T/blob/master/01_Introduction/Intro_Lecture.pdf

Week 11: data visualization in R at

https://github.com/ribernhard/PS239T/blob/master/11_r-visualization/01_data-visualization-lecture.pdf

Both links can also be navigated to from <https://github.com/ribernhard/PS239T/> by going to the appropriate weeks' folders.

Proposed Courses

In addition to the enclosed syllabi, I include here short descriptions of other courses I have taught or for which I have draft syllabi.

Introduction to Research Design and Methods

This course introduces students to political methodology by emphasizing what questions we can study with quantitative (experimental and observational) and qualitative (interview and ethnographic) methods, culminating in an original research design. At the undergraduate level, I focus on principles of basic scientific inquiry, especially experiments and the need for design-based inference. Students compare studies across disciplines and over time to understand key concepts like double-blinded studies, survey wording effects, and participant observation. At the graduate level, I provide more breadth and depth of research design, including an introduction to the potential outcomes framework, distinctions between lab, survey, and field experiments, quasi-experiments, and pre-registration of observational analyses. In the second unit of the course, students hear from guest speakers and discuss challenges of fieldwork, research transparency, and conducting mixed-methods research. In the third unit of the course, students and take surveys on Amazon's Mechanical Turk and then design and pilot their own studies.

Introduction to American Politics

This course familiarizes students with key texts in American politics, including de Tocqueville and the Federalist Papers, as they embark on a thematically-organized journey through the history of American politics: (1) institutions and American political development, (2) social and interest groups, (3) individual political behavior and its relation to institutions, and (4) the impact of groups on public policy. Students are asked to bring a historical perspective to each theme and explore changes over time via short papers in which they write mock debates between scholars, historians, and earlier political figures and current political figures. Students use blogs to share and discuss these pieces with a wider audience, and report back the results to the class at large.

Gender in Western Politics

An advanced seminar, this course explores changes in our conceptions of sex, gender, and family roles over the course of Western civilization and the attendant impacts on politics. The course begins by examining classical and medieval notions of gender and family, including Pomeroy on Ancient Greece, Simons on premodern Europe, and Scott on gender history. In the second unit, students explore modern notions, including Ulrich, de Beauvoir, Friedan, hooks, Gay, Lorde, and Despentés, and compare these thinkers to changes in politics, including women's suffrage and victories in public policy (e.g., Teele, McConnaughy, Hawkesworth, Skocpol). Students write short response papers throughout the semester, and depending on student interest, the class culminates with a final unit on women as candidates or on women as voters.

Identity in American Politics

As either an advanced undergraduate seminar or graduate course, this class delves more deeply into the intersections between race, gender, class, and place and how they have shaped political conflict in the U.S. For undergraduates, the focus is on current conflicts and debates: this could include hate speech and the First Amendment, urban-rural, class, and ethnic voting divides, gender in presidential elections, and/or dog-whistle rhetoric more broadly. Graduates are asked to situate these conflicts in their historical context and to pit behavioral and structuralist approaches against each other.

Assignments take the form of regular class debates and one-page analyses of current events. For both levels, class features speakers from within academia and from political organizations, and students assignments feature short op-ed style papers that they are encouraged to submit to newspapers. Readings will vary based on current events.

State and Local Campaigns

This course introduces either advanced undergraduates or MPP/graduate students to the campaign environment at the state and local level. Students meet local politicians and campaign consultants and learn about the steps of running a campaign, from initial fundraising to grassroots door-knocking. Particular attention is paid to the problem of diversifying candidates at the local level, including by gender (e.g., Holman, Schneider, Carroll, Sanbonmatsu, Dittmar), race (e.g., Brown, Smooth, Dowe, Hajnal, Trounstine), and class (e.g., Carnes, Crowder-Meyer). As their homework, students are asked to volunteer for local campaigns (for candidates or for policies) and reflect on their efforts in a final paper.