



COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

## School of Government and Public Policy

### POL 625: Political Psychology

**Day/Time:** W 1:00-3:30 PM

**Room:** Social Sciences Rm 332

**Office Hours:** Mon. 12-2 (or by appointment, or anytime I am in my office)

**Professor:** Frank Gonzalez

**Office:** 337 Social Sciences Bldg.

**Email:** fgonzo@email.arizona.edu

**Semester:** Fall 2017

### Course Description and Objectives

This course will provide students with a broad overview of research in the field of political psychology. Although many disagree with regard to what political psychology *is*, it is widely accepted that the field is incredibly diverse and interdisciplinary. Theories developed in political psychology build on a wide range of fields, including: political science, social psychology, cognitive psychology, evolutionary psychology, behavioral economics, sociology, communications, neuroscience, behavioral genetics, and many others. The research questions addressed by political psychologists are similarly diverse, and range in focus from understanding political attitudes and behavior, to explaining group conflict broadly, to developing applied interventions for affecting public opinion, informing the public, and improving public policy. Finally, the methods used by political psychologists range from survey research, to laboratory experiments, to field research/experiments, to text analysis, to qualitative studies. As such, an understanding of political psychology theory and research methods can be tremendously useful to just about anyone interested in studying politics and/or human behavior.

The course will be structured in major sections. In all sections, we will sample readings from political science as well as psychology (and other disciplines as appropriate). The sections will include overviews of: 1) what political psychology *is*, its history/current standing in political science, and major concepts (attitudes, emotion, and ideology); 2) the factors that shape political attitudes and behavior (e.g. biological, personality, social, environmental); 3) social identity and inter-/intra-group processes, with particular focus on race, religion, and gender; 4) political psychology research methods, with particular focus on the distinction between correlational and experimental research; 5) understanding public opinion and polarization regarding science and public policy; and 6) a section on a topic of your choosing(!).

### Course Objectives and Expected Learning Outcomes

1. Develop broad understanding of theories and research methods used in political psychology.
2. Critically evaluate major theories developed in political psychology.
3. Develop skills necessary to utilize political psychology theory and methods in one's own research.

## Course Format and Expectations

This class is a research seminar. I will review major concepts and moderate/guide discussion when appropriate, but each class will progress largely via in-class discussion. As such, students are expected to have done all readings for the week *prior* to class, and to come to class prepared to critically evaluate each reading.

Each week (except for the first couple of weeks), a discussion leader will take charge of guiding the discussion throughout the class. Students will have the opportunity to sign up for preferred classes to lead during the first class. Discussion leaders will be expected to ask questions about the readings to the class, guide discussion, connect the readings for that week, and develop broad, overarching themes for that week's readings.

**In addition**, all students will be required to write a 2-page reaction paper each week that both summarizes and critically evaluates the readings for that week.

The final product for the course will be a full research paper that utilizes political psychology theory and/or methods. Papers should be written as first drafts of manuscripts that may eventually be sent out for publication.

## Required Texts

- Huddy, Leonie, Sears, David O., & Levy, Jack S. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford handbook of political psychology (2nd Edition)*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

*The majority of course readings will be research articles available through JSTOR or Google Scholar. I will post any readings not available on D2L (let me know if you cannot access an article and it is not on D2L).*

## Optional, Highly Recommended Readings

- Fiske, Susan T., & Taylor, Shelley E. (1991). *Social Cognition*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Green, Donald P., Palmquist, Bradley, & Schickler, Eric. (2004). *Partisan hearts and minds: Political parties and the social identities of voters*. Yale University Press.
- Haidt, Jonathan. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Vintage.
- Hetherington, Marc. J., & Weiler, Jonathan D. (2009). *Authoritarianism and polarization in American politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hibbing, John R., Smith, Kevin B., & Alford, John R. (2013). *Predisposed: Liberals, Conservatives, and the Biology of Political Differences*. New York: NY: Routledge.
- Hibbing, John R., & Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth. (2002). *Stealth democracy: Americans' beliefs about how government should work*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Iyengar, Shanto, & Kinder, Donald R. (2010). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kahneman, Daniel. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Macmillan.
- Kinder, Donald R., & Kam, Cindy D. (2010). *Us against them: Ethnocentric foundations of American opinion*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Lodge, Milton, & Taber, Charles S. (2013). *The rationalizing voter*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lupia, Arthur. (2015). *Uninformed: Why people know so little about politics and what we can do about it*. Oxford University Press.
- Marcus, George, E. (2013). *Political psychology: Neuroscience, genetics, and politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Marcus, George E., Neuman, Russell, & MacKuen, Michael B. (2000). *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mondak, Jeffery J. (2010). *Personality and the foundations of political behavior*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, James, & Pratto, Felicia. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth. (2009). *Who counts as an American?: The boundaries of national identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaller, John. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University.

## Grading and Assignments

- Participation and Attendance - 5% each for a total of 10%: This class relies heavily on the participation of students. As such, attendance is required. Students are allowed 1 unexcused absence, but are penalized for each additional absence. Students who miss class due to illness or emergency are required to bring documentation from their health-care provider or other relevant, professional third parties. Failure to submit third-party documentation will result in unexcused absences.

Additionally, this class is designed to be interactive, and so students are expected to be active in class discussions and exercises. In-class participation in discussions (or a lack thereof) will directly affect one's final grade.

The UAs policy concerning Class Attendance, Participation, and Administrative Drops is available at: <http://catalog.arizona.edu/policy/class-attendance-participation-and-administrative-drop>. The UA policy regarding absences for any sincerely held religious belief, observance or practice will be accommodated where reasonable, <http://policy.arizona.edu/human-resources/religious-accommodation-policy>. Absences pre-approved by the UA Dean of Students (or Dean Designee) will be honored. See: <https://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/absences>.

- Discussion Leader - 2 @ 5% each for a total of 10%: Students will have the opportunity to sign up for preferred classes to lead during the first class. Discussion leaders will be expected to ask questions about the readings to the class, guide discussion, connect the readings for that week, and develop broad, overarching themes for that week's readings. Discussion leaders will be graded on their ability to structure the readings in a meaningful way, synthesize the readings to draw overarching connections and conclusions, and spark discussion when necessary. There is no need for powerpoint presentations or a lecture when you are the discussion leader.

- Reaction Papers - 15 @ 1% each for a total of 15%: Students will be required to write a 2-page reaction paper each week that both summarizes and critically evaluates the readings for that week. Papers should be double-spaced in 12-point Times New Roman font. Students should submit reaction papers on D2L prior to the start of that week's class. Reaction papers will be graded primarily on the degree to which students synthesize the readings (i.e. draw common themes across readings) and provide well-reasoned critiques of the readings (I am somewhat more interested in critiques than synthesis, and so papers should be roughly one quarter synthesis and three quarters critique). Ideas for research designs based on the readings are also welcome.

**Important:** Points will be deducted for going over the 2-page limit or not reaching at least 1.5 pages. One of the most difficult things to do in academic writing is be concise, and so reaction papers are an opportunity to refine this skill.

- Term Paper - 40%: Students will be required to write a full research paper that utilizes political psychology theory and/or methods. Papers should be written as first drafts of manuscripts that may eventually be sent out for publication. Papers should not have been already written prior to the start of the semester. Although it is okay for the paper to emanate from a project that has been on the "backburner" for some time, it is important that you take the opportunity to use this semester to write a new paper (i.e. not a prior conference paper or term paper from a previous class). Paper should be 25-30 pages (excluding title page, abstract, references, tables, and figures). **As with reaction paper, points will be deducted for going over the page limit.**

Papers should be empirical in nature. Students are encouraged to utilize existing data sets for their analyses, but if they would like to collect original data that is encouraged as well. Be warned, though, that collection of original data can be extremely time consuming and requires IRB approval for human subjects, and so students who wish to use original data should either have started data collection already (i.e. for a project already underway) or begin the process of collecting data immediately. Qualitative analyses or quantitative content analyses (e.g. text analyses) are also acceptable. Consult with me as soon as possible regarding what data you will use for your paper. In extreme circumstances, papers may be detailed research designs instead of full-length empirical papers.

*The paper will be due by noon on Friday of the last week of classes.*

- Final Presentation/Q&A - 25%: Students will give 10-minute presentations on their paper during the final week of class. The time limit will be strictly enforced, and so students are encouraged to rehearse their presentations beforehand to make sure they stay within 10 minutes. Students will be graded on the quality of the presentation as well as their ability to respond to questions afterward (Q&A not included in 10-minute time limit).

## Grade Scale

Letter Grade	%
A	90-100
B	80-99.9
C	70-79.9
D	60-69.9
E	59.9 and below

- **Requests for incomplete (I) or withdrawal (W)** must be made in accordance with University policies, which are available at <http://catalog.arizona.edu/policy/grades-and-grading-system#incomplete> and <http://catalog.arizona.edu/policy/grades-and-grading-system#Withdrawal> respectively.
- Should you wish to discuss your grade, you must meet with me in person. I am not able to discuss grades by email.

## Academic Integrity

Academic dishonesty is taken *extremely* seriously in this course. **Anyone found guilty of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism will, at a minimum, receive an F for this course, and will be referred to university authorities.** Fabrication means altering information dishonestly, falsification means inventing information dishonestly, and plagiarism means presenting someone else's work as your own, either by not giving proper acknowledgment of the source or by presenting in whole or in part any work that has been prepared by or copied from another person.

Students are encouraged to share intellectual views and discuss freely the principles and applications of course materials. However, graded work/exercises must be the product of independent effort unless otherwise instructed. Students are expected to adhere to the UA Code of Academic Integrity as described in the UA General Catalog. See: <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/academic-integrity/students/academic-integrity>.

The University Libraries have some excellent tips for avoiding plagiarism, available at <http://www.library.arizona.edu/help/tutorials/plagiarism/index.html>.

*Selling class notes and/or other course materials to other students or to a third party for resale is not permitted without the instructors express written consent.* Violations to this and other course rules are subject to the Code of Academic Integrity and may result in course sanctions. Additionally, students who use D2L or UA e-mail to sell or buy these copyrighted materials are subject to Code of Conduct Violations for misuse of student e-mail addresses. This conduct may also constitute copyright infringement.

## Class Conduct

This course will consist of a substantial amount of discussion and debate, and I look forward to class discussions that are energized and thought-provoking, but this is not an excuse for incivility in the classroom. Your fellow classmates will undoubtedly often hold different opinions than your own, and I expect you to handle this disagreement with civility and respect for differing viewpoints. To foster a positive learning environment, students and instructors have a shared responsibility to do so. We want a safe, welcoming, and inclusive

environment where all of us feel comfortable with each other and where we can challenge ourselves to succeed. Failure to show such respect will reflect in your final grade (specifically, points will be deducted from your participation grade).

It is also worth noting that laptops are acceptable in the classroom. However, they should be used strictly for note-taking.

**Threatening Behavior Policy:** The UA Threatening Behavior by Students Policy prohibits threats of physical harm to any member of the University community, including to oneself. See <http://policy.arizona.edu/education-and-student-affairs/threatening-behavior-students>.

## **UA Nondiscrimination and Anti-harassment Policy**

The University is committed to creating and maintaining an environment free of discrimination; see <http://policy.arizona.edu/human-resources/nondiscrimination-and-anti-harassment-policy>.

## **Incompletes and Late Papers**

Course incompletes will not be given except in extreme situations where all of the appropriate documentation is provided. Late assignments will be docked one letter grade if not handed in at the beginning of class on the due date (i.e., assignments handed in during the middle or at the end of class will already be docked one letter grade). Grades on the assignment will be lowered one additional letter grade for each additional day late.

## **Additional Resources for Students**

UA Academic policies and procedures are available at <http://catalog.arizona.edu/policies>. Student Assistance and Advocacy information is available at <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/student-assistance/students/student-assistance>.

## **Confidentiality of Student Records**

For more information on the confidentiality of student records at UA, please see: <http://www.registrar.arizona.edu/personal-information/family-educational-rights-and-privacy-act-1974-ferpa?topic=ferpa>.

## **Accessibility and Accommodations**

Our goal in this classroom is that learning experiences be as accessible as possible. If you anticipate or experience physical or academic barriers based on disability, please let me know immediately so that we can discuss options. You are also welcome to contact the Disability Resource Center (520-621-3268) to establish reasonable accommodations. For additional information on the Disability Resource Center and reasonable accommodations, please visit <http://drc.arizona.edu>.

If you have reasonable accommodations, please plan to meet with me by appointment or during office hours to discuss accommodations and how my course requirements and activities may impact your ability to fully participate.

Please be aware that the accessible table and chairs in this room should remain available for students who find that standard classroom seating is not usable.

## **Subject to Change Statement**

Information contained in the course syllabus, other than the grade and absence policy, may be subject to change with advance notice, as deemed appropriate by the instructor.

# Course Schedule and Readings

All readings should be done *prior* to the date for which the readings are assigned.

Date

Topics and Readings

---

## Major Concepts

---

Aug. 23

**What is Political Psychology?**

Handbook Ch.1

Druckman, J. N., Kuklinski, J. H., & Sigelman, L. (2009). The unmet potential of interdisciplinary research: Political psychological approaches to voting and public opinion. *Political Behavior*, 31(4), 485-510.

Krosnick, Jon A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? Distinguishing political psychology from psychological political science. In *Thinking About Political Psychology*, (pp. 187-216), ed. James H. Kuklinski. Cambridge University Press.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Jordan, C. H., & Zanna, M. P. (1999). How to read a journal article in social psychology. In R.F. Baumeister (Ed.). *The Self in Social Psychology: Essential Readings* (pp. 461-470). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

---

Aug. 30

**What are attitudes?**

Handbook Ch. 10

Hafner-Burton, E. M., Hughes, D. A., & Victor, D. G. (2013). The cognitive revolution and the political psychology of elite decision making. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2), 368-386.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (1994). Relationship between attitudes and evaluative space: A critical review, with emphasis on the separability of positive and negative substrates. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 401-423.

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (2007). The advantages of an inclusive definition of attitude. *Social Cognition*, 25, 582-602.

Fazio, R. H. (2007). Attitudes as object-evaluation associations of varying strength. *Social Cognition*, 25, 603-637.

Petty, R. E., Fazio, R. H., & Briñol, P. (2009). The new implicit measures: An overview. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.). *Attitudes: Insights from the new implicit measures* (pp. 3-9). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*



Cunningham, W. A., Preacher, K. J., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). Implicit attitude measures: Consistency, stability, and convergent validity. *Psychological Science*, 12(2), 163-170.

Hofmann, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H., & Schmitt, M. (2005). A meta-analysis on the correlation between the Implicit Association Test and explicit self-report measures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(10), 1369-1385.

Nosek, Brian A. (2007). Implicit - explicit relations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 2, 65-69.

---

Sep. 6

## **Affect and Emotion**

### Handbook Ch. 6

Marcus, George & Michael MacKuen. (1993). Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement during Presidential Campaigns. *American Journal of Political Science*, 87, 672-685.

Terrizzi, J. A., Shook, N. J., & Ventis, W. L. (2010). Disgust: A predictor of social conservatism and prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuals. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(6), 587-592.

Schnall, S., Haidt, J., Clore, G. L., & Jordan, A. H. (2008). Disgust as embodied moral judgment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(8), 1096-1109.

Shapiro, R. Y., & Mahajan, H. (1986). Gender Differences in Policy Preferences: A Summary of Trends from the 1960s to the 1980s. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 50(1), 42-61.

Brooks, D. J., & Valentino, B. A. (2011). A war of one's own: Understanding the gender gap in support for war. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(2), 270-286.

### *Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Balzer, A., & Jacobs, C. M. (2011). Gender and physiological effects in connecting disgust to political preferences. *Social Science Quarterly*, 92(5), 1297-1313.

Tybur, J. M., Merriman, L. A., Hooper, A. E. C., McDonald, M. M., & Navarrete, C. D. (2010). Extending the behavioral immune system to political psychology: Are political conservatism and disgust sensitivity really related?. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 8(4), 147470491000800406.

Smith, K. B., Oxley, D., Hibbing, M. V., Alford, J. R., & Hibbing, J. R. (2011). Disgust sensitivity and the neurophysiology of left-right political orientations. *PloS One*, 6(10), e25552.

Feldman, S., Huddy, L., Wronski, J., & Lown, P. (2016). Compassionate policy support: The interplay of empathy and ideology. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.

---

**Factors that Shape Political Attitudes**

---

Sep. 13

**Ideology: Foundations and Structure**

Handbook Ch. 19

Converse, Philip E. (1960). The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics. In David E. Apter (Ed.) *Ideology and Discontent* (pp. 206-261).

Jost, John T., Jack Glaser, Arie Kruglanski, & Frank Sulloway. Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339-375 .

Feldman, Stanley & Christopher Johnston. (2014). Understanding the Determinants of Political Ideology. *Political Psychology*, 35, 337-358.

Federico, Christopher M. (2016). The Structure, Foundations, and Expression of Ideology. In A. Berinsky (Ed.) *New Directions in Public Opinion* (pp. 81-103).

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Zaller, John, & Stanley Feldman. (1992). A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3): 579-617.

Lupton, R. N., Myers, W. M., & Thornton, J. R. (2015). Political Sophistication and the Dimensionality of Elite and Mass Attitudes, 1980-2004. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(2), 368-380.

Feldman, S., & Johnston, C. (2014). Understanding the determinants of political ideology: Implications of structural complexity. *Political Psychology*, 35(3), 337-358.

Sep. 20

**Biology and Politics**

Gonzalez, Frank J., Smith, Kevin B., & Hibbing, John R. (2016). 'No Longer Beyond our Scope': The Biological and Non-Conscious Underpinning of Public Opinion. In A. Berinsky (Ed.) *New Directions in Public Opinion* (pp. 186-204).

Petersen, M. B., & Aaroe, L. (2013). Politics in the mind's eye: Imagination as a link between social and political cognition. *American Political Science Review*, 107(2), 275-293.

Hibbing, J. R., Smith, K. B., & Alford, J. R. (2014). Differences in negativity bias underlie variations in political ideology. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 37(3), 297-307.

Charney. (2008). Genes and Ideologies. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6, 2. 299-319.

Smith, K., Alford, J. R., Hatemi, P. K., Eaves, L. J., Funk, C., & Hibbing, J. R. (2012). Biology, ideology, and epistemology: how do we know political attitudes are inherited and why should we care?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 17-33.

Jost, J. T., Nam, H. H., Amodio, D. M., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2014). Political neuroscience: The beginning of a beautiful friendship. *Political Psychology*, 35(S1), 3-42.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

McDermott, Rose. (2011). Hormones and Politics. In P. Hatemi & R. McDermott (Eds.) *Man is by Nature a Political Animal: Evolution, Biology, and Politics* (pp. 247-260).

Dodd, M. D., Balzer, A., Jacobs, C. M., Gruszczynski, M. W., Smith, K. B., & Hibbing, J. R. (2012). The political left rolls with the good and the political right confronts the bad: connecting physiology and cognition to preferences. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 367(1589), 640-649.

Mills, M., Gonzalez, F. J., Giuseffi, K., Sievert, B., Smith, K. B., Hibbing, J. R., & Dodd, M. D. (2016). Political conservatism predicts asymmetries in emotional scene memory. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 306, 84-90.

Oxley, D. R., Smith, K. B., Alford, J. R., Hibbing, M. V., Miller, J. L., Scalora, M., ... & Hibbing, J. R. (2008). Political attitudes vary with physiological traits. *Science*, 321(5896), 1667-1670.

Hibbing, J. R. (2013). Ten misconceptions concerning neurobiology and politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 11(2), 475-489.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Tassinary, L. G. (1990). Inferring psychological significance from physiological signals. *American Psychologist*, 45(1), 16.

Theodoridis, A. G., & Nelson, A. J. (2012). Of BOLD claims and excessive fears: A call for caution and patience regarding political neuroscience. *Political Psychology*, 33(1), 27-43.

Hetherington, Marc & Elizabeth Suhay. (2011). Authoritarianism, Threat, and Americans Support for the War on Terror. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55, 546-550.

Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2010). Personality, ideology, prejudice, and politics: A dual-process motivational model. *Journal of Personality*, 78(6), 1861-1894.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741.

Feldman, Stanley & Karen Stenner. (1997). Perceived Threat and Authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 18, 741-770.

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Feinstein, J. A., & Jarvis, W. B. G. (1996). Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: The life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 197.

Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., & Ha, S. E. (2010). Personality and political attitudes: Relationships across issue domains and political contexts. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 111-133.

Bakker, B. N., Rooduijn, M., & Schumacher, G. (2016). The psychological roots of populist voting: Evidence from the United States, the Netherlands and Germany. *European Journal of Political Research*, 55(2), 302-320.

---

Oct. 4

**Socialization/Environment**

Handbook Ch. 21

Jennings, M. K., & Niemi, R. G. (1968). The transmission of political values from parent to child. *American Political Science Review*, 62(1), 169-184.

Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., & Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across generations: Family transmission reexamined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3), 782-799.

Langton, K. P., & Jennings, M. K. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum in the United States. *American Political Science Review*, 62(3), 852-867.

Healy, A., & Malhotra, N. (2013). Childhood socialization and political attitudes: Evidence from a natural experiment. *The Journal of Politics*, 75(4), 1023-1037.

Erikson, R. S., & Stoker, L. (2011). Caught in the draft: The effects of Vietnam draft lottery status on political attitudes. *American Political Science Review*, 105(2), 221-237.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Broockman, D., & Kalla, J. (2016). Durably reducing transphobia: A field experiment on door-to-door canvassing. *Science*, 352(6282), 220-224.

Green, D. P., & Gerber, A. S. (2015). *Get out the vote: How to increase voter turnout*. Brookings Institution Press.

Giles, M. W., & Hertz, K. (1994). Racial threat and partisan identification. *American Political Science Review*, 88(2), 317-326.

---

Oct. 11

**Framing/Priming/Media**

Handbook Ch. 18

Iyengar & Kinder Ch. 1, 3, & 7 (on D2L)

Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 103-126.

Druckman, J. N. (2004). Political preference formation: Competition, deliberation, and the (ir) relevance of framing effects. *American Political Science Review*, 98(4), 671-686.

Slothuus, R. (2008). More Than Weighting Cognitive Importance: A DualProcess Model of Issue Framing Effects. *Political Psychology*, 29(1), 1-28.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Druckman, J. N., & Nelson, K. R. (2003). Framing and deliberation: How citizens' conversations limit elite influence. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(4), 729-745.

Druckman, J. N., & McDermott, R. (2008). Emotion and the framing of risky choice. *Political Behavior*, 30(3), 297-321.

Mutz, D. C., & Reeves, B. (2005). The new videomalaise: Effects of televised incivility on political trust. *American Political Science Review*, 99(1), 1-15.

Oct. 18

**Social Identity and Politics**

Handbook Ch. 23

Theiss-Morse Ch. 1, 3 &amp; 6 (on D2L)

Huddy, L., & Khatib, N. (2007). American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(1), 63-77.

Klar, S. (2013). The influence of competing identity primes on political preferences. *The Journal of Politics*, 75(4), 1108-1124.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Green, D. P., Palmquist, B., & Schickler, E. (2004). *Partisan hearts and minds: Political parties and the social identities of voters*. Yale University Press.

Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, 22(1), 127-156.

Fowler, J. H., & Kam, C. D. (2007). Beyond the self: Social identity, altruism, and political participation. *Journal of Politics*, 69(3), 813-827.

Klar, S. (2014). Identity and engagement among political independents in America. *Political Psychology*, 35(4), 577-591.

---

Oct. 25**Race/Gender/Prejudice**

Winter Ch. 1 &amp; 6 (on D2L)

Mendelberg Ch. 1, 4, &amp; 8 (on D2L)

Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40(3), 414.

Sniderman, P. M., Carmines, E. G., Layman, G. C., & Carter, M. (1996). Beyond race: Social justice as a race neutral ideal. *American Journal of Political Science*, 33-55.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 476.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Rocha, R. R., & Espino, R. (2009). Racial threat, residential segregation, and the policy attitudes of Anglos. *Political Research Quarterly*, 62(2), 415-426.

Giles, M. W., & Buckner, M. A. (1993). David Duke and black threat: An old hypothesis revisited. *The Journal of Politics*, 55(3), 702-713.

Voss, D. S. (1996). Beyond racial threat: Failure of an old hypothesis in the new South. *The Journal of Politics*, 58(4), 1156-1170.

Sniderman, P. M., & Tetlock, P. E. (1986). Symbolic racism: Problems of motive attribution in political analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42(2), 129-150.

Sears, D. O., & Henry, P. J. (2005). Over thirty years later: A contemporary look at symbolic racism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 95-150.

Feldman, S., & Huddy, L. (2005). Racial resentment and white opposition to race-conscious programs: Principles or prejudice?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(1), 168-183.

Winter, N. J. (2010). Masculine Republicans and feminine Democrats: Gender and Americans explicit and implicit images of the political parties. *Political Behavior*, 32(4), 587-618.

Beaulieu, E., Boydston, A. E., Brown, N. E., Dionne, K. Y., Gillespie, A., Klar, S., ... & Wolbrecht, C. (2017). Women Also Know Stuff: Meta-Level Mentoring to Battle Gender Bias in Political Science. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 50(3), 779-783.

---

Nov. 1

**Religion and Politics**

Wald, K. D., Owen, D. E., & Hill, S. S. (1988). Churches as political communities. *American Political Science Review*, 82(2), 531-548.

Layman, G. C. (1997). Religion and political behavior in the United States: The impact of beliefs, affiliations, and commitment from 1980 to 1994. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 288-316.

Layman, G. C., & Carmines, E. G. (1997). Cultural conflict in American politics: Religious traditionalism, postmaterialism, and US political behavior. *The Journal of Politics*, 59(3), 751-777.

Hoffmann, J. P., & Miller, A. S. (1997). Social and political attitudes among religious groups: Convergence and divergence over time. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 52-70.

Friesen, A., & Ksiazkiewicz, A. (2015). Do Political Attitudes and Religiosity Share a Genetic Path?. *Political Behavior*, 37(4), 791-818.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Friesen, J. P., Kay, A. C., Eibach, R. P., & Galinsky, A. D. (2014). Seeking structure in social organization: Compensatory control and the psychological advantages of hierarchy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106(4), 590.

Hennes, E. P., Nam, H. H., Stern, C., & Jost, J. T. (2012). Not all ideologies are created equal: Epistemic, existential, and relational needs predict system-justifying attitudes. *Social Cognition*, 30(6), 669-688.

Pennycook, G., Cheyne, J. A., Seli, P., Koehler, D. J., & Fugelsang, J. A. (2012). Analytic cognitive style predicts religious and paranormal belief. *Cognition*, 123(3), 335-346.

---

### Methodological Concepts

---

Nov. 8

### Correlational vs Experimental Research

Druckman, Green, Kuklinski, & Lupia Ch. 1 & 2 (on D2L)

Hillygus, D. Sunshine (2016). The Practice of Survey Research: Changes and Challenges. In A. Berinsky (Ed.) *New Directions in Public Opinion* (pp. 186-204).

McDermott, R. (2002). Experimental methods in political science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5(1), 31-61.

Gaines, B. J., Kuklinski, J. H., & Quirk, P. J. (2006). The logic of the survey experiment reexamined. *Political Analysis*, 15(1), 1-20.

Dunning, T. (2008). Improving causal inference: Strengths and limitations of natural experiments. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2), 282-293.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Nickerson, D. W. (2008). Is voting contagious? Evidence from two field experiments. *American Political Science Review*, 102(1), 49-57.



Nov. 15

**Public Opinion on Science/Polarization**

Handbook Ch. 22

Carpini, M. X. D., Cook, F. L., & Jacobs, L. R. (2004). Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: A review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 315-344.

McCright, A. M., & Dunlap, R. E. (2011). The politicization of climate change and polarization in the American public's views of global warming, 2001-2010. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52(2), 155-194.

Kahan, D. M., Peters, E., Wittlin, M., Slovic, P., Ouellette, L. L., Braman, D., & Mandel, G. (2012). The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks. *Nature Climate Change*, 2(10), 732-735.

Kahan, D. M., Jenkins-Smith, H., Tarantola, T., Silva, C. L., & Braman, D. (2015). Geoengineering and climate change polarization: testing a two-channel model of science communication. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 658(1), 192-222.

Lupia, A. (2013). Communicating science in politicized environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(Supplement 3), 14048-14054.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Schkade, D., Sunstein, C. R., & Kahneman, D. (2000). Deliberating about dollars: The severity shift. *Columbia Law Review*, 1139-1175.

---

Nov. 22**Using Psychology to Influence Public Policy/Nudging**

Sunstein Ch. 1, 3, &amp; 4 (on D2L)

Cook, F. L., Tyler, T. R., Goetz, E. G., Gordon, M. T., Protess, D., Leff, D. R., & Molotch, H. L. (1983). Media and agenda setting: Effects on the public, interest group leaders, policy makers, and policy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 47(1), 16-35.

Lai, C. K., Hoffman, K. M., & Nosek, B. A. (2013). Reducing implicit prejudice. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(5), 315-330.

Lai, C. K., Skinner, A. L., Cooley, E., Murrar, S., Brauer, M., Devos, T., ... & Simon, S. (2016). Reducing implicit racial preferences: II. Intervention effectiveness across time. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145(8), 1001.

Nov. 29

**Democratic Accountability**

Arceneaux, K. (2008). Can partisan cues diminish democratic accountability?. *Political Behavior*, 30(2), 139-160.

Miller, J. M., & Krosnick, J. A. (2004). Threat as a motivator of political activism: A field experiment. *Political Psychology*, 25(4), 507-523.

Valentino, N. A., Brader, T., Groenendyk, E. W., Gregorowicz, K., & Hutchings, V. L. (2011). Election nights alright for fighting: The role of emotions in political participation. *The Journal of Politics*, 73(1), 156-170.

Mondak, J. J., & McCurley, C. (1994). Cognitive efficiency and the congressional vote: The psychology of coattail voting. *Political Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 151-175.

Burstein, P. (2003). The impact of public opinion on public policy: A review and an agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 29-40.

Steenbergen, M. R., Edwards, E. E., & De Vries, C. E. (2007). Whos cueing whom? Mass-elite linkages and the future of European integration. *European Union Politics*, 8(1), 13-35.

*Optional/Recommended Reading:*

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Harvard University Press.

Hatemi, P. K., Medland, S. E., Morley, K. I., Heath, A. C., & Martin, N. G. (2007). The genetics of voting: An Australian twin study. *Behavior Genetics*, 37(3), 435.

Waismel-Manor, I., Ifergane, G., & Cohen, H. (2011). When endocrinology and democracy collide: Emotions, cortisol and voting at national elections. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, 21(11), 789-795.

Neiman, J., Giuseffi, K., Smith, K., French, J., Waismel-Manor, I., & Hibbing, J. (2015). Voting at home is associated with lower cortisol than voting at the polls. *PLoS One*, 10(9), e0135289.

---

**Conclusion**

---

Dec. 6

**Last Week of Classes - Presentations**

Presentations and Course Evaluations

Dec. 8

**Final Papers Due at 12 PM**

---